

ASTORIA PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

Astoria City Hall

January 7, 2014

CALL TO ORDER:

President Innes called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m.

INTRODUCTION OF NEW MEMBERS:

ITEM 2(a): Sean Fitzpatrick, Peter Gimre, Ron Williams

ROLL CALL:

Commissioners Present: President McLaren Innes, Thor Norgaard, Ron Williams, Peter Gimre, Sean Fitzpatrick, and Zetty Nemlowill

Commissioners Excused: David Pearson

Staff and Others Present: Community Development Director Brett Estes and Planner Rosemary Johnson; Consultant Matt Hastie, Angelo Planning Group. The meeting is recorded and will be transcribed by ABC Transcription Services, Inc.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS:

ITEM 4(a):

In accordance with Sections 1.110 and 1.115 of the Astoria Development Code, the Astoria Planning Commission needs to elect officers for 2014. The 2013 officers were President McLaren Innes, Vice-President Mark Cary, and Secretary Sherri Williams.

President Innes nominated Sherri Williams as Secretary, seconded by Commissioner Nemlowill.

Director Estes clarified that the by-laws require a secretary be elected and Staff member Ms. Williams coordinates the meeting minutes and sends materials to the Commission.

The Astoria Planning Commission unanimously voted to re-elect Sherri Williams as Planning Commission Secretary for 2014.

President Innes nominated Zetty Nemlowill as President, seconded by Commissioner Norgaard. The Astoria Planning Commission unanimously voted to elect Zetty Nemlowill as President for 2014.

President Nemlowill nominated McLaren Innes as Vice-President, seconded by Commissioner Norgaard. The Astoria Planning Commission unanimously voted to elect Commissioner Innes as Vice-President for 2014.

President Nemlowill called for a brief recess at 7:06 p.m. and reconvened the meeting at 7:09 p.m.

President Nemlowill thanked Vice-President Innes for serving as President in 2013.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

ITEM 5(a): November 26, 2013

Vice-President Innes called for discussion of the minutes. Hearing none, she moved to approve the minutes of the November 26, 2013 meeting as presented; seconded by Commissioner Gimre. Motion passed unanimously.

ITEM 5(b): December 3, 2013

Commissioner Fitzpatrick explained that he arrived late to the December 3rd meeting because he had an appointment that was scheduled prior to being appointed Commissioner. He made Mayor Van Dusen aware of this scheduling conflict, and the fact that he had a conflict with the Applicant of the first two agenda items, so he and Mayor Van Dusen agreed that he would arrive as close to 7:30 pm as possible. On Page 4, the minutes erroneously state he declared that he did business with the Applicant and he believed Commissioner Norgaard made this declaration. He explained that he abstained from voting on Items 3 (a) and (b) because he had not attended commissioner training. He had agreed to attend the meeting, but abstain from voting. He asked the meeting minutes be amended to reflect the corrections.

President Nemlowill recalled Commissioner Norgaard had declared that he does business with the Applicant. She thanked Commissioner Fitzpatrick for explaining his late arrival.

Vice-President Innes moved that the Astoria Planning Commission approve the minutes of December 3, 2013, with the following correction: Page 4, Paragraph 3, "Vice-President Cary, Commissioner Norgaard, and ..."; seconded by Commissioner Fitzpatrick. Motion passed unanimously.

REPORTS OF OFFICERS/COMMISSIONERS:

There were no reports.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:11 p.m. to convene the work session.

ITEM 7(a): WORK SESSION: Riverfront Vision Plan – Civic Greenway

Director Estes gave a brief review of the first two work sessions dedicated to creating Code language to implement the Civic Greenway Zone of the Riverfront Vision Plan. This work session will address concerns with public access overwater and on-land development. The next work session, scheduled for January 21, 2014, will address concerns with design guidelines and the proposed residential neighborhood to be located between the police station, fire station, and Safeway, where the Public Works shop is currently located. He anticipated another work session on February 25th to review draft Code language based on the Commission's feedback, and to ask the Planning Commission for any additional direction that may be needed at that time.

Matt Hastie, Angelo Planning Group, presented via PowerPoint an overview of the memorandum included in the Staff report, which focuses on options associated with over-water public access and on-land development, and reviewed the assumptions and objectives included in the Riverfront Plan. He addressed questions from the commission as follows:

- Public access to the water beyond the structure could affect property owners, depending on where the access is provided. In some areas, a public right-of-way extends out over the water, but an easement may be necessary if no right-of-way exists. While more applicable within other zones, providing access to the water through rights-of-way and easements may be applicable in the Civic Greenway Zone, but in fewer situations. Development could include uses such as marinas, which could be affected by public access to the water.
- The Rivertrail also provides an alternate access to the water through Civic Greenway Zone.
- Limiting access hours to facilities providing access to the water was recommended. The limitations on operating hours would be similar to what already exists for the Rivertrail. Another example of limited access would be if property owners gated walkways. For example, the red building near the port has a walkway around the building that is not within a right-of-way. The property owners may want to block access to this walkway during operation of the red building by installing a gate. The City has an easement on the north side of the building, which allows public access during daylight hours. Blocking access to certain areas at night serves as a safety provision.
- The recommended path width of 12 feet to 16 feet was taken from the updated standards for shared-use pathways in the Transportation System Plan. The Riverwalk is 10 feet to 12 feet wide. The shared-use pathway design standards were a nationwide standard.

- Key considerations for the Planning Commission with regard to public access overwater include:
 - Should development be required or encouraged to provide access?
 - Should access be encouraged by allowing developers to exceed the base standards for building size?
 - Should provisions be applied to all new overwater development or only development that would block physical access or views of the river?
- The language currently being considered regards the Civic Greenway. The City received a grant to update the Development Code to implement recommendations in the Riverfront Vision Plan. The project is being completed in two phases, covering the Civic Greenway Zone and Bridge Vista Zone. Code language is being drafted for each zone, but many of the recommendations could, and likely would, be applicable to other sections of the riverfront. Each zone will have different characteristics that will trigger different Code language. Access to the river is probably more applicable to other areas of the riverfront where more overwater development will occur.
- Big Red (100 31st Street) and Pier 39 (100 39th Street), which are overwater properties in the Civic Greenway Zone, are designated as historic. Option 3 would define major renovations to include a certain percentage of the value and could include change of use. It would not be appropriate for small changes, like installing new siding, to trigger a pier extension. The goal is to encourage property owners to maintain structures. Staff could work with the Planning Commission to better define a major renovation and decide on appropriate thresholds for triggering requirements.

President Nemlow called for public testimony regarding public access to water in the Civic Greenway Zone.

Elizabeth Menetrey, 3849 Grand Avenue, Astoria, believed it was confusing to talk about recommendations that apply to both areas during discussions about one area. She asked why the presentation included recommendations that would be more specific to another area. Director Estes explained that the focus was only on the Civic Greenway Zone. Some decisions made for the Civic Greenway Zone could be implemented in other areas. No decisions are being made about the Bridge Vista Zone. Planner Johnson added the Planning Commission is considering whether these recommendations should apply to development that meets the criteria of the Civic Greenway Zone. The piers and walkways are not tied to major overwater development.

Karen Kenyon, 864 Grand Avenue, Astoria, was appalled that the Planning Commission is considering overwater development between 16th and 39th Streets. This is the most beautiful area of the city. She loves walking on the Riverwalk and can imagine how it must have been early in the Astoria's history. The history and preservation is so important to this whole community. She could not imagine a three-story building in the area. Looking out across the area is a thrill for her. She has lived in Astoria for 34 years and each morning the view is just as thrilling as it was when she first moved here. She could not imagine allowing overwater development in the area.

Laurie Caplan, 766 Lexington, Astoria, attended an early meeting in the Flag Room and other meetings, which were packed with people who never attend public meetings. The consensus among a range of people was that buildings should not be allowed in the Civic Greenway Zone. The language Mr. Hastie was using was passive. He said that big buildings may happen here, like thunderstorms and acts of god happen. The only way big buildings will be built is if the City states it wants a big building in the area. The consensus at every public meeting she attended is that no one wanted anything built that would block access and views. This is vivid in her mind even though the meetings were several years ago. Everyone treasures the Riverwalk and people will drive 100 miles to spend the weekend walking on the Riverwalk or take the trolley. She understood that the City or the consultant was proposing to write language that would allow the City to change its mind or allow a project someone really wants to build. The language sounds like it would allow the City to sneak in things that the population overwhelmingly has rejected. It is strange to talk about a section of the Riverwalk where there is not supposed to be any construction when the first item mentioned has to do with construction and structures. There are many loopholes in this language and she encouraged and begged the Planning Commission to consider the implications. It is up to each person to keep Astoria as the treasure that it is. Director Estes clarified that the statements presented at the beginning were from the approved Riverfront Vision Plan, which is not proposed language. Ms. Caplan stated she understood. Director Estes recalled the last work session, where the Planning Commission discussed the appropriate amount of overwater development. The Planning Commission asked Staff for additional information, which will be discussed at a meeting in February 2014. Ms. Caplan said she knew that more discussion about overwater development would be taking place, which she appreciated.

Helen MacDonald, 801 Alameda Avenue, Astoria, read her written statement into the record, saying that she has imagined what could happen in the Civic Greenway Zone. The Port of Astoria is a very interesting, out of the way, real-world off-loading experience for the ship passengers, just like the Tillamook Cheese Factory, Corning Recycling Glass Plant in Portland, and TV programs like Deadliest Catch, Ax Men, and Ice Road Truckers. She questioned the wisdom of allowing the Port to assume the responsibilities of building more docks in the city because a number of maintenance and repairs are still waiting to be finished. She referred to a list from various news sources and the Port website noting the stages of completion on the various projects. The open expanse is an attraction for tourists and locals. Cluttering up the area with a convention center or cruise ship docks would be ignoring a jewel. She asked the Planning Commission to refrain from the development of the Civic Greenway Zone and honor the river visioning committee's choices for openness. She presented her statement, which included the list of unfinished Port projects, to Staff.

Ralph Wirfs, 864 Grand Avenue, Astoria, believed one of the established premises of tourism is a real working waterfront with log sort yards and fish plants. Cruise ship passengers that have been on the ship for several days get a chance to stretch their legs and walk the waterfront or ride the trolley. He believed tourism would be damaged if the cruise ships had to dock in the middle of town. He asked if there would be discussion about turning three sections of the Civic Greenway Zone into housing developments. Director Estes noted that on land development would be discussed in detail at the next meeting on January 28, 2014.

Drew Herzig, 628 Klaskanine Avenue, Astoria, confirmed that the Riverwalk was considered a City park and technically closes at dusk. The hours of operation should be reconsidered because dusk occurs quite late during the summer and the Riverwalk is incredibly beautiful at night. Technically, anyone on the Riverwalk after dusk is trespassing.

Jack Renquist, commercial fisherman, welcomed the new Commissioners. He recalled testifying at a meeting in the Flag Room several years ago, where the understanding was that there would be no river access from 16th Street to 39th Street. He walks the Riverwalk because it is a safe and refreshing place to walk and look at the river where there is always something going on. Development on the south side of the river has been great, with Mill Pond and the new Hampton Inn (201 39th Street). He asked the Planning Commission to keep development to the inside of the Riverwalk because development on the outside will take the enjoyment and safety away. On a nice sunny day, he sees mothers walking with strollers and bicycles, and he would like the Riverwalk to stay this way. He urged the Commission to keep development to the west of the Maritime Museum where people are less likely to walk due to traffic. The trolley is full every day because people enjoy riding the trolley and walking to Pier 39 to look at the river. There are plenty of other places more appropriate for development. He reiterated that development between 16th and 39th Streets should be kept inside the walkway so that people can enjoy the river.

Susana Gladwin, 1039 Lexington, Astoria, recalled attending planning meetings to discuss the canneries and logging yards. Astoria was in a depression 40 years ago and today, visioning has made Astoria a destination for people from Clatskanie and Longview, who come for cultural events. She would like to see river access points on the map. There are not very many vistas as you drive in on Highway 30. While it is wonderful to preserve the Riverwalk, she did not want to lose the views that can be seen while driving, like the views from Marine Drive and Commercial Street coming into town. There are not many of these views left. If visitors only saw a corridor of buildings as they drove in, it would be a shame. The economy of the city is partially dependent on Astoria as a destination. Astoria is also the county seat and has the medical center, which brings in people. Glancing at the river during sunset is lovely and there are not many places to get the view. She asked that the maps show where the river can be seen from Highway 30 and urged the Planning Commission to preserve the views.

Ken Adams, 271 4th Street, Astoria, agreed that most Astorians are opposed to overwater development. He believed Option 3 should be emphasized because the other two options only encourage, rather than require, access to the water.

David Isaacs, 801 Alameda, Astoria, has lived in Astoria since 2001, when he purchased his home. He enjoyed Astoria as a tourist for six years prior to moving here. He could not imagine building a new complex of businesses that will dwarf the trolley ride. Sending the trolley through a canyon of buildings built in an area being referred to as a state park is another issue that should be addressed. Many people just like him visit Astoria, but he has not seen many businesses come in from outside the region, other than the big box stores. There must be a reason for this. He was surprised that the Port failed to promote an extra \$1.5 million for the mini convention center, which would be nice on 15th Street.

Laree Johnson, 1193 Harrison Avenue, Astoria, said she was on the Lewis and Clark Bicentennial Board several years ago to help develop the celebration plans. She takes great pride in envisioning Lewis and Clark coming down the river. It is critical for Astoria to protect that history and view shed. Money speaks loudly, so people want to develop the river as it is a way to make money. However, the river needs to be protected for the priceless treasure that it is. Astoria is a steward of the river and it should not be for the privileged few that have the money to develop a condominium or a business over the river. She believed that currently, the Planning Commission needs to make sure that the language clarifies the intent to protect this historic view shed. She urged the Planning Commission to keep in mind what future generations can enjoy and appreciate about the river.

President Nemlowill noted that some of the public comments were from people who did not attend the last work session. She understood the Planning Commission had agreed on an interpretation of the Riverfront Vision Plan and in developing Code language that there would not be significant development, if any, in the Blueway Zone that is within the Civic Greenway Zone. She believed the graphics in the presentation of public access had given people the wrong impression. Director Estes recalled that building size was discussed, but discussion was not specific enough to develop the Code language. So, overwater development will be discussed again in February. Staff understood the Planning Commission did not want significant development, but numbers and percentages need to be determined. The images shown were developed for the Riverfront Vision Plan. The Planning Commission will need to consider if certain areas would allow something such as a one story, 20-foot wide building. If so, would public access be required? Even though the developable areas are very small in the Civic Greenway Zone, public access needs to be considered. Planner Johnson recalled that the Planning Commission discussed uses at the last meeting, and condensed the potential uses in the Civic Greenway Zone to maritime related uses, like a marina, or associated uses, like a small coffee shop with a marina. Director Estes added that discussions at the last Planning Commission meeting also regarded conditional and permitted uses in the overwater zones, which Staff would like to discuss further in February. He and President Nemlowill agreed that significant developments in the Civic Greenway Zone have been ruled out. Mr. Hastie recalled discussions at the last meeting that indicate significant limitations to development, but even if development is small, should public access be required? Public access is identified in the Riverfront Vision Plan and must be addressed so that he can draft Code language. He apologized for the confusing graphics.

President Nemlowill called for comments and questions from the Planning Commission.

Vice-President Innes asked where restrooms fit it, as they would be a small building. Director Estes stated he has noticed a change in the community's perspective since the Riverfront Vision Plan was adopted. When the Plan was developed, the community did not want restrooms along the waterfront because it was too tourist oriented.

Commissioner Gimre asked if it were possible to require that nothing be built outside of a maritime use. Staff explained that the Riverfront Vision Plan has already been adopted and cannot be changed. The Planning Commission is tasked with creating Codes that implement the Plan, which allows limited development in the Civic Greenway Zone and does not prohibit development. All maritime uses do not have to be prevented and could be limited. Commissioner Williams confirmed that uses could be limited to such an extent that no one would want to develop anything in this area.

President Nemlowill added that maritime uses could be minimal or significant. Staff agreed that some maritime uses involve structures and some do not. Limits on types of uses and building size would be included in the Code to prevent large three-story buildings, like condominiums or fish processing plants. She noted that a waterfront park is a significant part of the Riverfront Vision Plan and Civic Greenway Zone, yet this has not been discussed. Staff explained that the Parks Board would review the waterfront park. City Council has taken steps to demolish some of the buildings in the area. The Astoria Development Commission owns the entire parcel, which is envisioned in the Civic Greenway Zone as a park. This parcel is currently zoned HR, Hospitality Recreation, which allows structures to be up to 60 feet tall. This project will be discussed later.

The Planning Commission discussed the recommended options regarding public access and was divided between Option 2 and Option 3. President Nemlowill was concerned that Option 3 would have a negative impact on historic properties. The Planning Commission agreed that more details about the types and sizes of development would be necessary before deciding if provisions needed to be applied to all overwater

development, or just development that blocked physical access. Option 3 could exempt existing buildings to allow renovations of the two historic properties.

Staff cited several examples of privately owned facilities built on public properties, like Number 10 6th Street and Pier 11. Property owners would need to come to an agreement with the City on maintenance, access and hours of operation.

President Nemlowill called for a brief recess at approximately 8:25 pm and reconvened the meeting at 8:29 pm.

Mr. Hastie asked for feedback on his recommendations for hours of access, walkway design standards and whether piers and boardwalks through or next to a structure should be extended at least 10 feet beyond the outer edge of the structure.

The majority of the Planning Commission agreed that access hours should be limited, possibly seasonally, but were divided on the preferred width of piers and boardwalks. While 10 to 12 feet could be sufficient and less costly to build, 12 to 16 feet would better accommodate shared uses, making pedestrians feel safer as bicycles pass. Several Commissioners preferred requiring piers to extend 10 feet or more beyond the north face of development to preserve views of the river. Staff reminded that the Parks Department, City Council, and the Police Department would determine access hours. Planner Johnson clarified that she would need to check the actual hours of park closure in the City Code.

Referring to the PowerPoint presentation, the Commission preferred providing all options to provide for visual access, rather than just one option, depending on the scenario.

Mr. Hastie continued with his PowerPoint presentation providing recommendations for preserving visual access to the river from land through restrictions on building height, building stepbacks and setbacks, and when these restrictions should apply. Staff explained that heights on buildings with peaked roofs are measured at the mid-point between the eave and the ridge of the roof. Staff noted building heights of specific buildings to give the Commissioners a sense of scale. Mr. Hastie noted that consideration needs to be given as to how stepbacks relate to peaked and sloped roofs.

President Nemlowill said it is challenging to review significantly different zones. The Commission needs to consider the uses in each area to preserve visual access to the waterfront and could recommend some changes to the Mill Pond area to reflect the Riverfront Vision Plan's goals. When the plan for the Gateway Overlay Zone was created, the goal was to market the HR zone for a waterfront hotel. Since then, other hotels have been built, so there is no longer a need for the property to be developed as a hotel. The 60-foot height limit could be eliminated.

Mr. Hastie noted that the Planning Commission needed to consider floor area ratio (FAR) requirements within the Gateway Overlay Zone and tree species requirements along the view corridor. Staff and Commissioners discussed the current FAR requirements in the MH-Maritime Heritage and HR-Hospitality Recreation zones. The Mill Pond area is meant to have dense development.

Mr. Hastie reviewed applicability of requirements regarding building height, stepbacks and setbacks.

President Nemlowill called for public feedback.

Elizabeth Menetrey, 3849 Grand Avenue, Astoria, recalled Planner Johnson's comment that the Riverfront Vision Plan could not be changed and reminded that maximum heights could be established. Option 2, which has been recommended by the project team, dovetails with the recommendations for the area to have single-family homes and modest scale buildings. She recalled discussions from 2007 about keeping in mind the views from Marine Drive, adding that she likes the idea of a wider corridor because of the views. The Hampton Inn does block the view a bit as you come into Astoria.

Blaine Verley, 4798 Cedar Street, Astoria, asked what proposals for overwater development had been submitted. Director Estes stated that one area at the foot of 6th Street has been approved for overwater development. Other overwater developments have been approved over the years, but permits for those developments have expired. Planner Johnson clarified that the City cannot predict what will happen as far as any future overwater

development. Mr. Verley stated he has begun hearing about more housing along the waterfront and asked for details about on land development. Director Estes explained that a zone change has been proposed for the area east of Mill Pond to allow for residential development. The City has discussed moving the Public Works shops to the former landfill site; however, no funds have been allocated to relocate the shops. New houses in Mill Pond and the townhomes near the Police Station are the only development in the area. Mr. Verley believed the Riverfront Vision Plan provides an open invitation for development up and down the entire waterfront.

Mr. Hastie responded that the Riverfront Vision Plan imposes significant limitations compared to the existing requirements on any development that would occur. The Riverfront Vision Plan recommended that the area between the Mill Pond and Safeway be rezoned to allow for more development of a modest scale residential neighborhood, but no development proposals have been submitted. The Riverfront Vision Plan limits or restricts the size and scale of development in the area.

Planner Johnson added that the area where the zone change has been proposed currently allows a full City block, 45-foot tall building. The new zone would drastically reduce the type of development allowed in the area.

Mr. Verley said the Riverfront Vision Plan still sounds like an open invitation for development. Hampton Inn was a large development that he did not anticipate.

Planner Johnson stated that the market drives development and the City cannot predict how development will occur. The City can write the best Codes possible to deal with developments as they occur.

Kenneth Adams, 271 4th Street, Astoria, stated he preferred Option 3 and was disappointed that the Planning Commission gravitated towards Option 2 during their discussions. He wanted the Planning Commission to discuss the options again so that he could get a clear understanding. He believed the concern that requiring access around all sides of a building would be expensive was an over exaggeration. He did not believe the City would require public access around all sides of a building if Option 3 was chosen. Access that extends 10 feet beyond one side of a building would allow the public to see around the building. He believed that Option 3 was not that stringent because a developer would already be investing millions of dollars, and adding public access that might only be a 10-foot walkway on one side of the building would not be asking too much.

Commissioner Nemlowill said that both Options 2 and 3 would require public access for new construction. Option 3 would require public accesses around existing buildings as well and there are only two existing buildings in the Civic Greenway Zone.

Mr. Adams understood that with Option 3, public access would only be required for new construction or a major renovation that exceeded 75 percent or more of the assessed value of the existing structure. This would not be a burden on a property owner doing routine maintenance because routine maintenance would not trigger the requirement to provide public access. Waterfront buildings are expensive, but adding a 10-foot walkway that extended past the building on one side would not discourage a million dollar development or renovation. It would not be in the public's interest to grant a developer the ability to block views based on the expense of providing public access.

Susana Gladwin, 1039 Lexington, Astoria, said she was glad that view corridors were discussed and agreed that the view is affected by the Hampton Inn. She would like to see the views maintained as designated view corridors and wanted public access to line up with the view corridors. She did not want to see the entire riverbank covered with decks that extend out over the river because the waves coming in over the rocks are part of the feeling for the river. She confirmed with Staff that the two buildings are designated as historic. The orientation of peaked roofs could make a huge difference in visibility. Peaked roofs that are parallel to the river would block views of the river. She said the area where the cruise ships dock looks terrible. She wanted to know why the Port wanted another cruise ship dock when the ships already have a place to dock. Director Estes understood the Port wanted the flexibility and the option to use their property for such a facility in the future.

Ms. Gladwin understood it is important to keep one's options open, especially with regard to development. However, the Port has not completely developed their existing terminal, and yet the Port wants another location. She recommended planting vine maple and Cascara trees, which are low growing, native trees.

The Planning Commission discussed recommendations for building heights for on land development. Staff reviewed the portion of land included in the Civic Greenway Zone, noting that 45-foot tall buildings are currently allowed, but setbacks and setbacks are not required. The Riverfront Vision Plan assumes that the area along Marine Drive would remain a commercial zone, which could allow for commercial mixed uses or higher density residential uses. The areas closer to the river would have cottage style development, similar to Mill Pond. The rezone would occur as part of these Code amendments.

President Nemlowill asked why the area is being rezoned as residential instead of open space. Director Estes explained that Astoria does not have an open space zone. Mr. Hastie added that an open space zone removes all development potential. Building a park or creating an open space is not typically done through zoning. Implementing open spaces is done by acquiring the land and constructing a park or open space. He reminded that the focus is on Code amendments, not the purchase of land or other things that would be required to implement a variety of recommendations within the Riverfront Vision Plan. Director Estes said that the Riverfront Vision Plan requires Code and zone change amendments. The Parks Board and City Council will review open spaces. He recalled discussions at a City Council meeting about demolishing old wooden buildings behind City Lumber, noting that members of the public spoke in favor of keeping the buildings. He recalled that Ms. Menetrey spoke in favor of demolishing the buildings because it helped to implement the Riverfront Vision Plan for open space. The Riverfront Vision Plan will be used by several departments after the Code amendments have been approved.

The Planning Commission and Staff discussed the options for building heights, setbacks and setbacks of on-land development and the Planning Commission consented to support the following:

- Building Height: Option 2 – establish a maximum building height of 28 feet for the plan areas, with an allowance for up to 45 feet when additional building setbacks are applied or when building floors/stories above 28 feet are stepped back; existing variance procedures and criteria would continue to apply. The Commissioners shared concerns that 45 feet would be too tall in this area.
- Building Setbacks: Option 2 – establish a setback for floors/stories above 24 feet or two stories up to the maximum height allowed for the face of the building fronting a street leading to the river or fronting the Rivertrail. The Commissioners supported a setback of at least six feet.
- Building Setbacks: Option 2 – establish a minimum view corridor width of 70 feet, centered on the right-of-way centerline, for north-south rights-of-way between Marine Drive and the Columbia River.
- Eliminate the minimum 1:1 FAR requirement in the Gateway Overlay Zone for parcels fronting the rights-of-way that run between Marine Drive and the river in the MH-Marine Historic and HR-Hospitality Recreation zones of the plan area.
- The Planning Commission asked the project team to return with more information about trees.
- Applicability of the Code will apply to new construction and expansion, or reconstruction of an existing building that would result in all or a portion of the building exceeding proposed new building height, setback, or setback requirements.

Mr. Hastie reviewed next steps, noting that the new residential zone and building design standards within the Civic Greenway Zone would be discussed at the next work session on January 28, 2014. Once the work sessions are complete, an updated set of Code provisions will be created and discussed at a work session that has been tentatively scheduled for February 25, 2014. Further review and revisions will be completed, City Council will be updated on the progress, and then public hearings with the Planning Commission and City Council will be scheduled. He agreed to present the Planning Commission with a summary of where the Planning Commission is at in this process at the next work session.

Staff added that two meetings may need to be scheduled at the end of February because there will be public hearings on the Transportation System Plan and the Riverfront Vision Plan, which will be too much for one meeting.

There being no further business, President Innes adjourned the work session at 9:48 p.m.

ATTEST:


Secretary

APPROVED:


Community Development Director / Assistant City Manager