



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

Mixed Use Zones Project Advisory Committee (PAC)

Date: November 19, 2014

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

Location: 1900 SW 4th Avenue, Portland, 2nd Floor - Room 2500

Meeting Goals: Discuss preliminary zoning concept and next steps for modeling and testing

Committee Members in Attendance: Jason Barnstead Long, Bob Boileau, Lori Boisen, Timothy Brunner, Eric Cress, Brendon Haggerty, Michael Hayes, Heather Hoell, Duane Hunting, Sarah Iannarone, Doug Klotz, Charlotte Larson, Dennis Petrequin, Cora Potter, Vicki Skryha, Frank Walsh, Mike Warwick, Susan Lindsey

Project Team in Attendance: Bill Cunningham, Barry Manning, Samantha Petty, Lora Lillard (BPS); Deb Meihoff (Facilitator)

Members of the Public in Attendance: (22)

Welcome and Introductions

PAC Process Updates and Feedback

- Meeting notes distributed – forward comments within a week; the agenda packet will be made available on the Mixed Use Zones Project website.
- Comp Plan update hearings are complete. Written testimony can be submitted through March.

Transportation Demand Management (TDM)

PBOT Briefing, Peter Hurley

The Portland Bureau of Transportation (PBOT) is likely to propose a Transportation Demand Management program/requirement for mixed use development (mixed use zones). PBOT aims for Mixed Use and Institutional Zones to reduce projected transportation demand by 30 percent. They are researching how to implement this goal. This work is closely related to the citywide parking strategy. It is also something that is already in place for institutions. All major institutions are required to show how they are going to reduce transportation demand by 30 percent over the next 15 years as part of the process of updating their master plans. Some



Bureau of Planning and Sustainability

Innovation. Collaboration. Practical Solutions.

examples of solutions are bike/walk bucks, car share subsidies, transportation subsidies. These types of subsidies are effective and cheap. They increase usage of car alternatives if the infrastructure for transit, walking, and biking are in place and well-funded.

PAC Discussion/Comments

Staff responses are italicized.

Clarification: What is an institutional use? Is it a small business?

It is something like a school or a hospital.

What is the baseline for the 30 percent reduction?

Current vehicle trip projections will be used as a baseline.

Is this measured by person?

No by vehicle trips, or more specifically drive alone trips.

Are bureaus coordinating on this? First the city offered a parking reduction for building in a Mixed Use zone, and then there was a revision requiring higher parking ratios in these zones. Now we are hearing from PBOT that there is a push to reduce parking again.

We are coordinating with BPS/BDS/BOT to have a unified approach to this issue.

The trip generation model used in the street fee project has been criticized. Are you using that same model for this project?

There is a strong incentive to use a model that reflects a more urban pattern.

Please clarify how the subsidy solution will work.

One example would be a property manager providing a discount on bus tickets.

Clarify the 30 percent trip reduction. If you have a new building coming in how will that reduce trips? Won't it add more traffic?

It will not reduce existing trips by 30 percent, it will reduce new trips created by that construction by 30 percent of what they would have added with no transportation demand management intervention. Moreover, over time increased demand for public transit will increase public transit service (if funding keeps pace).

What is the development threshold where this demand management model will kick in? What types of development will be impacted?



Bureau of Planning and Sustainability

Innovation. Collaboration. Practical Solutions.

Considering somewhere around ten units, but we are still doing research. Mixed use, residential, and commercial uses would all be targeted.

Building in a dense walkable urban environment near existing transit lines generates less vehicle trips than a similar new development in a suburban environment. Why are we focusing on decreasing vehicle trips in parts of the city (like mixed use corridors) that already have relatively low numbers of vehicle trips? The “subsidy” will be passed on to people who are already contributing towards transportation demand management goals simply by deciding to live and work in these areas. Why not just reduce the cost of a bus ticket and subsidize everyone, not just people who live in an apartment or work in a mixed use building?

Public transit is already highly subsidized. So in a way everyone is already subsidized. For this demand management subsidy we are aiming for a high rate of behavior change.

It seems like you will just be passing along the cost of the subsidy to the very residents who are already choosing to live in transit friendly areas and are living in dense apartments. Why penalize them?

This is a very efficient model. It greatly reduces drive alone trips at a low cost.

Preliminary Zoning Concept

Staff reviewed concept and parameters of the preliminary zoning concept:

<http://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/509165>

Debrief Concept Workshops

PAC Comments/Discussion on the MUZP Workshops

- The community was reacting negatively to the buildings that were the same height all down a block. Community members preferred the look of a variety of heights. There was also a request to help the existing business stay open in corridors that are experiencing a lot of development over a short period of time.
- I heard support for allowing flexibility for design that would convey a sense of identity and a sense of place. Variety of rooflines is important.
- There were real questions about whether step downs should refer to zoning or to existing building heights.
- I heard support for keeping existing entitlements.
- The oohs and ahhs were vocal in the presentation of the architectural sketches. The idea of the street room caught the imagination of the public.



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

PAC Comments/Discussion on Preliminary Zoning Concept Presentation

- Why are some commercial services limited in a commercial zone? Clarify that language.
- Support businesses by considering the corridors and centers from a commercial perspective rather than a residential one.

Concept Modeling and Testing

Presentation available here: <http://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/511756>

PAC Comments/Discussion on Concept Modeling and Testing Presentation

- Are you “modeling” how these are working legally and politically? I don’t think you should even be modeling reductions that large.
- From the neighborhood perspective the bonuses decrease certainty. You need to make it clear what the allowed building height is with bonuses. Bonuses should be hard to do. Ratio the affordable housing bonus to encourage affordable housing in areas where it does not already exist.
- Why allow up to seven stories? Seven stories is not a viable height for construction given currently available materials and related costs.
- Parse the benefit to the neighborhood v. the benefit to the community at large. The neighborhood receiving the building should receive the benefits.
- Some of these zones need flexibility to build one story to build light industrial.
- For a landlord to take on a tenant who cannot afford market rate rents is a big risk. The city fees and building code make new buildings unaffordable for small business owners. Those matter much more than zoning.
- Model the timelines for affordable commercial spaces. Subsidize the early years of business rather than subsidize them long term. Look at Pittsburg.
- Think about housing affordability in terms of square footage. Think about housing forms, otherwise we might get micro-housing.
- The green bonus could be too easy. Green should be our standard, maybe it should be a regulation instead of a bonus.
- Light industrial is the next big growth area, we need to be planning how to incorporate this into Mixed Use zones.
- Clarify bonuses for neighborhoods. Don’t make the bonuses too easy. They should be significant.
- Affordable housing is an important bonus. It should be weighted heavily. Consider unit size as well.



Bureau of Planning and Sustainability

Innovation. Collaboration. Practical Solutions.

- How will these zone changes work in an area that has a district plan that limits FAR or a historic districts? This should be modeled to avoid confusion.
- Think about context for affordability. In East Portland market rate apartments are already affordable by this definition. Target neighborhoods that are experiencing displacement or have less affordable housing for affordability bonuses.
- Add a bonus option for working with Neighborhood Associations and Business Associations.
- Part of what makes commercial spaces affordable is small sized spaces 500 sq. ft. Dimensions can be important here. A start-up period is a good idea.
- A bonus for an active use that could be ground floor commercial or a small public space.
- Clarification of what the inner and outer neighborhoods are please? Where does N. Portland fit in? (*Staff: Eastern neighborhoods are generally east of 82nd. North is an inner neighborhood.*)
- Think about requiring things with the existing entitlement instead of reducing entitlement and then bonusing back.
- Can you bonus ground floor adaptable space that can someday become commercial? What about adaptable parking lots?
- From an architect standpoint we need better coordination between bureaus.
- We need corner setbacks and courtyards to promote the health of residents. These should be requirements.
- If we allow bonuses for commercial space (instead of regulation) we will have gaps in the retail fabric in the same areas we already have them.
- It appears based on the suggested FAR that there could be a reduction in housing overall. This will hurt affordable housing. You have to keep the supply up to keep affordability.
- We are not building green everywhere. There are a lot of units being built that do not qualify for LEED being built right now.
- There is already affordable housing on the outer east side. You need to bonus differently there.
- The affordable commercial space is a good idea to keep exploring.
- Regarding height, I don't think the existing four stories height limit was really an "entitlement," more of an "enticement."
- We had an affordable housing program 40 years ago but it was prohibitively expensive. Now we use federal funding that locks in affordability for 60 years. Who will monitor these programs? Thirty years would be the shortest timeframe to consider for preserving affordability. 40-50 years would be good. Consider how the property will transfer at the end of the credit. There will be some type of market exchange.



Bureau of Planning and Sustainability

Innovation. Collaboration. Practical Solutions.

- TDR is already on the books, you can do it in neighborhoods and the central city.
- Maximum height is measured to the parapet. Instead measure to the roof to get roofline variety.
- I wonder if we are dealing with silos in our government.
- The local neighborhood should benefit from the bonus.
- Please regulate transparency. We could make it a bonus but it would be better as a regulation.

Public Comment

1. Reducing entitlement and bonusing back up is a problem. Community based bonuses makes sense. Only apply trip reduction where you have the infrastructure to support it. More flexibility in areas that are under-developed. Building parking can be a necessity for a neighborhood even while reducing trips. These are two separate issues. People reduce trips but still need places to store their cars.

Adjourn