



Office of Mayor Charlie Hales  
City of Portland

April 11, 2016

**Memorandum**

TO: City Council Commissioners  
FROM: Mayor Hales  
CC: Joe Zehnder, Chief Planner, Eric Engstrom, Principal Planner, Susan Anderson, Director  
RE: Potential Additional Comp. Plan Amendments and Refinements

Since publication of the Comprehensive Plan Amendment Report on March 18<sup>th</sup>, several possible additional changes and refinements have come to our attention. I would like these further amendments considered.

1. **Buckman (#S21).** This map amendment applies to an area in Buckman that has a mix of small lot detached homes, duplexes, triplexes, and apartment buildings. Staff has proposed changing the area R2.5 while amendment #S21 would keep the area R5.

While the amendment may be seen as a way to prevent single family demolitions, the risk of this with R2.5 is overstated. Of the 140 dwellings in the area, 36 are single family homes, but only 6 of those are on that would be dividable in R2.5. Also, R2.5 is the most appropriate zone for the way the area is developed. The average density of the area is 25 units/acre. This exceeds the maximum density allowed under R2. Of the 60 lots in the area 33 are less than 2,500 square feet.

If Council wishes to retain R5 zoning, staff recommends the following approach. City Council should direct staff to use create an overlay or plan district to accomplish the following:

- a. Prevent the remaining 5,000 square foot lots in the area to be divided. This would be consistent with the R5 Zone standards.

AND

- b. Allow bonus density up to R1 levels if:
  - i. A building more than 75 years old has not been demolished on the site in the past 10 years. For example, the R1 density could be achieved through internal conversions, or additional ADUs).
  - ii. Development that involved demolition of buildings less than 75 years old or is happening on vacant lots or parking lots could be allowed via Design Review.

**(Co-sponsored by Commissioner Fritz, Novick)**

2. **Carbon Emissions Policy** (Refinement of #P43). BPS staff have suggestion a minor refinement to the New Policy to go after 4.63. **(Co-sponsored by Commissioner Novick)**

New Policy after 4.63. Reduce carbon emissions. Encourage a development pattern that minimizes carbon emissions from building and transportation energy use.

3. **Air Quality Policy** (NEW). Request from Tamara DeRidder for more emphasis on air quality in the plan. Staff suggests two additions – one related to vehicular emissions and one related to use of State DEQ data in making land use decisions. **(Co-sponsored by Commissioner Saltzman, Novick, and Fish)**

*“Policy 4.36 Diesel emissions. Encourage best practices to reduce diesel emissions and related impacts when considering land use and public facilities that will increase truck or train traffic. Advocate for state legislation to accelerate replacement of older diesel engines.”*

*“Policy 7.5 Air quality. Improve, or support efforts to improve, air quality through plans and investments, including reducing exposure to air toxics, criteria pollutants, and urban heat island effects. Consider the impacts of air quality on the health of all Portlanders. Coordinate with the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality to incorporate up-to-date air quality information and best practices into planning and investment decisions.”*

4. **Interim Congestion Standards** (NEW). This addition to Policy 9.49 adds reference to the new Interim Mobility Standards. These are regional standards that Metro requires for evaluating congestion. These standards have been used to evaluate investments and policies in the new Comprehensive Plan.

The proposed amendment makes clear that these standards have been used for evaluating the plan’s compliance with state and regional transportation requirements. Appending these standards to Chapter 9 Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan avoids any legal confusion about what standards were used to evaluate the plan, and subsequent amendments.

*“Policy 9.49 Regional congestion management. Coordinate with Metro to establish new regional multimodal mobility standards that prioritize transit, freight, and system completeness.*

- i. *Create a regional congestion management approach, including a market-based system, to price or charge for auto trips and parking, better account for the cost of auto trips, and to more efficiently manage the regional system.*
- ii. *In the interim, use the deficiency thresholds and operating standards of the Regional Mobility Policy, in Figure 9-4.*

Figure 9-4. Interim Deficiency Thresholds and Operating Standards

Location	Standards		
	Mid-Day One-Hour Peak*	PM 2-Hour Peak*	
		1 <sup>st</sup> Hour	2 <sup>nd</sup> Hour
Central City, Gateway, Town Centers, Neighborhood Centers, Station Areas	<u>.99</u>	<u>1.1</u>	<u>.99</u>

I-84 (from I-5 to I-205), I-5 North (from Marquam Bridge to Interstate Bridge, OR 99-E (from Lincoln St. to OR 224), US 26 (from I-405 to Sylvan Interchange), I-405	.99	1.1	.99
Other Principal Arterial Routes	.90	.99	.99

\*The demand-to-capacity ratios in the table are for the highest two consecutive hours of the weekday traffic volumes. The mid-day peak hour is the highest 60-minute period between the hours of 9 a.m. and 3 p.m. The 2<sup>nd</sup> hour is defined as the single 60-minute period, either before or after the peak 60-minute period, whichever is highest.

**(Co-Sponsored by Commissioner Fish)**

5. **350pdx Changes (NEW).** Members of the 350pdx organization have suggested a few small policy refinements to Policies 6.6 and 6.39c.

*“Policy 6.6. Low-carbon and renewable energy economy. Align plans and investments with efforts to improve energy efficiency and reduce lifecycle carbon emissions from business operations. Promote employment opportunities associated with the production of renewable energy, energy efficiency projects, waste reduction, production of more durable goods, and recycling.”*

*“Policy 6.39.c. Prime Industrial Land Retention. Limit regulatory impacts on the capacity, affordability, and viability of industrial uses in the prime industrial area while ensuring environmental resources and public health are also protected.”*

**(Co-sponsored by Commissioner Fritz)**

6. **Corresponding and Allowed Zones for Each Land Use Designation** (Figure 10-1). This addition to a table in Chapter 10 corrects a situation in St Johns where EG2 zoning is being used on as an interim in a Mixed Use Comp Plan designation. Specifically, this change adds EG2 to the list of “allowed” interim zones for Urban Centers in Figure 10-1. This means EG2 MAY occur in a Mixed Use designate area but additional EG2 zoning cannot be added. Only the “corresponding” zones in Figure 10-1 may be used for zone changes. **(Co-sponsored by Commissioner Fish)**
7. **NE 60<sup>th</sup> Avenue (#M45 and M71).** In consultation with Rose City Park Neighborhood, staff has developed some refinement to the zoning pattern along NE 60<sup>th</sup> (Map to be provided).
8. **Euclid Heights (NEW).** Rose City Park Neighborhood has requested down-designation from R2.5 to R5 for a small area near where 47th Avenue crosses the Banfield Freeway. The area is not adjacent to the MAX station or other frequent transit, but is adjacent to the Hollywood Town Center.

9. SE Henry Street (#B110) Opposition to up-zoning of property at 5401 SE Henry Street due to public safety issue (i.e., dead end street, lack of turnaround). This amendment would change all of the R2.5 on SE Henry to R5, between SE 52<sup>nd</sup> and the end of the street at 5601 Duke. **(Co-sponsored by Commissioner Saltzman, Novick)**
  
10. Rossi Farms (#F72) The Rossi family is asking for Mixed Use – Civic Corridor on the west side of 122<sup>nd</sup> Ave as opposed to the proposed R3 (the property at 3839 NE 122ND AVE, 1N2E22DD 400). **(Co-sponsored by Commissioner Fish, Fritz)**
  
11. Inclusionary Housing (Policy 5.34) Add “Work to remove regulatory barriers that prevent the use of such tools.” **(Co-sponsored by Commissioner Fritz, and Commissioner Fish)**
  
12. Historic resource: A structure, place, or object that has a relationship to events or conditions of the human past. Historic resources may be significant for architectural, historical, and cultural reasons. Examples include historic landmarks, conservation landmarks, historic districts, conservation districts, and structures or objects that are identified as contributing to the historic significance of a district, including resources that are listed in the National Register of Historic places. **(Co-sponsored by Commissioner Fritz)**