



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

Mixed Use Zones Project Advisory Committee (PAC)

Date: February 18, 2015

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

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

Page | 1

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

PAC Members in Attendance: Bob Boileau, Lori Boisen, Jason Barnstead-Long, Daryl Garner, Brendon Haggerty, Michael Hayes, Sarah Iannarone, Lauren Jones, Doug Klotz, Charlotte Larson, James McGrath, Susan Lindsey, Dennis Petrequin, Mike Warwick

Public: (10)

Meeting Goals: Discuss Revised Zoning Concept – updated parameters

PAC Process Updates and Feedback

Meeting notes distributed – PAC members should forward corrections or comments within a week; tonight's agenda packet will be made available on the Mixed Use Zones Project website.

- Upcoming Public Workshops*

Session #1

February 25, 2015, 5:30 – 8:30 p.m.

1900 SW 4th Avenue, Room 2500 (2nd Floor)

A Refined Concept presentation will occur at 6:30 p.m.

Session #2

February 26, 2015, 7:30 – 10:00 a.m.

1900 SW 4th Avenue, Room 2500 (2nd Floor)

A Refined Concept presentation will occur at 8:00 a.m.

A printable flyer is available online: <https://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/518949>

*The workshops will share our current proposal, but we will make clear to the public that the concept is in flux.

- Other/Announcements - none



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.

Prototypes and Economic Analysis Follow Up

- Since last PAC meeting staff met face to face with some committee members and received written feedback from others. One take away from these discussions is that we want to take a step back and revisit the MUZ goals and objectives. Project staff are committed to creating mixed use zones that support anticipated growth. We are testing proposed FARs and building envelopes to make sure the proposed regulations do not suppress our capacity for growth in these zones. Based on our testing so far the FARs may need to go up a bit to achieve this objective.
- We have asked Jerry Johnson to do another round of modelling to try find the right balance between encouraging growth and affordable housing. If we find that we need to change direction we will have DECA remodel some prototypes. We think we are close to finding a good balance.

Page | 2

PAC Comments/Discussion

Staff responses in italics

- There is still concern about the negative environmental and equity consequences of restricting housing supply. Can you model how maintaining current entitlements (or increasing them) would affect affordability?

We can ask Jerry Johnson if that type of modelling is possible.

Review PAC Feedback on prototypes/issues:

- The PAC is still of two minds on the current bonus structure and is interested in further discussion of the specific bonuses. Moreover, many PAC members and members of the public have creative ideas about other types of bonuses that we have not yet explored. Staff recognizes that we need to spend more time on these issues.
- There is general support for new glazing requirements in Centers, with a desire for more glazing on the Corridors.
- PAC members think flexibility for residential ground floor treatments is good, but needs to be further defined (adding numbers to the set back and elevated first floor).
- Frequency of entrances along corridors may need to be more frequent and there is a question about whether more entrances would have to be added retroactively if a building was later subdivided into multiple tenants.
- PAC members are interested in regulating articulation but wanted a chance to discuss what would be appropriate.





Bureau of Planning and Sustainability

Innovation. Collaboration. Practical Solutions.

- Setbacks, step backs, and step downs are supported by most but there is a desire to provide a wider menu of options, for example, increased articulation instead of step backs.

PAC Comments/Discussion

Staff responses in italics

Page | 3

- Can you quantify the cost of rear step downs and setbacks? What is the financial tradeoff of losing units to protect one house?
- It would be good to get feedback from Dyett about whether multiple entrances for a single user actually increases street life. While we understand multiple small tenants are desirable for active streets I am not convinced that multiple underused entrances on a single tenant create the same effect.
- An alternative would be to limit the amount of frontage per user.

Refined Zoning Concept Presentation

The Refined Concept presentation from the 2-18-15 PAC meeting is posted here: <http://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/519778>

- **Zone change criteria** - The draft criteria for a zone change within a mixed use designation. This criteria will be particularly important as the Comp Plan designation and the zoning are no longer one to one. Staff anticipate having an in depth discussion about this criteria and the zone change process in the next PAC meetings.
- **Translating current commercial zones to mixed use zones** - The crosswalk process will automatically take the current commercial zones and translate them to their indicated mixed use zones. Project staff believe this process will generate a zoning map that is 80 to 90 percent correct. After this initial map is generated the district liaisons will make manual adjustments to the map based on their knowledge of the neighborhoods and community feedback. They will bring the revised map to the Planning and Sustainability Commission (PSC).
- **Centers Overlay** - Part of the mapping process is defining where to apply the Centers Overlay. We have already done this and shared it with the PSC. Currently the Centers Overlay is applied to the multifamily and commercial zoning found in the Center designations represented in the Comp Plan. The Center Overlay can be further refined through area planning and with the help of the district liaisons.





Bureau of Planning and Sustainability

Innovation. Collaboration. Practical Solutions.

PAC Comments/Discussion

Staff responses in italics

- What about current uses in centers?
They would become nonconforming uses that can continue to operate but may have limited opportunity to expand.
- There is a fear by local communities that we will get undesirable (fast food, quick vehicle service) development in the window before the code is implemented.
That is a problem every time we update the code, there is not much we can do about it.

Page | 4

Presentation on design issues

The Refined Concept presentation from the 2-18-15 PAC meeting is posted here: <http://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/519778>

PAC Comments/Discussion

Staff responses in italics

#1 Relate bldg. height to street scale and function

- Flexible step backs are good and help us avoid the expensive and inefficient wedding cake design.
- How do other cities handle the upper level step back? Did our national research have any good ideas?
We can look at our report to find out.
- I strongly disagree with front step backs after three stories. I think the negative reaction from Division was an initial reaction to change and that it is dissipating as people realize what an active and engaged street Division has become. Four stories is a good scale for this size street and our research did not show a solar access problem at four stories. I do a lot of five over one development and on streets with 60 feet ROW streets and I think stepping back after the fourth story makes sense. You should be allowed to do what you need to do on an 80' ROW. We should be accommodating development at the street edge and regulating the transition to the neighborhoods.
- Some of these proposed design ideas directly conflict with Design Review and Community Design Standards. This detracts from clear and objective standards.
- The setbacks provide an opening to the sky for the pedestrian environment. The ten foot setback at ground level could work depending on how you use it. Whatever goes in the setback should contribute to the pedestrian experience.
- Railings should not count against height on the step backs because the area will be used as a deck.
- I support the 75% step back.
- Change the ROW criteria to less or more than 70 feet.





Bureau of Planning and Sustainability

Innovation. Collaboration. Practical Solutions.

- The step back regulation should be combined with the articulation regulation.
- Talk with businesses about how they would deal with the ten foot setback. CPTED should also weigh in about residential safety if ground floor residential is behind a ten foot setback.
- The setbacks (in exchange for building straight up without a step back) feel like a burden to developers because as part of the development process you are already setting back to improve the sidewalk and put in stormwater planters. We need to take property owners and business owners into account to we get the full picture.
- Good presentation, it feels like you were really listening to community concerns.

Page | 5

#2 Accommodate ground floor active uses and roofline variety

- Corner treatments: support from the PAC to further explore building up the corner and/or cutting out the corner to allow more room for pedestrians.

#3 Height transitions and buffering

- Would you need to step down to a residential zone if you have an alley behind the commercial zone like on Mississippi?
That is a good question that needs further discussion.
- The setback in the back makes parking and retail smaller. The idea of averaging side setbacks makes sense.
- Alt 1 makes sense for residential; Alt 2 is Penthouse only, no affordability. Step backs = thousands of dollars.
- Take away the setback in the rear and instead make a regulation to encourage residential development in the rear.
- Get rid of the fourth story front setback and focus on deferring to the neighborhood.
- This focus on a small bespoke Portland is past its prime. We need to maintain a supply of good quality workforce housing. By zoning with a light hand we will make housing less expensive to develop which will result in more affordable housing. Life is lived under 30 feet. Design the street level and pull back from other regulations. Prioritize affordability and supply.
- We are not finding that the new units are affordable, and in fact the units being replaced were affordable. I have not seen that the new developments are affordable even without requiring parking. Therefore, we may as well require good design and parking.
- I like this slide a lot. I have no problem with Portland keeping its character. Affordability will not be lost to these standards.

4 Building articulation and massing

- By using a percentage we are trying to allow the design to be steered by the architect.
- What about roof projections? Can you project over the step back?





Bureau of Planning and Sustainability

Innovation. Collaboration. Practical Solutions.

#5 Full block zoning

- Could this yellow residential bar replace the step back when the commercial zone abuts the residential zone on the side or at the corner? Could it replace the setback at the rear property line? This is a good idea that we should explore expanding further.

We will follow up with Mike Warwick on this

Page | 6

#8 Street Frontages

Glazing

- How does glazing apply on the side street?
- *We don't know yet*
- Run with the proposal it is good
- Doors should have glazing in them too.
- Try to require true transparency or display in windows.
- Liner retail should be the desired solution for parking garages bigger retail.
- You probably will need to exempt garage doors in order to meet PBOT and BDS requirements.
- Off street loading and special trash garages need to fit in somewhere and meet PBOT and BDS requirements.
- Where do parking garages go?

Entrance frequency

- If we only require one entrance now would more entrances would have to be added retroactively if a building was later subdivided into multiple tenants?
Yes
- I think at least two doors in a 200 foot space in necessary even on a corridor. If you are a single tenant who can afford 200 feet you can afford people at two doors.

#9 Front Street setbacks

- Fifty percent flexible setback is too much because it allows that area to be a parking lot.

Public Comment

- Step backs in the building facades and recesses in the build to line detract from the street wall, instead plant trees along curbs to provide scale.
- I'm concerned if you over zone you are limiting the ability to design. Encourage low income housing. You could require more parking if you don't provide low income housing. Why do you have two standards for 60 foot ROWs, this does not make sense.
- This seems like more layers of regulation rather than a simplification. I think developers will just sit on their property and not do anything. These are people's investments and there will be no return with all these regulations.

Adjourn

