

Summary Meeting Notes

Residential Development and Compatibility Policy Expert Group

Date: April 11, 2013

Time: 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.

PEG Attendees: Tamara DeRidder, John Gibbon, Anyeley Hallova, Michael Hayes, Gabe

Headrick, Rodney Jennings, James McGrath, Rod Merrick, Eli Spevak

Other Attendees: BPS staff: Debbie Bischoff, John Cole, Julia Gisler, Barry Manning (PEG

lead), Chris Scarzello

Facilitator: Deb Meihoff, Communitas

View the original <u>agenda</u>, including materials, for this meeting.

Key Points and Outcomes

- Generally speaking, PEG members are satisfied with policies that will guide where future multi-dwelling developments may be allowed. However, members noted a lack of policies to address deficiencies of services and amenities in areas already built at moderate densities and not envisioned to be as part of the centers framework.
- PEG members recommended BPS consider, either through policy or zoning, different approaches to address potential impacts of economic activity in residential communities based on building types and/or level of density.

Welcome, overview, introductions

Process Updates

Presenter: Barry Manning, BPS

Summary: Update on process and workshops; PEG feedback/Q&A

- A summary of the community Workshops is not yet available. Once prepared, Barry will forward a copy of the report.
- The PEG requested an update on the off-street parking studies and recent ordinance changes. The issue of parking for multi-dwelling buildings is mostly happening along mixed use corridors and centers - the Neighborhood Centers PEG is discussing parking policy next week. Additional studies and process regarding off-street parking is planned and/or underway; Barry will follow up via email with an update.



City of Portland, Oregon | Bureau of Planning and Sustainability | www.portlandonline.com/bps 1900 SW 4th Avenue, Suite 7100, Portland, OR 97201 | phone: 503-823-7700 | fax: 503-823-7800 | tty: 503-823-6868



Comprehensive Plan Working Draft Review

Facilitators: Deb Meihoff, Communitas; Barry Manning, BPS

Summary: PEG completed the group discussion on Working Draft Part 1 - Review of specific goal and policies for effectiveness at addressing the RDC issues, explore potential outcomes, and consider how they achieve or hinder aspirations for a more equitable city. The final issue to review was Issue 8 / Appropriate locations for new low and moderate density multi-dwelling development.

In discussing Issue 8, the PEG had less concern with the policies available to direct the location of new multi-dwelling development, than they did for addressing underserved multi-dwelling neighborhoods that already exist throughout the city (examples such as Gilbert Heights and pockets of density along Beaverton-Hillsdale Highway). The policies of the working draft address only the needs of future residential development and growth, focused in centers or along corridors. The PEG would like to see additional policy that supports and guides improvements to areas that have already developed with moderate density, but are not envisioned to be included as a center or a civic corridor. Many people are living in these areas who need increased access to services, amenities, and transit to meet the City's comprehensive plan goals.

PEG members had various ideas about how a new policy that addresses these dense, noncenter residential areas might be implemented:

- Consider special zoning options for places that have moderate to high levels of residential density and are not envisioned as a future center in the urban design framework - ways to allow for modest amounts of commercial services through conditional use or similar, infrastructure improvements to better access in these areas, etc.
- Focus on delivering a suite of services pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, limited commercial opportunities, better access to public transit.
- Transit is one key piece, but not the only thing that should be improved and for many of these areas it might not be the central framework for improvements. It is about much more than access to transit, especially since bus facilities (lines, frequency, stops) are not permanent.
- Topography and availability of walking routes / sidewalks in an area should be considered in determining need and location of areas to provide services and amenities.

Resource:

RDC Topic and Policy Review form





Non-Residential Activity in Residential Areas

Facilitators: Deb Meihoff, Communitas; Barry Manning, BPS

Summary: Discussion of non-residential activity in residential areas – e.g. home occupations, short-term lodging, business activities, schools and community-service uses, others. Questions asked included: What types and scale of activities make sense in residential areas? What are key parameters to consider in allowing such activities?

PEG's comments on potential policies to address non-residential activity in residential areas:

- Home occupations are generally not an issue in low-density residential areas. The
 existing code seems to have appropriate restrictions and ways to address
 potential conflicts of use, health and safety of neighbors.
- Don't add regulatory burdens for home-businesses that are benign from a neighborhood impact perspective.
- Conflicts are more likely to arise in higher-density, multi-dwelling homes.
 Consider policy that differentiates home occupation standards / allowances by building type.
- Should not rely entirely on noise controls, since the City is understaffed for noise enforcement citywide.
- Need to understand better what is in the sign code to determine if the current controls are adequate in residential areas. Electronic and illuminated signs should be disallowed. Small signs are generally viewed as appropriate.
- Short-term lodging provisions should be tied to the state definitions greater than three rooms is a Bed and Breakfast, fewer than that is not. PEG members have not experienced significant impacts from 'airbnb' type of short term lodging in residential areas. PEG members noted that other stakeholders may perceive this differently.
- Allowing co-location of community uses at school sites is fine, so long as it is not a requirement of a school. The City should explore whether or not different approaches may be needed for co-locating uses at existing schools, which likely pre-date neighboring residential uses, and new schools being established in an existing residential area.
- City should investigate level of occurrence and potential controls for residential (group) homes that transition from single-dwelling development to multi-dwelling through acquiring and expanding operations onto adjacent properties. PEG members noted some instances where a small group home operator bought multiple adjacent properties and expanded the group living arrangements across the multiple properties, essentially operating like a "residential facility" (note: residential home and residential facility are land uses defined in Oregon Revised Statutes Chapter 197).





Innovation. Collaboration. Practical Solutions.

Resources / handouts

 Issue paper: Businesses and other non-household living activities in residential areas/zones

Public Comment

[There were no public comments]

Next steps and follow up

- Final meetings of the RDC PEG in May and June will be primarily devoted to reviewing, commenting, and finalizing a memo summarizing key concepts, ideas, and themes that emerged from the year-long PEG discussion.
- Staff will follow up with PEG members with details of how to provide individual feedback on the Working Draft of policies, especially for topics outside the RDC scope.
- Staff will follow up with next steps the City is taking to study and further refine its regulatory approach to parking for new multi-dwelling developments. PEG members are invited to attend the Neighborhood Centers PEG, where they will be having a discussion on the issues.

For more information, please contact either Barry Manning Bureau of Planning and Sustainability at 503-823-7965 or Barry.Manning@portlandoregon.gov or Deb Meihoff, Facilitator at 503-358-3404 or deb@communitasplanning.com.

