



Bureau of Planning and Sustainability
Innovation. Collaboration. Practical Solutions.

Notes – Meeting #4

Campus Institution Zoning Update Project (CIZUP) Advisory Group

Date: Thursday, June 12, 2014
Time: 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.
Location: 1900 SW 4th Avenue, Conference Room 7A

In attendance: Beverly Bookin, Chris Brehmer, Elizabeth Decker, Tamara DeRidder, Justin Fallon-Dollard, David Ellis, Dave Johnston, John Bradley (for Karen Karlsson,) Tom Karwacki, Jill Punches, Mike Warwick, DJ Heffernan, Rebecca Ocken, Marty Stiven, Tom Armstrong, Steve Kountz, Rodney Jennings, Douglas Hardy, Pamela Weatherspoon, John Cole.

1) Introduction

Meeting minutes from the April PAG meeting were reviewed. An amendment to language regarding the base zone change option was suggested and accepted. (The final notes posted on the project webpage reflect the proposed amendment.)

The project timeline was reviewed including advisory group meeting dates. Refer to the document “Campus Institution Zoning Update Project, Advisory Group Timeline” available on the project webpage for additional detail.

The project timeline is designed to match up with the larger Comprehensive Plan update. The Comprehensive Plan Policies which are a foundation for this effort are still in a draft form. If they are amended through the public review process at the Planning and Sustainability Commission or at City Council some of the campus zoning update work may need to be amended as well.

2) Permitted, Limited and Conditional Uses

The *Allowed Use Worksheet* was presented to the group including a list of allowed, limited and conditional uses within four existing zoning districts: R7-Single Dwelling Residence, CS-Storefront Commercial, CG-General Commercial and IR-Institutional Residential. Three alternate categories were also presented for discussion: IC1-Medical Center, IC2-Urban Higher Ed and IC3-Residential Higher Ed. An Overlay Zone could be crafted using much of the same information provided as an alternative to a base zone if desired.



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

Printed on 100% post-consumer waste recycled paper.



Bureau of Planning and Sustainability
Innovation. Collaboration. Practical Solutions.

Three questions were posed to the advisory group:

- Are there significant enough differences among the uses allowed within the draft alternative (IC1), (IC2), and (IC3) zones to actually warrant three separate zones? Or is there enough similarity among the Institutional uses to utilize just one or two categories?
- Permitted vs Conditional Use. Should **all** individual buildings proposed on an institutional campus be subject to a conditional use review process? Or are there objective criteria such as use type, building size or distance from campus boundary that might move buildings from the conditional use to the allowed use categories process?
- Are there other land use restrictions that should be considered?

All hospitals would likely fall under the IC1 Medical Center zone. Lewis & Clark, Reed, PCC Sylvania and University of Portland would likely be classified as IC3 Residential Higher Ed. Other campuses are less clear and might fall under either an IC2 or IC3 classification.

The uses and standards applied in the alternative IC3 zone were modelled off of the existing IR Zone while the alternative IC1 and IC2 zones are crafted from existing commercial zoning districts.

Another method for classifying colleges might be to distinguish between commuter and residential colleges due to the differences in amenities offered and likely differences in traffic impacts between the two.

There was general support for proceeding with a regulatory structure that considers colleges and hospitals separately.

More discussion of on-campus commercial activity, such as restaurants and cafes was requested and will be revisited at the August meeting when perimeter development standards will be a specific discussion item on the agenda.

It was noted that a lot of important details are contained in the footnotes of the allowed use table and while the volume of such footnotes make them difficult to discuss as a group they are important to the administration of the code. “The devil is in the details”.

There are a number of land uses such as offices, daycare centers, restaurants and even limited research/manufacturing operations that may be considered accessory to the primary medical or educational use on a campus if they serve their main institutional mission but may be limited, conditional or even prohibited if they are intended to serve a larger population.



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

Printed on 100% post-consumer waste recycled paper.



Bureau of Planning and Sustainability
Innovation. Collaboration. Practical Solutions.

Satellite facilities within nearby commercially zoned centers and corridors may meet underlying zoning district use and development standards but consideration should also be given to their relationship to the main campus, specifically where transportation issues are concerned such as a requirement for a shuttle bus to reduce traffic.

The more institutional uses that can avoid a conditional use review process (through meeting clear and objective standards the more successful our effort will be.

Alternatively, conditional use processes are valuable and should not be discarded because they allow for land use approvals that are tailored to the individual characteristics of campuses and their surrounding neighborhoods – as opposed to one size fits all approach.

Members also suggested that design standards might be a better approach to allowing development than a complicated matrix of conditional uses.

There might also be legislative consideration given to the neighborhoods surrounding any specific institution that might protect that neighborhood from adverse impacts such as replacement of affordable housing with student rentals.

3. Development Standards

The development standards discussion was abbreviated due to time constraints and will be revisited at the August meeting. In general there are two categories of standards as described in the distributed Development Standard Worksheet: 1) those regulating intensity of development, and 2) edge-related design standards. Staff presented the following questions for the advisory group to consider:

- Do any of the proposed alternative standards for discussion give you pause as either too restrictive or conversely not restrictive enough?
- Are there significant enough differences among the development standards assigned to the alternative IC1, IC2 and IC3 zones to warrant three separate zones or could there be one or two institutional zones?
- Are there other Development Standards issues or limits we should consider?

Edge standards should be designed to account for conditions in surrounding neighborhood, for example avoid suburban character in an urban setting. Consider height limits which should also be considered an edge related standard, within context of surrounding buildings.



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

Printed on 100% post-consumer waste recycled paper.



Bureau of Planning and Sustainability
Innovation. Collaboration. Practical Solutions.

There is a trade-off between general, flexible principles of design guidelines which often require a conditional use review to administer and clear and objective standards contained in design standards that do not require such an additional land use review

How does landscaping standard relate to Portland Parks & Rec's citywide tree canopy goal?

There are some standards related to safety or off-campus behavior that are important to a successful relationship between a college and its surrounding neighborhood. Effort should be taken to investigate whether or not such issues can be folded into the development review process.

It will be important in establishing any development standards to consider their impact on the existing institutions and not create a lot of non-conforming situations which create permitting issues in the future.

Alternatively, the right development standards combined with the right allowed use list could allow most campus development to proceed as an outright use.

More definitions are needed in order to adequately answer the questions posed by staff. There are advisory group members supportive of retaining conditional uses processes as a means of tailoring conditions of approval to the specifics of unique development proposals and unique neighborhoods.

3) Public Comment / Adjourn

The importance of environmental regulations should not be lost in the PAG's deliberation. Staff noted that no changes to the environmental (c) conservation or (p) preservation overlay zones are contemplated

The meeting ended with a brief discussion regarding the concept of an institution created and city approved campus wide master plan providing development surety that might replace the need for individual conditional uses. Design review remains a viable tool for new construction regulation but use a higher threshold than is currently being applied which requires full review of relatively minor remodels and parking lots.

Please visit the project webpage at www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/institutions to access meeting agendas, discussion synopses, and additional background documents.



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

Printed on 100% post-consumer waste recycled paper.