



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

Meeting Notes

Mixed Use Zones Project Advisory Committee (PAC)

Date: October 21, 2015

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

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

Meeting Goals: Gather PAC feedback and answer questions on Discussion Draft

4:00 PM **Welcome**

4:05 PM **PAC Announcements and Feedback**

- Meeting notes
 - No changes needed.
- Other/Announcements
 - Schedule – The discussion draft out for comments until Nov. 16th. Staff will digest the comments/feedback and possibly make changes in the document.
 - The proposed draft will be done by end of Dec/early January.
 - The briefing for \Planning and Sustainability Commission will happen on the 2nd Tuesday of January. Public testimony will happen at a Public Hearing in February (2/9) and possibly a follow-up session. All properties that get a zoning change will receive notice.
 - Another PAC opportunity will be on Nov. 18th. The plan for that meeting is to talk about any big changes that may happen.
 - The bonuses still have some analysis that needs to happen. PDC contracted with EcoNW in partnership with BPS (Tyler Bump) and will be doing a follow-up analysis on the bonuses. We don't want to re-invent the wheel and will look more closely on affordable housing, but also evaluate the other 3 bonuses. Green features and affordable commercial space still pretty undefined. We're going to try and balance the bonuses and the analysis will tell us if we need to adjust values. Non-finalized results will be done by mid-December and may affect the proposed draft.

PAC Questions – *staff responses in italics*

- If bonuses don't work will we drop them?
- ***It depends on findings. Affordable housing is a top priority for the city and by the Housing Bureau. MFI levels include housing and utilities so energy efficient buildings with lower utilities are taken into account. We are trying to make sure it works within the market.***
- Is there any consideration for for-sale affordable housing units?
- ***Under consideration. We are having conversations with the Housing Bureau and looking at HOAs and so forth.***



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.

- Since the markets are so different throughout the city, are they looking at affordability based on different markets?
- **Yes, I think Housing Bureau would like us to look at that too. We are also going to take a further look in the analysis via smaller geographies, but reporting at Portland Plan scale.**
- Generating new construction affordable housing is generally impossible without some sort of subsidies. Those that do need affordable housing don't typically move into new developments. I think it's a noble effort, but doing this without a subsidy seems impossible.
- **Different cities have different directions for this. We have looked at multiple case studies and we luckily have people around the room that can help us with these discussions.**
- Recap of Info Sessions
 - We had six info sessions
 - The SW community, particularly Multnomah Village, were concerned the about scale and parking in their area.
 - East Portland had about 20-26 people, which was a very good turnout. Questions and comments ranged from feasibility, affordable housing, and that the bonuses may not offer enough development opportunity.
 - We have a Venture Portland outreach meeting tomorrow for small business outreach.

4:30 PM

PAC Questions and Comments on Discussion Draft Zoning Code Amendments

1. Round robin - quick feedback from each PAC member
 - What are top (1-3) things this new proposal/code is doing well? What elements do you support?
 - I like the scale of building to street, by right of way. It would work well for St. Johns.
 - I like the idea of the transitions, especially the set-back from behind.
 - Step downs are good for the concerns of the neighborhoods.
 - I like that residential is allowed in the CE zone.
 - Affordable housing is a big plus and affordable housing is income demand, not the same as low-income housing.
 - I like the window glazing and the pedestrian experience amenities.
 - I like that the window requirements do not allow to be fully replaced with public art.
 - There is a lot of agreement about the set-backs and addressing adjacent zoning.
 - Having a good mix of affordable housing/commercial is good. We need more vibrant mixes and I think this will help.
 - I like reducing the 9 zones down to 4. I think it better addresses the marketplace and is better for everybody. It is also a better way to address those expectations.
 - I think this code will promote a lot more creativity in the urban form.
 - I'm a fan of the affordable commercial space. It's hard to start a new business. Lots of failures happen because you can't sustain the rent. This could help with more diversity of businesses, which is better for the community.



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



Bureau of Planning and Sustainability

Innovation. Collaboration. Practical Solutions.

- Affordable housing is important and I'm really hopeful it will work in this new code.
 - The FAR is good for creative development. The current proposed ratios seem about right.
 - New centers and main street overlays are an excellent way of encouraging walkable/commercial areas. I like that it allows for flexibility outside those areas.
 - Residential outdoor areas language is good. It will encourage private and public outdoor opportunities.
 - I support the idea of shared parking.
 - I support the notification requirements.
- What main (1-3) parts of the proposal/code do you think are missing the mark? What, if anything, is causing you heartburn? Do you think it is possible to address your concerns with minor changes?
 - CM1 has limited retail services, what does that mean?
 - Curious about the affordable commercial bonus. Who do you see as the tenant?
 - I'm worried about the housing capacity. We don't want to end up like San Francisco. It's noble to preserve areas, but if your demographic isn't there in 25 years are you really accomplishing your goals?
 - With regard to the base FAR, I think it's a too low. If we want to address these housing problems, we need more density.
 - I'm concerned that private decks are considered open space.
 - I'm concerned that we're not having enough density in these mixed use commercial areas.
 - I'm worried about the relationship between parking and density. We can't afford to keep subsidizing a carbon-based economy.
 - I think some of the green features bonus should be standard for all development.
 - I'm worried about reduction in base by right FAR (in CM2). I think it should be 3:1.
 - I'm worried that we may make the bonuses so difficult that they won't be used.
 - I'm very concerned about the 10' setback in the outer corridors. If you want wider sidewalks in general, you should talk to PBOT about getting those on streets.
 - I don't think green walls are a good substitute for windows.
 - The ground-floor window standards should be improved to reduce frosting out glass. I will send you all more details on this.
 - We need to push hard for green features.
 - Parking is a big issue. I hope we get rid of cars later on, but I don't see that happening in the near future.
 - I want the affordable housing bonus to work. We don't want to rely only on the non-profits and housing bureau to supply this type of housing. That could result in separated, singular buildings and no mix of income within one building.





Bureau of Planning and Sustainability

Innovation. Collaboration. Practical Solutions.

- I'm concerned about the parking issue, especially spillover into residential areas from commercial areas. We will have to live with cars for a while.
 - I suggest a revisit in 3-5 years after adoption to see what is working/not working. We don't want to wait another 20 years before we rework the code again.
 - I'm worried about parking. People from outside the areas will still bring in their cars to these areas.
 - East Portland is very different from inner Portland. Development means different things out there. I think we should look at different areas and how the code may change in these areas.
 - We need to look at the idea of complete streets. Different zones may affect the look of the street. I don't like situations where two different zones are on different sides of the streets.
 - Affordable housing is a different issue in East Portland because most of our housing is already affordable. We really need business and economic growth. The bonus for affordable housing will look different in East Portland than other areas.
 - How do new base zones work with different overlays? I don't think it's very clear in the documents. How do they all interface with each other?
 - I'm concerned about the transfer of floor area from historic zones. In particular large buildings next to historic buildings.
 - For parking, is there any base line data? I would like to see something a little more "plan-ful" versus just not requiring parking for certain development.
 - The Sellwood-Moreland area does not have a design overlay for their commercial area, but should. Some of the comparable areas in Portland do.
 - I'm concerned about the ground-floor windows area in commercial and main street overlays, 60% should be for entire commercial corridor.
 - Green walls in place of windows doesn't seem like a good idea.
 - I'm concerned about TDM. It should be thought of in a more broad sense, not just about parking. We would like it as a general traffic issues as well.
- **Questions in the Comments Responses – *staff response in italics:***
 - What is limited retail in CM1? What does that mean?
 - ***For small-scale retail zones (CM1), we mean small size retail. The type of retail is more about size limitation than anything else. It is replicated from the CN1 zone. Each retail space would be up to 5,000 sq/ft. 10,000 sq/ft for office space. 30,000 sq/ft for retail near arterials on lots of 40,000+ sq/ft. This does not limit uses, but some neighborhoods are concerned about bars and other louder establishments causing issues in neighborhoods. We also want to limit industrial uses to a very small scale.***
 - Addressing the questions/comments about parking:





Bureau of Planning and Sustainability

Innovation. Collaboration. Practical Solutions.

- **We definitely don't think we've solved that issue yet. Grant Morehead and Peter Hurley from PBOT came to the last PAC meeting and talked about two proposals they are working on: 1) volunteer neighborhood parking permit program 2) TDM for buildings of 20 units or more**
- How do plan districts and overlay zones work?
- **Overlays overrule base zone. Plan districts override base zone and overlays. Plan district > overlay zone > base zone. We do need to go over all the plan districts listed in the discussion draft and see how their specific requirements affect the zone changes. We wanted to start out with the base zone and make sure we get that right first and then wanted to look into the overlay zones and plan districts.**
- Is there any baseline information for parking?
- **We will share more info on parking study done by Eric Engstrom for you all. We are trying to figure out if some of these commercial and parking sharing ideas and if they may address some of these parking issues. In all zones except CS today, if you have parking as part of your building you can't legally lease that out to somebody else. We are trying to liberalize that.**
- Are they looking at a regional parking structure to accommodate a larger area?
- **No, the City is not looking to build those at this time. We are trying to build in a market approach.**
- In the discussion draft it talks about stackable parking, but says it requires an attendant. What about others that don't need that?
- **Staff will look into this issue. PAC Member: Parking is not expensive enough, compared to other areas in the US, for stackable parking. You would need spaces selling for about \$150/month, at least. Right now the city is subsidizing parking at \$150/month because many people are not required to pay. I think it's a bad idea to just focus payment for parking in multi-family housing spaces. It is also an equity issues since some low-income populations live in multi-family housing.**
- How is this new code responding to the differences of East Portland to the rest of Portland?
- **Firstly, CM2 and CM3, unlike today's code, are removing lot coverage minimum requirements. Therefore you don't have to have as much building coverage required to develop. Also, we are upping landscaping requirement in outer areas - the eastern and western Neighborhoods. We have also called for building setbacks on Civic Corridors (which some PAC members have called into question).**
- Why is there a CM3 next to an R5 designation?
- **That is an artifact from our existing zoning which dates from the early 1990s. We re-did the zoning in about 2004, but did not change the height limits because we expect that area to redevelop some day and we were planning in the Measure 37 era, which scrutinized changes that affected potential value. If the neighborhood and property owners in the area think there should be a step-down or less intense zoning we can look into it.**





Bureau of Planning and Sustainability

Innovation. Collaboration. Practical Solutions.

- Is the 50% lot coverage only for East Portland?
 - **The current CS and CM zones require 50% lot coverage. We are proposing to eliminate that. The only place – besides plan districts or special overlays – that would set a minimum would be in the Center Main Street overlay zone areas, where the code calls for a 0.5:1 minimum FAR.**
- Summarized comments Deb (the facilitator) heard from the Committee:
 - There is a lot of concern about zoning in different areas and how that affects very different areas of Portland
 - There is differing opinions on affordable housing and commercial space bonuses.
 - Multiple people mentioned window requirements, in particular, 60% for the entire corridor and they should be transparent. Is that adequate enough?
2. Time permitting, PAC members should identify additional items that need work in PAC members' opinion.
- Page 10: goals and policies (9 & 10). Is that a typo?
 - Page 265: Figure 6.1, the colors in the key are hard to read.

5:45 PM

Public Comment

- I was involved in the SW Community Plan and I'm worried about one size fits all mentality for this. There is data from 2001 where they studied the area on foot. When we've looked at Census data it shows more renters than owners, a larger group of 25-30 year olds than previous years. More millennials moving into the area. The proposed changes will make Multnomah Village less pedestrian friendly. I think the centers and corridors concept is not tailored towards Multnomah Village. We want a neighborhood plan district for Multnomah Village.
- I'm from Multnomah Village, and have brought 691 comments from the neighborhood. They will be very interested to know about what was said here in the PAC meeting.
- At an Info session in SW, Barry said we could get a plan district for Multnomah Village. If we wanted a plan district, how do we go about doing that and what is the approval criteria?
 - **Staff response: Staff didn't say Multnomah could necessarily get a plan district as part of this proposal, but did say that a plan district is one type of code tool that could be used to address the issues in the area. Right now we don't have a plan for Multnomah Village, which usually precedes a plan district. If you wanted to formalize a plan district, you may want to testify to Planning and Sustainability Commission or City Council about the area and why it might warrant special considerations. You will need to articulate what you want and submit that information. That is still no guarantee it will happen. Based on resources at the City it may not be able to happen now.**
- What percentage of this document was done by staff vs consultants?





Bureau of Planning and Sustainability

Innovation. Collaboration. Practical Solutions.

- **Most of the Discussion Draft was developed by staff, but consultants have had a role in previous parts of the project. In the research phase the consultants looked at seven other cities to see how they were addressing the topics we were looking at in the MUZ Project (Dyett and Bhatia) They put together a document of best practices, which is part of the appendix in the first report. The consultants also helped us sort thru the zoning concept and how PAC could visually see it (Bill Tripp). They were responsible for creating development prototypes (DECA Architecture) and running preliminary analysis on development feasibility (Johnson Economics). They did give us some feedback on how to structure the code and how to be more understandable (i.e. graphics and tabular format).**
- **All consultants' materials are online. They are mostly found in the appendix of the assessment report and concepts report.**
- Has there been on economic analysis on parking?
 - **Not thru this project, but we have been in collaboration with PBOT the entire time.**
- I appreciate the comments on limiting CM1 areas within neighborhoods due to their noise issues. We will send some more written comments on that.
- In regards to affordable commercial space, I think a conversation about commercial land trust strategies with housing bureau may be a good idea.
- For affordability in terms of housing, we want to have mixed income neighborhoods and communities. I don't like the idea of an in-lieu fee, which could possibly make it so that all affordable housing is placed in one area.

6:00 PM

Adjourn



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.