

**CIZUP Meeting #5 Notes**  
**Thursday, August 14, 2014**

In attendance:

John Cole, David Ellis, Karen Karlsson, Sharon Maxwell, Mike Warwick, Chris Brehmer, Marty Stiven, Justin Fallon Dollard, Jill Panches, Rebecca Ocken, Larry Hill, Jack Orchard, Douglas Hardy, Tamara DeRidder, Mark Walhood, Tom Karwaki

**INTRODUCTION**

John Cole announced the release of Comp Plan Proposed Draft, and reiterated that the campus institution zoning project is intended to implement specific economic goals and policies contained in that document.

The draft June meeting notes were reviewed with no comments or objections. These will be posted on the project webpage.

An upcoming transportation issues meeting was proposed for Thursday, Sept. 11. Staff will send out materials in advance.

**DESIGN ISSUES**

Differences in campus location, campus scale and intensity of development have led staff to propose three sets of zoning standards intended to serve medical centers (IC1), urban higher-ed (IC2) and larger residential college campuses (IC3)

*A Development Standards Worksheet* was presented that included: existing development standards applied to institutions; representative development standards applied in two commercial zones, and an initial draft set of development standards intended to reflect the differences in institution character.

Questions were raised about the maximum FAR and height limits assigned to the IC3 Residential Higher Ed zone which are being reduced and the IC2 Urban Higher Education zones. It was reiterated that one of the goals of this project was to encourage institutions to build up within their existing boundary rather than spread out into the surrounding neighborhoods. Do the proposed development standards accomplish this?

Staff also used a PowerPoint presentation to assist in the subsequent discussion of development standards. Graphic information was presented showing building setback and height limits that are currently applied through base zone regulations to commercial and institutional buildings adjacent to residential neighborhoods.

Additional information was presented regarding two specific construction projects, the Providence Hospital Cancer Center (150') and Randall Children's' Hospital Tower (175") where building heights taller than what would otherwise be permitted through the base zone regulations were permitted through the CUMP/IMP and development standard adjustment processes.

The distance these towers are setback from the campus boundary contributes to their ability to successfully accommodate such height without imposing on the adjoining neighborhoods. In the Providence hospital example the adjacency to highway 84 also helped.

These were both seen as successful examples of tall buildings not overwhelming the neighborhoods but it was noted that the current setback standards and the setbacks proposed for the IC1 zone would allow tall buildings much closer to the campus boundary. Staff should investigate codifying the circumstances that allowed the two building examples.

A process discussion regarding the benefits of looking at individual campuses **holistically as** occurs under the CUMP and IMP processes vs. incrementally under base zone standards as would be the result under the proposed draft approach also occurred throughout the meeting. Some institutions such as Legacy Good Samaritan also have greater floor area ratio allowances than are included in the proposed draft development standards table. Will such allowances be grandfathered in under a new zoning scheme?

A well crafted CUMP or IMP should reduce the number of individual land use reviews required but in practice this has been an elusive benefit. Often, institutions are unable to accurately forecast what their development plans are that far in advance and tentative projects are included that are unlikely to materialize. This leads to a false portrayal of an institutions development future.

At the same time, from an institutions point of view, the value of a CUMP or IMP is the certainty that such an agreement provides. If a subsequent building proposal is within the anticipated size, location and land use type as specified in the CUMP it should be readily approvable with limited additional review.

At the meeting's conclusion, the attendees asked for clarification of the chart showing current and master-planned FARs for Portland's campuses. Staff will prepare an updated and expanded chart in response to this request.

It was pointed out that there are a number of instances where an institution's CUMP or IMP boundary includes property not under the ownership of the institution. Similarly, there are examples of institutions selling individual properties no longer needed to fulfill campus aspirations. Thought needs to be given as to what happens to these properties if they are assigned an institutional base zone and subsequently not acquired or developed in that way.

---