

# Mixed Use Zones Project

## Revised Concept Public Workshops Summary

### Feb/Mar 2015

The City of Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability is conducting the Mixed Use Zones Project (MUZ). The MUZ will revise Portland's Commercial and Central Employment Zoning Codes applied in Centers and Corridors outside of the Central City. These zones (CN1/2, CO1/2, CM, CS, CG, CX, EX), in which mixed uses are allowed, were created more than 20 years ago when auto-oriented and low-intensity commercial uses were more common. The project will address issues that arise with new more intensive mixed use buildings, such as massing and design, transitions and step-downs, and ground floor uses.

Portland is expected to grow — by roughly 122,000 households and 140,000 jobs — over the next 20 years. Where new people and businesses locate is key to supporting and enhancing the qualities that help make Portland an attractive place. Portland's new Comprehensive Plan proposes to focus neighborhood businesses and much of new household growth in mixed use "Centers and Corridors" that will serve as the anchors of convenient, walkable neighborhoods. This will help Portland meet its goals for becoming a more prosperous, healthy, equitable and resilient city.

### WORKSHOP DESCRIPTIONS

Four workshops occurring at both morning and evening hours were held Downtown and on the East Side. By providing multiple opportunities and locations to engage, the project team aimed to increase the accessibility of the workshops. Venture Portland, an organization representing Portland's neighborhood business districts, collaborated with project staff to host a workshop onsite to facilitate the engagement of local business owners. The workshops were designed to share information about the Revised Zoning Concept, including new draft development and design standards. A further goal was to collect feedback from the public through surveys, conversations with staff, and opportunities for formal written comprehensive plan testimony.

- **Session #1** February 25, 2015, 5:30 – 8:30 p.m., 1900 SW 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Room 2500 (2<sup>nd</sup> Floor)
- **Session #2** February 26, 2015, 7:30 – 10:00 a.m., 1900 SW 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Room 2500 (2<sup>nd</sup> Floor)
- **Session #3** March 9th, 2015, 3:30 – 5:00 p.m., Venture Portland 125 SE Madison St #112
- **Session #4** March 10th, 2015, 5:30 – 8 p.m., Cleveland High School Cafeteria 3400 Southeast 26th Avenue; joint session with the Powell-Division Transit and Development Project

The workshops opened with an open house setup. Participants were invited to educate themselves on the Mixed Use Zones Project through a series of poster displays with staff on hand to answer questions and collect comments. A presentation followed outlining the Revised Zoning Concept including bonuses and design issues. After the presentation, participants were invited to share any overarching questions or concerns about the project.



## COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

Workshop sessions were well attended by a mix of neighborhood residents, business owners, and developers. Renters, younger residents, and communities of color were underrepresented at all sessions. Over 100 people participated in the workshops.

2/25/2015 Downtown, 41 attendees  
 2/26/2015 Downtown, 34 attendees  
 3/09/2015 Venture Portland; 16 attendees  
 3/10/2015 Cleveland High School; 10 attendees.

**Total: 101 participants**

## WORKSHOP MATERIALS & PRESENTATIONS

Workshop presentations by staff and consultants covered the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability's Mixed Use Zones Project's *Revised Concept Draft*, ongoing public involvement, results of economic testing of bonuses and architectural modeling, zone application criteria, and various design strategies being explored.

**Workshop Presentation:** <https://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/520603>

**Full Architectural Prototype Report:** <https://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/513015>

## WORKSHOP SURVEY RESULTS

Participants at all workshop sessions were asked to give feedback on the revised concept ideas through a survey. The information and survey were also posted online for those that could not attend. A full summary of survey results can be found in Appendix 1. **A total of 46 surveys were collected**, representing almost half of workshop participants.

A copy of the workshop survey is available here:  
<https://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/520605>

### Survey Respondent Profile

A typical survey respondent is 52 years old, white, has lived in Portland 28 years, and owns their home. This is older than the median age for Portland, which is 36. It is representative of Portland's majority white population, but it is concerning that this perspective is almost the only represented in the survey data.

Resident: 39, Businessperson: 11, Development Pro: 9

Own: 33, Rent: 6, How Long in Portland: 28 yrs.

Neighborhood: Approx. 25 different neighborhoods represented

Race/Ethnicity: 28 white, 1 Native, 1 Hispanic, 1 European

### Survey Responses



**Areas of Agreement (>75% of respondents in support)**

- Allow additional 3' of building height for ground-floor commercial spaces.
- Allow parapets and minor architectural features to exceed height limits.
- Require a 10' setback adjacent to residential zones.
- Simplify building setback regulations and offer more flexibility for providing outdoor spaces along street frontages; require that a minimum percentage of building wall (40%-60%) be located close to sidewalks.
- Develop a "centers overlay"- to be applied in core commercial areas of centers - that requires buildings designed for active ground floor uses, requires pedestrian-oriented design features, limits auto-oriented/drive-through uses, and sets a minimum floor area development standard.
- Expand allowances for shared parking, allowing multiple businesses and residential buildings to share parking facilities.
- Allow for exterior display of merchandise, vending carts, etc.
- Require neighborhood and business association notification of new development in mixed use zones.

**Areas of Disagreement**

- About 1/3 of survey participants felt uncomfortable with proposed height and bulk regulations. Those who disagreed with the proposed scale were split on whether the buildings should be smaller or larger.
- Many survey respondents expressed concern about the use of pattern areas.
- Transitions to neighborhoods was an area of concern especially stepdowns in height to residential properties and rear setbacks. Again the comments were split on whether the transition should be more or less sensitive to the existing neighborhood context.
- Many survey commenters spoke up in defense of detached houses in commercial zones.
- Opinions on bonuses were divided, with many expressing a general mistrust in the bonus system.



## APPENDIX 1 Survey results and written comments

### Feedback on Zoning Code Development and Design Direction

The city is exploring a range of development standards and other regulatory approaches to be included in the new mixed use zones. Please share your feedback on your level of agreement (circle response) with the following potential approaches (topic numbers correspond to numbers used in the [workshop presentation](#) and display boards).

#	Zoning Code Approach	Level of Agreement			# Response
1.	<b>Relate building height to street scale.</b> Require 75% of the upper-levels of buildings along narrower corridors (less than 70' wide) to be set back from the street frontage: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. In the CM2 zone, limit building height to 3 stories (up to 38') within 10' of the front property line.</li> <li>b. In the CM3 zone, limit building height to 4 stories (up to 48') within 10' of the front property line.</li> </ul>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>42</b>
		54.8%	14.3%	31.0%	
2.	<b>Accommodate ground-floor active uses and roofline variety.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Allow additional 3' of building height for ground-floor commercial spaces.</li> <li>b. Allow parapets and minor architectural features to exceed height limits.</li> <li>c. Allow taller building height at corners located on corridor intersections.</li> </ul>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>43</b>
		<b>79.1%</b>	0.0%	20.9%	
		<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	
<b>72.7%</b>	13.6%	13.6%			
		<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>43</b>
		62.8%	16.3%	20.9%	



#	Zoning Code Approach	Level of Agreement			# Response	
3.	<b>Height transitions and buffering.</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>43</b>	
	a. Require taller buildings to “step down” to height of adjacent residential zones.	67.4%	11.6%	20.9%		
	b. Require a 10’ setback adjacent to residential zones.	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>		<b>40</b>
		<b>72.5%</b>	12.5%	15.0%		
c. Allow averaging of setbacks adjacent to residential zones, with deeper rear area setbacks in exchange for reduced setbacks within 50’ of street frontages.	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>37</b>		
	43.2%	37.8%	16.2%			
d. Exempt 1-story buildings from the 10’ setback requirement.	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>42</b>		
	45.2%	23.8%	<b>31.0%</b>			
4.	<b>Building articulation/massing.</b> Require facades of large buildings to be divided into smaller portions (at least 25% of façade off-set from rest of façade). Alternate triggering thresholds:	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>45</b>	
	a. Over 3 stories and over 100’ long.	62.2%	13.3%	24.4%		
	b. Over 4 stories and over 100’ long.	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>44</b>	
		59.1%	18.2%	22.7%		
5.	<b>Full-block zoning transitions.</b> On back-sides of full-block mixed-use zones, provide transitions to lower-scale residential zones located across the street by:	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>44</b>	
	a. Requiring buildings to step down in height.	65.9%	4.5%	29.5%		
	b. Require residential use within 15’ of these street frontages.	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>42</b>	
		52.4%	19.0%	28.6%		
6.	<b>Large sites/planned developments.</b> Allow for larger-scale developments on large sites (over 2 acres) in transit-rich locations, potentially through a land use review process and requirements for transitions in scale and other community benefits.	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>43</b>	
		58.1%	23.3%	18.6%		



#	Zoning Code Approach	Level of Agreement			# Response
7.	<b>Pattern area standards.</b> Apply design-related standards specific to the three major neighborhood pattern areas (Inner, Eastern, Western neighborhoods):				
	a. Less building coverage and more landscaping in Eastern and Western areas.	<b>Agree</b> 54.5%	<b>Neutral</b> 18.2%	<b>Disagree</b> 27.3%	<b>44</b>
	b. 10' minimum front setbacks along Civic Corridors in Eastern and Western areas.	<b>Agree</b> 47.7%	<b>Neutral</b> 25.0%	<b>Disagree</b> 25.0%	<b>44</b>
8.	<b>Street frontages:</b>				
	a. Ground-floor windows. Require 60% window coverage in centers, 40% window coverage along corridors outside centers.	<b>Agree</b> 61.0%	<b>Neutral</b> 22.0%	<b>Disagree</b> 17.1%	<b>41</b>
	b. Ground floor active uses. Require ground-floor spaces in core areas of centers to be designed to accommodate commercial uses (60% windows, accessible entries, high ceilings).	<b>Agree</b> <b>70.7%</b>	<b>Neutral</b> 14.6%	<b>Disagree</b> 14.6%	<b>41</b>
	c. Ground-level residential options. Along corridors outside center cores, provide options for the design of ground-floor residences: 1) 40% window coverage, or 2) setback from sidewalk, or 3) raised above ground level.	<b>Agree</b> 57.9%	<b>Neutral</b> 26.3%	<b>Disagree</b> 15.8%	<b>38</b>
9.	<b>Front/street setbacks.</b> Simplify building setback regulations and offer more flexibility for providing outdoor spaces along street frontages; require that a minimum percentage of building wall (40%-60%) be located close to sidewalks.	<b>Agree</b> <b>87.2%</b>	<b>Neutral</b> 5.1%	<b>Disagree</b> 7.7%	<b>39</b>
10.	<b>Outdoor space.</b> Require 48 square feet of outdoor or recreation space per residential unit (can be private space, shared outdoor space, or indoor recreation/community facility).	<b>Agree</b> 60.0%	<b>Neutral</b> 15.0%	<b>Disagree</b> 25.0%	<b>40</b>
11.	<b>Side setback requirements.</b> Require residential windows to be located at least 5 feet from side or rear property lines.	<b>Agree</b> 48.8%	<b>Neutral</b> 26.8%	<b>Disagree</b> 24.4%	<b>41</b>
12.	<b>Detached house development.</b> Limit new detached houses in the core mixed use/commercial areas of centers.	<b>Agree</b> 52.4%	<b>Neutral</b> 16.7%	<b>Disagree</b> <b>31.0%</b>	<b>42</b>



#	Zoning Code Approach	Level of Agreement	# Response
13.	<p><b>Performance Bonus for public benefits.</b> Please indicate your preference to an approach that sets a base development allowance and provides additional height or floor area when public/community benefits are provided in new development (e.g., affordable housing and commercial space, historic preservation, community services, publicly-accessible plazas, high-performance green features, and other potential elements).</p> <p>a. Set new development allowances and provide bonuses above existing (proposed).</p> <p>b. Set new development allowances and bonus back up to existing allowances.</p> <p>c. Maintain existing development allowances and bonus above existing.</p> <p>d. None of the above, or disagree with performance bonus approach.</p>	<p><i>Check preferred approach</i></p> <p>a. <input type="checkbox"/> = 24.1%</p> <p>b. <input type="checkbox"/> = 24.1%</p> <p>c. <input type="checkbox"/> = 20.7%</p> <p>d. <input type="checkbox"/> = 27.6%</p>	39
15.	<p><b>Neighborhood notification requirements.</b> Require neighborhood and business association notification of new development in mixed use zones.</p>	<p>Agree    Neutral    Disagree</p> <p><b>83.3%</b>    4.8%    11.9%</p>	42
16.	<p><b>Exterior display areas.</b> Allow for exterior display of merchandise, vending carts, etc.</p>	<p>Agree    Neutral    Disagree</p> <p><b>76.3%</b>    10.5%    13.2%</p>	38
17.	<p><b>Shared parking.</b> Expand allowances for shared parking, allowing multiple businesses and residential buildings to share parking facilities.</p>	<p>Agree    Neutral    Disagree</p> <p><b>87.5%</b>    7.5%    5.0%</p>	40
	<p><b>Core area requirements.</b> Develop a “centers overlay”- to be applied in core commercial areas of centers - that requires buildings designed for active ground floor uses, requires pedestrian-oriented design features, limits auto-oriented/drive-through uses, and sets a minimum floor area development standard.</p>	<p>Agree    Neutral    Disagree</p> <p><b>84.2%</b>    2.6%    13.2%</p>	38



**Priorities and Considerations**

Zoning Code regulations influence the design of development, and may also have impacts on development costs, commercial/business viability, and housing production in centers and corridors. What are your thoughts as to the relative priorities of the following in relationship to the mixed use zones? Please circle your highest priority.

	<b>High Priority</b>	<b>Moderate Priority</b>	<b>Not a Priority</b>
A. <b>Provide opportunities for neighborhood businesses</b>	59.0%	28.2%	10.3%
B. <b>Maintain capacity for housing in centers and corridors</b>	64.1%	23.1%	12.8%
C. <b>Address neighborhood compatibility and scale transitions</b>	52.6%	23.7%	23.7%
D. <b>Minimize impacts on development costs and affordability</b>	45.9%	21.6%	32.4%
E. <b>Improve sidewalk-level building design and pedestrian orientation</b>	67.6%	27.0%	5.4%

**Please tell us a bit about yourself (optional):**  
 Resident: 39 Businessperson: 11 Development Pro: 9  
 Own: 33 Rent: 6 How Long in Portland: 28 yrs.  
 Neighborhood: Approx. 25 different neighborhoods represented.  
 Age: 52 Race/Ethnicity: 28 white, 1 Native, 1 Hispanic, 1 European





## APPENDIX 2

TOPIC	COMMENT
<p><b>Topic 1</b></p>	<p><b>Relate building height to street scale.</b> Require 75% of the upper-levels of buildings along narrower corridors (less than 70’ wide) to be set back from the street frontage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. In the CM2 zone, limit building height to 3 stories (up to 38’) within 10’ of the front property line.</li> <li>b. In the CM3 zone, limit building height to 4 stories (up to 48’) within 10’ of the front property line.</li> </ul> <p><b>Go lower or stay the same</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Woodstock Blvd is approximately 70’ wide. Woodstock Charrette showed bldg. “scale” very important. Setback concept widely supported.</li> <li>• Glad you are thinking about this- Division is claustrophobic and sad.</li> <li>• Lower if adjacent to residential users.</li> <li>• Agree with setbacks, but think both zones should be treated in same way to avoid problems in future.</li> <li>• CM3 too tall / CM2 bonus should be difficult to obtain.</li> <li>• Limit CM2 buildings height to 1 story! Limit CM3 building height to 2 stories!</li> <li>• Should require 100% of upper levels to be setback; CM2 should be 3 stories max. CM3 should be 4 stories max.</li> </ul> <p><b>It depends</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How will setbacks/heights be impacted where view corridors and geographic features need to be protected?</li> <li>• This imposes down zoning in an older street town center i.e. 45’ wide corridor</li> <li>• Depends on existing conditions – width of sidewalk etc.</li> <li>• Allow for more variety trade off low areas for additional height (one height).</li> <li>• What about 80’ ROWs?</li> <li>• It is absurd to only cover 75% of cases - change this to 100%</li> <li>• Many of our ROW’s are about 60’, so this will affect neighborhood streets. It oddly limits architectural design.</li> <li>• Require this for buildings on Southside of street only. More floor area would greatly improve market supply of housing; so I think this might not be the best option. And what you see at the street level is much more important than the height of the building</li> <li>• I don’t have enough information. This could be too restrictive.</li> <li>• Must have on street parking for positive street scape.</li> </ul> <p><b>Go higher</b></p>



TOPIC	COMMENT
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These areas are setup to accommodate growth and help relieve pressure on the UGB – we should allow 4 stories minimum by right.</li> <li>• In CM2, allow 48’ at the street frontage</li> <li>• FAR should be 3.5 or more with half of underground parking not included.</li> <li>• I don’t like the density restrictions that rules like this impose.</li> <li>• I think this is too limiting. I wouldn’t require these height limits or setbacks.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Topic 2</b></p>	<p><b>Accommodate ground-floor active uses and roofline variety.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>e. Allow additional 3’ of building height for ground-floor commercial spaces.</li> <li>f. Allow parapets and minor architectural features to exceed height limits.</li> <li>g. Allow taller building height at corners located on corridor intersections.</li> </ul> <p><b>Disagree</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Just make the allowable height the allowable height please.</li> <li>• Max heights should be firm – not exceeded for any reason. Keep it simple.</li> <li>• There should not be any exceptions to height restrictions!</li> <li>• Require roofline variety but no additional height!</li> </ul> <p><b>Agree</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Great changes!</li> <li>• All of these accommodations seem to allow for increased flexibility which is good.</li> <li>• Definitely allow these!</li> <li>• I think this will provide better commercial space and more diversity in housing.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other ideas</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If corner removed, massing added should be stepped back.</li> <li>• Allow solid parapets to push up above lower height limits to 4’.</li> <li>• Combine with setbacks at corners to create safer, more inviting pedestrian environment.</li> <li>• Why not add a story? Maybe as part of a points to system.</li> <li>• I like the ability to cut/ articulate corners of building for better street treatment at corners.</li> <li>• The extra 3’ is only ok if they give the 3’ to the commercial space!</li> <li>• Maybe consider requiring ground-floor retail use and/or building standard in key locations.</li> <li>• Existing neighboring properties must be taken into consideration in order to protect their solar/air access.</li> <li>• Option C could become cliché or not utilized.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Topic 3</b></p>	<p><b>Height transitions and buffering.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Require taller buildings to “step down” to height of adjacent residential zones.</li> </ul>



TOPIC	COMMENT
	<p>b. Require a 10’ setback adjacent to residential zones.</p> <p>c. Allow averaging of setbacks adjacent to residential zones, with deeper rear area setbacks in exchange for reduced setbacks within 50’ of street frontages.</p> <p>d. Exempt 1-story buildings from the 10’ setback requirement.</p> <p><b>Concerns about size of setback or how it will be used</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Problems may be created where setback provides for outdoor drinking space thereby increasing problems/noise for residential neighbors.</li> <li>• Setbacks for all.</li> <li>• Should be 20 feet.</li> <li>• Consider 20ft setback for residential</li> <li>• 10’ should be minimum would prefer setback &gt;10’.</li> <li>• 10’ set back is insignificant landscape space – always a leftover not useful. Offer bonus for 15’ or 20’ or variety setback.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other Comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential buyers of residential properties need to be informed of adjacent zoning ramifications.</li> <li>• Adjacent height based on topography &amp; height.</li> <li>• On transit corridors, do not require setbacks where the side of the CM zone abuts an R-1 or RX zone. Rear setbacks, if required, should be based on height allowed in adjacent R zones, such as 35’ in R2.5</li> <li>• Adjacent to residential zone B max 35’ ht.</li> <li>• Don’t allow 1 story buildings. Bad for main streets.</li> <li>• Could developers negotiate with neighbors? Don’t give people incentives to build such low density – unless detached single family development.</li> <li>• Again, increased flexibility and reasonable tradeoffs make sense. The more that rules are set in the code and not left up to design review the better.</li> <li>• Option C seems like an odd idea, why?</li> <li>• I’d favor some type of “menu” or options approach to better address specific circumstances.</li> <li>• Instead of this step down approach, the zoning should be higher on the residential side near commercial to provide a natural step down as you go from commercial to residential.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Topic 4</b></p>	<p><b>Building articulation/massing.</b> Require facades of large buildings to be divided into smaller portions (at least 25% of façade off-set from rest of façade). Alternate triggering thresholds: Over 3 stories and over 100’ long, Over 4 stories and over 100’ long.</p> <p><b>Pro regulation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Require meaningful articulation. Not just a couple of feet.</li> <li>• Do not give bonuses – require.</li> </ul>



TOPIC	COMMENT
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building can be articulated much more every 100'. I might suggest every 50-75', also different materials could potentially be included in articulation.</li> <li>• Not 25%, that's only a 5-10' wide. Not clear at over 100 feet length.</li> <li>• Over 3 stories and under 100' long.</li> <li>• Always require articulation.</li> <li>• Option A should be over 2 stories and over 50' long. Option B should be over 4 stories and over 50' long.</li> <li>• Good idea!</li> </ul> <p><b>This is over-regulation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Articulation is expensive and should only apply to larger buildings</li> <li>• This sounds nice, but seems like it might be over-regulating.</li> <li>• What does "off-set" mean? This limits design solutions and creative architecture.</li> <li>• Not the right way to create better design. Will just limit design and create a new version of bad designs.</li> <li>• Quality of the facade (architecture, finish material, glazing) often more important than articulation.</li> <li>• Try not to decrease floor area significantly, absent a height bonus (keep off-set shallow and short).</li> <li>• Can use other standards to visually break up – color, pedestrian, etc.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Topic 5</b></p>	<p><b>Full-block zoning transitions.</b> On back-sides of full-block mixed-use zones, provide transitions to lower-scale residential zones located across the street by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Requiring buildings to step down in height.</li> <li>b. Require residential use within 15' of these street frontages.</li> </ol> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• B = Interesting good idea.</li> <li>• Create zoning that discourages full block developments.</li> <li>• You should have transitional land use zoning &amp; allow townhomes in between mixed use &amp; SF residence.</li> <li>• 35' max for ½ of site – 50' max.</li> <li>• This should depend on street width, light access. If lighting at residential property wouldn't change, who cares?</li> <li>• What about parks?</li> <li>• Make fair and reasonable rules, including protecting residential zones, but don't force design solutions.</li> <li>• Consider opportunities to expand ½-block MU zones to full block, where rear streets exists.</li> <li>• What about small scale retail that would only serve the neighborhood?</li> </ul>



TOPIC	COMMENT
<p><b>Topic 6</b></p>	<p><b>Large sites/planned developments.</b> Allow for larger-scale developments on large sites (over 2 acres) in transit-rich locations, potentially through a land use review process and requirements for transitions in scale and other community benefits.</p> <p><b>Do not allow Large Site Development</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Large scale is bland!</li> <li>• Large site development in the city has been mostly bad up to this point.</li> </ul> <p><b>Allow with some sort of review or conditions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With increased public review process, require neighborhood issues integrated/mitigated</li> <li>• Require design review and approved by neighborhood.</li> <li>• Require design review on large sites.</li> <li>• These should trigger required design review.</li> <li>• Too vague, what is transit rich? Should always have design review for large sale developments</li> <li>• The land review process transitions would be critical to assure compatibility with surrounding neighborhoods are size lots are different.</li> <li>• All in favor of allowances for (potentially significant) height increases, with review.</li> <li>• You should consider a PUD zone that allows flexibility</li> <li>• Most have 60’ ROWs through the site that are level and mostly paved, and dedicated to city.</li> <li>• In C zones commercial on 1<sup>st</sup> floor.</li> </ul> <p><b>Allow by right or concerns about regulations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By right!</li> <li>• I think Portland is too restrictive in transition (scale) requirements.</li> <li>• Way to vague! When the design review egomaniacs are given subjective power, they will abuse it and apply it unevenly and unfairly.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I don’t understand, this isn’t a new idea or question. We already do this.</li> <li>• Not sure what you mean, but sites like this shouldn’t be “wasted” with low density.</li> <li>• Super important. Chavez/Division (e/g/) Chaves/Belmont (e.g.) most of Powell – great locations for 7-10 stories.</li> <li>• Not available.</li> <li>• Especially units with affordable housing units.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Topic 7</b></p>	<p><b>Pattern area standards.</b> Apply design-related standards specific to the three major neighborhood pattern areas (Inner, Eastern, Western neighborhoods):</p> <p>a. Less building coverage and more landscaping in Eastern and Western areas.</p>



TOPIC	COMMENT
	<p>b. 10' minimum front setbacks along Civic Corridors in Eastern and Western areas.</p> <p><b>Concerns about Inner Neighborhoods</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What about inner?</li> <li>• A and B in inner neighborhood too.</li> <li>• Disagree strongly with reducing landscaping in streetcar roads – already park deficient need more green, not less, more creative approaches.</li> <li>• More (some) landscaping in inner. The “pattern” isn’t beneficial.</li> </ul> <p><b>Concerns about Outer Neighborhoods</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protect Eastern neighborhoods too!</li> <li>• Do not make eastern/western less pedestrian friendly by weakening street “enclosure” with excess width.</li> <li>• Some areas considered “eastern”, such as Lents, may be overly restricted despite urban character.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop Barbur Blvd and/or Multnomah Blvd. Do not develop Capital Hwy! Too dangerous for pedestrians and kids.</li> <li>• Option B should be 20’.</li> <li>• Too limiting on development.</li> <li>• There should be maximum front building setbacks primarily to minimize parking lots in front.</li> <li>• Civic corridors should be urban throughout the city; Barbur, 122, Division along RT alignment, etc.</li> <li>• I’m not convinced that general landscaping requirements are a good thing, especially long civic corridors., e.g.</li> <li>• Civic Corridors in Eastern and Western areas should be 20 feet.</li> <li>• Landscaping setbacks not beneficial along higher traffic/less on street parking. Preserve high value property.</li> <li>• Consider buffered bike lanes (cycle tracks) on higher speed, higher traffic roads.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Topic 8</b></p>	<p><b>Street frontages:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Ground-floor windows. Require 60% window coverage in centers, 40% window coverage along corridors outside centers.</li> <li>b. Ground floor active uses. Require ground-floor spaces in core areas of centers to be designed to accommodate commercial uses (60% windows, accessible entries, high ceilings).</li> <li>c. Ground-level residential options. Along corridors outside center cores, provide options for the design of ground-floor residences: 1) 40% window coverage, or 2) setback from sidewalk, or 3) raised above ground level.</li> </ol> <p><b>In support of proposed or greater window standards</b></p>



TOPIC	COMMENT
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 60% along corridors too</li> <li>• 60% maybe too high, especially if you have parking entryways.</li> <li>• I'd do 60% everywhere except where these option C rules would apply.</li> <li>• Ground floor windows are important. Residential units need more privacy. I'm uncertain/neutral about exact percentage.</li> </ul> <p><b>The market or retail use should drive ground floor design</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Depends on usage or business and type of business - too many entrances can limit usable floor space inside.</li> <li>• Too general. Many streets in corridors offer no on-street parking making commercial use unfeasible. Street parking is a must for commercial.</li> <li>• Whoever wrote option B and C doesn't understand that these ideas do not accommodate commercial or residential uses.</li> <li>• Match ground retail with market.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Required select 2 of the following* drew arrow to option C*.</li> <li>• What is active ground floor use? Options B and C require defensible space landscape features: gates, fences, etc.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Topic 9</b></p>	<p><b>Front/street setbacks.</b> Simplify building setback regulations and offer more flexibility for providing outdoor spaces along street frontages; require that a minimum percentage of building wall (40%-60%) be located close to sidewalks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Needs to be used for public activities, not outdoor storage &amp; trash containers.</li> <li>• Yes to green space, no to wall at sidewalk.</li> <li>• We need more public spaces &amp; parks to make density work.</li> <li>• No bonus unless design review for outdoor space</li> <li>• Why? Why not have all walls back especially in 'outdoor areas'?</li> <li>• Require building to "street line" at each end of frontage. Up the percentage of building to above current 50%.</li> <li>• Sidewalks in front of buildings must be 10' wide.</li> <li>• More variability in frontages.</li> <li>• Again, agree with concept – uncertain regarding percentage.</li> <li>• Welcoming storefronts, a place to pause?</li> <li>• Parking (off street) availability must be part of the discussion.</li> <li>• Don't "simplify" anything!</li> <li>• Do not simplify – smacks of back room deals.</li> <li>• Flexibility and allowing developers and architects to design creative solutions yields more vital environments.</li> <li>• This is the best idea.</li> <li>• I am afraid these may turn into dead zones; please use other standards to ensure active use of these spaces.</li> </ul>



TOPIC	COMMENT
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Definitely allows for more flexibility.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Topic 10</b></p>	<p><b>Outdoor space.</b> Require 48 square feet of outdoor or recreation space per residential unit (can be private space, shared outdoor space, or indoor recreation/community facility).</p> <p><b>This is not enough or sufficient</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It ain't much but it's something.</li> <li>A minimum - but prefer 75 feet</li> <li>Better if it was more.</li> <li>Need much more, 7ft x 7ft -= 49 sq. ft. That is not much!</li> <li>Yes!!</li> <li>At least.</li> </ul> <p><b>This is too restrictive</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This seems broad, are we talking about everywhere?</li> <li>This should be driven by 2 things – (1) the market and (2) the communities' responsibility to provide parks. Forcing poorly designed and useless spaces is not a solution.</li> <li>This is a horrible idea and will have counterproductive effects.</li> <li>Bonus instead.</li> <li>Too restrictive.</li> </ul> <p><b>What to do with the space</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It should be outdoor.</li> <li>Allow, encourage balconies to meet this. They also break up the flat plane of many facades.</li> <li>Require space to be usable &amp; handicap accessible i.e. 5' setback lawn should not double as shared outdoor space.</li> <li>How it will be gamed- penthouse suite with roof courtyard?! Before issuing any new permits for major projects bring existing construction into compliance (i.e. 29 NE Fremont), sidewalks (NE 47<sup>th</sup>) w/ SDC fees. (Where oh where do they go?!), and provide other infrastructure. ( daily bus service, for example) That helps a neighborhood accept, manage, and welcome new development.</li> <li>Add more street tree requirements for bigger buildings and building wall landscaping, green roofs.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>But really – The Parks SDC's that are being paid for mixed project should be re-invested in the area where the project is developed! In Richmond we have no parks and future parks SPC's are being spent in other neighborhoods.</li> </ul>





TOPIC	COMMENT
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with concerns regarding loss of light and air at adjacent smaller building ones for all the reasons mentioned during Q and A segment, as well as concerns regarding health.</li> <li>• Might consider differentiating between public outdoor space and private outdoor space. Former = more important, more valuable, as many such private spaces are grossly underutilized.</li> <li>• Is indoor space currently actually used – community rooms?</li> <li>• Need a standard not sure if this is the right number.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Topic 11</b></p>	<p><b>Side setback requirements.</b> Require residential windows to be located at least 5 feet from side or rear property lines.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate light &amp; air needed. Added bldg. requirements needed to address air &amp; noise where abut major transportation.</li> <li>• This will also be gamed, I suspect Wally R? Puts windows 6 inched from property lines.</li> <li>• Require outside space only. No indoor space.</li> <li>• 8 plus feet.</li> <li>• More – 10’</li> <li>• Building code already does this!</li> <li>• Should be 10 feet.</li> <li>• Should be greater than 5ft.</li> <li>• This makes good design sense and is already considered in fire codes.</li> <li>• Depends a lot on context. Let building/fire codes determine this.</li> <li>• Agree, as long as 5’ is more than what is presently required.</li> <li>• What would building setback be? Two feet?</li> </ul>
<p><b>Topic 12</b></p>	<p><b>Detached house development.</b> Limit new detached houses in the core mixed use/commercial areas of centers.</p> <p><b>In defense of detached houses</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What about a detached house w/ business on 1<sup>st</sup> floor?</li> <li>• Detached houses can be converted and become interesting commercial buildings – like on 23<sup>rd</sup>, Division and Mississippi. Many detached house conversations look better than big boxes. Buying houses in commercial corridors is the only way for entrepreneurs to own a commercial space.</li> <li>• Variability please.</li> <li>• It is supposed to be mixed!</li> <li>• Should have only mixed use – not “mixed use/commercial”.</li> <li>• There could be small remnant sites that may not accommodate anything else!</li> <li>• If someone wants to build a detached home that should be fine. It’s not all about density.</li> <li>• Provides unique scale transitions. See Reykjavik, Iceland.</li> </ul>



TOPIC	COMMENT
	<p><b>Detached houses are always under-development</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes. Don't allow under development.</li> <li>• Require existing houses to be removed or become commercial.</li> </ul> <p><b>Use another tool</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimum density principle should apply.</li> <li>• I recommend criteria to allow detached - in some circumstances it could be very disruptive.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Topic 13</b></p>	<p><b>Performance Bonus for public benefits.</b> Please indicate your preference to an approach that sets a base development allowance and provides additional height or floor area when public/community benefits are provided in new development</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Set new development allowances and provide bonuses above existing (proposed).</li> <li>Set new development allowances and bonus back up to existing allowances.</li> <li>Maintain existing development allowances and bonus above existing.</li> <li>None of the above, or disagree with performance bonus approach.</li> </ol> <p><b>Concerns about bonuses generally</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No bonuses – just make the height the height. Too many “free rides” and exemptions go to the least creative lowest quality developers already. Let’s not give them more.</li> <li>• No bonuses for what should be done anyway – wide open for abuse – must have off street parking – one plus space per unit.</li> <li>• With that many choices people will find ways to circumvent the bonuses or find ways to change interpretations.</li> <li>• Eliminate all bonuses! They are confusing and are really just a trick!</li> <li>• Bonuses should not be part of the system. They open the process up to too much fooling around with intended rules!</li> <li>• Most developers, including myself, will never do the “bonus”. Affordable housing only works if it is subsidized. This bonus plan will not work.</li> </ul> <p><b>Set entitlements lower or add conditions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No additional height bonuses unless height is reduced in base zones.</li> <li>• Prefer not to bonus up to 5 stories on narrow streets (4 stories is ok). It would be ok to allow taller heights at major intersections with wider streets.</li> <li>• I feel that builders/developers will do the bare minimum bonus to net more height. Option B will really put the reigns in to give the community something nice.</li> <li>• There is enough existing zoning capacity to meet growth demands.</li> </ul> <p><b>Don't reduce capacity</b></p>



TOPIC	COMMENT
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Don't reduce capacity! Why FAR bonus? Should be based on coding floors, not FAR.</li> <li>• Do not reduce existing entitlement, as calculated by what FAR you could now achieve in CS, CM and CX, EX zones.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alternative: Allow reduced or increased FAR for uses.</li> <li>• Only Offer bonus for providing public space</li> <li>• Existing 4 goes to basic 3 with bonuses to 4 and then to 5 for additional bonus-hold value of bonus to community not just to developer</li> <li>• Should consider how to approach "affordable" housing, since there are needs for both very low income and slightly below market units for middle class folks.</li> <li>• There is a big difference (in many ways) between 2-3 stories with a 4<sup>th</sup> stepped back and not stepped back.</li> <li>• Bonus heights should be limited to not more than 1-2 extra floors and should be stepped back if above existing allowance.</li> <li>• Bonus should go through Neighborhood review and only be allowed with off street parking (.75 spaces per unit for residential).</li> <li>• Increase options and flexibility. Reduce reliance on design review.</li> <li>• Devil's really in the details on this one! More public discussion needed.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Topic 14</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Comments</li> </ul>
<p><b>Topic 15</b></p>	<p><b>Neighborhood notification requirements.</b> Require neighborhood and business association notification of new development in mixed use zones.</p> <p><b>Yes please and maybe other things too</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This (ideally) can be very reassuring to nearby neighbors</li> <li>• Notice &amp; required neighborhood involvement (need 3 day to schedule meeting)</li> <li>• Also design review. Use to be like this was how developers voluntarily did it. The awful development happening now will be with us forever or till it last – what a waste</li> <li>• Hold developers to delay equal to talking/dealing with neighborhood to incentivize good neighbor agreement.</li> <li>• As long as it is also required for developers to attend at least one community meeting to present their plans.</li> <li>• No exceptions</li> <li>• Neighborhoods should be able to limit car oriented development like car washes and gas stations.</li> <li>• Include signage also with number of units, size of units, etc.</li> <li>• Yay public participation!</li> <li>• We are living with the consequences of no notification of WA Mo High school changes to community.</li> <li>• Notification and presentation?</li> </ul>



TOPIC	COMMENT
	<p><b>Should be encouraged for some projects</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is this something that is not already required?</li> <li>• Major projects only.</li> <li>• Sure. Just don't give neighborhood associations more power over the approval process.</li> <li>• Should not be required but should be encouraged.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Topic 16</b></p>	<p><b>Exterior display areas.</b> Allow for exterior display of merchandise, vending carts, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only on private property</li> <li>• Where?</li> </ul>
<p><b>Topic 17</b></p>	<p><b>Shared parking.</b> Expand allowances for shared parking, allowing multiple businesses and residential buildings to share parking facilities.</p> <p><b>Agree</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, PDC, BDS, PBOT &amp; BPS need to identify &amp; present strategic public parking</li> <li>• Common sense solution.</li> <li>• Requiring commercial parking is wasteful when not shared</li> <li>• Yes!!! Of course! 21<sup>st</sup> century!</li> </ul> <p><b>Disagree or Concerns</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parking requirements need to reflect reality. Don't allow developers to externalize their cost. My block is now a parking lot and unsafe for the 12 kids that live there.</li> <li>• All residences must have dedicated parking – no building without adequate off street parking.</li> <li>• Agree with idea of sharing but worry that residential may then be forced to use car for transit when otherwise would not.</li> <li>• Require off-street parking when next to single family home areas.</li> <li>• As long as ADA compliant.</li> <li>• This is a slippery slope. Without enforcement it will be abused. Each property should meet code.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use parking meters.</li> </ul>
<p><b>OTHER</b></p>	<p><b>Core area requirements.</b> Develop a “centers overlay”- to be applied in core commercial areas of centers - that requires buildings designed for active ground floor uses, requires pedestrian-oriented design features, limits auto-oriented/drive-through uses, and sets a minimum floor area development standard.</p>



TOPIC	COMMENT
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very interested in this.</li> <li>• Nice ideal. Hard to require if market is not there yet.</li> <li>• All this is good thinking, but will or can it be enforced? (Not in current BDS climate, I suspect).</li> <li>• Encourage across the board.</li> <li>• But need to streamline design review.</li> <li>• Plus all buildings along transit streets must build up a sidewalk to meet state transportation planning rule (TPR) standards.</li> <li>• Centers are easier to design than corridors because corridors bump up against residential buildings. Along corridors buildings must not be more than 35' in height unless special. In commercial zones commercial must be on first floor. Residential above ok. Should do an area plan for each center and corridor to insure proper mix of uses for the area.</li> <li>• Won't we have plenty of capacity with current zoning? I highlighted this because it has been neglected and there are no good remedies being currently applies.</li> <li>• Require adequate off street parking to keep the economic vibrancy of the center.</li> <li>• Absurd! Why have special points of mixed use zones?</li> <li>• A zones identity is critical. No one knows what CM1 CM2 or CM3 is. People know with storefront commercial or neighborhood commercial is. Code should not be proscriptive and require uses such as residential. Never works.</li> <li>• Centers overlay should preserve the existing character of centers.</li> <li>• Again, this is already in place, unless I am mistaken.</li> <li>• Also corridors. Recent development along BH Hwy (Shattuck to Oleson) has been ugly and pedestrian-hostile.</li> </ul>

**OTHER COMMENTS**

**Place Specific**

- Encourage CM2 zoning on Sandy Blvd. & 82<sup>nd</sup> Ave corridors where it overlaps with the Roseway Neighborhood center.
- Alberta Street has become a mostly one story strip mall of boutique retail. Please do more to incentivize construction of taller, denser buildings with housing above retail. We'd love to have the "problem" of apartments being built on Division Street!
- Option C - highest priority is maintaining character and affordability of existing neighborhood! This Multnomah Village area is a neighborhood first, commercial center second. Will Multnomah Village be up zoned in the future (that ½ mile radius from Capital Highway?). Would hate to see mixed use commercial seep into the neighborhood and destroy single family dwelling character of the neighborhood. What makes this Village appealing is its size in relation to neighborhood. Enlarging the commercial spaces and



multifamily dwellings just too “stuff more newcomers in close to services” will absolutely destroy the thing people value about our area and Portland in general. Move too many people in close and start the mass exodus to suburbs in 20 years! So much for the tax base. Pendulums can swing too much toward sub-urbanizing and commercializing this area. While it may drive some tax bases up, preserving what makes this area unique will preserve what makes Portland unique. Need a little more Governor Mc Call. Thanks for listening!

### **Concerns about down zoning/affordability impacts/capacity/development costs**

- I’m concerned these changes will drive up development costs, reduce capacity and result in a chilling effect on development in the city thereby putting pressure on the UGB. I moved here because I wanted to escape sprawl and the disinvestment in urban areas. What about our 2040 plan? These mixed use areas have excellent transit and existing infrastructure. We should maximize the capacity to the extent possible (4-5 stories at a minimum). The bonus provisions seem unrealistic (who will decide and monitor the affordable commercial space for example?)
- Please do not allow this process to down zone real property. This will affect long term land holder’s and developer’s value negatively. All for growth the planned growth in corridors. Thank You. FAR for Com 2 is 2:1 this is factually low relative to growth demands. Consider a higher FAR.
- CM@ should be 3.5 FAR or higher or not transition to residential. Current property owners have the right to what is currently allowed, height. For residential in commercial zones. Do not apply FAR to lots 10,000 SF or less lot size or 3.5 FAR or more (diagrams are drawn on survey).
- I get so tired of what I believe is a very vocal minority that proclaims, “It doesn’t fit in this neighborhood?” or “It is too big!” I think Portland needs to be bold in allowing for higher density and taller heights. I believe we are too restrictive and should allow for greater flexibility in the design of mixed use buildings.
- I do not understand any of the down zoning and reducing the heights of buildings. All of these plans will cause less density and make it more expensive for housing in Portland. If you want affordable housing, there should be more density and taller buildings. This is going in the wrong direction.

### **Parking**

- Support house conversions to support entrepreneurs. Minimize (or eliminate) parking requirements in small zones for commercial use. Let neighborhood associations decide to limit auto use, prevent too much commercial parking, prevent drive-through, to limit business impacts/noise in areas near residential. Do not let neighborhoods limit development to keep new residents out!
- Need to provide coordination of design concepts and acceptable public parking. i.e., combined back yard shared parking area.
- My # 1 concern is parking. Do not like to see single family homes losing their street parking such as NE 45<sup>th</sup> off Fremont. And my # 2 concern is traffic. If adequate parking, neighborhood are at their best. Walkability & places for cars.
- Another great bonus for consideration is the provision of shared vehicle facilities/parking, especially given the potential to reduce traffic and parking pressure.



### **Air/Light**

- Need landscape requirements to be strengthened to require larger trees (and other landscaping) to help balance the development scale and soften massing. Building heights should take into consideration solar shading impacts. 4 stories on Division (at Southside) keeps Northside at pedestrian level in shade during the winter months when we need the sun the most! Please share this type of impact analysis for consideration. Need more side setbacks on upper stores to allow more windows on side facades to allow for more day lightening, natural ventilation, and reduce large blank wall facades. Please include people in your models to evaluate “human-scale,” Also perspectives of modes shown from above skew perception.
- Compatibility with and minimal intrusion on neighborhoods as possible. Air/light for neighborhoods.
- Somehow, existing properties must be respected and taken into consideration when a new development is proposed. So often, homes already established for decades are cut off from the view/sun/air their owners have enjoyed. The step down approach is a good start, but perhaps it needs to be further with a “sun angle” concept to height where a new development doesn’t cast a shadow on neighbor’s existing property.

### **Design/Articulation**

- I think building articulation can easily be accommodated in buildings of less than 100 feet in width. What is to stop one developer having two 100’ tax lots adjacent in one block then developing the same building on each lot resulting in 200’ of same building over 200’. I think a requirement to use different materials treatment should be required in larger project (i.e. Stucco, brick, block, metal, etc.) CM1 zones, when next to CM2 zones could have more flexibility to match height and design of CS (CM2) – CM1 would typically have more land and could easily accommodate stories, height, setbacks, step backs, etc. For a more viable project & be more appealing to neighboring CM2 uses – but allowing site to remain CM1 would also all development to better accommodate parking for the use anticipated – i.e. grocery, larger retail.

### **Community Participation**

- I would like to see posting on site with an opportunity to review on any zoning changes where commercial abuts residential.
- Neighborhood association need more input to what is being constructed. The entire mixed use discussion must include parking. It is the same tie between a land use and transportation discussion. Corridors must not become canyons between multistory buildings.
- I think a key will be for the planning staff to clearly illustrate what proposed regulations/guidelines will mean. Perhaps by doing case study examples to show how they would work. People could then understand them and offer constructive ideas rather than knee-jerk reactions related to fear of change, density, etc.

### **Make code clear and simple**

- I am a big proponent of providing tools to develop to incentivize them to add amenities, affordability, etc. However, I don’t believe that creating onerous code restrictions and



architectural design guidelines necessarily results in better buildings. Many corridors and high volume streets have no on-street parking, and this offers no opportunity for viable commercial or retail uses. This needs to be considered. I believe that the market forces that drive development economies, architectural design, lending guidelines and appraisal conditions do more to drive project viability than setbacks and FARs. Design review, as currently applied, is so subjective and unevenly applied as to be essentially useless, but adds a huge cost to development. Clear regulations, maximum flexibility and good incentives are the best approach.

- None of the options. You need to simplify and clarify. Not the direction being sought per your questions.

#### Other

- Planners and members of city council should be required to live in randomly selected new high density areas for some period of time to understand what they are creating. We should say “no” to high density living, put a high density urban growth boundary around NY and let the new urbanists live, work, and play there!!
- How are we not creating heat islands if we don’t require inner city landscaping? Some of our corridors are already very hot in the summer. There needs to be a way to create small “parklets” at regular intervals – a large tree with a bench or table – even a water fountain along corridors.
- Appreciate all the work that has been done.
- Residential units need room for alternative modal storage including: trailer, bikes, bike trailers, hoveround, shared wheel chairs.
- Make sure that neighborhoods gain some rights in development process. Basically, make mandates delays in development equal if the developer will not deal with neighborhood at all, giving developer incentive to deal with neighborhood.
- Great job overall. Setbacks and stepbacks proposed area a bit too far in my opinion. At the end of the day, we’re still talking about relatively small buildings. Remember, building density on corridors is a proven system that worked very well in the past in many cities across the world.
- I have focused on quality of streetscape and preserving high value property. And good pedestrian/commercial experiences.

