Portland is well known for its urban planning and smart growth approach to development. As part of its strategic planning process, the Design Overlay Zone was added to the planning code in the 1982. This review process was intended to combat the popular flat, imposing, and often windowless architectural design plaguing cities at street level (see Appendix III). Fighting hostile street facades, the design standards and review board were meant aid in encouraging more pedestrian oriented design and street activation. Since then, the Overlay Zone has evolved to include protecting valuable cultural, scenic and architectural resources. It aims to enhance infill development, to contextually address buildings within the existing neighborhood fabric, and to encourage transit orientated development within the City of Portland. These methods and other aspects of the planning code have worked together to preserve and enhance much of Portland’s architectural legacy and values.

Today, the city is renowned for its immense walkability, excellent city planning and unique local character. Tourist and residents alike are captivated by innovative designs and adaptive re-use of historic architecture. Thoughtful planning strategies, design guidelines, and a public review process has created a city often ranked on top list for multi-module transit, innovation, destination travel and quality of life by publications such as the American Community Survey, CNN Money, Travel + Leisure Magazine, and Forbes, respectively. Unfortunately, not all of Portland’s ranking are as impression, in June Hoyt Advisory Services ranked the city 21 out of 50 for difficult cities to develop using factors such as regulation and land availability to calculate its results.

Overtime, the Design Review process has become less organized and expedient, often sending a confusing message to applicants, creating delays in scheduling reviews, and repeating seemingly resolved issues during a later phases of the review process. These inconveniences increase project costs, often reduce the projects potential value, and increase the tension between residents and developers. With these systemic issues in mind, the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability (BPS) and the Bureau of Development Services (BDS) commissioned Walker-Macy to document, review and prescribe processes for design overlay zoning. This report, named Design Overlay Zone Assessment or DOZA, has already been unanimously approved by the City Council this past April.¹

This article reviews the current growth projections for the City of Portland and planning strategies to manage it, current zoning and design overlay review, recent design overlay projects and outcomes, and lastly, the recommendations and implementation progress for the DOZA report.

¹Kristina Benson is a Master of Real Estate Development candidate and has been awarded the Center for Real Estate Fellowship. Any errors or omissions are the author’s responsibility. Any opinions are those of the author solely and do not represent the opinion of any other person or entity.
A GROWING PORTLAND

Looking around Portland it’s hard to miss the sea of cranes, rising rents, and ambitious infrastructure projects. The state and local economy continue to grow, nearing the ninth year of a bull cycle. In 2016, Oregon’s gross domestic product grew by 3.3 percent, second highest rate in the nation. Additionally, according to the Bureau of Economic Analysis, 2016 marked the eighth time since 1998 that Oregon ranked in the nation’s top five for GDP growth. The state and local economy continue to grow, nearing the ninth year of a bull cycle. In 2016, Oregon’s gross domestic product grew by 3.3 percent, second highest rate in the nation. Additionally, according to the Bureau of Economic Analysis, 2016 marked the eighth time since 1998 that Oregon ranked in the nation’s top five for GDP growth. At the local level, Portland’s unemployment rate dropped to a low of 3.5 percent in June, hitting what economist Tom Potiowsky called the economic “sweet spot”.

Also growing is Portland’s population. Since 2000 it has increased by a dramatic 7.3 percent, bringing the total population to approximately 640,000 people. This unprecedented growth will continue as Walker-Macy expects Portland to add another 123,000 households by 2035. These two factors will continue to spur real estate development projects.

For permits to be approved, developers must follow the specifications laid out in the city zoning code and master plan. Last December, the City Council adopted the 2035 Comprehensive Plan that calls for intensifying growth in neighborhood centers as part of its smart growth strategy. By January 1, 2018, the corresponding changes and updates to the zoning map, zoning code, and other documents needed to empower the city’s vision will take effect.

Neighborhood Centers will be a key factor in absorbing Portland’s expected population growth by increasing the planned density and zoned activities. In Appendix I, the Urban Design Framework Plan shows the network of commercial nodes, open space, transportation corridors, and greenway belts that link the city. As important cultural and economic nuclei, Neighborhood Centers often require additional review as part of planned districts and overlay zones. Consequently, a disproportionate amount of construction is funneled into the design review process. Therefore, having a understandable and efficiently working design overlay zoning process is key for the economic productivity that the real estate industry brings to Portland.

THE ZONING CODE

The tools created by the zoning code and comprehensive plan work together to provide a skeletal framework that encourages community principles such as walkability, diversity, and inclusion are seamlessly integrated into the existing urban fabric. Portland’s code has three structured categories a site might fall into: base zones, overlay zones, and plan districts.

All sites have a base zone, which sets basic parameters about site use, floor-area-ratios (FAR), building height, and others. To help illustrate their purpose, below are three summaries of base code descriptions:

• **Residential 1,000 (R1)** - Medium density multi-dwelling zoning, 43 units/acre up to 65 with bonuses, typically 1-4 stories, near neighborhood and district collector streets or commercial areas and transit.

• **Storefront Commercial (CS)** - Commercial areas with storefront character (sidewalk orientation, pedestrian friendly), full range of retail, service, business, local and regional market areas

• **General Employment 1 (IG1)** - Mostly smaller lots, high building coverages, and close to street
In addition to base zone requirements, some sites will fall into plan districts. A planned district allows for a specific area of the city to tailor the zoning code to better reflect the needs of the neighborhood and local characteristics the community wants to foster. For example, the following summaries highlight the principals behind planned districts:

- **Central City Planned District (CC)** - Eastside Central City - Encourages designers to capitalize on the district’s character, industrial heritage and strengthen pedestrian friendly retail.

- **St. Johns Planned District (SJ)** - Creates an urban level of mixed-use buildings to strengthen its role as a commercial center, and to emphasize pedestrian and transit-oriented design in the Neighborhood Center.

- **Northwest Plan District (NP)** - Promotes housing and mix-use development, discourages auto-orientated design, enhances pedestrian experiences, supports various levels of development near the streetcar alignment.

Lastly, overlay zones address a specific subject that might be in multiple areas throughout the city. Below are three summaries of overlay zone descriptions:

- **Design (d) Overlay Zone** - Requires a Type II or Type III design review to insure new infill construction enhances the neighborhood aesthetic and community standards.

- **Scenic Resource Zone (s)** - Establishes height limits and view corridors to protect significant scenic resources to enhance Portland’s appearance.

- **Historic Resource Overlay Zone** - Protects and preserves significant parts of the region’s heritage, new and old buildings within a historic district require resource review.

Figure 1: Design Overlay Areas and Proposed Expansion
The Design Overlay Zone triggers the majority of cases being reviewed by the Design Commission. The overlay zone guidelines are created as part of a community planning process within the design districts to ensure certain types of infill development will be compatible with the neighborhood.

Figure 1 illustrates the current Design Overlay areas and its projected expansion along civic corridors. Future design overlay areas are hatched, areas in blue offer a two track design review process (Type II or Type III), and tones of red highlight areas that require a discretionary (Type III Review in Portland’s Central City design area as red, and the Gateway area as pink). These commercial corridors and centers are expected to absorb up to 80 percent of Portland’s projected growth and thus warrant additional oversight. Additionally, areas cover a large part of Portland’s land area as well. Outside of the core Central City and Gateway districts, the Design Overlay Zone covers approximately 38 percent of city acreage, with an upcoming 11 percent increase in coverage into proposed expansion areas, base on calculations from Walker-Macy.

The Portland Zoning Code and Master Plan create a multilayered structure meant to support and protect the city’s resources. Portland’s long tradition of design review has helped enhance the public realm in the central city by guiding development in context-sensitive areas. Yet, as an increasing number of projects are driven towards Type II and Type III design reviews, the city may be to have placed an unintentional governor on construction.

In compliance with state law, Portland offers a two track approval process: the discretionary review track, Type III or the non-discretionary track, Type II, also referenced as the clear and objective track. Projects within the city center and gateway districts must follow the discretionary review track, which requires a Type III Land Use review. During either a Type II Land Use Review, completed by staff, or a Type III Land Use Review, completed by the Design Commission, the reviewing body determines if the proposal fulfills the objectives of the design guidelines.

Table 1: Two Track System of Land Use Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discretionary</th>
<th>Clear and Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjective; requires judgment and flexibility</td>
<td>Objective; doesn’t not require judgment; limits flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Review</td>
<td>Building Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Guidelines</td>
<td>Design standards in code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public comment and potential hearing with Design Commission</td>
<td>Limited public involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required in Central City and Gateway</td>
<td>Potential option everywhere else</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Walker Macy Design Overlay Assessment
THE DESIGN REVIEW PROCESS

The Discretionary Review Track

The design guidelines used in the discretionary review period are a separate document from the Zoning Code and updated through their own process. The Central City and Gateway areas have a full set of fundamental guidelines, while some areas have additional district-specific guidelines to further enhance design details. Neighborhoods without district-specific guidelines are covered under the Community Design Guidelines.

These qualitative approval criteria provide more flexibility in how planning and design goals are achieved than the alternative objective and clear standards. These goals include complex design themes that often emphasize aesthetic and functional values. For example, a few district guidelines explore the multi-faceted meaning of “quality and permanence” by recommending that “building materials should not only be long-lasting but should have interesting textures and patterns.” Others may address permanence as a building's ability to respond to the context, composition, and visual interest of a building's design. The figure on this page shows how a building has successfully integrated this goal by mirroring architectural elements from the surrounding streetscape, thus reflecting the wider neighborhood context.

The Community Design Standards

Found in the city's zoning code (33.218) these standards are prescriptive criteria for development projects that provide a clear and objective track with no additional review. Any project that cannot meet these standards must go through a discretionary review. Due to the longevity and scale of commercial buildings, a key tool in supporting the comprehensive plan is a design review process. In some cases, having design review or the guidelines does not correlate to better design, due to ambiguity as well as the interoperation of the guidelines—without providing enough direction, examples, suggestions for interoperation.

The city's Design Commission uses the tools provided by the guidelines, standards, and zoning code to guide projects in better reflecting the city’s vision. This volunteer commission, provides leadership and expertise on urban design and architecture. The Commission's goals are to provide public dialog, architectural enhancement, and cultural identity for the neighborhoods and districts affected by the Design Overlay Zone. The commission is composed of “members representing different areas in development and the public realm. To ensure a variety of viewpoints, no more than two members may be appointed from any single area of expertise. These areas include design, engineering, financing, constructions, or property management, and a minimum of one representative from regional arts and culture council, and one representing the public-at-large must be represented.”

The seven member team, none of whom may hold public elective office, work diligently on behalf of the public. In 2013, the number of meetings averaged once per month lasting around four hours. In 2014, the Commission added an additional monthly meeting.
Through this process, it can take months to get approved. This demand, growth is expected to continue, especially as the 2035 Compressive Plan projects unprecedented growth within mix-use town centers, most of which are in “d” zones (DOZA, p 11).

According to state law, a project has to navigate the review process within 120 days of submittal. A project's first hearing has to take place within 51 days of submittal. But architects can sign waivers releasing the city from the state obligation. “Every project gets a 120-day waiver,” Cliffe said. “We always sign the waiver.” By signing the waiver, architects can return before the Design Commission if it denies a project proposal at its first appearance. The waiver also protects appeal rights. If architects do not sign the waiver, then they cannot provide new or changed information later in the process. Also, if the project were denied, the team would have to start the process over.”  

Figure 2 illustrates the CO permits for projects within Design Overlay Zones for multifamily dwelling projects. These numbers do not include permits issued to historic landmarks or historic districts. (DOZA, p 6) Overall, 23 percent of projects require a discretionary design review with more than half of those being projects in the Central City or Gateway that must complete the discretionary review process.
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As Portland and the economy grows, the Design Commission is responsible for reviewing more and more projects with the same resources. Though the review board experiences the same cycles felt elsewhere in the real estate industry, the city’s growth often disproportionately occurs within its design overlay areas.

Due to zoning goals and neighborhood planning strategies, “the Type III design review process adds significant time and costs to projects. The amount of time spent in making changes to plans often greatly exceeds what is normally budgeted into design fees for securing entitlements,” according to DOZA. Fees for the review process are dependent on a project’s size and range from a minimum of $5,250 to a maximum of $27,000. Furthermore, the preliminary design advise review (DAR) can add an additional $2,520 of costs to a project.  

13 Presently, a third monthly meeting has often been required. By adding this additional hearing to the calendar, the commission strives to help projects move quickly through the project pipeline. 14 “Each meeting consists of four or more hearings, which last between one and three hours, depending on the size of the project. The meetings start at 1:30 p.m. and can last well into the night.” 15
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Many projects pushing the envelope forward involve integrating innovative ideas and designs in engineering and architecture. Projects pushing these boundaries can be challenging in and of themselves but they face additional barriers during Design Review.

During an interview, Architect Bob Schatz expressed his frustration with the lack of constancy in defining building material quality, permanence, and response to context. A project in his neighborhood passed through the Design Review Board with a set of generic “book plans” even though low-grade building materials were specified. The design reflected a local cottage house style. Meanwhile, other projects in the same neighborhood experienced higher levels of scrutiny and failed while exceeding most building construction standards by using Green Building principals. Appendix V illustrates the example projects. The subjective nature and complex design themes that the discretionary review process entails is especially challenging for development projects when terms aren’t clearly defined or enforced.

Problems also arise when the community has not been effectively engaged. Developers need to seek conversations about the project with the members of the public. City staff need to help educate residents about the review process and scope. Currently, outreach is often done by mail or sign notification and at times the public testifies on topics outside the Commission’s control, like parking requirements, or density allowances. Helping fix the notification and educational aspect about the process, helps residents anticipate change and provide input.

For example, the Ankeny Apartments between Sandy Boulevard and 11th Avenue at 1122 SE Ankeny Street can attest to both sides of this equation. The L-shaped building totals 16 apartment unit with ground-floor retail. Throughout its review process it has received criticism from its neighbors about privacy while receiving praise from City Council for attempting the net-zero energy challenge. The Commission appreciated that the construction materials were of the highest quality, including highly insulated walls and roof, triple-pane passive-house windows, and, originally, solar panels. Neighbors worried about light penetration and privacy due to building height differences, damages to their homes during the construction process, and one neighbor even went so far as to call it “elder abuse” and claimed the project would destabilize the area creating affordable housing issues and a “plague of blight.”

The issues were ultimately tipped toward resolution by city council, who on August 9, overturned the Design Commission in an appeals case. This lengthy process took over 18 months and cost the developer, Landon Crowell, $160,000 in additional city fees, or an average of $9,411 per unit.  

Leading up to council’s decision, the developer to tried to solve the problems with the neighborhood by hosting a community outreach meeting. During this period of mediation, they established a series of design compromises with the neighbors in attendance. Changes and compromises reached throughout the process included setback adjustments, exterior building materials, and height adjustments. The building changed from zero-lot line to 18 inch to 3 feet set backs on 3 sides. They also added wood siding and reduced the building size from 26 units to 18 units. Lastly, to aid the appeals process, the development team sweetened the deal by adding construction mitigation review and use an auger system for pile construction. Before finding this resolution Landon Crowell had five Commission hearings and four City Council hearings.
Occasionally the Zoning Code and Overlay Zones create a more self-directed conflict of interest that creates economic impacts for developers. For example, historic overlay zones in the middle of districts slated for densification often result in opposing goals: historic building preservation and new construction growth. As maximum allowable heights rise above the existing buildings new construction will want to maximize its value. The Design Review Commission can have a big effect on the size and scope of construction by limiting the allowable FAR and building heights. DOZA reports, “Many people make investments in property based on the entitlements spelled out in the Zoning Code. Indeed, tax assessors even determine valuation in part by allowable potential set forth in zoning codes. Long-range planning must be the process for establishing basic zoning entitlements.” (For instance, the Grand Belmont on 514 SW Belmont Street dramatically felt these consequences. Originally, the building was designed with 214 units, rooftop common room, with terrace, ground-floor retail, 102 parking spaces, 23 stories, and a towering height of 240 feet. But due to concerns brought forth by the Design Review Commission, it was downsized to 121 units, 7 stories, 14 parking spaces, 81 feet of height, but also added 184 bicycle spaces, before it was finally approved. The Grand Belmont’s first architect, Vallaster Corp, submitted many versions of a taller tower, including during the Design Advice Requests (DAR) process. Finally, Ankrom Mosian, who was first contracted as a supportive resource, submitted a severely reduced final design. Ankrom Mosian’s previous experience with Portland zoning code and success with the historic overlay zoning commission proved to be essential to the building’s approval. The smaller project was unanimously approved and construction is expected to be complete late 2018.

Working within Portland’s design review process can be confusing to the public and professionals alike. “If I have a client that has gone through the process, they know what to expect,” said Leslie Cliffe, an associate principal at Bora Architects. “If I have an out-of-state developer, in those cases, they are super surprised at the level of input the city gets.” All the DARs, additional reviews, and appeals add up in fees, time, market opportunity cost. When asked about working with the Design Review Commission, Stephanie Fitzhugh, a project manager at DiLoreto Architecture, said “Long waits to appear before the city’s commissions are adding to delays and increased project costs. “Everybody is feeling it; everyone is frustrated,” she said. “Basically, it comes down to: Does the city really want to prevent people from building their projects?”

Supporters of the Commission note the importance of connecting with the community throughout the development process. During an interview with Mark Edlen, of Gerding Edlen, he emphasized the importance of “getting out in front of the community” by hosting public presentations of the project and letting the community get a first look of the design. Knowing about a project before the construction fences go up helps pave the way for more successful community support.

Furthermore, the community and neighborhood associations want to be a productive part of the process. Flint Chatto, co-founder of the Division Design Initiative wants to help more actively engage the community. The group first focused on the Division Street improvements. According to Chatto, “City officials lack the tools to evaluate the context of a project.” Neighborhood groups like the Division Design Initiative are truly concerned about style, context, standards and project transparency. “People need to know how they can make constructive comments,” Hinshaw said. “That kind of information isn’t
broadcast widely enough.” Hinshaw also wants to encourage those small funky add-ons without a design review process, but that creates conflict for streets like Division where most the work is this small scale. The group is mixed on whether smaller projects should be subjected to the review process, if small project review should be eliminated altogether, or if an additional design commissions should be formed. There is a lot of “support for forming a second design commission now,” Chatto said. “There is a big bottleneck of projects. Many people have suggested one [commission] per quadrant. Even having one to two additional commissions would be big.”

After reviewing projects through the city, DOZA found that passing through the design review process does not guarantee that a project is a higher quality project. Concordantly, neither does building outside the Design Overlay Zone limit a projects ability to become a Portland success. There is a cross spectrum support for good design throughout Portland but there are many signs of a poorly functioning review system, yet not a wholly broken one. Appendix IV. has a table with projects under consideration from the design review board from the 1st quarter 2017.

The city contracted with Seattle-based Walker Macy to research the direction they should take to improve the design review process. Over the years the purpose statement of the Overlay Zone has evolved from a tool focusing on preservation and compatibility towards supporting transition and anticipated growth. As the purpose evolves so should the structure of the review process. The recommendations of Walker Macy include adjusting the review thresholds to provide higher review standards for bigger projects and lower review standards for smaller projects, improving public notices, and possibly adding additional design review commissions (currently there’s just one). They compared Portland’s review process with that of other cities with similar structures and found that they reduced delays by limiting their scope, having a greater reliance on staff to review and manage the process details, and by strictly managing discussion during meetings to expeditious reviews. Walker Macy published their report in April. This summer, the City Council approved their recommendations. The DOZA assessment looked at the current review process and overlay zones, examined peer cities, interviewed people and organization, and looked at projects that have been built. The following is a summary of their report and comments about implementation:

The DOZA report divides its recommendations in to three types of changes: administrative, tools, and process. For administrative changes, they recommend having more staff, improving public notices, and developing new tools and training for the commissioners and staffers. These types of changes are typically easier to initiate because they don’t require any changes to city ordinances. Already, the staff has updated their notice procedures by including renters in future mailings. Changes in the tools category include updating the City Standards and Guidelines. Over decades, these documents have been tweaked and amended instead of formally reviewing and revising the documents. Lastly, items that address process include realigning the Commission’s roll, purpose statement and procedural steps, and making it easier for neighborhood associations to get involved by hosting public workshops.

Any changes made need to embody the main goals of the Design Review Commission: to support high quality design development projects with an efficient and effective process, to ensure the applicants and public have access, understanding and engagement opportunities, and to balance the understanding of context with a clear predictable system.
First, DOZA recommends adjusting the design review thresholds. This adjustment would be based on project size so that smaller projects would receive a smaller review requirement than large scale development. Figure 3, on the following page, shows how a new review threshold could change the work load of the Design Review Commission. Restructuring thresholds based on geography and within a tiered approached that factors in the magnitude of change would benefit small businesses and properties by making building upgrades simpler without the added time and expense of review.

Figure 3: 2013-2015 Change in Review Type Based on Proposed Threshold Revisions

Once the threshold is revised, a few changes should be made within the “d” overlay zone itself. This includes consolidating, simplifying and revising the community design standards, and the design guidelines. The Community Design Standards for the clear and objective track are not succeeding in producing well-designed, contextually responsive buildings.

Many standards have not been updated since the late 1990s. Furthermore, the city has experience significant changes since then, including views on how design can impact the urban environment. Additionally, many of the design guidelines are outdated and create complex recommendations that slow down the review system, add delays, and sometimes inhibit better design solutions.
The three tenets of design, respond to context, evaluate the public realm, and expand “quality and permanence,” should guide the rewriting process to successfully achieve these goals. For example, the ground floor of a building greatly impacts the character of public spaces. Therefore, the expansion of the active ground floor use definition and clarification should include more examples and types of appropriate engagement. Streets that have little or no activity often have ground floor residential but lack the appropriate transitional spaces between public and private space. Additional activity enhancing design features that can ease this transition could include porches, raised stoops or setbacks in semi-public spaces. Other clear and objective examples include, addressing the relationship between the sidewalk and facade, addressing pedestrian access and circulation, and requesting ground level elevations and sections at a scale that helps determine appropriateness.

The Design Commission is a key element of the regulatory review power for the City of Portland but its review process has been slowed down not only by the number of projects but a lack of organization. Updating the purpose statement, creating a new charter to address both regulatory authority and limitations of the role and responsibilities of the commissioners, and increasing training for the both the Commission and staff will help the commission fulfill its duties.

A new charter should define the charge of the Design Commission and staff related to its authority and reviews. This includes examining the role and responsibilities of members, authority and limitations of the Commission, public outreach, improvements to events like annual retreats, refreshers, and how to unify the direction given to applicants. Additionally, part of the recommendation is to change how the meetings themselves are managed: keep discussion times on track, focus on applying adopted design guidelines, and limiting a project review to 90 minutes. Furthermore, an important piece of the Design Commission is having a well-prepared staff. Regular staff training should ensure that the guidelines and their subsequent applications are clear. This includes better on-going coordination outside of individual projects and quarterly meetings regarding long-term planning goals with Bureau of Planning and Sustainability.

To better aid developers seeking design advice, re-organize the city’s review process to correspond to a project’s typical design process. The Design Review Commission and staff should use the revised timeline to help avoid discussing specific details too early. And once an issue is resolved during one phase, it should not be revisited in later meetings. Additionally, staff should establish a follow-up process where construction documentation and on-site checks are completed to ensure follow-through. Table 2, contains a concept of new submittal stages.

Establishing a citizen academy would aid in more public outreach and educational opportunities for community members and applicants alike. The City could sponsor seminars, biannually throughout the city. Additionally, they could publish a glossary of terms, collapse the tools into a few sets with similar structures, and use clear graphical explanations of the process. These changes will help encourage positive interactions to uphold a sense of communal responsibility for designing and building the city, and create attitudes of discourse while working together to create better places.
DOZA RECOMMENDATIONS

Lastly, the city should monitor and evaluate the effects of the enacted recommendations over a five year period while keeping clear documentation of the changes and impacts. During this phase, if there remains a backlog of projects, the city should consider a possible second commission.

Now that DOZA assessment has been approved the next steps for the city will be revisioning documents like City Standards that need to be changed through the city ordinances starting with a discussion draft will be released in November 2017. Comments will be integrated into the next draft that is set for release in February 2018. Then the Planning and Sustainability Commission will hold hearings on the proposed draft and integrate the second round of changes. When complete, final draft should be ready to go before city council by next summer, where they will vote on the draft and any amendments. Thirty days after its approval, the final set of rule to take effect. The changes to the standards will be voted on by the BPS Commission and the guidelines will be voted on by the Design Commission. 21

Hopefully with these changes the Design Review Commission will be better able to fulfill their purpose. (An outline of these recommendations can be found at Appendix VI: Recommendations Outline)
APPENDIX I: URBAN DESIGN FRAMEWORK
APPENDIX II: CURRENT DESIGN REVIEW AREA

Areas subject to Design Review
- Discretionary Design Review Required
- Two-Track Design Review
- Historic Districts
- City Boundary
APPENDIX III: EXAMPLES OF HOSTILE GROUND-FLOOR DESIGN
APPENDIX IV: EXAMPLES OF SUCCESSFUL ACTIVE GROUND-FLOOR DESIGN
### APPENDIX V: SELECTED DESIGN REVIEWED PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Estimated Times Reviewed</th>
<th>Date Approved</th>
<th>Story F.A.R.</th>
<th>Type III</th>
<th>Arch</th>
<th>Dev.</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11th &amp; Adior</td>
<td>610 SW 11th Avenue</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Feb 16, 2017</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.1.1</td>
<td>SERA (Jeff Robert)</td>
<td>Morfessor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ankerly Apartments</td>
<td>1122 SW Ankerly St.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>T3D</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Type III</td>
<td>YGH Architecture</td>
<td>Landen Dowell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>SW 16th Avenue and Burrard</td>
<td></td>
<td>Apr 20, 2017</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Type III</td>
<td>Anken Misan Architects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overton 15</td>
<td>1440 NW Overton St.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Type III</td>
<td>Cool Architects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Grand Belmont</td>
<td>514 SE Belmont St.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dec 12, 2016</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.79.1</td>
<td>200a Architecture Review</td>
<td>Urban Asset Advisors (Scott Henderson)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modera Buckman</td>
<td>12th ave and Belmont St</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Type III</td>
<td>Moda Architects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modera Gibson</td>
<td>N 14th Ave &amp; Gibson &amp; Royal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Type III</td>
<td>SERA</td>
<td>Moda Residential Trust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Income Housing</td>
<td>SW Park &amp; Columbia</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Feb 16, 2017</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Type III</td>
<td>G30 Architects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infill - 1440 SW Taylor</td>
<td>1440 SW Taylor Street</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Feb 16, 2017</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Type III</td>
<td>Lebo Architects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor Apartments</td>
<td>1500 SW Taylor St.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Type III</td>
<td>SERA</td>
<td>Ministry Group, Trilogy 3, Investments, Langley Treatment Properties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1438 W Burnside St.</td>
<td>1438 W Burnside St.</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Type III</td>
<td></td>
<td>Building setbacks, 6’ sidewalk change to 12', special building line could increase to 25' (request for extra 10' be waived) needs public hearing, needs public hearing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 MLK Jr blvd</td>
<td>8 MLK and Burnside</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Type III</td>
<td>GREC Architects</td>
<td>Gending Eden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd Cinemas Redlands</td>
<td>1402 NE Maltrones</td>
<td>677</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Type III</td>
<td>Hotel Architecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creek Security Group G</td>
<td>9125 NE Cascades Parkway</td>
<td>30/5/20177</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Type III</td>
<td>Scott Edwards Architecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Infill - 1440 SW Taylor: Used F.A.R. transfer, unanimous approvals
- Taylor Apartments: "Excellent example of infill development!"
- 1438 W Burnside St: Building setbacks, 6’ sidewalk change to 12’, special building line could increase to 25’ (request for extra 10’ be waived), needs public hearing
- Lloyd Cinemas Redlands: Staff review no approval req, BLD review of parking spaces, SED review of stormwater facilities, softs design, walkways, project responds well to feedback
APPENDIX VI: EXAMPLES PROVIDED BY BOB SCHATZ

METAL AND REAL STONE SIDING
SOLAR PANELS
HIGH QUALITY METAL WINDOWS
NEW SIDEWALKS
STORM WATER HARVESTING
OVER INSULATED FOR ENERGY EFFICIENCY
DESIGNED BY AN ARCHITECT

DESIGN DENIED

HARDIE-PLANK PAINTED SIDING
LEAST EXPENSIVE VINYL WINDOWS
DESIGNED BY PLAN BOOK

DESIGN APPROVED

THESE TWO PROJECTS ARE ACROSS THE STREET FROM EACH OTHER IN GATEWAY. EACH OWNER SPENT THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS FOR DESIGN REVIEW.
A. PROCESSES

1. Adjust the thresholds for design review to provide a high level of review for larger projects in d-overlay districts but lessen the level of review for smaller projects.
   a. Restructure the thresholds based on two geographies: 1) Central City and 2) Neighborhoods: Inner, Western and Eastern – including Gateway.
   b. Modify thresholds for design review to reflect a tiered approach based on the magnitude of change.

2. Improve the review processes with a charter, better management of meetings and training for both the Design Commission and staff.
   b. Manage Commission meetings more effectively.
   c. Provide training for staff.
   d. Convene regular Design Commission retreats.

3. Align the City’s review process with the design process.
   a. Organize the City’s review process to correspond to a project’s typical design process.
   b. Focus deliberations.
   c. Require DARs for Type III reviews for larger projects in the Central City.
   d. Expect a collaborative attitude from all participants.

4. Better communicate the role of urban design and the d-overlay tool.
   a. Improve public information and education.
   b. Hold applicant orientation “primers” on a regular basis.

5. Improve the public involvement system.
   a. Post large signs noting impending reviews.
   b. Increase mailed notices for Type II and Type III reviews.
   c. Require applicants to document community input.
   d. Ensure inclusivity in decision-making process.

6. Monitor and evaluate these amendments.
   a. Document where changes are occurring and what the impacts are. The analysis should be evaluated by BPS, BDS, Design Commission, and Planning and Sustainability Commission.
   b. Formalize the annual reporting in Design Commission’s “State of Design.”

7. Consider establishing more than one Design Commission following a period of evaluation.
APPENDIX VII: EXAMPLES PROVIDED BY BOB SCHATZ

B. TOOLS

1. General | Clarify and revise the purpose and scope of the d-overlay.
   a. Revise the purpose statement for d-overlay to reflect current thinking.
   b. Simplify d-overlay terminology.
   c. Clarify the scope of design review.

2. General | Sync the standards and guidelines.
   a. Use a parallel structure for standards and guidelines.
   b. Combine the standards and guidelines into one document.
   c. Create a consistent format.
   d. Separate out historic review criteria.

3. General | Use the three tenets of design to simplify, consolidate, and revise the Standards and Guidelines.
   a. Respond to context.
   b. Elevate the public realm.
   c. Expand “quality and permanence.”

4. General | Broaden “base/middle/top” to encompass other design approaches.

5. General | Recognize the unique role of civic buildings in urban design.

6. Community Design Standards | Ensure that the CDS add value to recently adopted base zoning codes.

7. Community Design Standards | Provide for optional ways of meeting standards.

8. Community Design Standards | Craft appropriate standards for the Gateway area.

9. Community Design Standards | In recrafting the Community Design Guidelines, recognize the changing nature of the city.

10. Central City Fundamental Design Guidelines | Collate special district design guidelines into one citywide set.

11. Central City Fundamental Design Guidelines | Revisit and simplify some of the guidelines.

12. Central City Fundamental Design Guidelines | Collate the subdistrict guidelines into the Central City Fundamental Design Guidelines.
END NOTES


