

**SE 122<sup>nd</sup> Avenue Rezoning**  
PAG Meeting #4  
January 26, 2012  
6:30-8:30 pm

**Staff Present:** John Cole, Chris Scarzello, Brett Ratchford

**PAG Members Present:** Annette Mattson, Jim Braet, David Edwards, Sue Gillean, Mark White, Roberta Krogman, Jean DeMaster

---

**Materials Distributed:** Agenda, Minutes from PAG Meeting 3, Potential Comp Plan/Rezone map, Potential Rezone Memo, Property Summary, Title 33 Commercial Zones, Commercial Zoning Handout.

John Cole convened the meeting. After reviewing the agenda John offered the group the option to end 30 minute early and to move the discussion of Home Occupation changes back to a later date. The group agreed with this proposed agenda change.

**Potential Rezone Changes**

John presented the 10 areas that are being considered for rezoning in the study area. For each proposed area he explained his rationale for inclusion. After going through the 10 areas, Chris interjected with an explanation and clarification of the difference between a rezoning and a comprehensive plan change. At the conclusion of John's presentation he asked the group if this set of recommendations is in line with what they had imagined for the project.

The PAG members seemed to agree almost unanimously that the recommendations were too timid. PAG members were hoping that most of 122<sup>nd</sup> would be rezoned to commercial versus the nodal rezone recommendations that were presented in John's recommendations.

Annette commented that with the population growth of the last 20 years in the area and the expected growth in the next 20 years that 122<sup>nd</sup> Ave will need to have a lot more commercial to absorb this influx of people. Mark commented that the proposed changes are focused more on just cleaning up non-conforming uses and standardizing some areas and are not bold enough for the long term needs of the area.

The next part of discussion focused on parking and landscaping. There was some confusion about when parking and landscaping is required in commercial zones. John explained the different requirements for different commercial zones. There was also discussion of whether 122<sup>nd</sup> Ave is officially a "frequent" use bus line per TriMet's definition. While the PAG members felt the bus is infrequently available, John added that, according to TriMet's website, the main bus on 122<sup>nd</sup> does qualify as a frequent bus which implies certain commercial developments wouldn't need to offer parking as a zoning requirement.

John then explained the results of economic analysis that pointed toward the great need for commercial development along 122<sup>nd</sup> Ave. He then explained how, in almost all commercial categories, the study area showed commercial "leakage." Leakage basically means that residents are going elsewhere to purchase goods and services as opposed to staying near 122<sup>nd</sup> Ave.

PAG members then brought up the suggestion that some properties on Powell should be considered part of this proposed rezone area. Previously, properties this far north were not considered a priority for this study. John and Chris agreed those properties had potential but as they were not part of the original study adding this area may pose some problems. The problem is mostly due to transportation modeling requirements enforced by ODOT. As those areas would expand the scope of the rezone it would increase the cost for doing transportation modeling and would also likely push back the timeline. Chris explained that adding these properties might push the total acreage of rezonings past a “tipping point” that may slow the project timeline down considerably. John offered to consider including these areas and would attempt to push them through with the original package of properties to be rezoned by summer 2012.

Mark commented that the zoning of the last 10 years has been less than optimal for the area. He said he and other residents feel their quality of life has gone down due to the zoning and development trends. He said whatever the new development is, it should focus on holistic development and not lead developers just build the cheapest and easiest to assemble structure possible.

The PAG members indicated they would like the area to have more transitional zoning. They pointed to the easel that had examples of successful commercial areas (Hawthorne, Lombard, MLK, etc.) and indicated that they think 122<sup>nd</sup> should have more diversified zoning to mirror these successful areas.

John concluded his portion by summarizing the groups interests mainly as just being they want the rezoning to be bolder. The PAG group agreed with this. John said he would look for additional residential properties that may represent additional commercial zoning opportunities and get a more “aggressive” version of the rezoning proposal back to the group prior to February’s open house.

### **Design Standards**

Chris Scarzello started by explaining the Supplemental Compatibility Standards manual that was developed as part of the Albina Community Plan in the mid 1990s. The point of reviewing this document was to show the PAG members what is possible in terms of establishing rules for builders in the rezoned areas. The group then discussed some basics of compatibility requirements as they related to multifamily zoned properties.

PAG members inquired if there could be a MF zoning that specified the types of residents that would occupy the building. For example, they thought encouraging building that would attract veterans or the elderly would be a good addition to the neighborhood. There were strong feelings amongst most of the PAG members that, due to the amount of MF zoning in the study area, the resultant increase in the amount of children in the area has put undue stress on the local schools. Most PAG members commented they feel the current school overcrowding is a big issue for the area going forward.

John asked Jean about what she thought about capping the number of beds that a developer could put in a unit. Jean was skeptical of this suggestion as she said her organization has a difficult time renting out studio or 1-bedroom units in this area. Jean said the bulk of rental demand in the area is for the 2-bedroom and up units.

PAG members seemed concerned that a height compatibility standard could limit construction in a negative way as much of the areas housing stock is from around WWII. The worry here is that the abundance of 1-story homes would drag down the height average and limit much new development. Jim proposed perhaps a 160% standard or something similar to allow more flexibility than the 120% of average height standard laid out in the Albina Community Plan.

Chris' final point was that we need infrastructure here not just zone changes. New paved streets and sidewalks really should be constructed prior to or in conjunction with new multi-family development and not just in front of the development itself but on a more comprehensive scale.

### **Wrap Up & Next Steps**

John reminded the group of the open house at the end of February. David suggested contacting other area neighborhood associations or business associations so they could attend the open house if interested.

The meeting adjourned at 8:30pm.