

Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

Tuesday, July 26, 2016

4:00 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

Commissioners Present: Jeff Bachrach, Andre' Baugh (by phone; left at 5:30 p.m.), Mike Houck, Gary Oxman, Michelle Rudd, Katherine Schultz, Chris Smith, Eli Spevak, Maggie Tallmadge

Commissioners Absent: Katie Larsell, Teresa St Martin

City Staff Presenting: Tom Armstrong, John Cole, Eric Engstrom, Barry Manning, Joe Zehnder

Chair Schultz called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. and gave an overview of the agenda.

Documents and Presentations for today's meeting

Items of Interest from Commissioners

- *Commissioner Smith:* Tomorrow at Council is the hearing on the Powell-Division Local Action Plan. I'll be representing the PSC and sharing our thoughts as we relayed in the letter.
- *Commissioner Spevak* noted he checked out some of the beaches in the Central City on his way in today. Thank you for being here.
- *Commissioner Houck:* Be sure to check out *Commissioner Spevak's* rebuttal piece in today's Portland Tribune regarding infill development.

Consent Agenda

- Consideration of minutes from the June 28 and July 12, 2016 PSC meetings

Commissioner Smith moved to approve the Consent Agenda. *Commissioner Spevak* seconded.

The Consent Agenda was approved with an aye vote.

(Y9 – Bachrach, Baugh, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Smith, Spevak, Tallmadge)

Task 5: Miscellaneous Zoning Code Amendments

Hearing / Recommendation: Tom Armstrong, John Cole

Presentation

John gave an overview of the 8 components of the amendments package. Item number 8, the trail alignment designation, received the most testimony.

Disclosures from PSC members:

- *Commissioner Rudd's* firm represents a group in Guild's Lake (item 5)
- *Chair Schultz* has a potential conflict with item 3.

Commissioner Houck noted the trail conversation and a PP&R staff member's (Brett Horner) comments that could be helpful in today's discussion.

Commissioner Smith clarified the RH 4:1 FAR question. If anything this is a downzoning, correct?

- Yes.

Item 2: This area was downzoned due to drainage and landslide issues. Guild's Lake has three separate changes.

Staff clarified Commissioners' questions about the school district capacity criteria.

Testimony

1. Dennis Harper: Concerned that a swath of NW Portland will be zoned RH with an FAR 4:1 as shown in maps 120-6 and 120-7. Almost all this FAR is in the historic Alphabet District, which threatens the eastern half of the Alphabet District. 2:1 FAR would be a better fit here.
2. Martha Cox, Columbia Steel Casting and Heron Leasing: The FAR change would be costly for our company, and the value of property would be lost. The wetland impact would be expensive to develop and maintain. Manufacturing companies can't pass on added costs, so we will incur this. Security and public safety is also one of our major concerns. *see written testimony*
3. Dana Krawczuk, representing Broadmoor Golf Course: The public trail that's proposed here is a liability for the golf course. As proposed, the trail impacts 5 of the 18 holes on the course. We think alignment would be better in the Metro marsh area. *see written testimony*

Commissioner Bachrach asked about the trails in this particular location.

These are both new trails being proposed in these amendments.

4. Sharon Goldsworthy, Eastridge Park HOA: Concerned about the Scouters Mtn trail alignment. The trail is proposed to pass through an environmental protection area that is at risk for earthquakes and landslides. The alignment is contiguous to a number of individual properties and is intrusive. There is no neighborhood support for the alignment. *see written testimony*
5. Jim Sjulín, 40 Mile Loop Land Trust: Support alignments that have been on the map for many years. I do have some concerns about removals of trails. We are happy and willing to work with staff to resolve the issues we've identified. *see written testimony*
6. Tim Davis: Original zoning code called for more density than what we currently have. We need to at least double our density to make housing more affordable.
7. Walter Valenta, 40 Mile Loop Land Trust: The stars on the map are controversial. On the 40 Mile Loop, we have been living with this for quite a while. We want to have more discussion about these before we move things. The hardest part is getting the easement for the trail alignments. We want to be sure the stars are practical. And before we remove stars on private property that are already there, we need to be careful because they're hard to put back on. *see written testimony*

Commissioner Smith: Why are the stars just showing up on the map now? What is the process that triggers that?

Every 20 years we put stars on the map that signify where we think connections for trails should be made. We are now refining the stars in the process, but there are whole missing segments, particularly along the Columbia Slough, because we don't know where the trails should go. Stars represent choices and decisions.

Commissioner Houck noted we're talking about one of the most important trails and park systems when we're talking about the 40 Mile Loop.

We hired the Olmsted brothers to help us determine this years ago. It's 140 miles long now,

including loops of loops.

8. Phil Beyl, St Mary's Cathedral: FAR should not be reduced in RH from 4:1 to 2:1 where we are. We are already zoned 4:1, so a take-away from this would be a huge economic impact. If we want to preserve historic structures, there are better ways than limiting density.
9. Wendy Chung, NWDA: We are requesting deletion of maps 120-7 and 120-6 to eliminate the 4:1 FAR allowances in the RH zoned parcels. We don't think eliminating the bonus will affect density, so please give us the same consideration in the Alphabet District as you did for Irvington. *see written testimony*
10. Karen Karlsson, NWDA: Regarding the Guild's Lake Plan and limiting office uses, NWDA is highly supportive of this. The Comp Plan identifies how significant historic districts are (new Comp Plan Policy 4.49). There are only 7 properties that have an FAR 3:1 in the historic district; 4:1 is too much. *see written testimony*
11. Stephen Griffith, Riverview Abbey Mausoleum Co: We would like to see the trail at Red Electric shifted. The section we're concerned with is at Taylors Ferry Road. There is also a roadway that was built in 2006, and if the trail were aligned slightly differently, the alignment would be better.
12. Tom Brenneke, St Mary's Cathedral: Our church owns 3 blocks for our facility in NW. We strenuously object to any consideration to reduce FAR from 4:1 to 2:1. A change like this would cut our property value in half.
13. Allison Reynolds, Solterra: Owns and develops a property at N Cook and N Williams. RX being downzoned to RH, and it would now have a 2:1 FAR. We're asking to keep the building that is currently being developed to remain conforming and have a 4:1 FAR; without this, it will become non-conforming as soon as the new code is adopted. *see written testimony*
14. Brad Perkins: Appreciate the upgrade of Sullivan's Trail to the constrained list. *see written testimony*
15. Dorothy Cofield: Spoke to a mapping correction that will be resubmitted and corrected by staff. *see written testimony*

Written Testimony Received

Chair Schultz closed the hearing at 5:02 p.m.

Discussion

Commissioner Smith noted that people only got time to read the plan this weekend.

Chair Schultz: We will see if we need more time to consider before voting.

Staff walked commissioners through each of the 8 components of the proposal.

Item 1: Allow retail plant nurseries as a conditional use in residential zones

Commissioner Smith: This was the PSC's recommendation to Council in the Comp Plan.

PSC members confirmed staff's recommendation.

Item 2: Preserve rights to one house on lots that were buildable prior to down-zoning as part of the City's natural hazard mitigation strategy. (R10 to R20 downzones only)

PSC members confirmed staff's recommendation.

Item 3: Amend the RH zone FAR map series to reflect changes made 2035 Comprehensive Plan Map and Composite Zoning Map.

Chair Schultz recused herself from this discussion point.

Staff noted that the changes being made to the 120 map series does not add FAR.

Commissioner Spevak asked about the testimony from Allison Reynolds.

- Tom: I'm not sure of the specifics of that location. But any development between now and the Comp Plan being effective, we will have a legislative process to catch all the new developments to true up the Comp Plan and Zoning designations.
- FAR won't be non-conforming until the Comp Plan is effective in 2018. After that when we know we have the state acknowledgement, we will go back and look at examples like this to "catch up" with the changes and correct them.

Commissioner Smith would like a process to understand how the historic district mapping changes affect all historic districts.

- Irvington, Alhabet and Kings Hill are the areas that are affected.
- See map of proposed RH 4:1 FAR areas in historic districts. They are centered around the core of the city.
- Earlier advocacy from Irvington was to take out this district in its entirety. In the Alhabet District, we would like to be able to modify the FAR maps, but this is difficult given our timeline.
- If we don't change the map, it is the status quo as today handled by the Historic Landmarks Commission. Landmarks can change FAR, which can be an issue or question. We can bring this back on August 9 to the PSC if necessary.
- *Commissioner Oxman* would like to have the time to review before making a recommendation, particularly about the Alhabet District.
- We estimate there are 600 units of additional capacity in the RH area. Dropping FAR would be a swing of about 300 units of capacity. Given the proximity to Central City, this is a concern from staff.

Commissioner Baugh asked if the Landmark's Commission is ok with this proposal.

- They have not weighed in specifically.

Regarding the 4:1 to 2:1 FAR, would they would be approved in the IZ process?

- Eventually they would be eligible for the IZ bonus.

Commissioner Smith: Do we want to affirm the 4:1 tonight? Or discuss further to remove the Alhabet District?

- Staff will take a finer look and bring back to the PSC.

Item 4: Allow established office uses in historic buildings to continue in the R5 zone as an incentive to preserve historic resources rather than continue as a revocable permit.

PSC members confirmed staff's recommendation.

Item 5: Amend the Guild's Lake Industrial Sanctuary plan district to limit office uses and expand the area where these limits apply.

Commissioner Rudd recused herself from this discussion point.

Commissioner Smith asked that if we're expanding subarea B because other lots were rezoned as part of the Comp Plan.

- The property owner on the western edge currently has industrial zoning. In our industrial zoning is this allowance that if you have an historic landmark, you can get 2:1 as an incentive for historic preservation. We think this should be carried over into this area.

Commissioner Smith: I am amenable to carrying over the historic preservation bonus.

Commissioner Bachrach commented on testimony we received on this and discussion about a future transportation study. If there are studies that show more traffic capacity, are they now locked in at this lower FAR?

- When we refer to transportation studies, this speaks to the zone change process. Properties north of Wilson will have IH as they do today. Comp Plan for mixed employment EG zoning will need to include the additional transportation studies. This is what they will be allowed to do (1:1 FAR or can buy up to 1.85:1 FAR).

This is mostly the ESCO site plus about 4 properties south of Nicolai. Redevelopment of the ESCO site.

PSC members confirmed staff's recommendation with the noted text corrections for Guild's Lake.

Item 6: Address school district enrollment capacity during zoning map amendments, land divisions, and planned developments in a district that has a school facility plan.

Commissioner Spevak asked about the legality of this. I like the compromise with DDSD in terms of the zoning map, but this seems like a broad approach to a narrow issue without a sunset issue. I'm concerned about what mitigation options would look like. I want to see some more detail about what this would look like.

Commissioner Bachrach: My understanding is that the concept of the statue is that when you establish zoning is so school capacity wouldn't have to be reestablished. If you're doing a subdivision, you shouldn't have a school capacity requirement. So I share *Commissioner Spevak's* concern.

- Joe: This has recently been changed at the state level.

PSC members confirmed staff's recommendation.

Item 7: Delete requirement for addressing "no-net-loss of housing" policies for quasi-judicial comprehensive plan map amendments and zoning map changes.

PSC members confirmed staff's recommendation.

Item 8: Update the trail alignments designation on the zoning map to correspond to the Major Public Trail alignment adopted in the 2035 Comprehensive Plan.

Staff supports the testimony from Dorothy Cofield on behalf of the Saltzman Rd property. This was a mapping error that we'll be fixing with the trail alignment that will continue to the municipal boundary. Staff doesn't support the additional testimony regarding changing fence height allowances as part of this.

We did receive testimony from the NW Turtle Working Group that looked at the Peninsula Canal alignment. This goes along the top of the levee. Once we're past the Riverside GC, the group has asked that the trail alignment go to the bottom of the levee so that the people using the trail are not visible to an active nesting pond turtle group.

Commissioner Houck noted the stars on the trail alignment have been on the map for more than 30 year along the 40 Mile Loop. I personally have angst about making recommendations from the PSC right now when there is an opportunity for other groups to interact with the City and/or Metro to take things into consideration over time. We shouldn't take anything off an existing alignment. The 40 Mile Loop group's suggestion to work with staff makes sense to me to come up with a solution.

Commissioner Bachrach agrees with this but would like to include property owners as part of the working group.

Tom noted if you look on page 135 of the staff report there is the Comp Plan map that was adopted. The proposals today implement this map in the Zoning Code.

Commissioner Rudd: We heard testimony that if you had the trail stars on your map and you were going to develop, the City requirement that you improve a trail on your property turned on how expensive your proposed improvements were and why didn't your obligation to improve a trail relate to the burden/trail need the proposed development created. If you're going to develop and you have stars on your property, why isn't it related to how much of a burden you're putting on the trail system?

- There is a proportionality review and a relationship to the creation of need as part of this analysis.
- This map has been adopted, but it is not detailed enough to see individual properties. Now we're looking at the individual stars and individual properties, which is why owners have more recently been notified. Remapping was to help align PP&R and PBOT maps where they didn't agree in the past.
- If you don't think the map is right and you want to revisit it, then you'd have to tell Council the Comp Plan map is wrong and that it needs to be amended.

Commissioner Bachrach: Regarding the testimony about fencing, is the prohibition because it's in an E-zone?

- Yes, it has to do with standards in the E-zone.

Commissioner Houck: We need to see the overall picture and system.

BPS staff did not come up with these new segments of the alignment.

Further discussions on item 3 and 8 will come before the PSC. There was a staff amendments to Item 5 from staff.

Recommendation

Commissioner Smith moved to approve the Miscellaneous Zoning Code Amendment package items 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 and 7 including the Guild's Lake text revisions provided to staff. *Commissioner Houck* seconded.

Commissioner Rudd recused herself from the vote.

The motion passed.

(Y7 – Bachrach, Houck, Oxman, Schultz, Smith, Spevak, Tallmadge)

Central City 2035 Plan Hearing

Joe provided a brief overview of the CC2035 Plan and schedule for upcoming meetings about the project.

Disclosures from PSC members

- *Commissioner Smith* owns a property in the Pearl district. No proposed zoning change at this location.
- *Chair* works on many projects but doesn't have a project with a conflict of interest.

Testimony

Kirk Ranzetta, Chair, Portland Historic Landmarks Commission (PHLC): The PHLC mostly reviews Type III land use reviews, as we look to ensure significant and important historic features and how new construction can be accommodated in these areas. Building heights are a key note that we have concerns about. Many heights were established before the historic districts were put in place. We'd like to see 75' on three of the districts and 50' in Irvington. *see written testimony*

Julie Livingston, Chair, Design Commission: Thank you to staff and the PSC to comment on the CC2035 Plan. The DC has noted 7 specific issues as outlined in our letter. *see written testimony*

Commissioner Houck: Regarding the window glazing, Audubon has worked with City staff about bird-safe buildings. Have you been working with them?

- Julie: We haven't yet had a briefing from the Audubon, but BPS staff has been bringing us good research.

Commissioner Oxman: How does the additional bonus for industrial FAR work?

- Additional 1:1 for industrial office use if at least 33 percent or 5000 square feet on ground floor. We would like to see a tiered bonus structure.
1. Daniel Salomon: A Goose Hollow resident who moved there to be part of a livable community in 2013. I understand population increase but think a balance can be struck between welcoming new Portlanders. Don't raise heights in historic districts. Keep the West End heights at no higher than 100 feet. Make sure no buildings block the view of Jefferson St arches. Request that 1000 feet below the timberline be visible from Vista Bridge.
 2. Sherry Salomon: I don't like the ever-rising limits to heights in Goose Hollow. This threatens the character of our neighborhood and encourages demolition.
 3. Stephen Salomon: Mt Hood views need to be retained, especially at the Salmon St Fountain.
 4. Shaina Weinstein: Re: low-carbon buildings. I support the building marketplace to incorporate best practices in every building. Concerns about using just one building rating system (LEED). We would like the plan be neutral to building rating systems. Green Globes helps building owners reach the same goals as LEED, and there are other options and rating systems as well.
 5. Tim Atkinson, Stinson Lumber: LEED-only review will reduce competition in the green building marketplace and is costly compared to other potential rating systems. Consider other rating systems to offer competition.
 6. Timm Locke: OR Forestry Institution to advance forest products. Low-carbon building standard could better address off-sets and other options. Energy consumption is important, but it's not the only contributor. Increased use of wood would be an additional bonus to reduce impact.
 7. Caitlin Horsley, HBA of Portland and Home Performance Council: Low-carbon building standards. *see written testimony*
 8. Deborah O'Neill, Architectural Heritage Foundation: Lower heights in the West End to 7:1 FAR and a maximum height of 100' west of Park. East of Park should have a base of 9:1 FAR with max height of 250-325'. So the West End will continue to be a step-down transition area. Oppose the RX to CX changes.
 9. Wendy Rahm, Architectural Heritage: Confirming comments of Deborah O'Neill. FAR and height changes would create a step-down to the more modest West End neighborhoods from downtown. This would be a good transition that would preserve the distinction between the areas as well. *see written testimony*

10. Susan Bliss: Historic preservation in the West End. WE should add a fourth policy under West End subsection. Encourage reuse, rehab and seismic upgrade... to preserve and enhance. Add an action in the action list for BDS and PBEM for the West End. *see written testimony*
11. Tom Neilsen: The West End is an important transitional area between downtown and the more modest neighborhood areas. We need the step down to maintain the distinctions. FAR base of 7:1 in the West End to ensure density is in a more compact form. *see written testimony*
12. Duane Bietz: Thanks to staff for moving the residential/business uses on Salmon. I don't endorse the RX to CX changes though. *see written testimony*
13. Richard Rahm: Advocate for the 7:1 FAR and maximum height of 100'. One major problem is building size, specifically height. Support historic preservation. *see written testimony*
14. Judy Bell: We need a new site for open space as an action for PP&R in the West End since we don't have any open space here now. Additional trees could be included to mitigate heat island and air pollution. *see written testimony*
15. Christine Neilsen: West End. Policy change isn't more than words and hopes unless it's reflected in the Plan in greater detail. There isn't park space in the West End, nor a community center or garden or elementary school... so there is really no place to build community. Request that the Plan reflects the need for park and community space. *see written testimony*
16. Robert Wright: A large share of population growth will be in the West End. We need on-site parking for some portion of residents, particularly for families as we are expecting. CC2035 should have a minimum on-site parking requirement as well as EV charging requirements. This should be included in multi-dwelling buildings. Retrofitting is complex and expensive, so it should be required. *see written testimony*
17. Walter Weyler: Thank you to the PSC and staff. West End. Policies 3.12 and 9.52 declare intent to limit growth of overall parking supply. I take issue with this concept. We can't stifle the arts community by pinching parking availability at our arts centers. Change to include review by arts and residents' input to discuss parking requirements. *see written testimony*
18. David Newman: Co-founder of Friends of South Park Blocks. Endorse historic designation but would like to see the timeline shortened. *see written testimony*
19. Gerald Witt, reading for Terry Dalsemer: *see written testimony*
20. Sara Edy: SE MLK and Main. Against building height in Central Eastside (CES) to preserve views from Salmon Springs. This would be dramatic loss in potential height. Would restrict to 45' and 200' plus bonuses, which is significant compared to what's allowed now.
21. Jim Morton: SE MLK and Main. Against building height in CES to preserve views from Salmon Springs. I own a 94 year old building that's been on the national register of historic places since 1989. Don't intend to redevelop or to see. It is a multi-generational property, but the next generation may choose differently. Or the building may be harmed by fire or another unexpected accident. Do not move forward with the view corridor proposal.
22. Staci Monroe, BDS: BDS has 8 areas of concern. *see written testimony*
23. Allison Reynolds, Unico: Owns the US Bancorp Tower (Big Pink), one of the tallest buildings in Portland. Limited to 460' after it was built, so current development is non-conforming. We hope the PSC will revise the proposed draft to allow unlimited height for this and other tall towers downtown for these legacy buildings. Update maps 510-3 and 510-4 to allow for these

height requests. *see written testimony*

24. David Noren, SEIU Local 49: Worked with Policy 3.3 and addressing affordable housing in the new Comp Plan. There is no requirement for additional public benefit if you have transfers of FAR, which should be subject to require public benefit. *see written testimony*
25. Mark Velky: Support keeping views of Mt Hood at Vista Bridge and lowering heights on SW Jefferson and keeping the view from Salmon Springs. Think about the ethical obligations and what was discussed in the West Quad planning process. There were missing disclosures on the West Quad SAC. We need an above-board process, so don't support the additional height requests.
26. Ben Gates, Urban Patterns: Testifying on behalf of families with children. Request that the same bonuses be brought into the CC2035 Plan. We should allow bonus FAR for 2 and 3 bedroom units built to specific sizes. There should be a community amenity bonus to exempt public schools, day care facilities and libraries to not count against FAR. Award bonus FAR for these amenities.
27. Audrey Craig, Portland Forward: Focus on housing and the future of density in Portland. Lack of family support in the CC2035 Plan. We support family-friendly development in the Plan for housing diversity and complete neighborhoods. But there are fewer incentives for developers to build for families in the Plan. Revise to keep affordable housing but build on this with bonuses for family-sized units.
28. Tracy Prince, Goose Hollow Foothills League: Unanimously endorsed comments in the letter from GHFL. *see written testimony*
29. Liz Cooksey, Goose Hollow Foothills League: *see written testimony*
30. Kal Toth, Goose Hollow Foothills League: *see written testimony*
31. Mary Roberts: Buckman neighborhood. There is a discrepancy in the borderline corridor and height restrictions between the southern and northern ends of the corridor that should be balanced. *see written testimony*
32. Fred Leeson, Bosco-Milligan: Pay attention to the view corridors in the South Park Blocks in particular. Losing a few floors of developable space can keep what makes Portland special. *see written testimony*
33. Jason Franklin, PSU: Request increased FAR along the transit mall due to the billions of dollars the community has invested in transit. CC2035 creates a great vision for the University District, but the proposed draft doesn't get this yet. We'd like to work with staff to increase FAR from 6:1 to 9:1 and proposed 4:1 to 6:1 along the Orange Line on SW Lincoln. *see written testimony*
34. Ian Stude, PSU: Spoke to Section 2B (amendments to the TSP). Support the amendments largely, particularly the performance targets and policies about TDM and transportation options. PSU contributes to traffic in the area (about 20 percent of downtown traffic at peak times). But we are high users of the transit system and single largest bike trip generator in the Central City. Look to reestablish 4th Ave as a major city bikeway. Support the Green Loop but don't inflate it over other work. *see written testimony*
35. Carrie Richter, on behalf of Kan Du, LLC and David Leiken: Opposes staff's height reduction that interferes with opportunity to redevelop the Roseland Theater property. *see written testimony*

36. Stan Herman: Owns property at Alberta/Albina. Would like zone change to CX to develop a hotel right near this light rail station. There has been an overlay already established here. *see written testimony*

Commissioner Smith noted this is in an industrial sanctuary, which could be an interesting location for a hotel. Would this hotel serve the Industrial Sanctuary, or would it be accommodating regional demand?

Actually, it's zoned IG-1. We're right by the Rose Quarter, so it would be a good location for accommodate visitors for events. Rooms are smaller and affordable.

37. Dave Moore, Alt Source: CES. Purchased 1120 SE Madison this year with the intent of making it our headquarters. But it's in a designated view corridor. And we want flexibility to grow our company and build up as we have unlimited height right now. *see written testimony*
38. Walter Valenta: A big idea that isn't just zone changing in this Plan is the Green Loop. This will be the thing that this Plan could be remembered for if we actually build it. I support the Green Loop and encourage us to think about how we accomplish building it.
39. Tony Jordan, Portlanders for Parking Reform: Don't go backward on max parking entitlements. Proposed ratios should be much lower, not higher, to meet mode-share targets. Unbundle the price of parking to expose the hidden costs of parking in Title 33. *see written testimony*
40. Charles Tso, Portlanders for Parking Reform: Don't go backwards, particularly on TDM. Direct staff to bring a proposal to give Central City employees a choice for a parking cash-out to give commuters more choices and reward alternatives to solo driving. *see written testimony*
41. Bruce Burns: CES multi-block property owner and member of CES Advisory Committee. Oppose the new building height limits in the CES industrial district. Any new lower height limitations will result in loss of tax revenues, potentially in the millions of dollars for just one building. Inspirational high-rise buildings can complement historic buildings. *see written testimony*
42. Haithem Toulan: 306 SE Ivon St on the Eastbank. Please make revisions to allow development happen. This is 3 acres of bare land right now. *see written testimony (plus photo and graphic)*
43. Noel Johnson, Killian Pacific: We would like to continue to be involved in problem-solving and work on the details. We are not for or against the standards proposed, but we want to continue to have the opportunity to work with staff on the details.
44. Helmut Gieben: Owns commercial property on the Riverplace Esplanade. Built 30 years ago, and there are lots more people and bike/pedestrian conflicts now. This affects the viability of the businesses here. PP&R management is only to make sure people can get through as quickly as possible.

Commissioner Houck noted the signs about walking your bike in this area.

They used to have those signs, but they have not been included or restricted at this time.

Commissioner Smith: I don't have the classification maps in front of me, but I believe there is a designated bikeway on the other side of the athletic club. So it seems like a similar conflict to what we're trying to manage on Waterfront Park. I wonder if part of the answer is to have a more attractive facility for bicyclist nearby.

Yes, that could be between the existing esplanade and the roadway.

45. Bruce Stephenson, Pearl District Business Association: Referred to Comp Plan Policy 1.19. We should clarify that use-area specific plan should guide PDC development decisions, for example for Centennial Mills. Provide a network along the waterfront and open spaces as called for in the Pearl District Plan. Clarify that area-specific plans are followed. *see written testimony*
46. Kiel Johnson: Lives in the Lloyd District apartment and business owner of a bike repair shop at the bottom of the tram in SoWA. In favor of the Green Loop and how it continues active transportation in Portland.
47. Nolan Lienhart: West Quad AC member. *see written testimony*
48. John Southgate, for Ken Unkeles and Tom Goldsmith: Property owners on the north side of the Fremont Bridge, across the street from T1. Support rezoning to EXd. But request consideration of height and FAR; would like to proposed 250' and 4:1. It's ironic that the current IH zoning doesn't have height caps but the proposed zoning does. Thank you to staff.
49. Doug Klotz.

Written Testimony Received before 5 p.m.; additional testimony received will be included in the record for the August 9 PSC meeting.

Chair Schultz continued the hearing to the August 9, 2016 PSC meeting.

Task 5: Mixed Use Zones Project

Work Session: Eric Engstrom, Barry Manning

Presentation

Topic 6, CE Zoning for Auto-Accommodating Uses

The proposed MUZ zoning map is based on a process described on page 316-318 of the Proposed Draft. Its foundation is a conversion table that assigns new MUZ zones based generally on the existing zoning and the new Comprehensive Plan. As part of the zoning map conversion, some areas or sites that currently have auto-accommodating zoning (CN2, CG) were converted to a more pedestrian-oriented mixed use zone (CM1, CM2).

In the case of the CG zone, this primarily occurred in areas designated as "centers" in the Comp Plan. This resulted in an overall loss of area zoned for auto-accommodating uses. Several stakeholders (Retail Task Force, Space-Age Fuel, Albertsons, Fred Meyer, U-Haul, McDonalds, Bitar, others) have testified that they wish to retain or be zoned to CE, the most auto-accommodating zone, to support business operations or to anticipate future development where pedestrian-oriented or mixed use development is not economically feasible in the foreseeable future.

Staff recommends:

1. To apply CE zoning to a limited number of sites, primarily outside of Inner Ring and town centers in response to testimony from property owners and the RTF.
2. Do not use CE zoning more broadly in centers
3. Do not apply CE zoning more broadly based on Policy 4.24

Item 1.

See the CE Requests and RTF Recommendations map (slide 4)

- Orange dots are the CE requests
- Blue are the RTF requests

Map 6.1.A shows with green circles the areas staff recommends. This is a combination of properties not currently zoned CE and those mistakenly identified as needing a change.

Map 6.1.B includes CE requests and RFT suggestions highlighted with staff recommendations.

Option 1: Do not expand any CE Zoning.

Option 2 (Staff Recommendation): Maps A and B: Limited changes in response to testimony: accept a number of CE requests outside of centers, at the edge of centers, or in special circumstances, on collector streets and only where existing uses match CE character. This includes a combination of Owner/User requests (6.1.A) and Retail Task Force recommendations (6.1.B).

Option 3 (Option/Map 6.1.C): All of the above, plus additional sites that the Retail Task Force recommended shown on map 6.1.C. Some of these nodes, although within designated centers, are auto oriented today. The Retail Task Force suggests interim use of CE is appropriate to accommodate existing development and enable near-term investment in these nodes. Due to property values and achievable rents, staff believes that for some nodes conversion to a more urban mixed use development pattern is likely more than 10 years in the future.

If the PSC chooses to consider Option 3, the nodes that may be most appropriate for interim CE application are:

- 82nd/Foster
- 82nd/Powell
- Division/122nd

Option 4 (Option/Map 6.1.D-CM1 and Map 6.1.D-CM2): All of the above, plus broaden application of CE zoning in response to Policy 4.24 by remapping as follows:

- Additional conversion of auto-oriented CM1 areas to CE, outside of centers, outside of the inner ring neighborhoods, on collector streets.
- Additional conversion of auto-oriented CM2 areas to CE, outside of centers, outside of the inner ring neighborhoods, on collector streets.

Chair Schultz asked about *Commissioner Baugh's* support from the previous conversation.

- He is arguing against CE as it is inequitable for East Portland and the land that may currently be vacant there.

Commissioner Tallmadge asked about the difference between pedestrian and auto-accommodating.

- There is little difference between CN and CE. We want to accommodate pedestrians and transit users.

Commissioner Smith: Including the Hollywood Fred Meyer confounds me because it's right in the inner ring. Why would we want CE here?

- It's currently CG, and we thought it would make sense to retain this since it's more set back and more of a suburban layout than, for example, on Hawthorne.

Commissioner Oxman asked about the line between Option B and C. It sounds like the RTF was more in favor of C.

- RTF and many of the owners are more aligned with 6.1.C and 6.1.D. Staff wants more pedestrian-oriented centers. We are trying to avoid creating more gas stations and auto-uses in places we're designating as mixed-use centers.

Commissioner Rudd: If we say in CE there can be these drive-through uses, are there requirements for the developers to minimize impacts on pedestrian access?

- All pedestrian and window requirements and standards remain in CE, CM1, CM2 or CM3. CE has a broader allowance for manufacturing uses as well.

Commissioner Smith is thinking about the community input we've heard. I don't want to back track to more auto-oriented development, and I don't want to surrender big sections of the city to auto-oriented design.

Chair Schultz: Do the CM zones limit drive-through as a use? If you left it CM and embedded the fuel station, etc within a building envelop that meets all the criteria, would that be allowed?

- As currently defined, we would have to change the code so that something within the building would be allowed.

Commissioner Oxman: We want to think about how to involve community to have other opportunities other than auto-accommodating development. Is there a way to include community involvement to talk about what kind of development we will have?

- In URAs and NPI areas we do get substantial input where there is PDC involvement. But not necessarily otherwise.

Commissioner Spevak: I'm curious if the default zoning would be CM2. It sounds like the code language would allow them to rebuild drive-throughs. Is this correct?

- Currently Albertsons at Cully is CM2. Fred Meyer on Interstate would be CM3.

What is the cost to switch from CM to CM3 after this process?

- It would be a zone change request, so you have to show the new zone is the right zone and you have service availability criteria to meet. In the \$10k's and could take about 6 months.

Commissioner Bachrach is skeptical of the RTF recommendations. They do make an argument that people want the lower-priced food stores, and people will drive to lower-priced food if they need to get it.

- The RTF has regularly argued for more of these sites, so they were looking at the practical economics as well. We're going to allow existing drive-throughs to be rebuilt. To the extent we're concentrating CE, we're locking them into that future, and it will be difficult to change that.

Commissioner Tallmadge asked about Fred Meyer across from Providence Park... what is that zoned?

- It's CX in Central City (CM2 or CM3).
- *Chair Schultz* noted this is an example for a place and site that met standards they originally thought they couldn't.

Commissioner Smith noted Map 6.1.B and the nuances that made the pink less desirable.

- These were RTF requests, not property owners. Only difference is the source of the request.

Commissioner Smith: I'll suggest that Map B without the Hollywood Fred Meyer and the Cully Albertsons. A "slightly lighter version of Option 2". This is basically on the outside or edge of centers, which I'm willing to live with.

Commissioner Houck agrees with this recommendation. *Commissioner Spevak* is also supportive.

General PSC support of the "modified 2" recommendation.

Adjourn

Chair Schultz adjourned the meeting at 8:58 p.m.

Submitted by Julie Ocken

DRAFT