

Centers and Corridors Parking Project

Stakeholder Advisory Committee

Meeting #5 - Notes

April 30, 2015
6:00 – 8:00 P.M.

SAC members in attendance: Alex Cooley, Gary Davenport, Allen Field, Gail Hoffnagle, James Kautz, Tony Jordan, Rebecca Kennedy, Mary McCurdy, Kay Newell, Kurt Nordback, Steve Russell, Kristin Slavin, Chris Smith

SAC members not in attendance: Pablo Bravo, Tamara Deridder, Kathryn Doherty-Chapman, Carol Gossett, Sean Green, William Gregg, Oreatha Johnson, Gerik Kransky, Ted Labbe, Rod Merrick, Rick Michaelson, Sue Pearce, Jo Schaeffer, Mike Westling, Don Wood

Staff in attendance: Colleen Caldwell, Judith Gray, JP McNeil, Francesca Patricolo, Zef Wagner, (Bureau of Transportation), Barry Manning (Bureau of Planning and Sustainability), Erika Nebel (Commissioner Novick's Office), Gail Curtis (Oregon Department of Transportation), Matt Bell (Kittleson and Associates), Rick Williams (Rick Williams Consulting)

The meeting began with a quick Project Update from Judith Gray. Grant will be returning in Mid-May. Meeting notes from Meeting #4 were passed out and approved (at mid-meeting break).

Barry Manning came to talk about the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability's (BPS) Mixed Use Zoning Project. This project is a corollary to PBOT's Centers and Corridors Parking Study.

The project aims to meet Comprehensive Plan goals for complete neighborhoods, to meet housing and job growth projections, and to simplify the development code. The existing commercial zoning designations are not adequately equipped to deal with mixed use development. This project addresses that problem while also minimizing the need for major changes in residential neighborhoods. Currently, BPS staff are working on concept development and will be moving into code development in the fall.

The major changes proposed with the project is to restructure Floor Area Ratios (FAR's) in mixed use zones, to strengthen the FAR bonuses for public benefits in Centers Overlay Zones, and the addition of requirements to minimize impacts on adjacent residential areas.

Questions & Comments:

Question: Have you considered that this proposal might create more commercial space in core areas than can be supported by demand?

Staff Response: We have considered that but are not sure of the answer to that question yet.

Comment: Concerns were raised about window requirements that might have the effect of limiting the amount of windows for upper-story residential – if 60% glazing is required on ground floor, this could limit upper stories because of energy codes

Staff Response: This is good to know. I'll pass that along.

Question: Can you talk more about affordable commercial areas and what that means?

Staff Response: We are still fleshing this out. The idea is that we would offer commercial spaces at lower or discounted rent. Implementation isn't clear yet. Perhaps a CDC could oversee that program.

Question: What is 60-80% MFI for affordable housing? How does that translate into rent for an apartment?

Staff Response: I'm not sure what 60-80% MFI off the top of my head, but it would translate to lower rents.

Follow-up Question: Wouldn't that just lead to microapartment development?

Staff Response: We've heard that concern, and we're looking at code to address that.

Question: Have you thought about using parking as a bonus?

Staff Response: That's come up a lot. We're not sure how that will play out yet. However, as it is, parking isn't used against developers in terms of FAR.

Question: On the ground floor businesses in an MU zone, is the expectation that customers walk-up or that one would drive and park their car?

Staff Response: A mix of both – the expectation is mostly walkable/bikeable, but as can be seen in walkable centers now, they are also a regional draw.

Question: How did you get to 60-80% MFI?

Staff Response: There are currently options available for 30% MFI and lower, such as that offered by Home Forward. The 60% threshold is seen as one that still keeps it in the market value range for a developer

Matt Bell of Kittelson Associates and Rick Williams of Rick Williams Consulting presented an update on the Centers and Corridors Parking Study. Presently, the consultants are working on Task 3, and presented findings from the Parking Inventory, Occupancy, and Turnover Study were given for the NE 28th Avenue and the Hollywood study areas. Next steps for the project are to:

- Refine future parking demand
- Complete analysis of remaining study areas
- Evaluate potential parking management strategies
- Develop parking management plans

- Meet with stakeholder groups

Questions & Comments:

Comment: A useful metric to use would be one that measures how far you have to walk to your destination during peak hours.

Response: This data does not measure that, but in the future we plan to do intercept surveys that would ask people how far they needed to walk to get to their destination.

Comment: To piggyback on the previous comment, if you look at the occupancy map, a lot of the green (vacant) areas are at the edges of the district, which are located farther from the major destinations.

Question: A recent study conducted for the 20's Bikeway seemed to show higher parking utilization. Why is this study different?

Response: Parking usage fluctuates. One of the strategies we need to use to study parking is to continue to refresh the data. It is important to keep track of how usage changes over time, particularly as strategies are implemented.

Question: The times the study was conducted are midweek – NE 28th would peak on a Friday or Saturday night. Is this really a “typical” day? How did you get to using that data?

Response: It may need to be studied further and during different time periods. One concern is planning just for the peak hour, which could result in an oversupply of parking during most time periods.

Question: Have you considered a parking permit program for the CEID, Hollywood or NE 28th that could be sold to commuters or for employers?

Response: The current permit program seeks to avoid encroachment into neighborhoods. Once encroachment is dealt with through residential permits, permits can be provided to employees. If there is capacity after that, permits could be offered to commuters.

Comment: It seems that the violations of the one-hour minimums and the proposed solution (extending to two-hour time stays) misses the point. What provides for the most efficient use of space? It may be for parked cars just because the drivers want more free parking time.

Response: This is a chicken and egg problem – if we start enforcement on one hour violations, then we may start to alienate the customer base.

Comment: A business owner from N Mississippi commented that the use of short time stays – 15/20 minutes – to lead to turnover.

Comment: Wouldn't the encroachment rate be an important thing to look at – that is looking at the impact of commuters and shoppers parking in neighborhoods? Is there a way to measure that?

Response: It is possible to do that, especially in Hollywood where there's a clear division between the commercial and residential areas. It would be much more difficult in the NE 28th study area and some of the others.

Question: How were the projections for future parking utilization done?

Response: We took the parking inventory and used current parking data, along with housing and employment data, to project the future base parking demand. There were some key assumptions made, namely that many inputs that could be variables would remain constant, including accessibility of the district, mode splits, vehicle ownership, residential/jobs ratio, and off-street parking supply.

Follow-up Comment: That is a lot of assumptions, many of which are not likely to remain constant.

Question: Could you do projections for parking utilization based on projected changes in retail/employment/residential characteristics?

Response: Yes. That could possibly be done with a more sophisticated model that takes into account anticipated land use changes.

Question: Can you find a way to characterize the time stays and occupancies by area throughout the day?

Response: To some degree this is already done for some of the study areas.

Question: If another area or neighborhood wanted to have a similar parking analysis done, how would they go about doing so?

Response: We're trying to set up a methodology that can be replicated in other areas.

There meeting was opened for public comment.

Question: Why were the study areas that were selected chosen?

Response: To try and have areas with a broad representation of the different parts of the city – from mature to developing neighborhoods. The goal was to look at typologies so they could be replicated in other areas.

Question: At what point will the committee be able to talk about the issues that they feel strongly about? For the past few months the agendas have been filled with briefings and presentations of data. We live in these neighborhoods and often know these areas, so this is not really new information. There are interests that this committee has that haven't been discussed or addressed.

Staff Response: We will begin to have those conversations in the near future. We will be sure to add time to upcoming agendas for the committee to talk about their issues of concern.

The meeting adjourned at 8:00 pm.
