

Item #	Page #	Code Section	Proposed Amendment	Rationale	Requestor	Comment	Category
General							
1	31	33.420.050 (General Threshold)	Remove the prohibition on adjustments to the standards track	Given the greater complexity of the new standards there are likely to be situations, not yet considered, where it isn't possible to follow the letter of the code. An adjustment path would allow the intent of the code to be followed, without kicking a project into design review	Bortolazzo		
2	34	33.420.050.C Commentary	Commentary should be expanded for description of each tenet, including Q&R	No mention of responding to climate change and mitigation and adaptation to climate change, as noted above. This seems odd, given the heading includes resilience. Quality and Resilience, . Amend to add <u>Responds to climate change through mitigation and adaptation measures.</u>	Houck		Consent
Quality and Resilience				Standards sorted by the Standards Working Group			
Site Planning and Pedestrian Circulation							
3	57	33.420.050.C Standard QR1 Reqd.	Consider removing this standard requirement altogether	Seems unnecessary and unclear. This is regulated by fire code.	Bortolazzo		Discuss
4	57	33.420.050.C Standard QR2 Reqd.	<i>No change</i>				
5	59	33.420.050.C Standard QR3 Reqd.	Ensure locked gate can't be placed across connection to trail (may need covenant for this)	It could be very tempting for a developer to meet this requirement initially, then down the road block exactly the connection this standard is intended to preserve. If a developer feels they need to restrict access, they can use the discretionary design review process instead	Spevak	PSC Group: Proposal to make optional but with PSC Disussion. Staff note: It might not always be the case that the gate to a residential development provides completely open access. The connection may be more important. It is hard for zoning code to regulate property management / behavior on site.	Discuss
6	61	33.420.050.C Standard QR4 1 pt.	<i>No change</i>				
On-site Common Areas							
8	61	33.420.050.C Standard QR5 3 pts.	<i>No change</i>				
9	61	33.420.050.C Standard QR6 2 pts.	Consider dropping this item	I'm OK keeping this as an Optional design standard, since indoor common rooms are nice and meet some policy goal. But they're not visible from the street and my preference is to exclude them entirely from design review. If they're critical, they can be added to the base zone.	Spevak	Standards Group: Concern with standards regulating the inside of a building.	Consent - Remove Standard
10	61	33.420.050.C Standard QR7 Reqd.	"At least 15 percent of the first floor façade ..."	Window and door area is much more important on the 1st floor than in higher up floors, facing on to outdoor common areas. As with the comment above, I'd be fine leaving this out of the design guidelines entirely.	Spevak	Standards Group: Discussed how much is 15%. Staff noted that this threshold is often used for entire façade. Agreed to leave as is.	
11	61	33.420.050.C Standard QR8 2 pts.	Consider dropping this item	See comment for QR6	Spevak	Standards Group: Discussed and agreed to leave as is.	

Item #	Page #	Code Section	Proposed Amendment	Rationale	Requestor	Comment	Category
Windows and Balconies							
12	61	33.420.050.C Standard QR9 Reqd.	Consider removing this standard requirement altogether	3" trim is arbitrary and recessed windows can add cost/complexity in wood frame construction. There are plenty of examples, on Design Review-approved buildings, that do not meet this standard.	Bortolazzo		Consent - No change, but option for adjustment
13	61	33.420.050.C Standard QR9 Reqd.	Clarify that alterations should match the window trim of the existing building for all "new <u>street-facing</u> windows".	Limit the 'Alteration' section of this standard to street-facing windows and street-facing fascades (as I believe is the intent). This is a technical fix to clarify intent	BPS from Spevak		Consent - Amend standard
14	61	33.420.050.C Standard QR10 2 pts.	No change				
15	63	33.420.050.C Standard QR11 3 pts.	No change				
16	63	33.420.050.C Standard QR12 2 pts.	No change			Standards Group: Discussed reducing sunshade projection from 3-ft to 2-ft.	Consent - Change per discussion
17	63	33.420.050.C Standard QR13 2 pts.	Consider dropping this item	See comment for QR6	Spevak		
18	63	33.420.050.C Standard QR14 2 pts.	"... provide at least one operable window in each exterior wall."	Clarifying intent	Spevak	Standards Group: Discussion revolved around # of operable windows, and whether it could apply on a single wall.	Discuss - Clarify intent/ standard
19	63	33.420.050.C Standard QR15 2 pts.	No change				
Building Materials							
20	65	33.420.050.C Standard QR16 Reqd.	"... the exterior finish material in 80 percent of the building's walls, excluding windows, doors and trim, must be materials listed in the approved materials list in Table 420-3."	Clarifying intent	Spevak	Standards Group: Discussed concerns raised by Design Commission. In addition to technical language fix, considered limiting materials to 3 per site (not façade) and only allowing one other material within the 20% to avoid excessive clutter.	Consent - Change per discussion
21	65	33.420.050.C Standard QR17 2 pts.	No change			Standards Group: Agreed to a language fix for maximum 3 materials per site for consistency with above.	Consent - Change per discussion
22	65	33.420.050.C Standard QR18 1 pt.	Typically, returns are smaller (like on zero lot line or older buildings) or align with a change in plane or fenestration. Should instead make this required with a return of 2'. Add an option for the entire wall (1 to 2 points).	10' is an awkward dimension for a material to return on a side wall.	Bortolazzo	Standards Group: Discussed reducing material return. Consensus was to provide 1-pt for a return of at least 2-ft	Consent - With change to 2-ft return
Table 420-3 Approved Exterior Finish Materials							
23	69	Table 420-3 Finish Materials	Consider putting these standards in an Administrative Rule, as was recently done with ever-evolving standards in 33.510 (bird safe glazing, low-carbon buildings, etc).	Listing specific building materials in a Zoning Code that doesn't evolve at the same pace with industry changes will result in an outdated Code and will not provide the flexibility for projects that want to use new materials to utilize design standards.	Bortolazzo		Discuss - Materials Table as Admin Rule

Item #	Page #	Code Section	Proposed Amendment	Rationale	Requestor	Comment	Category
24	69	Table 420-3 Finish Materials	Add materials that do not require coating (zinc, copper, etc.)		BPS	BPS Staff: Gauge materials on metal or transposed. This should be fixed. Also, Comm Schultz can help with grade tables for metal. PSC Group: Either list materials that don't need coating, or require it. Group had concern about limiting concrete on side walls at property line, if they end up being covered up. "Architectural Concrete" could be a solution on side walls.	Consent - Metal gauge #'s and allowing a list of unfinished metals. Discuss - Concrete Options (+)
25	65	33.420.050.C Standard QR19 1 pt.	Drop this point.	This point could be purchased without providing public benefit. Yes, the developer might be educated through the process, and might conceivably use that level of knowledge to inform a future project. But that's too tenuous a public benefit to confer a point, especially in contrast to other measures that earn a point. Also, note that there are plenty of LCAs available for free that developers or the public can review if they like. So it's not like this valuable perspective isn't available through other venues.	Spevak	PSC Group: Is this scope creep? Does it improve design? At the least, the assessment should focus on exterior materials.	Discuss
Roofs							
26	67	33.420.050.C Standard QR20 Reqd.	Consider removing this standard requirement altogether	Seems arbitrary and unwarranted. Why can't a building taller than 35' have a pitched roof?	Bortolazzo	PSC Group: Need a better visual representation of where one can and cannot provide a pitched roof. Are there more targeted areas that should be considered? Opinions vary from remove as a standard to require everywhere.	Discuss
27	67	33.420.050.C Standard QR20 Reqd.		I'm not proposing to change this standard. But it's an example of how key elements of the 'm' overlay, accompanied by fairly minor re-mapping, could be subsumed within the 'd' overlay (so we don't need both).	Spevak	PSC Group: See above	Discuss
28	67	33.420.050.C Standard QR21 - 24 Reqd./1-2 pts.	Consider dropping these items	See comments for QR6	Spevak	PSC Group (on QR21, others follow). Incorrect Guideline reference in commentary. Should be Guideline #9. Ultimately, understanding that standard works together with exemption	Consent - No code change, but correct Commentary
29	67	33.420.050.C Standard QR22 2 pts.	Ecoroof: Amend to read: A Requirement Provide an ecoroof that covers at least 40 percent of the total building roof area or 2,000 square feet whichever is greater. The ecoroof must meet the Stormwater Management Manual's Ecoroof Facility Design Criteria (Required). Optional: For each additional 20 percent ecoroof coverage 1 point, to maximum of 3 points. Another approach would be to amend the Optional Points to award 3 points for the first 40 per cent roof coverage and 1 point for each additional 20% of roof coverage, up to 100 per cent coverage and 6 total points.	2-options that better incentivize the provision of ecoroofs.	Houck	PSC Group: Discussion about value and expense of various green roof treatments and installations.	Discuss all roof options together

Item #	Page #	Code Section	Proposed Amendment	Rationale	Requestor	Comment	Category
30	67	33.420.050.C Standard QR22&23 2 pts. each	Add at least one point to these standards (3 total, each)	Eco roofs and solar energy systems are expensive features, reward accordingly	Bortolazzo	See above	Discuss all roof options together
31	67	33.420.050.C Standard QR22&23 2 pts. each	It should be made clear that the same area of roof can accommodate an ecoroof and solar panels. Therefore, one could accumulate more points than if only ecoroof or only solar were installed.	Portland State University Research has demonstrated that solar with ecoroof are compatible and in fact solar has been shown to be more efficient with the cooling effects of an ecoroof below the solar panels. I will follow up with the research if desired.	Houck	See above	Discuss all roof options together
32	67	33.420.050.C Standard QR24 1 pt.	Reflective Roof Surface, Delete this standard.	There is no need to encourage this approach for which no points are warranted. During the CC2035 process we had a robust conversation about the efficacy of white and blue roofs vs ecoroofs. While there was not unanimity among PSC members, my take away from those conversations which resulted in ecoroofs being required in the Central City was that white and blue roofs were not considered to be efficacious in attaining energy efficiencies when compared with ecoroofs which provide many more benefits, beyond their stormwater management function (habitat for, particularly for pollinators but other wildlife a well; access to greenspaces; urban heat island attenuations; aesthetics; and others). To provide 1 point for something that is already an industry standard makes no sense to me.	Houck	See above	Discuss all roof options together

Public Realm

Standards sorted by Commissioners Spevak and Schultz

Ground Floors

33	45	33.420.050.C Standard PR1 Reqd.	Allow 9' first floor residential ceiling heights in 1-2 story buildings.	10' ceilings are lovely - but cost \$ and are less efficient to heat/cool. With tall buildings, a tall first floor enhances the public realm by giving prominence to the 1st floor. But for shorter buildings, it's less important - so cost and environmental concerns can override.	Spevak		Discuss
34	45	33.420.050.C Standard PR1 & PR2 Reqd./3 pts.	Under both of these standards, the standard for residential use should include the wording "at least" (i.e. "at least 10 feet" in PR1 and "at least 12 feet" in PR2)	This is a technical fix to clarify intent	BPS from Spevak		Consent
35	45	33.420.050.C Standard PR3 2 pts.	Add language that this optional standard only applies to sites outside the m-overlay.	Since the m-overlay already requires active use, this amendment clarifies that the points are to be gained for voluntarily providing commercial.	BPS		Consent
36	45	33.420.050.C Standard PR4 2 pts.	Drop points for Affordable Ground Floor Commercial. If this remains, change "Portland Development Commission" to "Prosper Portland" both here and in 33.130.	This is a programmatic item, not a design review item. And even the covenant only lasts 10 years. (FYI - The zoning code MUS chapter says "Portland Development Commission" rather than Prosper Portland. Also, I tried several web searches and was unable to find anywhere on Prosper's website the promised administrative rules. I eventually found the Resolution (#7277) containing the rules. But this was a case of how hard it can be understand zoning code options once someone has to leave Title 33 and look elsewhere for information.	Spevak (OR Smart Growth Letter)	Note that Prosper (i.e. PDC) is in support of this program. Daylighting it may increase its use.	Discuss

Item #	Page #	Code Section	Proposed Amendment	Rationale	Requestor	Comment	Category
37	45	33.420.050.C Standard PR4 2 pts.	Amend language to require the letter from PDC stating that the space meets their requirements. Note: We cannot change our reference to PDC until they change their reference to Propser in the City Charter.	This is a technical fix to clarify intent and better align with base zone standards involving PDC.	BPS	Note that we cannot use the term "Prosper Portland" until City Charter is updated with that term.	Discuss (w/ above)?
38	47	33.420.050.C Standard PR5 2 pts.	<i>No change</i>				Discuss
39	47	33.420.050.C Standard PR6 Reqd.	"New mechanical louvers..."	So mail slots facing the street are OK	Spevak		Consent
40	47	33.420.050.C Standard PR7 Reqd.	Two requests for changes: 1st, remove the 'hanging' sentence from the end of the 3rd bullet. 2nd, remove the 4th bullet as 33.262 already applies a glare standard to other properties.	The first is a typo and the second is a technical fix to clarify intent	BPS/BDS		Consent
41	47	33.420.050.C Standard PR7 Reqd.	Drop 4th bullet point	Avoid redundancy with base code	Spevak	See above	Consent
Entries / Entry Plazas							
42	47	33.420.050.C Standard PR8 Reqd.	<i>No change</i>				
43	49	33.420.050.C Standard PR9 2 pts.	<i>No change</i>				Discuss - See Design Commission comments
44	49	33.420.050.C Standard PR10 2 pts.	Reduce to 1 point	This point can only be earned by projects with off-street parking. It should match value of the point available in PR21 for having no off-street parking.	Spevak		Discuss
45	49	33.420.050.C Standard PR11 Reqd.	<i>No change</i>				Discuss - Is this an issue?
46	51	33.420.050.C Standard PR12 1 pt.	<i>No change</i>				
47	51	33.420.050.C Standard PR13 4 pts.	<i>No change</i>				
Weather Protection							
48	51	33.420.050.C Standard PR14 Reqd.	Make this Optional rather than Required unless there is a clear and objective path to extend 4' awnings over the ROW in all situations.	If there is any possibility PBOT would not approve a canopy or awning over the ROW, this required standard would effectively establish a 4' setback on a lot that might otherwise have a 0' setback.	Spevak	Per encroachments manual, PBOT allows projections up to 66% of sidewalk width as long as it is 2-ft away from curb. A sidewalk 6-ft or wider could have a 4-ft awning and most streets have a much larger furnishing zone than that.	Discuss

Item #	Page #	Code Section	Proposed Amendment	Rationale	Requestor	Comment	Category
49	51	33.420.050.C Standard PR15 Reqd.	Since these are mandatory, confirm with PBOT that awnings projected into the ROW are always allowed by-right. Otherwise, these awning requirements could amount to default front yard setbacks.	Same note as above		See above	Discuss - All weather protection?
50	53	33.420.050.C Standard PR16 Reqd.	The last sentence is missing a period.	This is a typo	BPS		Consent
51	53	33.420.050.C Standard PR17 2 pts.	<i>No change</i>				Discuss - All weather protection?
Utilities							
52	53	33.420.050.C Standard PR18 Reqd.	<i>No change</i>				Discuss - Wall or screen
Vehicle Areas							
53	53	33.420.050.C Standard PR19 2 pts.	Consider increasing the points to 3	Incentivize pervious paving materials	Bortolazzo		Discuss
54	55	33.420.050.C Standard PR20 Reqd.	<i>No change</i>				Discuss - What is in setback?
55	55	33.420.050.C Standard PR21 1 pt.	<i>No change</i>				Discuss - Why is it there?
56	55	33.420.050.C Standard PR22 2 pts.	<i>No change</i>				
57	55	33.420.050.C Standard PR23 1 pt.	Consider 2 points for photovoltaic shade structures	Incentivize use of photovoltaic	Bortolazzo		Discuss
Arts and Special Features							
58	55	33.420.050.C Standard PR24 1 pt.	<i>No change</i>				
59	57	33.420.050.C Standard PR25 2 pts.	<i>No change</i>				
60	57	33.420.050.C Standard PR26 1 pt.	The last sentence about stormwater facilities should be removed. These facilities do not contain water year-round	This is a clarification to distinguish a water feature from a stormwater facility which can't meet the requirement to have water year-round.	BES/BPS		Discuss - Align with guidelines?
Context							
Building Masses and Corners							
61	37	33.420.050.C Standard C1 1 reqd, 4 pts. max	The second bullet should state that the "wall must project <u>at least</u> 3 feet . . . "	This is a technical fix to clarify intent	BPS/BDS		

Item #	Page #	Code Section	Proposed Amendment	Rationale	Requestor	Comment	Category
62	37	33.420.050.C Standard C2 3 pts.	No change				
Landscaping							
63	39	33.420.050.C Standard C3 4 pts. max	Amend to read: For each tree preserved that is greater than 20 inches in diameter <u>2</u> points may be earned up to a maximum of <u>8</u> points. <u>8</u> pts max.	Preserve existing trees. For reasons cited above, p 15, I would like to hear from the Urban Forestry Commission and the city's Urban Forester for their input on this item.	Houck		
64	39	33.420.050.C Standard C3 4 pts. Max	Award points for preserving large trees (20"+) in the front 20' of the property - and for new construction include trees in the abutting ROW	Per HCLC's letter, it's the trees out front that are most relevant for design standard consideration (especially with so many points awarded). Note: I understand the reluctance to give points for things in the ROW. But if we award points for awnings that extend into the ROW, we should do the same for trees in the ROW	Spevak (HLC Letter)	Note that trees in the r.o.w. are a standard improvement and are generally not reviewed by BDS.	
65	39	33.420.050.C Standard C4 2 pts.	Change second sentence to: "Trees must be a minimum of five feet in height, listed on the Portland Plant List, and planted such that no two trees are more than 15' apart."	Current language is unclear	Spevak	This rearranges order. Will need to verify the use of "such that"	
66	41	33.420.050.C Standard C5 1 pt.	Amend to read: On sites that are 20,000 square feet or larger, at least 30 80 percent of the total landscaped area must be planted with native species listed on the Portland Plant List....."	Thirty per cent is a pretty low bar.	Houck		
67	41	33.420.050.C Standard C5 1 pt.	Add to the end: "Preserved plants and trees can be included in meeting this standard."	Provides credit for integrating pre-existing native plantings	Spevak		
68	41	33.420.050.C Standard C5 1 pt.	Place a space between the number 80 and percent in the standard.	This is a typo. See above. Note that standard is at 30% (it was a combination of 30% total landscaping and 80% native trees).	BPS from Spevak		
69	41	33.420.050.C Standard C6 1 pt.	To get these points, an unobstructed pedestrian area extending 6' from face of building must be preserved	Ensure that earning this point doesn't incent builders to restrict pedestrian flow	Spevak (Klotz letter)		
Older Buildings / History							
70	41	33.420.050.C Standard C7 1 pt.	Shift to graduated point scale	See HLC letter for more detail	Spevak (HLC Letter)		
71	41	33.420.050.C Standard C8 1 pt.	The term "size of windows" should be replaced by "area of windows" since that is a more clearly measureable standard	Size (the current word) is unclear: Area? Height? Width? This is a technical fix to clarify intent	BPS from Spevak		
72	41	33.420.050.C Standard C9 1 pt.	Drop points for a plaque	Nice, but doesn't contribute to good design	Spevak (HLC and others)		
73	43	33.420.050.C Standard C10 1 reqd, 3 pts. max	Clarify that this applies to designated national Register Landmark or City of Portland Historic Landmark	Clarify what is intended by "Historic landmark"	Bortolazzo	Note that code defines Historic Landmark separately from districts.	

Item #	Page #	Code Section	Proposed Amendment	Rationale	Requestor	Comment	Category
74	43	33.420.050.C Standard C10 1 reqd, 3 pts. Max	Clarify that this standard only applies to buildings adjacent to designated National Register Landmarks or locally designated City of Portland Historic Landmark (but not entire districts or 'contributing structures'		Spevak (Klotz letter)	See above	
75	43	33.420.050.C Standard C10 1 reqd, 3 pts. Max	"The exterior materials on at least 80 percent of the new building's street-facing facade must match the exterior materials on the historic landmark's street-facing facade."	Narrow this standard to the street-facing facade, rather the entire building (some of which may not be visible from the public realm)	Spevak		
76	43	33.420.050.C Standard C10 1 reqd, 3 pts. Max	Under the first bullet, change "asas" to "as" Under the 4th bullet, remove the wording "on the new building" as this is already stated in the preamble to C10	The first is a typo and the second is a technical fix to clarify intent	BPS from Spevak	Note, this change depends on above request.	
Adjacent Natural Areas							
77	43	33.420.050.C Standard C11 4 pts.	Either narrowly define "common outdoor areas" to be hard-surfaced or drop 'common outdoor areas' from the list.	My lay interpretation of 'common area' would include a nice grassy lawn or grove of trees, either of which would be lovely to include within 50' of a waterbody. If the intent is for 'common area' to mean a hard-surfaced area, it should be defined as such - or left out entirely.	Spevak		
78	43	33.420.050.C Standard C11 4 pts.	Drop 'seep' and maybe 'spring'	I'll agree with Design Commission - that design standards are appropriate for natural features that can actually be seen. We should rely on other regulations to prevent negative environmental impacts on water bodies.	Spevak	33.910 Definition: "An area where groundwater is discharged onto the land surface, creating either saturated soil conditions or visible flow at the land surface."	
79	43	33.420.050.C Standard C12 2 pts.	Public View of Natural Feature. Amend to read: Outside of environmental zones, provide a view corridor between the public street and an existing natural feature..... <u>without diminishing the ecological integrity and scenic qualities of the natural feature.</u>	My rationale for suggesting this amendment is that, particularly along the Willamette Greenway desire for private "views" are used as an excuse to cut trees. Just yesterday the Johns Landing Homeowners association topped every black cottonwood tree in a half-mile of river front and cut many trees over 1 ½" DBH.	Houck	If accepted, the language must be made objective and measurable. Also, standard only applies to a view from street to natural feature on-site. Example given wouldn't qualify.	

Summary of QR Items Discussed with Subgroup

Consent Items = QR2, QR4, QR5, QR6, QR7, QR8, QR9(?), QR10, QR11, QR12, QR13, QR15, QR16 (but see matls below, QR17, QR18, QR21)

Discussion Items = QR1, QR3, QR14, Matls. Table, QR19, QR20, QR22, QR23, QR24