

((D))VISION DESIGN INITIATIVE

3534 SE Main Street, Portland Oregon, 97214
www.DivisionDesignInitiative.org
ilovedivision@gmail.com

DIVISION DESIGN COMMITTEE

An inter-neighborhood coalition collaborating to refine a shared vision for a growing Division

Division/Clinton Business Association

Sydney Mead, DCBA Chair

Hosford Abernethy Neighborhood District

Linda Nettekoven, HAND Board

David Aulwes, Landscape Architect

Mount Tabor Neighborhood Association

James Smith, Architect/MTNA Board

Richmond Neighborhood Association

Heather Flint Chatto, Planner, RNA Board

Cyd Manro, Chair, RNA Board

Denise Hare, RNA Board, Economics Professor

Charles Kingsley, Community Representative

South Tabor Neighborhood Association

Sandra Hay Magdalena, STNA Board Chair

Southeast Uplift

Bob Kellett, SEUL Staff

Sustainable Southeast

Liz Potter, Community Representative

May 17, 2016

RE: Division Design Initiative Comments on Proposed Mixed Use Zoning
Planning and Sustainability Commissioners,

On behalf of the inter-neighborhood Division Design Committee, an inter-neighborhood coalition representing seven neighborhood and business associations in Southeast Portland, the DDC Executive Committee is submitting the attached recommendations for the City of Portland as part of our testimony on the new Mixed-Use Zoning proposed by City staff.

This committee was initiated in 2013 response to significant community outcry about the lack of public involvement in the major redevelopment of the Division Corridor and concerns about incompatible neighborhood development. This coalition represents appointed and elected committee members from the Richmond Neighborhood Association, Hosford Abernethy Neighborhood District, Mount Tabor and South Tabor Neighborhood Associations, Division Clinton Business Association, Sustainable SE and SE Uplift.

Over the past two years, the Division Design Initiative has engaged more than 1,000 community members in developing a vision for the future of Division. We have been listening to the community through extensive outreach and engagement including:

- Facilitated 20+ public meetings, neighborhood design walking tours, community mapping events to identify key sites and special places, an open house, development workshop, and education forums.
- Conducted community preference surveys on vision and design priorities in partnership with Portland State University and Architecture for Humanity
- Developed policy research and design recommendations including: Top Ten Policy Recommendations for the City of Portland, RNA adopted Community Notification & Engagement Policy, and the Division Street design guidelines

During this two-year Division Design Initiative project, community leaders have actively worked to help shift the dialogue away from complexities that polarize communities when discussing issues of density to the fundamental importance of DESIGN, ideally focusing less on where we may be divided towards what we can agree upon as shared goals. Further, we have developed specific recommendations, after much rigor and research. These are attached as proposed design guidelines for the Division Plan District (See attachment 1 & 2).

Summary of Recommendations

To engender community support for increased density and infill, we need to better systems in place to ensure compatibility. This includes: context-specific design guidelines and design review, enhanced permit submittal requirements and other mechanisms noted in these recommendations including a residential FAR measurement now, and retention of key vintage area character locations to maintain the Portland identity we have become so famous for and which we are in jeopardy of losing. Finally, we also need a more specific "Area Plan" to better refine the zoning proposed for the Richmond and surrounding neighborhoods that have been the focus of so much growth and change.

Specific Recommendations

1. **Division Plan District: Incorporate the new Division Design Guidelines**

The Community, in partnership with the Division Design Initiative, and a coalition of Division neighborhood and business associations is nearing a final draft (see attached) that will go for adoption by the relevant neighborhood and business associations in the next 8-10 weeks. We would like to codify these where possible. We request:

- a) The Division Design Guidelines be integrated into the “Division Plan District” in the new Mixed Use Zoning and
- b) The Division Plan District should be extended to match the boundaries of the Division Main Street Plan (and also the Division Design Guidelines scope) which extend from 11-60th.

Many of the design preferences in these guidelines are also supported by the Division Perception Survey. (see attached 295 Design Preferences Responses). Based on this evidence, including support from the Richmond Neighborhood Association, and the extensive two-year public process, as well as supporting policy research and design recommendations developed based on broad community input, we would like to strongly urge the Planning & Sustainability Commission to include the Division Design Guidelines in the proposed Division Plan District.

2. **Enhance Compatibility & Reduce overly Boxy Building Forms - Restore the Residential FAR Requirement for Mixed Use Buildings now, not in 2018.**

A floor area ratio (FAR) for the residential in mixed use buildings is not counted as an intentional incentives to the development market placed into code in the 1990’s to further encourage mixed use buildings. However, the market is now providing this in force and the unintended consequences of this waiver is now becoming a growing concern.

Community members have expressed significant concerns that recent buildings on Division and elsewhere in the City present an overly box-like appearance, with large blank walls, and significant shading, light overspill and privacy impacts on adjacent properties. This exclusion for measurement of residential floor area is contributing to many of the negatively perceived characteristics that has been the concern of community members both at many neighborhood meetings and in the Division Perception Survey results here: <https://divisiondesigninitiative.files.wordpress.com/2015/11/2-opinion-of-new-construction-on-division.pdf>.

Our consultant from Urbsworks, has identified this as a top issue to address now (see Attachment 4). We encourage the City to take action on this critical issue now to avoid creating more overly boxy, flat, and incompatible building design. This has also been identified as a top priority in the Division Design Initiative’s Top Ten Policy recommendations, and has been supported by many neighborhood and business associations including RNA, DCBA, HBBA, MTNA, HAND and others.

Please take immediate action to restore a measure of residential FAR now instead of creating another two years of unnecessarily overly bulky, boxy building forms if we wait until the Comp Plan approval timeline of 2018.

3. **Support for Preservation of “Vintage” Low-Rise Commercial Areas**

We support this proposal by the City to limit development to a 3-story (35’) scale in commercial storefront areas with continuity of 400’ of pre-1920’s buildings. These areas are often the established main street cores of Portland’s mixed-use corridors. This would address the community concerns about preserving community character and some of our older, special places and buildings. The Richmond neighborhood has already voted for a three-story scale on Division so this is consistent with adopted board votes and community priorities further noted as a strong preference for buildings of 1-3 stories in the Division Perceptions survey. (See Attachment 3)

The Richmond Neighborhood Plan (1994) has stated goals to:

“Accommodate anticipated population growth through ‘main street’ development (mixed residential/commercial uses along major transit streets) or other construction methods that retain or enhance existing neighborhood character.” (Policy 4: Housing, Objective 4.4)

This policy is consistent with neighborhood priorities to accommodate new infill, however, it also highlights the community priority for retaining and enhancing existing neighborhood character.

4. Support for Design Review & More Quadrant Design Commissions

The new development on Division, while adding valuable housing capacity and needed revitalization, has also been a significant departure from existing neighborhood character. This stark contrast in scale, quality, building massing, style and character, and other resulting impacts has been the source of great community concern expressed through newspaper articles, extensive public testimony, neighborhood surveys and other media.

None of the buildings on Division have had any Design Review by the City’s Design Commission and many Richmond residents are concerned that we need more design review to ensure new developments support better compatibility within the existing fabric in established “pattern areas” of Portland communities. Design review will help but we also need more than one Design Commission to help facilitate a more efficient and timely review process. We need Quadrant or area design commissions that know the character and buildings in a community and can better respond to the context and compatibility considerations where new development is proposed. Further, we also need better design review criteria to assess compatibility in new development. To this end the Richmond Board has adopted their own Community Notification and Engagement Policy which highlights submittal materials that are needed for evaluation of compatibility (see Attachment 5) including a context elevation showing proposed new development adjacent to existing buildings, solar shading analysis, privacy and view impact analysis. These criteria should be included in design review and formal “Compatibility Criteria” should be added to evaluate new development.

5. Request a Southeast Area Plan

This has been done for almost all other areas of the City, however Southeast is one area that the City has neglected to do this for and it is long overdue. We support this as it may present an opportunity to refine zoning, parking, business district and other issues.

Thank you for your important work and your thoughtful consideration of these recommendations.

Respectfully,

Heather Flint Chatto, Urban Planner & Designer, LEED AP
Acting Chair, Division Design Committee & DDI Founding Member, RNA Board Member 2012-2016
2121 SE 32nd Avenue, Portland OR 97214

CC: Division Design Initiative, Executive Committee
Susan Anderson, BPS
Joe Zender, BPS
Eric Engstrom, BPS
Barry Manning, BPS
Bill Cunningham, BPS
Marty Stockton, BPS

Attachments as Supporting Documentation:

- (1) Specific recommendations for the Mixed Use Zoning overall and the Division Plan District
- (2) Proposed Draft Division Design Guidelines
- (3) Survey results from the Division Perceptions Survey on Design Preferences.
- (4) Recommendations from Urbsworks, Division design & policy consultant for the design guidelines
- (5) Richmond Neighborhood Notification & Engagement Policy

Portland Proposed New Mixed Use Zoning Requirements

TOP RECOMMENDATIONS

Applicable to Entire Mixed Use Zoning Requirements

Building Form/Envelope

- a. **Stepback at 4th floor of Street Façade:** Specifically on narrow/60' E-W main street corridors (DDI has a solar analysis to support this rec). Areas with a Neighborhood Center designation may also warrant this.
- b. **Building Façade Divisions:** Refine the building articulation requirements to be smaller building increments (ideally 50' segments) at street facing façade within some areas to better match the older small lot pattern areas of our streetcar era lots and buildings.
- c. **Side Step backs on upper levels:** to encourage more windows that maintain air/light, support passive cooling/resiliency, and reduce/minimize creation of large blank walls. This would also reduce concentration of so many windows to the rear residential which have many resulting impacts as noted below.

Landscape & Parking Approaches to Minimize Development Impacts

- a. **Add Screening Requirements:** Add screening requirements to prevent light overspill, privacy intrusion, noise, etc (e.g. balcony screens) where adjacent to residential zoning or existing uses.
- b. **Increase Building & Site Landscape Requirements:**
 - 1. Require bigger trees for bigger buildings at street to minimize appearance of building bulk and scale
 - 2. Requirements for increased landscape at rear as a buffer (impacts privacy, noise, light spillover)
 - 3. Increased building facade landscaping – e.g. trellises, kangaroo pouches on wall of building façade similar to Vancouver BC, living walls (impacts look and feel of corridor). City of Seattle uses “Green Factor” criteria to set menu of options for landscape criteria (see summary in Innovative Design & Development Codes, p 32-33)
- a. **Parking Impact Management Plans:** Transportation Demand Management plans (e.g. annual bus passes, shared use parking, onsite car share vehicles) for a lower threshold of units in no parking buildings, and additional loading requirements. City is currently proposing TDM Plans for buildings with ~20 units or more. However, 10 units would be a more appropriate threshold for TDM Plan requirements

Incentives & Bonuses

- a. **Reuse of Existing Buildings** - Incentives for adaptive reuse of older buildings (Including those that may or may not be designated as historic). The focus is on older buildings with special character (e.g. Hawthorne-Belmont-Division in the 30s, & 11-12th and 20th/21st areas, Clinton corners at 21st and 26th, Fremont, Mississippi, Alberta, Albina, Foster/Powell sections). Transfer of Development Rights/credits are good but we need further tools like waivers of System Development Charges (SDCs).
- b. **Beneficial Uses** - Provide Incentives for beneficial uses such as affordable housing, senior housing, day care and alternative-transit oriented businesses. Waiver System Development Charges (SDCs).
- c. **Innovative Energy Performance** - Bonuses & Incentives for Zero Energy Buildings

- d. **Remove Residential FAR Exemption in Current Code for Mixed Use Buildings** – Expedite adoption of a residential FAR requirement for mixed use buildings. Dedicated residential and commercial use buildings have an FAR requirement but mixed use building do not have this for residential. The Mixed Use Zones proposal includes this but won't take effect until 2017, however we need this NOW.

New Division Plan District

Add Division Plan District Additional Design Standards: Through more than 18 public meetings, an inter-neighborhood design committee, community surveys and extensive community outreach, we have defined many of our neighborhood design patterns, design priorities, compatibility criteria, and notification requirements. We would like to codify these where possible by adding to the Division Plan District. What might be appropriate for incorporating any of these from the proposed Division design guidelines (if ready and approved by NA's in time) into standards within the current MUZ proposal?

Building Form, Landscaping & Screening - Include all requirements for MUZ proposed above, especially

- Stepbacks at 4th floor
- Side stepbacks to minimize blank walls, add more windows for air and light and minimize concentration of windows on the rear of buildings facing residential uses
- Increased Landscape & Screening Requirements, etc.

Add Permit Submittal Requirements to Evaluate Context Sensitivity/Compatibility:

- Require submittal of elevations in context of existing adjacent building and block development to ensure new development does not create a significant neighborhood and street compatibility conflict by creating visual discontinuity in size, scale, style
- Statement of Compatibility with existing neighborhood goals and design guidelines
- Solar Shading Analysis
- Visual Impact Analysis – similar to Marty Eichenger project at 26th & Division

Relate Building Form to Existing Established Division Main Street Patterns (typically found on Division, Hawthorne & Belmont):

- 45 Degree Angle Cut Building Corners – maintains visibility for vehicles & pedestrians and when cut out solely at first floor can create areas to
- Raised Sills
- Clerestory Windows
- Visible Building Increments of 25'-50'
- Recessed entries
- Maintain Regular rhythm of entries every 15'-20'
- Include permanent awnings & overhangs for windows and entries
- Window variation and patterns that relate to adjacent buildings
- Articulated rooflines

Include Strongly Encouraged Design Features that help articulate building massing

- Oriel windows
- Balconies at the street that protrude from the façade beyond the roof and building edges to break up building massing
- Stepdowns to adjacent lower scale development



This design guidelines draft* is proposed for adoption by the inter-neighborhood Division Design Committee (DDC) at their monthly public meeting on May 26, 2016

Once adopted by the DDC, subsequent meetings will be scheduled with the DCBA, RNA, HAND, MTNA & STNA for review and adoption over the next 8-10 weeks.

* The final Division Design Guidelines will include graphics, illustrations and appendices.

PROPOSED DRAFT DIVISION DESIGN GUIDELINES

May 17, 2016

Division Design Guidelines Proposed Draft 5.17.16

Scale & Massing

- Minimum of 18' first floor height
- 3 stories preferred, if 4th story, then should stepback top story a minimum of ___ x sf to maintain feeling of 3 stories.
- Step up/down to taller building heights
- Stepped heights: Not more than 2 stories scale transition preferred, but if not accommodated then alternatives should include x, y, and z (e.g. landscaping, art, windows, balconies)
- Avoid boxy building forms – by breaking up massing (balconies, stepbacks, articulated rooflines, stepping up and down roofs and building heights, etc.

Stepbacks

- Upper level side stepbacks – Above the first story, use side stepbacks 10' from property line, maintain street wall
- Light wells – not less than 12 feet wide parallel to the exterior wall and not less than 5 ft deep (Illustrate with graphic)

Compatibility & Contextual Design Transitions

- New development should demonstrate compatibility with the adjacent architecture by incorporating a minimum of 3 of the following 7 features similar to the neighboring architecture:
 - Scale
 - roof forms
 - window proportion or patterns
 - materials
 - Style
 - Ornamentation elements
 - Color

- Historic Preservation** - Use the Historic Review Procedures Hierarchy of compatibility to first match the building, then the adjacent development, then the character of the surrounding context/street

- Relate to neighborhood patterns: *Relate Building Form to Existing Context & Established Division Main Street Area Patterns (DDI Guidelines). The following are typical area-specific neighborhood patterns found on Division, Hawthorne & Belmont):*

- 45 Degree Angle Cut Building Corners – maintains visibility for vehicles & pedestrians and when cut out solely at first floor can create areas to
- Raised Sills (bulkheads) & Storefront Windows
- Clerestory Windows
- Visible Building Increments of 25'-50'
- Maintain Regular rhythm of recessed entries every 20'
- Include permanent awnings & overhangs for windows and entries
- Window variation and patterns that relate to adjacent buildings
- Articulated rooflines

- Where transitions should be considered and mitigating design measures used for new development**

- a) On Arterials that abut Division
- b) On Division Street between buildings
- c) On new buildings facades abutting residential uses

New buildings should Avoid/Minimize:

- Light overspill
- Overconcentration of windows
- Privacy impacts (ensure balconies located with care)
- Excessive shading (define excessive) of adjacent properties. This is especially key for southern exposures, relationships next to food producing gardens, roofs with solar panels or structures that rely on passive or active heating/energy generation

Encouraged at Transitions:

- Provide screening from balconies to maintain privacy of adjacent neighbors
- Create or maintain larger landscape buffers to mitigate residential privacy impacts

Storefront – Encouraged Elements

- Relate to neighborhood patterns
- Transoms, clerestory windows
- Covered entries, and rain protections for the pedestrian along the sidewalk
- Building-integrated awnings, canopies and overhangs
- Operable windows (ex. American Local, Ken's in NW, rollup garage doors)
- Arcades
- Building integrated seating (Roman Candle)
- Entry Doors with transparent windows
- Incorporate art – tiles, bike parts,

Sustainable Design

- High Performance building design for energy and water (e.g. zero energy buildings, LEED, Passivehaus)

Site Design

- Maintain “Solar Equity” for adjacent uses to the extent feasible
- Encourage “Missing Middle” housing types (courtyards, plexes, townhouses, ADU's) that both add significant density and also respond to neighborhood building massing and form.
- Include a plan for adequate loading & service access
- Pedestrian-oriented design is encouraged including walkways, paseos and passthroughs.

Architectural Style

Encouraged Styles that are traditionally represented in the Neighborhood [show examples of each style]:

- Main Street Storefront Commercial
- Art Deco
- Streamline Modern
- Arts & Crafts
- Spanish Mission

Exemplary SE building architectural examples [organize by corridor]:

- Ford Building
- Eugenio's (35th & Division?)
- Double Barrel (20th & Division)
- American Local (30th & Division)
- Roman Candle & Ava Gene's
- Oregon Theater
- Move the House Project (38th & Division)
- Sunshine Tavern Building
- BMW Building on Hawthorne
- Shanghai (28th & Division)
- Others....(more missing middle examples)

Materials

- Corrugated panel allowed
- Natural and durable materials
- Brick, wood, metal and steel is encouraged
- Graffiti barrier coating of street level building materials is encouraged (e.g. sacrificial and permanent coatings
- “Real” Stucco – should include a plan for maintenance

Landscape

- Preserve landscaping of significant size (X Caliper or height?)
- Maintain existing larger (define) plant materials
- Landscape screening abutting lessor zoned site
- Encourage native species

Signage

- Figurative signs
- Classic Portland shaped signs
- Pedestrian oriented
- No internally lit box signs
- Billboards are not allowed
- Neon signage (see Goleta Design Guidelines)

Lighting

- Dark sky lighting to protect from overlighting (see Tuscon code)
- Minimize light trespass
- Shielded - or at a minimum captured on façade (Ford Building example)

Residential Unit Orientation & Configuration

- Encourage unit sizes and configurations that support flexibility in furnishing arrangements
- Encourage unit orientation that is sensitive to relationship with other neighbors within and outside the building
- Option to convert to live/work if on the first floor

Commercial/Retail Space Configuration

- Design for future expansion (moveable walls)
- Big enough for a diversity of uses and business types (especially for neighborhood services as well as retail)
- Option to convert to live/work if market conditions are less supportive of retail
- Encourage reuse of existing residential buildings for commercial uses

Public Space

- The neighborhood encourages all developments to provide shared indoor or outdoor space that will benefit the neighborhood (Examples: D-Street Village interior paseo, St. Honore courtyard)
- If including a public/private actively use space, ensure the following:
 - Plan for a noise mitigation approach (including landscape buffers, water features to provide white noise) and discourage outdoor uses after 10 pm (already in code)
 - Ensure availability for receptacles for trash and recycling
- Building encourages public interaction
- Space for sidewalk cafes
- Activation of alleyways for dining, seating, public access-ways, art
- Building integrated seating
- Plazas

Discouraged/Not Allowed

- No blank walls above the second story
- Metal screens on the street facing facade
 - Vertical plane metal screens should not cover more than 25% of street facing façade (show an example here of what is not working and another of how it could be done better)
- Should not obscure windows
- Storefront windows should not be obscured more than 25 % (e.g Zoom Care, frosted or fritted glass, little big burger on Division)
- Façade – Composite panel siding not more than 25%
- Plastic siding

Streetscape

GOAL: Unify the corridor through consistent design approaches. Encourage streetscape themes that connect and reflect the surrounding community through art, water, education, environment, history and culture.

- Decorative benches
- Trash & recycling receptacles
- Artful bike racks
- Kiosks
- Wayfinding that helps visitors navigate, reinforce neighborhood identity and sense of place (signage, sidewalk paving, roundabouts/traffic circles, art)
- Decorative, pedestrian-oriented lighting
- Interactive art (e.g. sculptures on Division)
- Planters, hanging baskets and other landscaping that softens the pedestrian environment
- Street trees that contribute to color, texture, habitat and, protective canopy
- Innovative stormwater management features that balance pedestrian flow with green infrastructure function

((D))Vision Design Initiative

“YOUR VOICE MATTERS” SURVEY PROJECT

Responses from the Division Perception Survey

Emphasis added (bold) to highlight frequency of issues of scale, building form, and site design preferences expressed from the community which, in addition to significant public outreach and engagement, have informed the DDI/DDC proposed design guidelines and mixed use recommendations)

About the Survey

The Division Perceptions survey was developed by a Portland state university student in the Spring of 2014 for a community involvement class. It was distributed extensively through Southeast neighborhood and business associations via emails and newsletters, including RNA, DCBA, SEUL, MTNA & STNA. The survey was also promoted through takeaway cards at individual art box installations at local businesses in partnership with Architecture for Humanity along the Division corridor at key locations including New Seasons, Unfold Yoga studio, North Bar, Bollywood Theater, Village Merchants, the Richmond health clinic, et al.

Since the survey was never intended to be a statistical sample, it can only represent those in the survey pool. That said, the survey does represent a diverse array of southeast and Division area residents, business owners, occupations, ages and opinions.

It provides some key insights into community feelings about the recent redevelopment of Division, opinions and concerns, special places and buildings, desires and vision for the future that are strongly felt with some significant trends that are worthy of note and consideration in the Mixed Use Zoning proposed by the City.

Entire Survey Data Available Online at: <https://divisiondesigninitiative.org/division-perceptions-survey/>

PREFERENCES FOR FUTURE DEVELOPMENT ON DIVISION

Q| Design: What are your design preferences for future mixed-use development (Residential and Commercial uses in the same building) on Division? For example, size, scale, style, building form, facade, street frontage, etc.? (295 Respondents)

- **Roof step downs to minimize bldg bulk & maintain solar access, breakup bldg massing**, durable & natural materials (e.g. brick & wood), balconies, more green design elements, green walls, PVs, green roofs, more variation of windows, **no blank walls, dividing up bldgs into smaller visible increments** to match existing 25' traditional rhythm of bldgs, **more step downs next to smaller scale bldgs. Incorp. of exist. building arch. styles on Division or nearby main streets** - incl. art deco, and main street facade elements. If a modern style, aim for a northwest design (shed roofs, wood and glass).
- no answer
- **2-4 stories, super-ped-friendly. Niches for public open space, for sure, and big sidewalks.**
- **Much smaller scale**, with parking. Mixed use. **No more square boxes.** High quality finishes. Self-sustaining architecture. Platinum LEED certified. Condos or townhomes.
- Get the damn cars off the street!
- **No more than 2 stories, preferably 1. Facade that is more natural - wood, metal. Less ugly painted siding.**
- **No building higher than two stories!** No building allowed within 100 feet of the property line of an existing single family residence. On-site parking required for permits for all new multi-occupancy dwellings.
- parking for residents
- Any new buildings need adequate parking. Buy spaces and build a parking structure to serve the neighborhood. Cost of building should be covered by all the housing/commercial units which have already moved into the

neighborhood and are causing the traffic nightmares. The traffic is bound to get worse as neighborhood density increases. Ensure commercial area is affordable to include shops such as Mirador and neighborhood doesn't change to reflect only Starbucks can move into new buildings.

- **"Stepped back above the second story!**
- **Prefer brick** and/or modern design."
- **Human and friendly.** Ditch the gray brick and the beige paint. Don't make it God-awful ugly like the Salt and Straw building. Modern design can be fun and appealing. **No taller than three stories.** Green plants as a feature. House tear downs not allowed to be replaced by out-sized houses that leave almost no yard in any direction. Some "square footage" is outside, and it has value too!
- "This is all too late to consider.
- The massive building is done
- maybe we can plant a tree or 2"
- Residential and commercial in the same building are my preference, and **not too huge, and fitting in with the era in which the neighborhood was built.**
- no answer
- Street level retail - **classic / traditional style; setback from street to allow for wide sidewalks**
- **3/4 story, stepping down to the neighborhood homes opposite the Division side of the lot. I like density but some outdoor space for residents and others taking breaks from walking the street is desired as well at street level.**
- **"Variety in size, color, something to break up the monolithic appearance of the new buildings. Shops flush with sidewalk and 2nd - 4th floor apartments set back at least 6 feet."**
- **Smaller and more in keeping with the age of the neighborhood. More welcoming from the street.**
- no answer
- fewer apartments and more parking. Families will not live in the tenements that are being constructed since there is no parking
- Include Parking.
- no answer
- **"The building on the corner of 30th and Division that houses American local - 2 story. Best blends into the neighborhood.**
- Parking required for all multi housing over a couple of units.
- NO MORE BIO SWALES or anything that takes parking off of Division."
- "Why do you assume we have to have mixed use? Lots of consumer oriented retail, and bars, bars, bars. **Two story stepped back designs.** None of that UDG crapola. Also, The Remmers are horrid developers.
- They make everything look like an ugly Portlandia-Beaverton hybrid."
- **Build and design in keeping with the blue-collar immigrant nature of the neighborhood, and in the greenest way, with lots of windows, solar access, patios that greet the neighbors not create a closed face. Again the white structure with the chain mail is a shining example of what should never again be built.**
- **"The new buildings need to be set back from the footpath. There really should be open spaces on each building site.**
- To reduce the impact of buildings, I believe green landscaping is important and softens the harshness of these shoe-box shaped buildings."
- love mixed use buildings. Would like to see more retail below, residential above. Feel it creates a safe vibrant streets. I think our **4 story limit is fine, work needs to be done about step backs.**
- glass and **not so tall right off sidewalk. more gradual raise from pedestrian stand-point.**
- **"No 4 story apartments looming over people's living space**
- 2 resident town homes
- **Take a look at the building on the north corner of Division and 30th restaurant below 1 apt above that is reasonable in size and aesthetics. If you are going to build, build with class not some 2 bit structure that is made on the cheap and will look like hell inside and out in 10 yrs"**
- **Love the use and re-use of buildings,** for example, at 34th & Division, where Roman Candle Bakery and Ava Gene's are located. A couple of the new apartment buildings are of a scale that works well and are integrated nicely (building where Salt & Straw is located). The apartment buildings at 37th and next to Sen Yai are simply dreadful.

- "I'd prefer buildings more in keeping with a local Portland neighborhood in style, rather than the ultra urban look of the current buildings in progress.
- **More space between buildings and the street, with some space between buildings. Limited to 2 or possibly three stories."**
- **small scale, consistent with the former aesthetic**, more local run businesses that are affordable.
- The four story, gigantic buildings are ugly atrocities, particularly the building at 37th and Division. In contrast, **the mixed-use developments at 38th and Division (Little Big Burger) and 32nd and Division (Sunshine Tavern) are lower profile and more in keeping with the neighborhood.**
- "I think I covered this in the above questions.
- **Smaller, smaller, smaller!"**
- **Courtyards, no more than 3 stories**, classic 'Brownstone' styling similar to many in the Pearl District, a focus on 1 or 2 bedroom units, Lots of storefronts, some side or back parking. We have enough bars, hopefully more family friendly restaurants.
- It would have been nice if the buildings had some architectural trappings reflecting the arts & crafts nature of the surrounding neighborhoods.
- **No more than 3 stories, not more than half a block wide, and a little back from the street to allow for either greenery and/or places to eat or to sit. No more flat-front facades, lack of artistic details, windowless sides of big buildings**, and boring color!
- "the dream that 82 units & no parking will be OK because the typical resident will be ""service industry, bike & public transit users"" is not a realistic plan for a city and a community. its more like a nightmare for the residents already in place.
- i totally understand that parking spaces cost money...but when the city takes sides and allows giant projects with no parking - they're taking a side that essentially sends a message
- ""sorry for your loss...but congestion is coming - suck it up""thanks city of portland."
- **We need performance spaces, and something to encourage diversity.**
- no answer
- Oh, for goodness sakes.....some imagination!!!! **No more big boxes!!!!!!**
- These "mixed use" buildings are ALL the same, wherever they are built. **They need to be less tall in height, with copious use of red brick or true-wood siding, vertical windows that at least look double-hung. Quality, traditional doors. Some kind of roof form. A bit of a setback.**
- **"Same size, maybe even taller if they step back the massing.**
- **Use forms and icons from the existing character for inspiration.**
- Somewhat traditional, but also contemporary.
- **Use brick!"**
- "One design rule would help. $S=(F-1)*10$. Set back from the sidewalk is equal to the floor # minus 1 times 8. first floor (retail) has no set back, 2nd fl. has 8' set back, 3rd. fl, 16""set back. Balconies and decks would not be counted. as needing set back, providing a 8"" deck for all units. This would **eliminate the sun blocking, wind tunnel effect of the present units.** Reasonable parking space requirements, say 8 spaces for every 10 residences"
- no answer
- **I'm personally a fan of the mix of modern and classic we're seeing already. I guess what is more important to me is a pedestrian scale - store fronts and restaurants that open up onto the side walk. I'd love to see some street seats pop up here and there too.**
- It would be nice to have less of the "greedy buildings" that have been mentioned in the Oregonian and Portland monthly. **It would be great if these new buildings incorporate green building principles, innovated architecture, parking, and other amenities that make them integrate into long standing neighborhoods in a better manner.**
- "1) 4-story max
2) **avoid blank vertical facades**
3) **alternate setbacks, courtyards, and plazas with sidewalk arcades**
4) provide parking for residents and customers.
5) revise city guidelines for all new structures of 10 or more dwelling units. Require 1) off-street car parking spaces for at least half of dwelling units; 2) car-share parking spaces and secure bicycle parking."

- **Modern, efficient, preferably no taller than 2 stories, require some type of runoff management** ("green roof", trees, swales, etc)
- no answer
- no answer
- I would encourage highly mixed use medium rise buildings to the specs of the current zoning. Style should be determined by current trends rather than forcing a false sense of nostalgia. **Perhaps a requirement that the building have architectural distinction.** But leave the definition vague.
- "That building near 34th - the white one with the grate on the front looks like a prison and pisses me off every time I see it. Why would anyone want to live there? So, no more of those.
- My ["immediate family member"] is relocating to SE Portland from ["major W. coast city"] and would have been delighted to buy one of the new condos BUT ["they (singular)"] would require a secure parking spot which is impossible. So, ["they (singular)"] will be buying someplace else."
- ground floor retail
- Mixed use could be positive. Parking and transportation need to be addressed. **Size and scale need to be balanced with regards to impacts to existing residences.** Street capacity and infrastructure resources are limited. Developments that impact that need to be capped within reasonable limits and/or bear the financial burden of mitigating the impacts. It is unfair and counter productive to put the additional tax burden on existing residents to pay for improvements that do not benefit them.
- Answered in previous question
- no answer
- **More green space and plantings. Mixed facade vs. flat surfaces.** Deep sidewalks. Benches. Cross walks.
- If you're going to do mixed use, **make more public plazas, preserve a space in your retail complex for small start ups and pop-up shops, create areas for food trucks and small vendors.**
- no answer
- "apartments need parking
- lower levels for stores/commercial"
- **I would like more of the new buildings to look old since the new apartments all look so contemporary.**
- no answer
- Wider sidewalks, underground parking, outdoor tables and public spaces for sitting, 3-4 [story] buildings in sections where ugly strip mall buildings stand.
- Residential and small biz retail. **No bigger than 3 stories and use of materials and design that fit into the neighborhood** - i.e. NO rusting metal, ultra modern angles, and tons of concrete!
- **It needs to be affordable**, so that it doesn't all have to be luxury rentals or condos. **But it would be nice to have more interesting facades facing Division, like on some of the older buildings. New buildings on Division should be 4 to 6 floors**
- Onsite parking provided, at least spaces for 75% of the adults intended to live in the structure. No more than one three story structure per block. Limitations on two-story structures per block. Setbacks from the sidewalk to provide space for dirt and plants.
- no answer
- **Small. Very, very small.**
- no answer
- **I want to see buildings that will age well.** I know modern is very popular right now, but this look becomes dated in a decade or two and buildings need to be around a lot longer than that. The majority of the houses in the area are craftsmen style bungalows from the early 1910 -1930s. **It'd be great if more of the new construction echoed building styles from that era -- and scaled appropriately.**
- I would like to see less height in the buildings as it leads to feeling cramped and closed in.
- "add parking
- require parking
- demand parking"
- **Shorter buildings, inviting outdoor seating areas.**
- **3 to 4 (up to 5?) story storefront buildings with awnings and balconies**
- **"Something that actually fits in the neighborhood** with some outdoor space features. Affordable housing to keep a diversity of residents.

- -Something that actually looks like an architect designed it instead of looking like a suburban developers budget cash cow."
- **smaller is better**
- "see above
- **Buildings should ""fit"" in with the neighborhood, not overwhelm it. While square-block boxes may be the most profitable and, apparently, cheapest to build. Ugly solid, (sometimes windowless!) walls leaving only enough room for a sidewalk don't seem to leave any breathing room for the street. Division is only one lane in each direction; it's not a Hawthorne. I thought we stopped building unappealing lifeless boxes in the 70s because they were just that."**
- **Smaller buildings no more than 2-3 stories.** Residential and commercial mix is Okay. Grocery stores and restaurants on the ground floor is fine. When we travel to Europe we find businesses we can easily walk to - we don't ever rent a car.
- no preference
- Ground floor commercial and 2nd / 3rd floor residential with on site parking. Access from Main Street (like the main street / green street plan dictates)
- **Smaller scale similar to the three-plex near 26th.** Brick or stucco facades. Limit the height for new buildings. Require natural materials be a primary component of facade designs. Limit color choices for facades. If we are a Greenstreet, then keep the palette natural. **Consider a more generous setback** for mixed use so that the sidewalks are easier and safer to navigate
- **Hi quality materials, some setbacks for plants, benches, extra sidewalk room, etc.** Something classy not flat and barren. **break up the flat space, use good materials on windows.** See Old Lauro Kitchen building, property on south side of Division at 37 or 38 - which has some space for gathering and breaks up space. big grey building west of Sen Yai is hideous as is the one south of Whiskey Soda lounge, **Those buildings need bigger spaces to look good. In a tight space, they are unattractive. Work with the space we have.**
- no answer
- **Need to avoid too many tall building and lose green space and lose neighborhood feel.**
- current is pretty good. make structures greater than 25 units have some off-street parking or pay a parking fee/tax to be used for mass transit, biking , etc.
- **Several story buildings with retail space on the ground floor. Preferably low-car complexes that add density and diversity to the area.**
- High density mixed use.
- **Two stories max with some variation on distance from street** and self-contained parking underneath
- I like the mixed use and think it's more sustainable.
- mixed use is fine, but STOP with all the new development already. Let things settle down. and **Please, stop razing old, charming buildings for big, ugly boxes. We are losing the aesthetic charm all along Division and across the city as developers knock down old for the new.**
- Three story mixed use is good, but could there be at least temporary limits on the number of units per block--until we see what the problems are? At present it is a grand experiment. I think the apartment buildings should have some common outdoor space-- like the one under construction at 48th and Division. **I'd like to see design review that would at least question features like the metal grate front that covers windows.** Ugh.
- pedestrian scale, commercial uses on the street level
- **low rise mixed use. retail/dining on ground floor, two or three stories of units above, preferably condos. They could be modern like those at 26th or more traditional.**
- craftsman homes, native plants and trees mixed use architecture
- **"size should be the important factor IF we make developer break up the facade (both in terms of projections into/away from the street and height both up and down from the street. if we can't hold developers to those guidelines, than we shouldn't allow an entire block to be developed at a single time.**
- it could be argued that the existing buildings built in the last few year meet the desired density, height and infrastructure for the next 10 years. if we halted all massive construction and let the next ten years be about smaller developers/homeowners building what they can the size/density/parking/other issue might work themselves out. but...if we keep allowing the same developers to buyup all houses on a given block and build a bohemoth building that takes up the whole block- than in 10 years we will have a street without businesses

because people will no longer wish to walk along it. the apartments will then turn to slums and we will have taken what is one of portlands best/most walkable neighborhoods and made it one of the worst.

- **I don't think that most neighbors grasp that this isn't a density problem and it isn't a parking problem. It's a QUALITY problem."**
- Parking!
- **I understand and support more density in inner SE. How about we space out these giant apartments? Attempt to blend in with a traditional neighborhood instead of making cheap "design" modernistic crap. A little less concrete, some of those look like they were made by the Corps of Engineers.**
- **"no more than three stories**
- **more reuse of existing buildings** like the old wild oats store"
- **How about a little set back? The street feels overpowered by the tall buildings on such a small street.** Or reduce the height of these buildings. There is money to be made so make some underground parking for goodness sakes. Does everything have to have the modern look? Can we keep cars off the bike route? Lots more cars, speeding and not stopping at stop signs because the traffic is backed up.
- **Not so tall. More congruent with those nearby.** Include parking. **Set back from the street so it's not like a canyon.**
- no answer
- **Nothing above three stories, as it creates a shady dark zone both on Division itself and on the residential properties to the north of Division. Pedestrian friendly, design.** Some off-street parking!
- "Parking beneath main level
- **3 stories and below in height**
- **Architecture in line with Old Portland Home design**
- Mixed use"
- **the current buildings going up are kind of ugly,** not sure what exactly it is
- **size: no more than 20 units, architecture that is interesting but not too flamboyant, nothing that overwhelms neighboring buildings, set back and space for public to gather, trees and natural features. sustainability is important to me, so passive energy design features and sustainable design is key.**
- **"no more than three stories.**
- **fits well (design) in the neighborhood.**
- adds to the center concept.
- reduces auto use and improve transit/pedestrian use.
- **landscaping is important.**
- If appropriate commercial should be on ground floor.
- **should fit a master plan for the area.**
- **include design review or other design control mechanisms."**
- **I'd like to see a good mix of modern and classic- the variety is what keeps portland unique.** Its also great that we have a great mix of dives to high-end establishments throughout division.
- no answer
- **I would love to see some sort of design standards to improve the quality of construction,** but I think it's very difficult to judge architecture by any "standards". I definitely think the City needs to require more than token parking when higher density structures are added. I'm not sure whose quality of life the planning department thought they were improving with this zoning.
- Hunh? This question is written in city planning jargon. I don't understand what the options are. What I know is, I prefer buildings that aren't ugly and that come with their own parking spaces. If new residences go up, **how about some duplexes or fourplexes.**
- **"it's nice when a building matches the 'flavor' of the street it's on.** but Division is first of all a commercial strip and second, the area is changing so rapidly there really is no one style. **shorter is better than taller for light and open feeling, wider sidewalks are preferable** (I prefer more sidewalk and less landscaping, if that's a choice that has to be made, otherwise a mix is best).
- Color would be nice. Don't scarifice convenience for style, don't make it more difficult to gain access to businesses or homes. What I'd really like to see is a jitney that runs up and down the strip with parking at either end, a free service that runs constantly all day long - wouldn't that be cool?"

- No fake brick or fake stone, buildings should be honest and not try to match historical buildings in a shoddy fashion. Instead they should reflect context in other ways, such as addressing human scale, choosing warm materials that aren't fake, and utilizing landscapes and plants to break up a building's bulk and invite diffuse light and color
- Mixed use development would be great. **4 to 6 stories along division that step down towards the neighborhoods. nothing over 8 stories.** if parking is required, put it out of sight - in garages or below ground. don't restrict styles, it makes things feel too homogeneous.
- **"Size: no bigger than today's buildings**
- Style: form follows function
- street interface to be gradual, from human scale to towering scale, w/shaded courtyards easing the transition.
- Not easy problems to solve."
- "Mixed use bldngs are fine but I worry we might build too much commercial before we are ready for it. Would like the following:
 - **Mix of bldng heights**
 - **Thoughtful solar access**
 - More creative step downs to house nearby
 - No blank walls
 - Clearly delineated, welcoming street entrances
 - room for vegetation as part of the architecture
 - Spots to pause as in benches in front of Roman Candle
 - Spaces for art
 - Views of trees and sky
 - Rooftop gardens
 - Common areas in bldngs so people can get to know each other
 - Some simple elegant architecture that lets your eyes rest -- right now too many of the bldngs seem to be competing for attention with no sense of pattern or rhythm
 - Continue emphasis on sustainability but not at the cost of better design"
- **"My ideal building is the one at the corner of 30th and SE Division on the northwest corner, where Caffè Pallino used to be. It is a low building with a few units and commercial space below. My second tier, and probably more sustainable, is the Sunshine Tavern building which has substantially more units and space for multiple businesses.**
- I am less happy with the **buildings that have gone up recently which are taller and often flat facing, with virtually no street character. They are cold and detract from the neighborhood vibe. They seem to be more about cramming in more units than helping shape the streetscape."**
- no answer
- **Buildings should look like they fit in the neighborhood not like they belong in the Pearl.**
- I would prefer buildings of 3-6 stories that feature setbacks after the street-front story, allowing light and space in. I love the residential over commercial type building. No preference on facade or style, but would like to see more variety.
- **"Ideally, 1-2 stories, with 3-story max.** Wood exteriors, earth tones, the building across street from Night Light is great example. **Sunshine Tavern building good for use of wood exterior. More consistency in roof lines and design between old and new buildings.**
- But, this question is beyond the vocabulary and understanding of mos people. I could point out much better what I mean tha put it into words. I don't have the architect/design speak to know what things/designs are called."
- Size of the current construction projects is about as big as I'd want to see in this neighborhood. Anything bigger would seem completely out of place.
- It would be nice to have some buildings that were constructed with some design intention beyond "cheap, easy and fast."
- I don't think mixed use commercial will work. Not very successful urban planning idea.
- **More green space flanking Division --- no buildings right up on the edge of the sidewalk; courtyards are great, but don't forget the green!**
- mix it up some...variety would be niceoffer courtyard space or something to soften the impact on the street...all of the these taller buildings built right up to the set back make it a little claustrophobic.

- Division Street should be lined with mixed use, dense, multi-story buildings with at least 4 stories each.
- 4 to 5 stories. Ground level commercial space.
- I am a believer in mixed use. Buildings should be close to the street, to create a sense of place. Style of new buildings should be modern, and NEVER try to imitate older styles. That is always a recipe for architectural mediocrity.
- **Two story. Three at most with commercial at street level** with adequate parking for residents and those interested in the commercial property.
- I would say that all development must include parking.
- no answer
- **Two story maximum** to protect residential areas surrounding it.
- **Two to three story, enough with the buffed boxes, back up a little from the street.**
- no answer
- **Smaller**, with parking, better materials. Concrete, brick, wood. No gypsum exterior panels.
- Conformity to style and character of existing neighborhood.
- **Smaller scale than the buildings like Richmond Flats, greater setbacks**, Craftsman or that era, lower height (at most one floor higher than the 2 story houses 1910s Craftsman houses - not the current "2 story houses with above ground "basements"), landscaping including trees and green ground cover, underground parking for residents. No to the supposed green building that look like they are put together with leftover scraps from other projects; no to 50s, 60s or 70s era styling - especially large scale. Houses in the area are having lots sold off and houses far too big for the neighborhood or the site put in. The new houses look larger than the largest existing houses and crammed into a partial lot, many with their "basement" at ground level - they are essentially 4 story houses in a neighborhood of 2 and 1-1/2 story houses.. Many of the mid-century houses were meant to have spacious yards and the ones which have sold the yards off might as well be torn down as usually huge houses are crammed in next door and it is extremely aesthetically displeasing.
- Find another fucking street already.
- no answer
- leave it alone
- no answer
- Parking, parking, parking. Did I mention parking? If more buildings go in, I'd like to see attractive, creative buildings like the one on 26th and Division. The recent buildings are ugly. The D Street village looks cheap and unreflective of the character of the neighborhood. No more than 3 stories (obviously). Retail space that is not just the same thing you'll see in any high-scale area of Portland. And parking.
- no answer
- **Small in size** with parking
- Arts & crafts, **no more than 3 story**
- "More buildings that reach to 4 stories would be welcome. inevitably some gaps would remain with lower buildings, but that's okay. I'd like to see overhangs, or more details at the tops of the buildings, instead of the flat top line you often see. More articulation in the face is desirable. Not just big notches, but articulation on a smaller scale (6 inches, one foot, etc), that adds a finer grain to the front of the building. The street frontage should be built up to the sidewalk, to create a pedestrian-oriented corridor.
- Parking lots should be eliminated. Any parking that is provided should be accessed from side streets, and narrow driveways.
- Style could be modern or traditional, as long as there is articulation of the facades, ground floor retail windows that are not blocked by planters or tables."
- 10-50 units no parking, 1-4 stories.
- Mixed use with shops, restaurants, service-based businesses. A variety of structures, not just raze the old, build new. More entertainment type businesses.
- I don't know much about building design, but I like when things are unique, and kept small, with lots of interesting details (like on craftsman style homes) and plants. I like dark wood accents, other natural elements like stone, and large windows. **Landscaping is very important. I like when things match the style of their surroundings but still have some unique character. I definitely appreciate when extra thought is clearly put into design and buildings aren't just slapped up as cheaply as possible. It's very noticeable when the new buildings are boring, generic, and cheap, and it makes the area around them seem sad. I definitely do**

not like when they just look like a big four story box. The new D-Street complex is interesting. I don't personally like the bright orange color they used but I appreciate that they at least did something unique. I like the vintage style.

- No high-rises. Residential at a variety of prices. Places for food carts (which are one of the things that make Portland so special). **Keep things funky--that's what we like.** Please, PLEASE no non-local chains. If we want chain restaurants/stores/etc., we can go to the suburbs. **Keep inner Portland interesting.**
- No more ultra-modern buildings. **The mixed-use buildings should respect the age of the neighborhood, i.e. brick facades, bay windows (no vinyl), cornices, no more than 3 stories.**
- **Maximum two-three story, traditional materials** (horizontal wood lap siding; double-hung windows, pitched roofs or flat, depending on what's nearby; traditional commercial entries (recessed, clipped corner, etc.) there is NOTHING creative about "mixed use" buildings - it is the city's choice for new development in every Portland neighborhood.
- no answer
- **3 stories or less to keep sun exposure.** Preserve sidewalks. Incorporate low income housing as well.
- None
- I prefer more windows at the ground level, and high quality, durable materials at the ground level. I strongly prefer that there not be one mandated style of building or building features, but rather a variety of building styles and sizes. **It's nice to see an occasional setback to provide a patio or other outdoor feature to provide a relief from the building mass.** I prefer to see more than one building per block with distinctive designs - but NOT one building designed to appear as multiple buildings - it never looks right! **3-5 stories seems appropriate for the street. As I mentioned above, setbacks for some of the upper stories would allow more light onto the street, and could be used for roof patios, which can help activate the street and provide more distinctive character.**
- No new multi story above 50th, and keep scale in that area primarily single-family. **Like the small homes between 43rd and 44th with gardens and interesting variations in design. Don't like most of the new multistory buildings which lack character.** Would like more setbacks from the street and plantings.
- no answer
- Perhaps a few indented courtyards (such as the one between Salt and Straw and St. Honore
- I think that a varied mix is of styles, and to a lesser degree scale. I do however, think that there should be some sort of uniqueness to any new projects. I think that any building beyond single family housing should have street level commercial along as much frontage as possible.
- **"I don't mind somewhat modern buildings but these huge glass and concrete things they been building are ugly and will look dated within 5 years.**
- **I'd like buildings no taller than 3 stories, medium sized, maybe with some vintage touches to match the surrounding locales"**
- **No taller than 2 stories, take style of neighboring buildings into account, and include parking -- it's just realistic.**
- I'm afraid it's a done deal...the **preposterous mix of facades along the stretch of new development (fly swatter metal grate building, bright orange faux tudorish, brick front, modern cube, industrial metal and glass) mixed in with the old buildings means that pretty much anything goes...and absolutely nothing goes together.** Perhaps that is the aesthetic defined?
- **Make them look like the buildings that are already there.**
- The current aesthetic resembles that of Ikea.
- "preferences are everything built previous to the past 6 months of rampant development.
- **preference is stop destroying what stands, just improve. why do you suppose the popular inner city neighborhood properties are the vintage 'old charm' PDX???"**
- no answer
- **Like the 3-4 floor building model for a main business street.**
- **Limit to 3 stories;** provide parking for both residents and customers (Zupan's on Belmont does this); the most local style, though hard to adapt to a multi-story building is bungalow style/Arts and Crafts. **It would be nice to see designs reflecting that style rather than glass boxes.**
- **make sure you keep accessible sidewalk & ramps please. So people on bikes and wheelchairs and who use walkers and other mobility devices can actually make their way through the neighborhood.**

- **Max of 50 units on four floors. Energy saving/generating features. Contemporary design.**
- no answer
- **Keeping the scale smaller would be more feasible for the area.**
- no answer
- The buildings should have parking for at least 75% of the residents. Currently the buildings that are going up look too similar, variety in design would help keep the unique character of Division Street. So get away from blocks of color on boxes.
- **Think about how new construction can fit in with the classic construction of the neighborhood. One or two level, brightly painted and individualized store fronts with large windows. Less metallic and glass structures. Room for seating on street.**
- Small to medium sized mixed use with parking. Interesting shapes and facades to add diversity to the mix. **D street have character and balance of scale. Not looming oversized apartment structures bearing down on you.**
- **"There should be a lot of well designed public space, with water features, with native plantings, a poetry post, that sort of thing.**
- Division has become a garish homage to the Portland restaurant, a farm-to-fork Disneyland. It's not a very interesting place and it's not worth the effort to navigate the traffic to get there. And once you get there, there's no place to park.
- Except for the media superstars like the overrated Ava Genes, I wonder how all those restaurants will survive?
- There should be more business diversity amongst all those restaurants."
- no answer
- Residential and commercial need to provide integrated parking. **Stay at 2 stories for buildings. Natural colors -- not the bright orange that's on one of the new apartments. Lower density with more of a mixture of old and new. Facades that fit with the older buildings. More trees and green space/plantings.**
- **"Limit high rise structures.**
- **Limit strip mall type/generic appearance.**
- Limit super modern designs that look like they belong downtown or the Pearl District and not in an eclectic neighborhood community.
- Provide parking lots to cut down on off street parking congestion."
- no answer
- I like the retail on the street with the residents above. Don't really have any concern as long as everything sustains itself. That is wouldn't want vacant apartments or stores. But if they fill up, not going to worry about size. I have ZERO concern about parking, and would be opposed to any parking requirements. The whole point is to get denser.
- **2-3 stories.** Pedestrian-friendly (no cement facades without windows or artwork or nature/water elements). More thought as to design and beauty.
- **taller, more colors, less plain concrete, more store fronts**
- **Limit building height;** provide off-street parking for residents and guests, try to preserve some of the "old Portland" or "Craftsman" style in architecture some of the time.
- Residential and Commercial uses in the same building with below grade parking makes sense. The current range of 4-6 stories makes sense since the surrounding residential areas are still very intact and their scale is smaller. **Taller buildings along Division are the way to go.** Single-family homes still on Division will eventually be moved, deconstructed or converted to commercial uses.
- no answer
- None. GO TO SE FOSTER!
- Division is already too built up with large mixed used buildings. **The street is tiny-the scale is wrong and dangerous to walk around. Socioeconomic and ethnic diversity should be more emphasized. A library branch and/or community center would be excellent. More public spaces for hanging out, which the food cart pod offered.**
- Affordable housing. single family homes, affordable apartments, no expensive condos.
- **It would be nice if you could tell which block you were on rather than everything on the major 'hood streets (ex, Alberta, Mississippi, Division, etc) looking so similar. Where's the character in that? They're**

all starting to blend together. So, design that was influenced by the existing community, utilizing it's unique flavor.

- "Newer development is aesthetically a detriment when the height is incongruent to the existing structure it may be placed beside on Southeast Division Street. **A district with buildings of like height - so as to not dwarf the older existing commercially zoned structures - upon the street would be preferable.** It would be nice to have more bicycle infrastructure as well, at the current time it is very difficult to locate adequate bicycle parking in certain blocks, due to the sidewalk tables and the construction."
- **Store fronts with lofts are fine, but anything over two, maybe three stories stands out. The cubist futuristic buildings are obnoxious.**
- **small, facade should blend in with period of building surrounding it**
- I like the idea of mixed-use but **no more than 3 stories tall. I would like those building types to be up to the sidewalk.**
- **no answer**
- **Prefer mixed use, modern or faux-vintage exteriors, up to 8 stories.** Up to one half block in size.
- I prefer mixed use buildings that front on Division. **They should all include ground-floor retail. On-site parking should be minimal. Max height of in the range of 6-10 stories. Style can be anything. Prefer mixed-income developments.**
- The sizes are probably about right. I would like to see more suitable landscaping, a bit more greenspace, a much less concrete/steel/aluminum. I want buildings to be pleasant from the street both individually and as part of the streetscape.
- You are going to need huge parking structures!
- They should be urban, in nature and design, engaging the street, with parking incorporated into the designs (but not as open parking lots visible from the main street). Some of the terrible 60's through 90's apartment buildings, as well as some of the light industrial buildings of those eras are suburban in design and do not belong on a main street of an urban neighborhood.
- **Be respectful of what you build - you are part of a larger canvas, stop trying to make a personal statement - try to fit in.**
- **no answer**
- I think the current size and scale has been great. Encouraging public spaces, or breaks mid building would be even better. So instead of a whole block face there's a break, maybe a small indent where the main entrance is. They don't all have to have benches or fountains.
- **"Most important--no more than two or maybe three stories.**
- **Deeper set back with more interface spaces.**
- **Adapt to surrounding structures.**
- Don't build to property line.
- Stop pushing density."
- **no answer**
- **Again--look at D Street Village. I love almost every aspect of that concept.**
- residential and commercial is fine together, but fix the parking. Continue with the current types of new buildings in style.
- Any building form, any facade.... Street frontage ON Division. **Let's not make strip mall SoCal... 3 stories max.**
- Size: no bigger than what is present, both in height, depth and width. Frontages should not be all glass. No garish or all white color schemes.
- To leave Division alone. If it is to be touched **keep the style and building form in line with the neighborhood.** Provide parking for ANY apartment building that goes up-- COMPLETE Parking for every tenant. Make rent, building, and restaurants affordable so that Portland does not turn into NY.
- **no answer**
- **no answer**
- **A great example of terrible design is the "Division St. Penitentiary" next to the Whiskey Soda Lounge. A big white cube, covered with prison bars.** This is a great example of someone trying to make a building at the lowest cost possible. **I prefer building designs that break up the skyline, have a modern edge, but look like**

well made structures of permanence. I fear that half the new apartment buildings on Division St. now will not age well, and look shabby within five years.

- living walls, wood siding left the color of the real wood. Windows. The interior look of the wild oats building is nice. The orange color is a little annoying.
- Currently, there are rental houses from 34th and 36th and Division that fit the scale of Caruthers. I have a concern that the area between 34th and 36th and Division will be redeveloped into an MDU. When the houses get razed, I don't look forward to a view of the back of a three story building.
- **Smaller! Trying to max out a lot by putting X amount of condos in each building is too much. A population increase like this in one area is overwhelming.** I'm all for new businesses, though businesses had been doing just fine renting the structures that had already been standing. So knocking things down for the sake of building something bigger. If it ain't broke, don't fix it!
- **Smaller scale, less generic/modern, not too tall**
- **"Anything over 4 stories seems out of scale with the current neighborhood but it needn't be a hard and fast rule.**
- I believe the aesthetics should be dictated by people qualified to make such judgments (ie, city planners) who have the city's interests in mind (and not developers who are turning a quick buck) but I mistrust the design decision of the people who live in proximity and have the time to complain about it. These neighbors may have different objectives than I and although they may be organized, may not represent the neighborhood's view. Not everybody wants Division to stay the way that it was. I am excited about this new commercial strip, as I think many busy young people are.
- **I like the concrete commercial main floor with two floors of wood framing or masonry above. It gives a good feel to the street while what you see from farther away is more contextually matched to the residential. I think there should be lots of windows facing the street, but not lots of windows facing what used to be private back yards."**
- Any new buildings should provide parking
- Hmm. I think **keeping things at 3 stories will help keep the open feeling of the street.** I don't really have a modern/traditional design preference. The better made the new construction, the better. Also development that includes green space, energy efficiency, etc. are a plus.
- Style is one. The style of some buildings that are going up look ghetto and will not age well and assimilate into the neighborhood design. **Buildings should be thoughtful and also blend in well with the neighborhood or should be architecturally significant in their own right where they become a destination or add civic pride. Size should be big to maximize land and they should have street frontage and some business opportunities on the ground floor or a public space (or green space) that is inviting to the neighborhood.**
- How about some crosswalks between 50th and 42nd.
- I think it would be okay to have single use residential buildings as long as the ground floor has interest or elevated patio or stoop setback (for their privacy). I think it is impossible to always fill the ground floor with commercial or residential. Why not have quieter uses like offices, too? **We need some quieter segments on Division to make it a livable place. It can't be all glitzy and commercial the entire length of it.**
- I don't mind modernist design or retro knockoffs. **My main issue is that the building envelopes are mostly just giant cubes built out right to the lot line as much as possible. I would much rather see taller buildings with more varied setbacks, terraces, mews, or other design ideas to keep Division from becoming just a condo canyon. Also, I'm fine with building housing with no parking.** I'd be fine with it on my own block as well. Just put a parking district in place and direct the proceeds to local improvements. No one, not even long time residents, is owed a free space on the street to store a car.
- no answer
- **rehabilitating existing buildings and keeping them under 4 stories, but have a modern twist that reflects the northwest architectural style - perhaps reflecting the work of John Yeon or John Storrs or earlier architects such as Belluschi or Doyle. Nothing too pretentious.**
- "Any property zoned commercial should be required to have commercial on the ground level.
- Appropriate parking is needed especially with larger housing complexes.
- Have a small easement along the street to widen the sidewalk for use for dining or other appropriate use.
- More trees.
- **New buildings no more than 3 stories unless appropriate."**

- No more commercial unless replacing another one. Residential only or **very small I scale only, fitting in with previous non-gentrified look, practical basic services business only.**
- no answer
- retail+2, on-site parking (or under-site), architectural interest (no more eyesores like on 48th or across from Do It Best). redevelopments like the Victory Bar building are great. re-use!
- I would like to see tile designs envisioned by the local community adorning the outside facade of new development. This would help the community to feel invested in the place that they live and that they can help to further illustrate the identity of the Division corridor.
- **Less boxy, more artistic, more flora, colors, let the sunlight in to the street**
- Balconies, form to the structures, open areas in restaurants where the windows can at least open, lots of wood.
- Mixed use with parking.
- I would like them to have **step-downs. Not feel so visually massive.** It would also be nice if they were farther back from the sidewalk & had more greenery.
- no answer
- Mixed-use is fine, but need to incorporate parking. No more McCondos that all look the same! So gross.
- **2-3 story max, human scale, set back from sidewalk, buildings match older styles**
- **While I like some of the unique architecture of the newer construction, I would like to see preservation of older buildings. I would like to see new construction that has a more intimate, historic style.**
- **Low-rise (2-3 story), mixed-use OK, with some residences access at street level. Trees. Trees. Native landscaping at the street. Brick and historical materials, with a retro/modern feel. Pay homage to the old Portland style homes, and the light industrial feel of some of the old buildings. Green/eco materials and structure.**
- It would be nice if **trees and/or landscaping and/or art could be planned into the street scape.** Bicycle parking is sorely needed, as is a structure that has parking (even parking that is charged for). I get the feeling that the residential neighbors are losing all peace and/or parking.
- I've written on this already: **new development should respect the architecture of the surrounding neighborhood, incorporate sightlines that create safe and desirable public spaces** (witness the courtyard setback in the development that includes Salt and Straw, and the outdoor space maintained in the corner of D Street Village), allow for greater density but acknowledge the need for parking, are attractive for families at a variety of economic levels, and are sited to allow for walkable distances to businesses and schools.
- **Use more wood or metal in facades.** More underground parking.
- Just keep it mixed.
- **Smaller, lower, setbacks from residential properties, in keeping with early 20th century design of the neighborhood**
- The new buildings are all really blah. The ones torn down weren't very architecturally relevant, but seems like new ones could be! **The facades are very boring and the colors often glaringly bright and atrocious. And where are the green spaces? I have seen people from the new buildings lying on my lawn to get some green time!**
- **two story residential and commercial mixed use, energy efficient, with parking for visitors and residents.**
- no answer
- no answer
- Not sure
- Ground Floor Retail; Parking; **Live work; balconies/common meeting areas outside; less boxy in appearance**
- no answer
- I think it's a good idea to **hold the height down to four stories. The style can be anything as long as quality materials are used. Some of the new apartment buildings on Hawthorne look much better than any on Division.**
- I am partial to development meets the scale of the street. The antithesis of my likes would be a large, block-long, 4-story building with a straight facade. Providing variation in scale, form, and material prevent the space from feeling closed in.
- **"- No tall high rises.**
 - No more buildings without their own parking spaces.
 - No more low income, hippies and transients are plentiful in our neighborhood.

- **Keep fairly strict on maintaining 'Portland style' vintage character.** Enough modern in the mix for now..."
- **"up to four stories, maybe five with step-backs.**
- Covered outdoor spaces and sidewalks.
- More depth/texture to facades.
- Parking structures"
- Underground parking. **Colorful, creative facades and details that speak to the existing character of Division Street. 2-3 story buildings with the 3rd story set back, with beautiful balconies (not metal cages).**
- **Higher quality materials and design, more classic and less cheap modern style that will be outdated in 5 years.** The D Street Village sign is TACKY
- **No buildings taller than 2 stories. At least 12 foot setbacks.** Craft-style.
- **"No more than 3 stories high**
- **More landscaping and green spaces"**
- **"No more than 3 stories**
- **Upper story has set-back**
- Not too close to street
- **Consideration of neighboring houses** (don't destroy view from windows, etc)
- **Substantial landscaping (green space)"**
- **Some sort of design review...**Why do we have a building that looks like a jail?
- **Higher quality exterior materials. Some detailing and relief in the shell to give visual interest.** Parking required in the building or on the site - not necessarily to serve every visitor, but to relieve the movement into the residential neighborhood.
- **Stylistic integration with the existing structures would be nice, but more important is design so that new additions do not create impositions upon the already present residents.** So...in my estimation, there should be NO new residential development until the problem of providing adequate nearby recreational park space for ALL elements of the populace. Commercial development should be limited with the directive that such development will not indispose nearby residents with excess activity and parking.
- mixed use reduces crime and increases foot traffic. **most importantly is the feeling of "human scale" as a person walks on the sidewalk. greenery is important**
- keep it looking like old Portland and STOP cramming so much HIGH density on all the streets. WE DON'T NEED TO START LOOKING LIKE NEW YORK CITY. The filming of Portlandia and Grimm will go away and people will stop moving here. Then we'll be stuck with a bunch of ugly empty apartments. ENOUGH!
- You are making it impossible.
- no answer
- Mixed use buildings. **Varied scale in size and style of building. Incorporate public spaces along the street where people can gather.**
- Mixed use tree lined street. Whenever possible, use existing buildings rather than building new.
- **"2 story buildings** with warm colors, not cold metal and white.
- If residences and be in the back, rather than just upstairs, that would be nice.
- **Preferable to building new is the conversion of old houses or adding on to existing buildings to re-invent them."**
- any designs that foster neighborhood interaction and community gardens, public parks, or other green spaces.
- no answer
- **Definitely one to two story, maximum.** The taller building may have its place in industrial areas or downtown, but not a residential neighborhood. The cheap wood/barracks style have got to go. As an example, of what appears to be newer construction, the Roman Candle bakery and Townsends tea building is a more appealing facade. Lots of welcoming windows, stucco siding, smaller neighborhood friendly scale.
- "Again, I'd prefer good, aesthetic contemporary design.
- Check out Edgemar in Santa Monica, CA. Very artistic and humanistic."
- **Buildings designed like existing neighborhood, could give old house look, or brick and ivy fronts. Not too tall or creates canyon. A place between sidewalk and buildings for people to sit or hang out.**
- I would **prefer to see buildings that retain some green space rather than using every square inch of a lot. I would also like to see buildings that have more details that coincide with the architecture of the**

neighborhood. The condos for the most part look to me like windowless boxes and I don't understand why they are all beige. It would be nice to see some colors.

- "I would prefer no more.
- If you had of asked me 3 yrs ago I would say commercial on bottom floor and a total of **3-4 stories** with some parking."
- More courtyards along the way add interest and if more could provide cover from light rains it would be good for business and interaction. I'd like to see wider sidewalks all the way along.
- **"Reduce typical size** and ALWAYS include off-street parking as a requirement.
- Require all housing developers who receive subsidies to build 'transit-oriented' housing to actually assure that they meet that. Failing, they should be liable for returning the subsidies."
- **small and let's take a break for a while.**
- All of it!
- A huge fire would improve the corridor.
- Parking for shoppers.
- **Smaller mixed use is good..**6 to 10 units max with retail on first floor. Avoid monstrosities like those being built on Hawthorne e.g. like the new one next to 'Porque No' mexican food restaurant. My god! How did they get away with building that POS...similar to the monster between 44th and 45th.
- answered before
- **4-6 story, multi use buildings.** Mixed income residential in same buildings Minimum parking spots. Old Portland style. Not too much box residential or commercial design. Must have inviting fronts and gentle backs for residents behind any structures
- **Styles reminiscent of 1920s architecture. Probably no more than 4 stories.** Things that look inviting from the street.
- Mixed use would be nice but no new buildings - make use of what's already there.
- I would prefer some larger residential and commercial mixed use spaces. We need to provide housing and job opportunities and not push people out to the burbs.
- **More compact buildings,** affordable housing, parking for tenants, common spaces, garden areas for tenants, kid friendly businesses.
- No large stores. Keep them small, locally owned, and affordable for the business owners.

Date 15_0827 Updated 30 September 2015 | **Project** Division Design Initiative Policy Framework
To Linda, Heather | **From** Marcy McInelly | **Copy** Joseph Readdy, Joy Alise Davis

DIVISION DESIGN INITIATIVE POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

PROPOSED TOP TEN LIST

(Marcy's)

1. Close the residential Floor Area Ratio (FAR) loophole
2. Fix Floor Area Ratio (FAR) to building height mismatch to get better urban form
3. Measure stories instead of height for more predictable building design
4. Adopt form based code regulations to achieve context sensitive design
5. Spread out land use intensity and share the burdens and benefits of density between main streets and neighborhoods
6. Improve notification and enable constructive community engagement about growth
7. Return SDC money to affected neighborhoods
8. Permit density transfer mechanism to encourage older better buildings to stay
9. Incorporate solar policy into zoning code amendments
10. Require tracking of and accountability for environmental impacts

Richmond Neighborhood Association

3-Step Notification & Community Engagement Process

The following 3-step notification policy was approved by the Richmond Neighborhood Association (RNA) Board on March 14, 2016 in response to extensive neighborhood input about a desire for more notification and ability to have more meaningful and timely input about the future growth of the Richmond Neighborhood. For questions about meetings and notification contact the Richmond Neighborhood Association.

1 Notification for Proposed Projects

- a) **Projects $\geq 5,000$ SF or ≥ 5 units proposed within the Richmond neighborhood should provide notice to the following potentially affected nearby stakeholders:** Business Association, Neighborhood Association, local historical society [if impacting any permanent structure built prior to 1940*], and adjacent neighboring properties and residents (including rental apartments) within a 500 foot radius.

*This date is defined as a threshold established because of the traditional quality building stock that exists in the Richmond neighborhood from this time period and earlier including Victorian, art deco, craftsman, early 20th century commercial main street mercantile architecture etc.

2 Neighborhood Association Visit(s)

When to Come to the Neighborhood Association: A minimum of one visit to the neighborhood association is encouraged (and is required if on Division Street per City policy) to present an overview of the project to area residents, businesses, and property owners. However two visits to the project’s neighborhood association (NA) are encouraged as follows:

1. Suggested Courtesy Visit to the NA at the “Conceptual Design” stage: Visit to the NA to gather general feedback and give early notice. Timeframe: ideally within 90-180-days prior to submittal.
2. Pre-Permit Visit: Building applicants should make a presentation visit the Neighborhood Association not less than 60 days prior to building permit submittal.

What Project Materials to bring to NA meeting:

1. Site Plan & Proposed Building footprint/plan - Minimum of 25 - 8x11 copies denoted with scale, north arrow, existing trees (and size of DBH –depth at breast height), and showing adjacent surrounding development.
2. Building Façade Elevation Drawings showing proposed building in context with existing adjacent building and block development.
3. Solar Shading Analysis – illustration of solar shading impacts to adjacent development
4. Privacy & View Impact Analysis Drawing – showing how the placement of windows and balconies may or may not impact adjacent neighboring properties privacy and may impact any important public views.

3 Follow up: Applicant Comment & Response Form

An applicant should document and submit a list of comments received from the Neighborhood Association Meeting to the Neighborhood Association with a responding statement for each comment as to how each are being considered.

Neighborhood Association: Date of Visit:	Applicant: Owner:
SAMPLE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMENTS	SAMPLE APPLICANT RESPONSE
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Preserve mature tree at NE corner 2. Prefer balconies at street 3. Vary window patterns – continuity with variation 4. More street entries desired 5. Step building height up and down 6. Vary rooflines 7. Commercial at the first floor, smaller affordable commercial spaces requested 8. More family-friendly unit sizes and amenities 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Will relocate on-site to preserve 2. Now included on SE façade 3. Incorporated exist. neighborhood patterns for storefront window design 4. Added more frequent entries 5. Will consider this to maintain better solar access 6. Will discuss with architect 7. Cannot make this work with program without amenities bonus 8. Redesigning midblock of building to include shared courtyard with more green space and art; added several 2& 3 bedroom units