

*Sellwood-Moreland Improvement League*  
*Land Use Committee Virtual Meeting*  
Meeting Notes February 3, 2021

Land Use Committee (LUC) members present were David Schoellhamer, Miriam Erb, Vikki DeGaa, Rocky Johnson, Francisco Salgado, Bob Burkholder, Kirsten Leising and Shari Gilevich.

The meeting was called to order by Chair David Schoellhamer at 6:00 PM. No other community members were present.

**Updates**

1666 SE Lambert Street project: The developer is making changes to the proposed development and now plans to attend the March 3, 2021 LUC meeting. The committee thought that we should make sure the developer addresses the issues listed in our previous letter to him.

Neighborhood contact rules: Later this year, the City will be revising the contact rules in response to various suggestions that have been received, including those from this committee.

Future meeting with city planner: The group discussed the purpose and goal for meeting with a city planner, which initially was planned for early 2020. At that time, the intent was to further our relationship with city staff and get input on our proposed Main Street design guidelines. The group discussed options to meet with city planners including Staci Monroe or Phil Nameny. Staci Monroe, Development Services, could give insight into how the city applies the code to development during design review. Phil Nameny, Planning & Sustainability, is working on the DOZA project and design standards, and will present DOZA to City Council. He might have ideas why the Main Street design guidelines were not acceptable under the DOZA tenets, and how they should be presented to City Council.

Committee members discussed frustration with the city's lack of interest in the neighborhood's work and recommendations. It would be helpful if the City showed pictures of what they explicitly want, instead of writing vague descriptions that seem to get us only studio and one-bedroom apartments. The concern is that developers will go as cheaply as possible while issues with density and affordable housing remain. When the city dismissed the Main Street design guidelines as being only western architecture, it seemed like a quick way to just say no to the neighborhood.

Committee members agreed on meeting with Staci in March to build a relationship with staff. Other City planners who might attend would be one who works on projects in this neighborhood, such as Art Graves. Miriam was thanked for her effort in putting this together.

**Non-western Architecture Study**

David displayed pictures of non-western architecture. Committee members had annotated the graphics to identify features consistent with Main Street elements. From a broad range of cultures, buildings were found with terraces, stepbacks, balconies, vertical windows, recessed entries, arches and prominent bottom-middle-top features, all design elements found in the Main Street design

guidelines. These images with descriptions form an excellent base to dispute what had been said when the Main Street design guidelines were presented to the Planning Commission.

The decision was to send our report and annotated pictures to Paul Nameny before the Feb. 15th Southeast Uplift meeting as it might be possible to discuss our ideas with him then. This document also will be sent to City Council with SMILE's written testimony. Bob Burkholder said that the SMILE Board did not need to approve as long as our original document is referred to. Any additional photos can be sent to David.

### **Design Overlay Zone Amendments (DOZA)**

The City Council hearing on DOZA has not been set, but the DOZA Recommended Draft is available. The Land Use Committee (LUC) can review this document and focus comments on Community Design Standards, CDS, as they apply to so much development in the neighborhood. It was decided that LUC members will re-group into four subcommittees to review. A subcommittee will have the previous table of standards and our comments about the standards, and the new standards table from the Recommended Draft. The task is to compare the two tables and suggest changes to our testimony about the new standards for our testimony to City Council. Each subcommittee may want to prioritize what it wants to incorporate into DOZA.

It was noted that the City changed DOZA's four original tenets (Site Planning; Building Massing; Street Frontage; Facades - Q/R & PR) into three tenets (Quality & Resilience; Context; Public Realm). Our comments to the Planning Commission were based on the three tenets, so new comments will be easy to track.

Two other items were in our original testimony: for the previous R2 zone -- now RM1 -- the City did not test the development potential on a 5,000 square foot lot as we requested. Also, one of the design standards was found to be automatically satisfied by the base zoning code or the City never tested it. David will see if the city responded to our earlier testimony on these topics. The committee agreed to this process, and he will email materials to committee members.

The committee discussed the need for advocacy to prepare for the City Council hearing because this hearing likely is our only chance for input and to get our guidelines in some form into City code. We want specific features, such as recessed windows, to be in the CDS as optional standards, and, where the City has designated the Main Street Overlay, we're asking that at least one of the standards that we've advocated be required. The thought is that if the City hears from enough people advocating for these options, they'll probably support the ideas. A volunteer to lead an advocacy effort is needed to get people to testify and pitch it when we meet with council members. It was discussed to use the email list of people who were involved with the Main Street design guidelines project and the ListServe to find this volunteer.

The committee discussed working with other neighborhoods to testify about community standards to have a bigger impact, though it was thought that testimony would be more impactful if each neighborhood sent people to testify rather than having one person testify for numerous neighborhoods. SMILE can advocate for itself about the Community Design Standards while others

may be focused on design review. Everyone agreed that it was a big job to get the advocacy campaign going.

David thought that the lead advocacy person would interface with other neighborhoods, build relationships with them and coordinate the testimony, as well as get community members to write letters. (He noted that the coordinated effort in front of the PC didn't do much good.) Kirsten's experience was that neighbors know that this work is important, but they find it hard to commit to monthly meetings and be involved with the city. She would like to be involved with advocacy, though not be the only person, and would like to understand the material and process better. Vikki suggested that Board member Elaine O'Keefe could help as the Board is putting together a new communications committee.

The members agreed that not just one person has to volunteer to do advocacy. Also, a simple, clear message to the City Council is needed about what we want. Do we want that all the Main Street design guidelines are in DOZA, or would it be a specific request, that, for example, we want three specific design elements in any new building?

David suggested that the advocacy effort be a combination of work by the LUC, largely by writing the bigger letter and distilling comments to bullet points, then the committee and Kirsten getting the message out. Involving the new communications committee in advocacy might also be a great benefit. He noted that we still need to create our core message, but at least we're discussing the process and this is an improvement over what we did with the Planning Commission.

Over the next month, the committee will get re-familiarized with the design standards and testimony to prepare for the City Council hearing.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:25 PM.