

Memorandum

April 14, 2021

To: Urban Design Panel

From: UDP Executive Committee

RE: DISCUSSION ITEMS AND SUPPORT FOR DOZA RECOMMENDED DRAFT-DRAFT TESTIMONY TO CITY COUNCIL

Council hearing to consider DOZA is on **May 12th**

- DOZA Recommended Draft (DOZARD) can be found here (page numbers noted below are from this draft):
https://www.portland.gov/sites/default/files/2021/doza_volume2_recommendeddraft_feb21.pdf
- DOZA webpage: <https://www.portland.gov/bps/doza/recommended-draft>

DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. **The DOZARD allows buildings up to 75' to use prescriptive standards, the current threshold is 55'**
Section 33.420.050.B.3. Page 33.

- *Standards do not allow public process, Standards cannot adequately address social, physical and natural context in a public forum, in a DZ the City allows communities to have a voice in how their community grows, in a DZ there is pressure for developers to listen and get creative, in a DZ staff and Commission are a 3rd party to hear both sides and find something that can work, issues are different across communities and Standards don't address those differences*

Draft Recommendation: Retain the current threshold of 55'.

2. **The DOZARD proposal is to eliminate the required DAR when qualifying affordable housing projects choose a Type 2 instead of the required Type 3, current requirement requires a DAR when a Type 2 is picked**

Footnote to table 825-1. Page 153.

- *DAR/Type II bundle allows a public forum without a lengthy Type 3 review process, DAR pre-emptively gets the issues on the table for the project to work on early before too much investment and can avoid costly revisions, DAR allows broader public participation on par with a Type 3 and with less process, Council's current Housing Emergency struck a good compromise by requiring a DAR and allowing less process with a Type 2.*

Draft Recommendation: Require a DAR when a Type 2 review process is chosen, support expedited process for affordable housing projects.

3. **Factors Reviewed during Design Review-DOZARD does not include zoning entitlements, maximum height and maximum FAR as features that can be reduced during the design review process.**

Section 33.825.035. Page 159.

- *It is desirable and sensible to guarantee allowed FAR/height to a project because that is economically driven. One could also argue that it is very sensible to reduce height/FAR because these factors are the cornerstone to how one approaches designing a responsive building on a site.*

Draft Recommendation: Support the DOZARD proposal.

4. Design Commission membership

Section 33.710.050.B. Page 133.

- *2 members are proposed to be dedicated positions for “Sustainable Building Practices” and “Natural Resource Management”. Proposal includes current requirement of a RACC liaison. Proposal limits Public-at-Large: “cannot be employed in a development related field”. The above totals 4 members of a 7-member Commission.*

Draft Recommendation: Refine language to emphasize that the Design Commission be comprised of a diverse set of perspectives, including sustainability and resource management, but that the emphasis on membership is experience and expertise in urban design.

5. Urban Design Diagrams and District Character Statements

- *Currently, the DOZARD does not specifically reference urban design diagrams developed for the Central City Plan Update as important context documents for design review. District character statements are mentioned but are a deferred action subject to funding.*

Draft Recommendation: Develop and adopt as a high priority urban design diagrams and character statements for all districts subject to design review.

SUPPORT THESE PROPOSALS AND PERSPECTIVES

6. Bridges require Design Review

Sections 33.420.041 C. & .045 A.8. Pages 15 and 17.

- *Significant civic infrastructure in the City should be reviewed with a DZ lens – Design Review is about how people engage with urban design.*

7. Expanded prescriptive exemptions that allow alterations to buildings

33.730.050 B. Page 145.

Section 33.420.045. Starts on page 17.

- *Exemptions that ensure the public realm is active and successful – e.g. awnings, louvers/vents, storefront, non-street facing facades, above the ground floor.*

8. DAR

33.730.050 B. Page 145.

- *Aligned with the design process, provides clarity to what a DAR is, add parameters to the process, acknowledges the DAR's value.*

9. **Thresholds**

Table 825-1. Page 153

- *Better aligns development intensity & potential impact with level of review*

10. **Admin Improvements**

https://www.portland.gov/sites/default/files/2020/doza_volume4_recommendeddraft_appendix.pdf

see Appendix A, pages 1-51

- *BDS has implemented several successful process and admin improvements outside of the Code since the beginning of DOZA and continues to do so.*

11. **Guidelines**

https://www.portland.gov/sites/default/files/2021/doza_volume3_recommendeddraft_citywidedg_feb21_compressed.pdf

- *Strong, strongly encourage Character Statements to supplement the 'Context' guidelines.*

12. **Design Review**

General support for the Design Review process. It works and adds value to our growing City.