



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

Mixed Use Zones Project

Advisory Committee (PAC) Notes

Page | 1

Date: May 20, 2015

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

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

Project Staff in Attendance: Barry Manning, Bill Cunningham, Eric Engstrom, Tyler Bump, Jessica Connor, Madeline Kovacs (BPS); Deb Meihoff (Facilitator)

PAC Members in Attendance: Jason Barnstead-Long, Damien Hall, Michael Hayes, Heather Hoell, Duane Hunting, Sarah Iannarone, Doug Klotz, Charlotte Larson, Susan Lindsay, Jason Miner, Dennis Petrequin, Cora Potter, Vicki Skryha

Public (17)

Meeting Goals: Review Code Concept Report and feedback; next steps for PAC

Welcome and Introductions

PAC Announcements and Feedback

Meeting notes

- Are available in printed form and online

Project Update, Schedule, and Overview

- PBOT is conducting parking analysis in 5 study areas (centers & corridors) looking at parking demand and other issues. Learn more <http://www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation/67561>
- Intercept survey is being followed up with two in-depth discussions with residents of current mixed use buildings.
- We hope to release a Discussion Draft in August, including maps and code proposals, and a proposed draft should be released this fall for public comment before PSC hearings in November & December. City Council hearings are expected to take place in spring 2016. If accepted by Council at that time, one year is allowed before MU zoning regulations would take effect in 2017.

Other/Announcements

- A Portland Parking Symposium will be held on Monday, June 29. Learn more <http://www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation/67561>



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 are ongoing Comp Plan meetings and work sessions that PAC members may want to attend. Learn more <https://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/57352>
- Tyler gave a brief overview of the Growth Scenarios Report (GSR), available now. More information will be available soon, and the GSR is scheduled go to Council in June. Learn more <http://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/449310>

Page | 2

Recap of Intercept and Resident surveys and public presentations

- MUZP recently conducted an intercept survey and a new mixed use building tenant survey (composed of both renters and owners), asking about residents' experiences of Portland's centers & corridors. Questions focused on parking, amenities, and neighborhood demographics.
- With regard to public presentations, people are generally supportive of concepts and direction. Ongoing concerns include height/scale, affordability, and livability. The goal is to make both affordable living situations and viable business opportunities work together successfully.

Review Code Concepts Report

The report was written over the last two months, most content has been discussed in detail by PAC.

Significant refinements:

- Base and bonus FAR - summary of current FAR's:
 - CM1 Zone: Base FAR 1.5:1; Bonus FAR 2.5:1
 - CM2 Zone: Base FAR 2.5:1, Bonus FAR 4.1
 - CM3 zone: Base FAR 3:1; Bonus FAR 5:1
- Reviewed concept report to find visual examples of FAR massing. Some updates include a change in the way parking is addressed compared to early prototypes (high FAR leads to underground/structured parking). PAC recommendation: Include number (range) of units, and parking in visualizations.
- The bonus structure is much the same, with the same suite of five options, and still prioritizing affordable housing. Affordable housing is the only bonus option which allows you to meet the bonus maximum, while all other options cannot exceed 50% of the bonus allowance (two or more together could meet it). This bonus structure is also an attempt to make MUZ compatible with the Central City bonus system.
- After receiving feedback through outreach and testimony submitted, and much internal debate, a preliminary design review decision has been reached. After reading comments, we weighed options to have design review be required for all buildings more than five stories, and the concern over dis-incentivizing the provision of affordable housing. How do we address concerns and also fulfill Comp Plan goals?
 - A decision was made to apply design review in our highest growth opportunity areas, where the market is driving the highest amount of change. These are places within a 3-mile radius of the Central City, which have a MU – Urban Center (UC) designation. The map on p.19 of the concept report identifies areas where a d overlay exists now, and potential expansion through UC designation.





Bureau of Planning and Sustainability

Innovation. Collaboration. Practical Solutions.

PAC feedback and questions – *staff responses in italics*

Will the change in FAR potentially affect building types and materials? And, how would this affect plan or historic districts that already exist?

Plan and historic districts will likely override MUZ. Details still being worked out there, and MUZ requirements may not necessarily be applicable to plan areas.

Page | 3

Consider that if you only do affordable housing, then the developer may not consider other options.

We want to focus on yielding housing in the 60% of affordable range. Subject to change, but it's a place to start. Yes, 80% has been taken off the table, favoring more housing made available in the 60% range

Just rentals, or ownership being considered as well? Would be good to include ownership in affordability considerations and goals.

We are not sure yet. MUZ staff is working on this question with technical advisors. Another question still being worked out is how to administer affordable commercial in MU zones, and administration of historic transfer (a concern especially in NW as pointed out by PAC).

Does the setback requirement help to save and/or plant trees?

Potentially, but green features bonus is more relevant. MUZ projects would get 50% of the bonus allotment with high-performance green features such as energy efficiency and the provision of landscaping with tree canopy. Agree that it can be difficult to find trees in commercial areas.

Is provision of public plaza to achieve a bonus instead of provision of private/shared outdoor space?

No, bonus is in addition to any OS requirements.

Commercial limitations quite varied in smaller zones. Suggest trying to make a bit more similar?

Part of the challenge here is that we are collapsing 9 commercial zones into 4 Mixed Use zones, where the smaller-scale commercial zones already had some variation. Moving forward, we need to be able to allow for a similar range of uses.

In terms of manufacturing limitations, we want to allow for a broader range of uses in some zones. The challenge in CM2 and CM3 is that we wanted to allow some manufacturing, but never enough so that it could become the dominant use. In areas converting from EX to MUZ, we needed to ensure that we weren't creating many nonconforming uses.

Consider limiting manufacturing in centers and corridors areas – don't want this goal to compete too much with access to services for residents.

We also expanded allowances in some zones, so that we have an adequate supply and range of employment land to support middle-wage job creation. Functionally, the EX zone





Bureau of Planning and Sustainability

Innovation. Collaboration. Practical Solutions.

in inner city areas for example has transitioned to something that looks much more like the Pearl district.

It is difficult, looking at the Concept Report, to tell what changes were made to arrive at this draft.

We included some summary of the process in the appendix, but not a lot of detail. Our goal was to get the concept out so that people have something concrete to respond to.

Page | 4

Will you consider grandfathering in manufacturing in all residential zones?

That is a District Liaison question, based on site specifics. Some places in MUZ zones could be made to be more conforming.

I am concerned that without a more prescriptive limit in CM2 and CM3, in centers we may end up with a lot of 1:1 lot coverage and industrial/manufacturing uses. Would we ever consider/ is there included a minimum FAR, not just a maximum?

We are proposing a minimum FAR of 0.5:1 in the area mapped with Centers Overlay zone.

In the Centers overlay, are we currently moving towards a definition requiring “commercial” ground floor or “active” ground floor uses?

Last meeting, we talked about designing buildings so that they could accommodate active uses, including features such as high windows. The Design Commission, with the release of the State of the Design report, identified a lack of commercial activity at the ground floor in commercial areas as a key concern, and so supported stronger requirements throughout the city. We are responding by requiring commercial uses in the Centers overlay areas. Probably not 100% of a building ground floor will be required to be dedicated to commercial, but will need to still serve as an anchor, supporting the designated commercial hub. Actual requirements are still under discussion. (In a future meeting, we will also have a defined map of centers and corridors, where these requirements would be applied.)

If there is no fifth story, can a developer still take advantage of the affordable housing bonus? How is this different outside of the Inner-Ring MU-UC areas?

It is more difficult, but still possible to do a bonus with 4 stories. The 5th story in CM2 would be allowed in MU-UC areas and Civic Corridors where the design overlay is applied. We are not trying to discourage 5 story buildings, but we want to make sure that we have tools to address larger buildings. However, the vast majority of the areas where the fifth floor is not allowed are places where market dynamics are not currently likely to produce that much development.

In Sellwood, many buildings are 1-2 stories. That is changing. Apart from 5 story buildings, you need other new development – including 3- and 4-story buildings - to be compatible with neighborhood character, too.

What about the option to undergo voluntary design review to get a 5th story?



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.

Not sure – we should look into what this may entail.

Not sure that the process of triggering design review for 5+ stories is understood. Why? If this becomes the regulation, are we creating another whole design review process? Design review takes time, and it can be expensive. Still concerned it might affect creation of affordable housing.

Staff agreed that yes, we need to think critically about the bandwidth of design commission and staff. In addition, many existing design standards are also undergoing review currently.

Page | 5

So the application of the “d” overlay would mean that all these projects would be appeal-able by the neighborhoods?

A design land use review decision could be appealed. If a project met the design standards, then those are typically not appeal-able.

What about the large sites provisions?

Staff did determine some standards, to be considered in the master plan design review agreement. Extra height could be achieved, but this depends on base zone. We kept FAR consistent with base zones. A key component of large sites is its link to community benefits agreements.

Upper level step back – what did we discuss previously?

At the last meeting, there was a push and pull on that topic. Staff proposed to drop the 4th story street-side step back in the CM2 zone. Staff concluded, and the PAC generally but not unanimously agreed, that the articulation standards can achieve the goal of the step back by stepping back and/or by breaking up massing while not dictating a one-size-fits-all approach.

Was sun access a key reason for requiring a street-side step-back?

Neighborhood comments about scale were probably the main reason for the step back. Our consultant Bill Tripp did some solar analysis of 4-story buildings on narrower rights of way that indicated there was not really an issue.. Also, BPS is conducting more solar access analysis, which will inform these requirements.

People are still very interested in condominium-style parking spaces. People who don't drive every day but still have a car need to keep it somewhere.

We are looking at many parking options. Allowing some form of commercial or shared parking in the zones could address this.

PBOT requires a setback/wider sidewalk as part of new development. Having it as ROW makes more sense than a setback, as the setback doesn't function as a public space. Sometimes, having a sidewalk too wide can actually create dead space.





Bureau of Planning and Sustainability

Innovation. Collaboration. Practical Solutions.

Public Comments

I am still not clear on the design review process. So, if a design overlay zone is being applied, is this a discretionary review?

For some developments a discretionary design land use review will be required. We intend to make most of these “Type II” reviews, done by staff. They would need to show how they meet Community Design Guidelines. Some development – particularly those with housing – are allowed to meet Community Design Standards instead of going through a discretionary review.

Page | 6

What about potential future use of sharing multi-story garages in commercial areas?

Options being researched include this one, as well as options for x% of commercial and y% residential parking for the same building.

What is FAR?

Stands for Floor Area Ratio: The ratio of building floor area compared to the site area.

What is the Central City?

Includes Downtown, Old Town/Chinatown, Central Eastside, Lloyd District, Pearl, and South Waterfront.

There is a 4-story, 71-unit building proposed for Multnomah Village near the Multnomah Arts Center, and the neighbors are upset. Will Multnomah Village look like Division?

Not sure what the zone is on the property (likely CS). But, the applicant is generally entitled to the code in place at time of complete application. With the adoption of the MU zones, the by-right entitlements would be a bit different (lower) than the existing allowance, but in the CM2 zone an applicant would still be allowed to go to four stories. So, if the zone is CS now, then theoretically it would become CM2 and there would be a bit less floor area allowed compared to today unless they go for a bonus. BPS are still doing some map fine-tuning through District Liaisons, so suggest you plug in to that process.

What about the height limits for Multnomah village?

For the most part, it would likely be no more than 4 stories in Multnomah Village, as it is not a Mixed Use Urban Center, and therefore not eligible for a height bonus in CM2 zone.

Adjourn

