



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

CIZUP Meeting #8 Notes Thursday, November 13, 2014

In attendance: John Cole, Tom Armstrong, Mark Walhood, Douglas Hardy, Elizabeth Decker, Jill Punches, Dave Johnston, Tom Karwacki, Jim Parker (Laurelhurst NA), Elizabeth Rees-Cadigan (BES), Jim Kuffner (UofP), Scott Boardman, Steve Kountz

INTRODUCTION

Individuals, Neighborhood Associations and Institution representatives are beginning to submit formal comment letters to the Planning and Sustainability Commission in regard to the Comprehensive Plan Policy Document and Comp Plan Map. A number of these also address the Campus Institution Zoning Update Project. These letters will be compiled and distributed to the group.

Meeting Notes from the October 9th advisory group meeting which focused on Transportation Demand Management, Transportation systems improvement and development review process were presented for approval. The advisory group wants it noted that PBOT indicated that they do not have staff to administer some of their TDM. Special events particularly big athletic events are important and need to be considered separately. With these amendments the notes will be posted on the project webpage.

Process Check / Next Meeting

Refer to distributed Campus Institution Zoning Project Schedule. Staff will prepare a draft concept report for the advisory group's review in January. Advisory group members are invited to submit written comments on the concept report and participate in upcoming outreach efforts scheduled for this winter. A staff proposal will then be presented to the Planning and Sustainability Commission in May together with the Concept Report and any Advisory Group comments. Subsequent scheduling in front of City Council will need to coordinate with the larger Comprehensive Plan Update.

If the Comprehensive Plan (task 4) is appealed or significantly amended then the content or schedule for this project will need to be revised. There are some significant comments from NA's regarding policies that have not been adequately addressed yet by the PSC. There are a series of workshops ahead. Final written comments should be submitted by March 13th.

Allowable Land Uses (Concept)

Refer to distributed Concept Report#2. Note that the number of campus institution zones have been reduced from three zones to two: a CI-1 Urban Campus Zone and a CI-2 Residential Campus Zone. Portland Community College Cascade Campus and Southeast would be combined with hospitals under this scenario as "Urban Campuses" with the remaining campuses being classified as residential campuses due to the distinction in campus typology and surrounding street network and neighborhood character.



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.

Staff presented a table of allowed uses within each of the proposed zones and the following advisory group comments were returned:

Retail Sales and Service: allowed in the Urban Campus Zone. Limited to 5,000 square feet in the Residential Campus zone and subject to a conditional use permit.

Some advisory group members questioned the 5,000 square foot number as arbitrary and/or too small. Perhaps it should be a percentage of the campus building sf. Others commented that such a use across the street from a residential neighborhood would be an unwanted conflict.

There was a significant amount of discussion regarding how to distinguish between commercial activities such as a gift shop, bookstore or dining hall that are considered accessory to the principal healthcare or college campus and principal retail activity. There is often no bright line but the code currently does restrict such activities from having an external presence. One commenter suggested a tiered approach based on size and location on campus.

A similar discussion ensued regarding office uses. How can the city distinguish between accessory uses supporting the institution's mission and independent "commercial" office activity? What goes on internally is of limited concern and could be a matter of right (book stores cafeterias etc. Towards the exterior, what's across the street might govern. Keep perimeter businesses as conditional uses.

Manufacturing and Production uses: Staff's initial thinking is to limit such facilities to 10,000 square feet as an allowed use (by right) with an option to increase the size of such facilities in the CI-1 Urban Campus zone through a conditional use review. This is similar to size limitations placed on manufacturing and production facilities located within existing urban and general commercial zones.

Again, advisory group members commented that this number was way too low and cited examples from other states. Research and development activity that took place at the interior of a campus would be less of a concern than if it was at a campus perimeter. It was pointed out that research and development were classified as an "industrial service" land use and the code should include provisions for this as part of the contemplated business incubator support.

Questions were raised regarding residential uses and what would be considered group living. Dormitories for students are an example of group living but they are also an accessory use to the main college activity. Fraternities, sororities, nursing homes and some group homes for physically or mentally challenged individuals are also examples of group living. Household living includes "households" that occupy (but are not limited to) a single family residence, duplex apartment or condominium. Certain types of senior housing such as has been built on the Marylhurst campus might be considered group living. Advisory group members were inclined to distinguish between group living accessory to the main campus use and open market residential projects undertaken as a business enterprise.



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.

Similar difficulty in distinguishing between accessory and primary uses was also expressed for such things as medical facilities, chapels and museums. The group was split on how much flexibility should be afforded institutions in this regard.

Development Standards (Concept)

A draft Reference table of development standards was distributed to facilitate group discussion

Maximum building heights of 150' for hospital towers set back from the campus edge in CI-1 zones and 45-60' height limits in the CI-2 zone were proposed by staff as well as floor area ratio's of 3:1 in the CI-1 zone and 0.5:1 in the Ci-2 zone. Additional building coverage, landscaping and other development standards were also offered for advisory group consideration.

Additional detail and documentation will be necessary prior to the presentation of final development standards or corresponding reactions from advisory group members. A few general comments however seem likely to carry forward.

The context of the neighborhood is important in determining the suitability of proposed development standards. Matching adjoining development standards and pushing additional development towards the interior of the campuses seemed reasonable as did the idea of a package of perimeter design standards coordinated with the mixed use zoning update project to apply along commercial corridors.

Institutions were reluctant to give up development entitlements that they received through approved CUMP/ IMP approvals

Staff reviewed the process options by which institutions could transition from any existing CUMP/IMP approval to a base zone. Options include requiring a rezoning application at the expiration of any current approval, making such a rezoning application an option for the institution and legislatively rezoning all campuses as part of the Comprehensive Plan update. (This is not an exhaustive list.) At this point staff is leaning towards making the quasi-judicial rezone application a requirement at the expiration of any existing CUMP/IMP.

Public Comment / Adjourn

An audience member indicated that not enough discussion has been held regarding environmental constraints. BES has been extraordinarily important in environmental issues surrounding development of the Lewis and Clark campus and such input should not be lost in any proposed process.

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.