

Residential Infill Project – Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC)

Meeting #9 Summary Minutes **APPROVED BY SAC**

Date: Tuesday, March 15, 2016

Time: 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.

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

SAC Members in Attendance: Linda Bauer, Sarah Cantine, Alan DeLaTorre, Jim Gorter, John Hasenberg, Marshall Johnson, Emily Kemper, Douglas MacLeod, Mary Kyle McCurdy, Maggie McGann, Rick Michaelson, Mike Mitchoff, Michael Molinaro, Eli Spevak, Teresa St. Martin, David Sweet, Garlynn Woodsong, Tatiana Xenelis-Mendoza

SAC Members NOT in Attendance: Rod Merrick, Danell Norby, Douglas Reed, Vic Remmers, Barbara Strunk, Eric Thompson

Note: Brandon Spencer-Hartle stepped down as a SAC member prior to this meeting.

Staff/Consultants in Attendance: Joe Zehnder (BPS), Sandra Wood (BPS), Morgan Tracy (BPS), Julia Gisler (BPS), Todd Borkowitz (BPS), Mark Raggett (BPS), Pei Wang (BPS), Anne Pressentin (Envirolssues), Camille Trummer (Office of Mayor Hales), Kristin Cooper (BDS) Brandon Spencer-Hartle (BPS)

Others in Attendance: Elaine McDonald, Adam McSorley, Terry Parker, Margaret Davis, Jim Karlock, Paul Grove

Meeting Objectives:

- Review next steps for public outreach
- Apply SAC charrette results and advance the discussion of scale of narrow and attached houses

Abbreviations: Q = Question; C = Comment; R = Response (staff/consultants)

Post-Meeting Clarifications or Links



WELCOME AND MEETING INTRODUCTION

Facilitator Anne Pressentin (Envirolssues) thanked SAC members for their attendance, identified the meeting objectives (see above) and highlighted the meeting agenda. As discussed prior, future SAC meetings will last only two hours (6pm to 8pm). The project team will inquire at the end of this meeting whether this worked well for all SAC members.

SAC members should note the purpose statement in the SAC Charter:

“The Residential Infill Project Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) has been formed to help staff understand the benefits, burdens, and tradeoffs associated with different regulatory approaches through the lenses of key stakeholders who may be affected directly or indirectly by project outcomes. The purpose of this charter is to define the roles and responsibilities of the SAC, City staff, facilitator and consultants and describe how the SAC meetings will be conducted.”

SAC members should also remember to always respect and abide by agreed-upon ground rules.

Link to SAC Charter: <https://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/564206>

Post Meeting Clarification - SAC Ground Rules:

1. Be prepared for meetings.
2. Treat one another with civility.
3. Respect each other’s perspectives.
4. Listen actively to understand.
5. Limit side conversations.
6. Participate actively.
7. Honor time frames, including start/end times.
8. Silence electronic devices.
9. Speak from interests, not positions.
10. Bring a spirit of negotiation and creativity to solutions.
11. Be willing to put issues outside purpose/agenda into a parking lot.

Review of Past SAC Summary Minutes:

Facilitator Anne Pressentin (Envirolssues) asked SAC members for any comments on draft SAC Meeting #8 (March 1, 2016) Summary Minutes. Hearing no comments on the draft SAC Meeting #8 Summary Minutes, the SAC-approved version will be posted online soon.

Link to SAC-Approved Meeting #8 Summary Minutes:

<https://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/570097>

Q: Where is the purpose statement located at in the charter?

R: On Page 1 of the SAC Charter.

C: This language differs from the project purpose in the project summary online.

R: The project team will ensure that the materials online are consistent.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT UPDATE

Public Involvement Lead Julia Gisler (BPS) updated the SAC on continued planning efforts for future public engagement in the Residential Infill Project. Thank you to Mary Kyle McCurdy, Jim Gorter, Marshall Johnson, Alan DeLaTorre and Barbara Strunk for their participation on Tuesday, March 8th in a SAC subcommittee meeting on public involvement. The project's six-week public involvement efforts will occur May 9th thru June 20th. SAC assistance is needed to help get the word out and provide the best, most effective outreach approaches. The effort will include the following four tasks:

- 1. Host an online public open house.**
- 2. Host four geographic-specific open houses in different areas of Portland.** BPS staff will be contacting each of the SAC's district nominees to discuss more. Desiree Williams-Rajee (BPS) suggested co-sponsoring these open houses with local community groups.
- 3. Convene focus groups to better understand specific user needs.** Recent home buyers and persons with disabilities are two potential groups identified by BPS project staff, who also seek other ideas from SAC members on who best to engage.

C: Local renters?

C: Landlords?

C: There is some concern that the four open houses will just mirror the Residential Infill Survey results that reached only a small percentage of Portlanders.

C: The subcommittee discussed different avenues for creating awareness.

C: It will take real outreach to get to more groups "not yet represented at the table."

R: BPS staff will have ample time to plan outreach.

C: Convene a focus group of real estate professionals.

R: The City does not have the staff resources to go to all of Portland's neighborhood associations.

Q: Is the intent of public involvement to get beyond Portland's neighborhood associations.

R: Yes. Correct.

C: This is why co-sponsorships should assist.

C: The neighborhood associations are already active in the Residential Infill Project.

C: Agreed. There is no need for the SAC to self-select neighborhood association advocates to reach out to.

R: The City is responsible for reaching out to these groups.

C: Convene a focus group of business associations/bureaus; convene advocates for parks and recreation.

R: The project team will discuss more.

R: The project team remains open to additional SAC suggestions.

C: The project needs to be careful to not present biased concepts to stakeholders.

C: Try the Community Alliance of Tenants and the Welcome Home Coalition.

C: The Portland Housing Authority/Home Forward could help communicate information.

R: BPS project staff will send a template to SAC members for talking about the Residential Infill Project with community groups.

C: Community development coalitions (CDCs).

R: The project team contacted many of these groups for the survey, but will need to do more than just inform this time around.

4. **Get on the agenda of key stakeholder groups.** BPS project staff recently met with the Portland Commission on Disability's Accessibility in the Built Environment (ABE) Subcommittee, and aims to introduce and gain feedback on the Residential Infill Project from other strategic community partners.

C: Aim to reach people who are not regularly online.

C: Outreach to high school and college students, even if students are not yet old enough to vote.

Link to Portland Commission on Disability's Accessibility in the Built Environment

Subcommittee website: <https://www.portlandoregon.gov/oni/article/567149>

Public Involvement Lead Julia Gisler (BPS) indicated that the SAC subcommittee meeting on public involvement received the draft public involvement plan and requested comments by Thursday, March 17th. Julia asked if any other SAC members wanted to review it; no SAC members indicated a desire to do so.

SCALE OF NARROW AND ATTACHED HOUSES

Charrette Takeaways

Project Manager Morgan Tracy (BPS) highlighted some key takeaways on scale of narrow and attached houses from the SAC Charrette (SAC Meeting #6 on 1/21/16). They include: applying consistent regulations for skinny and narrow lots; allowing some setback projections; associating maximum front setbacks with adjacent buildings; allowing an averaging of side setbacks between two skinny houses; allowing minimum side setback reductions for shorter buildings; limiting building height and/or changing how it is measured; controlling bulk more aggressively and creating a separate path for allowing alternative compatibility standards. Various building controls for off-street parking were also a priority for many SAC members.

Link to the presentation: <http://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/569837>

Presentation of Scenarios for Narrow Houses

Urban Design Studio Lead Mark Raggett (BPS) presented the maximum application of Portland's current code and then introduced three alternative scenarios that address the scale of narrow houses. For simplicity, and similar to the presentation of the scale of standard houses in SAC Meeting #8 (March 1, 2016), the narrow house scenarios compare maximum buildouts of houses on typical lots in the single-dwelling zone (in these scenarios, 25 by 100-foot rectangular lots). Scenarios illustrate potential outcomes resulting from key "big moves" defined in each scenario. They also assume a preference for houses that are smaller than allowed by Portland's existing code.

All scenarios propose a single set of standards, regardless how the lots were created (land division or lot confirmation). Due to the nature of narrow lots, all narrow house scenarios propose five-foot side setbacks. None of the three scenarios require off-street parking.

Scenario 1 – ‘Size and Shape’ reduces the limits for height, front setbacks, rear setbacks and building coverages, and also increases the minimum outdoor area requirements. This proposed scenario also changes how height is measured and limits main entrances to only three feet above grade (existing code limits the main entrances of skinny houses to four feet above grade).

Q: Does Scenario 1 measure height to the midpoint of top of roof?

R: Height is measured to the top of flat roofs and midpoint of sloped roofs, the same as how height is currently measured, but limiting it to 1.2 times the width of the house (equal to existing code for narrow lots, but not skinny lots).

C: As it is difficult to create an 18-foot, two-story building, recent revisions to the accessory dwelling unit (ADU) code was changed from 18 feet to 20 feet.

C: Agreed. Eight-foot ceilings are incredibly tight to make work.

Post-Meeting Clarification: BPS project staff agree and will revise this concept to reflect these comments.

Link to City of Portland Code on Accessory Dwelling Units (Title 33.205):

<https://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/53301>

Q: In the plan view, why does the purple house on the right (Scenario 1) look deeper than the white house on the left (existing code)?

R: The perspective angle and proposed reduced height slightly distorts the view. Also, Scenario 1 proposes a greater front setback and required outdoor area, impacting the building’s location on the property.

C: The building in Scenario 1 is deceiving; an 18-foot floor height will not work.

C: Agreed. That’s why the two-story minimum allowance for accessory dwelling unit (ADU) code was changed to 20 feet.

Scenario 2 – ‘Proportion’ deploys a floor area ratio (FAR), a tool that allocates building square footage in proportion to the building’s lot square footage to better promote design flexibility, incentivize desired building features and deemphasize undesired building features. While more commonly used for commercial buildings (including in

Portland), FAR is gaining attention for use in residential development in other cities. The scenario proposes an FAR of 0.7:1 for houses on typical narrow lots in the R-5 single-dwelling zone, but different FARs could be applied to different lot sizes and/or pattern areas. The 0.7 FAR proposed in this scenario would allow a maximum of 50 percent building coverage feet of building on a lot less than 3,000 square feet in area. For a 25'x100' lot (2,500 s.f. lot) this results in a maximum 1,715 square foot floor area; current limits to minimum building setbacks and outdoor area do not change. The proposed height is limited in this scenario to 1.5 times the building width, equal to the limit allowed for skinny houses (but not narrow houses) in Portland's existing code.

In this scenario, street-facing garages are not allowed outright, but could be allowed through a planned development (PD) process. Like the existing code for skinny houses, this scenario limits main entrance heights to four feet above grade.

Q: Does the floor area ratio (FAR) in Scenario 2 include or exclude the floor areas of detached accessory dwelling units (ADUs)?

R: As presented it includes all floor areas of all structures on a lot, including detached ADUs, but this could be modified to incent/allow ADU development.

Scenario 3 – 'Shape and Context' employs a combination of changes to the existing development standards, including adding new regulations, changing measurement methods and modifying other existing regulations. Key changes include:

- Utilizing a new (low side) base point for measuring building height
- Tying maximum front setbacks to adjacent houses
- Increasing minimum outdoor area
- Tying building coverage to building height
- Prohibiting street facing garages without exception.
- Like the existing code for skinny houses, this scenario limits main entrances to four feet above grade but allows for taller if stair risers are shallower.

Q: What is the internal building square footage of each building coverage option?

R: (see below)

- 45 percent coverage @ 15 foot maximum height =1,125 square feet
- 40 percent coverage @ 20 foot maximum height =2,000 square feet
- 30 percent coverage @ 25 foot maximum height =1,875 square feet
- 25 percent coverage @ 30 foot maximum height =1,875 square feet

Urban Design Studio Lead Mark Raggett (BPS) asked SAC members had any questions on these three scenarios for skinny/narrow houses.

Q: Could detached accessory dwelling units (ADUs) fit with any of the scenarios?

Q: More specifically, could detached accessory dwelling units (ADUs) fit on a 25-foot by 100-foot lot with any of the scenarios?

C: Yes, but one would need to make the primary house smaller.

C: BPS staff should be very conscious about this potential limitation in each of the proposed scenarios.

C/Q: Scenario 2 has a maximum 50 percent building coverage, yet appears to have a smaller footprint than the existing skinny lot shown with a maximum 40 percent building coverage. Why is this?

R: Good question. Scenario 2's proposed building setbacks propose a larger rear setback and minimum outdoor area, limiting mass of the building in this scenario.

Post-Meeting Clarification: The FAR limit of 0.7 with a 50% building coverage limit was illustrated for sake of simplicity as a 2 story house covering 35% of the lot (35% on two floors=0.7 FAR). This flexibility is one advantage of the FAR tool. The house could alternatively be single level covering 50% of the lot (.5 FAR), plus an additional 500 s.f. (.2 FAR) on the second level, or three levels covering 23% of the lot, or some combination in between.

Measuring Scenarios for Narrow Houses against Guiding Principles

Project Manager Morgan Tracy (BPS) highlighted the eight draft guiding principles that the SAC agreed to temporarily accept as imperfect for use at the January charrette to compare options, reiterating they are not a quantitative “grade”, but rather present an illustration how the scenarios achieve project aims. The exercise allows SAC members better and more holistically assess the scenarios, and “paints a picture on what scenario serves each principle better” and identifies the tradeoffs to prioritizing one draft guiding principle over another.

The project team assigned one of four statements (1. Improves; 2. Slight Improvement; 3 No Change; 4. Slight Reduction and 5. Reduction) for how each of the three narrow lot scenarios meets each of the draft guiding principles. General findings from this initial assessment include:

- Narrow lots generally do not fit the existing context in R5 zones, but do in R2.5 zones. The scenarios each reduced either the size or height to better integrate into adjacent development.
- Narrow lots provide another housing form, but are still detached single dwelling type.
- Narrow lots allow for some adaptability, provided there remains room in the maximum building envelope. Since the scenarios generally reduce this envelope, the adaptability is likewise reduced.
- Scenarios generally improve privacy as a result of being shorter, or with larger yards.

- As a result of their building footprint, narrow houses are generally more land efficient than standard width houses; yet do not use land area or energy as efficiently as attached houses.
- Narrow houses generally advance affordability as they are generally less expensive than standard houses. Each of the scenarios removes the required parking, increasing affordability.
- All scenarios apply one set of standards to narrow/skinny lots, improving the clarity of rules.

Q: What is the difference between ‘not allowing’ and ‘prohibiting’ garages?

R: ‘Not allowing’ garages suggests that an alternative, discretionary process could be taken by an applicant to allow them; ‘prohibiting’ means that are not allowed under any circumstance.

Q: Do these scenarios allow required parking in the front setback?

Q: Can the SAC discuss allowing required parking in the front setback now?

R: SAC members can do so in their small group discussions.

R: BPS staff will also revisit this with the SAC once they develop better graphics to more effectively communicate the nuances to this issue.

Presentation of Scenarios for Attached Houses

Urban Design Studio Lead Mark Raggett (BPS) presented the maximum application of Portland’s current code and then introduced three alternative scenarios that address the scale of attached houses. For simplicity, like the narrow lot scenarios and similar to the presentation of the scale of standard houses in SAC Meeting #8 (March 1, 2016), the attached houses scenarios compare maximum buildouts of houses on typical lots in the single-dwelling zone (in these scenarios, 25 by 100-foot lots). Each illustrates potential outcomes resulting from key “big moves” defined in each scenario.

The proposed scenarios for attached houses assume a preference for houses that are smaller than Portland’s current code and, like with the proposed scenarios for narrow houses, for a single set of standards regardless how the lots were created (land division or lot confirmation). Like existing code, they all require one off-street parking space. However, the requirement is only for lots more than 1,000 feet from transit and a maximum of one 16-foot curb cut for parking access. Questions for the SAC to consider include:

- Should code incentivize attached houses over narrow houses, vice-versa, or not at all?
- Should code incentivize two attached houses to appear as a unified structure, or as two homes side-by-side?
- Should entrance heights be limited, and if so, by how much?

- On corner lots, should the entries on two attached houses be required to face different street frontages?
- How should code address parking and garages for attached houses?

Q: Do these proposed scenarios for narrow lots relate only to narrow lots, or do they include standard lots?

R: Both, but the scenarios focus on typical abutting narrow lots.

Q: How do standard lots vary from narrow lots?

R: Narrow lots are less than 36 feet in width.

Q: Do these scenarios include rowhouses [more than two attached houses]?

R: No.

Scenario 1 – ‘Size and Shape’ decrease the limits for height, front setbacks, rear setbacks and building coverages, and also increases the minimum outdoor area requirements. This proposed scenario also changes how height is measured.

In this scenario, street-facing garages are only allowed outright if tuck-under, alternate paving materials were used and driveways were paired for a reduced-width curb cut. This scenario lowers limits for main entrances to three feet above grade. It promotes building articulation features to encourage visual unification between two attached houses (so the structure reads as one “house”).

C/Q: The slide image for this scenario shows only one tuck-under garage. Does the proposed concept allow one garage for each attached unit, or only one garage for the entire attached structure?

R: The proposed concept would allow one single garage for each attached unit. Two garages were not shown on the image for readability.

Scenario 2 – ‘Proportion’ deploys a floor area ratio (FAR), a tool that allocates building square footage in proportion to the building’s lot square footage (see more description above in Scenario 2 for narrow houses). The scenario proposes an FAR of 0.8:1 for houses on typical attached houses in the R-5 single-dwelling zone and a maximum of 50 percent building coverage feet of building on a less than 3,000 square feet – no change from the existing code.

In this scenario, street-facing garages are not allowed outright, but would be allowed by approval through a planned development (PD) process. This scenario limits main entrances to four feet above grade, equal to the limit allowed for lots than 36 feet wide in Portland’s existing code. Unlike Scenario 1, Scenario 2 promotes building articulation

features to encourage visual *differentiation* between two attached houses (offset facades and distinct rooflines).

Scenario 3 – ‘Shape and Context’ employs a combination of changes to the existing development standards, including adding new regulations, changing measurement methods and modifying other existing regulations. Key changes include:

- Utilizing a new (low side) base point for measuring building height
- Tying maximum front setbacks to adjacent houses
- Increasing minimum outdoor area
- Tying building coverage to building height
 - 50 percent coverage @ 15 foot maximum height =1,250 square feet
 - 40 percent coverage @ 20 foot maximum height =2,000 square feet
 - 30 percent coverage @ 25 foot maximum height =1,875 square feet
 - 25 percent coverage @ 30 foot maximum height =1,875 square feet
- Prohibiting street facing garages on narrow lots (less than 36 feet wide) without exception.
- Like the existing code for attached houses on narrow lots and Scenario 2, this scenario limits main entrances to four feet above grade but allows for taller if stair risers are shallower.

Project Manager Morgan Tracy (BPS) indicates that Scenario 3 has the potential to complicate future additions (second story additions may exceed reduced building coverage and single story additions on two story houses may likewise exceed building coverage limits).

Q: Is parking treated differently in Scenario 3 than it is in Scenarios 1 or 2?

R: No. It’s treated the same in all three attached houses scenarios.

Q: In this scenario, could lots on corners be adjusted so that attached houses face different street frontages?

R: Yes. This could be assessed more in small group discussions.

Measuring Scenarios for Attached Houses against Guiding Principles

Project Manager Morgan Tracy (BPS) again highlighted the eight draft guiding principles to illustrate how the scenarios achieve project aims. Similar to the scenarios for narrow houses, the project team assigned one of five statements (1. Improves; 2. Slight Improvement; 3 No Change; 4. Slight Reduction and 5. Reduction) for how each of the three attached lot scenarios meets each of the draft guiding principles. SAC table discussions should critique the project team’s assumptions for both narrow and attached houses.

Q: All of the scenarios require parking. Why not treat them the same as narrow houses?

R: That's a good observation.

C: One could fit a third dwelling unit in the spaces taken up by required garages.

R: Correct.

Q: Should this be an option?

Q: And maybe gain a third dwelling unit?

R: The scenarios expand the existing parking exception of 500 feet near high-frequency transit to 1,000 feet, but does not go as far as not requiring parking altogether.

Link to City of Portland Code on Minimum Required Parking Spaces (Title 33.266.110.D):
“Minimum for sites well served by transit. For sites located less than 1500 feet from a transit station or less than 500 feet from a transit street with 20-minute peak hour service, the minimum parking requirement standards of this subsection apply” ... “Where there are up to 30 units on the site, no parking is required”: <http://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/53320>

Q: Could the proposed articulation features assigned with each scenario be used on the remaining two concepts?

R: Yes. The itemized rows in bold red outline shown in the scenario comparisons (parking, garage, main entrance and articulation features) are independent of the rows that establish form (height, bulk, setbacks, outdoor area) and could be applied between the different scenarios.

Q: Does attached housing refer to just two attached dwellings, or multiple attached dwellings also?

R: For these scenarios, just two units attached.

Q: Do the attached housing scenarios apply for corner lots?

R: Yes. Standard 25- by 100-foot narrow lots are often paired together and can be found on both corner and non-corner lots.

Q: Where is height being measured from in the proposed Scenario 3?

R: The scenarios measure from the lot's low point in Scenario 3 and from the lot's high point in scenarios 1 and 2.

Post-Meeting Clarification: This height distinction is not clear in the presentation illustrations due to the flatness of the example lot.

SMALL GROUP EXERCISE

Facilitator Anne Pressentin (Envirolssues) provided instructions in a small group exercise. SAC members should form into small groups of three to four members that will be assigned a City staff person to observe discussion and help keep conversation focused on their task. Half of the groups will discuss scenarios for narrow houses; the other half will discuss scenarios for attached houses. Members of the public were invited to observe SAC discussions but are asked to not interrupt the SAC's exercise discussions. Groups are tasked with answering the following and are asked to report back to the greater SAC afterwards:

- Which scenario best addresses height, setbacks building coverage/bulk and outdoor areas?
- What elements could be changed to improve one or more scenarios? Why?

In response to a SAC member suggestion from Meeting #8 (March 1, 2016), the project team initially planned to task SAC members in performing a "round two", answering and reporting back on the following: 'Considering points the other SAC tables have made, how would you improve on your table's preferred scenario?'

Ann Pressentin polled SAC members on whether they preferred to answer the 'Round 2' question and extend the meeting, or skip the question and end the meeting at the original end time of 8:00pm.

C: Finish at 8:00pm

C: I'm willing to stay until Midnight.

C: Let's plan for 8:00pm.

Given the SAC member responses, Ann Pressentin suggested focusing on the 'Round 1' questions and ending SAC Meeting #9 at 8:00pm.

SAC Responses to Small Group Exercise: Narrow Houses (there was no Table C):

Table A: Alan DeLaTorre, Marshall Johnson, Teresa St. Martin (Mark Raggett - BPS)

- Scenario 1: 18 feet is not a sensible floor height.
- Scenarios 2 and 3: 40 to 45 percent coverage is sufficient, but not on smaller lots.
- Garages should be 'not allowed' but not 'prohibited' so that builders have flexibility.
- Once a home has more than three access steps, mobility is already impacted; there is no difference between 3 and 14 feet.

- Matching front setbacks is a good idea.
- 15- by 15-foot outdoor areas (proposed in Scenarios 1 and 3) are preferred; people should be able to do whatever they want within this space.

Q: So someone could not build an accessory dwelling unit (ADU) within this space?

R: Someone is more likely to do something else within this space.

Q: Are ADUs being built on lots with skinny houses?

R: ADUs on lots with skinny houses are mostly built in basements.

Q: On newly-built houses?

R: Yes.

Table E: Jim Gorter, Mary Kyle McCurdy, Maggie McGann, Mike Mitchoff (Julia Gisler - BPS)

- Scenario 1: '1.2x width of house' is not buildable; this option should be "off the table".
- Scenario 3 has good variability but is "tricky" to implement; also – most people would not presumably desire a three-story unit with no lot coverage.
- Scenario 2 is the most reasonable. It "ups existing code." There remains uncertainty whether a floor area ratio (FAR) of 0.7:1 is ideal; it may need to go higher or lower, or perhaps increased if an accessory dwelling unit (ADU) is built.
- Scenario 2 is simpler than other scenarios, making building easier for everyone.
- The "non-regulatory package" is sufficient.
- Table E did not assess any ideas for garages.
- Attached houses should be treated the same as houses on standard lots; possibly allow bonuses to incentivize attached houses.

Q: Why stop at allowing only attached houses with two units?

R: The SAC will discuss in its next meeting.

Post-Meeting Clarification: The next meeting, SAC Meeting #10 (on Tuesday, April 5, 2016) will assess scenarios for alternative housing types.

SAC Responses to Small Group Exercise: Attached Houses:

Table B: Emily Kemper, Garlynn Woodsong, Douglas MacLeod, Rick Michaelson (Morgan Tracy – BPS)

- Consistency between skinny and narrow houses is extremely important.
- '1.5x width of house' is the preferred height.

- Many skinny houses are poorly designed; prohibit garages on skinny houses and let the market determine whether they be attached or detached.
- Table B does not like Scenario 3 but have not determined whether Scenarios 1 or 2 are better or worse.
- Use floor area ratio (FAR) with existing setback limits.
- Do not mandate articulation features as appropriate building design depends on a lot's context.
- Height is important when determining appropriate main entrance design. Allow larger staircases with landings.
- Do not prohibit garages for attached houses.
- Require a ten-foot rear setback (not five-foot).
- Outdoor area regulations are "dumb." "Regulating someone's backyard is pretty goofy; regulating 12 by 12 or 15 by 15 serves no purpose." The City does not regulate minimum outdoor areas for apartments units, so why do it for attached houses?

C: Outdoor areas do have significant impact on adjacent properties.

Post-Meeting Clarification: Section 33.120.240 of the Portland Zoning Code (multi-dwelling zones) requires at least 48 square feet per unit with a 6'x6' minimum dimension. Combined areas must be at least 500 s.f. that accommodates a 15'x15' minimum dimension.

Table D: Sarah Cantine, Eli Spevak, David Sweet, Tatiana Xenelis-Mendoza (Kristin Cooper - BDS)

- If there are no parking requirements for standard detached houses, why should there be for attached houses? Regulations for attached and detached houses should be the same.
- Include parking in floor area ratio (FAR) calculations.
- There are good and bad roof forms. How can the City regulate roofs without unintended consequences?
- Scenario 2 provides the most flexibility in managing bulk.
- Exempt accessory dwelling units (ADUs) and basements from floor area ratio (FAR) regulations.
- Floor area ratio (FAR) is confusing to neighbors; use only as a tool for 'fine tuning' regulations.
- Floor area ratio (FAR) might add increased flexibility.
- Two attached houses are preferable to two detached houses; 'break the rules' by increasing density bonuses for attached houses.

Q: Did Table D discuss stair height of outdoor area requirements?

C: No.

Table F: Linda Bauer, John Hasenberg, Michael Molinaro (Sandra Wood - BPS)

- Measure height per Scenario 1.
- Ensure roof designs for attached houses can effectively shed water; consider whether builders would build only flat-roofed houses in response to any new height regulations.
- Lowering building height is preferred; Table F did not reach consensus on how best height should be measured.
- Table F did not discuss lot coverage concepts.
- Table F did not reach consensus on 'not requiring' versus 'prohibiting' garages and whether either would impact the building of taller scale houses.

Q: Did Table F discuss limits on parking in regards to pattern areas?

C: No.

C: People should be allowed to park in front yard setbacks.

C: The code should be changed to allow people to convert garages in skinny houses into accessory dwelling units (ADUs).

- Matching front setbacks (Scenario 3) is okay, but there should be a 15-foot minimum setback regardless of the location of adjacent houses.

Supervising Planner Sandra Wood (BPS) observed that Table F also discussed the pros and cons of measuring height from a lot's low point versus a high point (Scenario 3 proposes measuring from the lowest point around the house).

C: Measuring from the front setback would prevent houses from becoming too tall.

C: The City has enough trouble measuring level lots; separate code is needed to address building height on sloped lots.

C: However the City currently measures building height is sufficient.

SAC Reflection to Small Group Exercise:

Facilitator Anne Pressentin (EnvirolIssues) asked SAC members to reflect on the discussion on the scale of narrow and attached houses.

C: Is the 18-inch bay window projection allowance greater than the existing code allowance?

R: 12 inches is the existing code allowance.

C: More allowance is preferred.

C: There are a lot of existing rules governing projections.

C: Allow shifting side setbacks on multiple skinny lots.

C: On skinny houses, flush entrances are preferred over entrances that are set further back from the front elevation.

C: The distinct roofline design (articulation) is more prone to trapping rain.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Terry Parker: Terry lives in the Rose City Park neighborhood. There is concern that the results from the Residential Infill Project will apply only to Portland's "working class" neighborhoods. Zoning should dictate lot size. Maintaining on-street parking is important. There should be a focus group of long-term residents – people who bought into their neighborhoods because they liked their qualities. Homes without yard space turn over more often.

Jim Karlock: Jim is attending his first meeting regarding the Residential Infill Project. The project disregards the will of the people, who recently voted by a 2:1 margin for no increased density, then voted for no increased density by a 3:1 margin one year later. Still, every comment in today's SAC meeting relates to "cramming" increased density in Portland neighborhoods. Density reduces housing affordability (Portland is the 3rd most unaffordable city in the United States) - driving out all low-income people, and overloading roads, sewers and other infrastructure. It is "utter nonsense" and is an "utter disregard for the will of the people."

Post-Meeting Clarification: Measure No. 26-11 (May 2002) asked, "Shall Metro Charter: prohibit Metro housing density increases; repeal existing density requirements; require notice of local government proposed density increases?" and was defeated 63%-37% in the tri-county region (<https://multco.us/elections/metro-measure-no-26-11>): The competing measure (No. 26-29) which did not repeal existing density requirements, but prevents Metro from imposing increased density (but does not limit City's authority) passed by the same margin: 63%-37% (<https://multco.us/elections/may-21-2002-measure-26-29>).
Results: <https://multco.us/elections/may-21-2002-election-results>

Margaret Davis: Margaret is with United Neighborhoods for Reform. All of the draft guiding principles fit into the anti-demolition context. 87 years is the average age of houses in Portland. Maintaining privacy and trees is critical for smaller homes. A recent Oregon Department of Environmental Quality study concludes that 'living small' is the best thing an individual can do to reduce their carbon footprint. Renovation needs to be a more affordable option – it even

creates more jobs than new construction. Allowing developers to build bigger buildings will limit renovations. Houses should be built more creatively and at a higher quality.

WRITTEN PUBLIC COMMENTS

Provided by Robert Lennox via email to BPS staff 3/13/16:

"Thank you for being gracious and inclusive regarding our public input. Could you please add this to RIP SAC records?"

"From the discussions at the last RIP SAC meeting, finding a method to include more neighborhood context is still an important component."

"As our South Burlingame group tried to discuss with Morgan during the breakout session, and other members of the RIP SAC have pointed out, satisfying all of the Guiding Principles for all building types/regions may be impractical. The Introduction to 2035 Comprehensive Plan Guiding Principles (<http://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/552037>) identifies many of these difficulties. For example, on page I-27 it states "Portland has five major patterns areas: Inner Neighborhoods, Eastern Neighborhoods, Western Neighborhoods, Central City and Rivers. Each area has unique needs and characteristics." These characteristics need to be preserved in a context that is sensitive to each area's needs. Even within each of these areas, there is reason to further classify regions further to protect unique qualities of our neighborhoods. The code generated from the RIP SAC needs to maintain Portland's unique neighborhood character and in a context that will be sensitive to an area's history, geography, and infrastructure. We still believe that a one solution to all approach to solve the infill conflicts will not achieve all these goals in all areas of our city."

"Our southwest area has some real challenges in accommodating the type of infill we are seeing because of the deficient infrastructure. On Page I-36 of the Introduction document stated above, most of southwest Portland is identified as low in regards to neighborhood completeness defined as "community amenities, product and services." The Introduction continues recognizing the city's failure to prioritize equally "Due to historical inequitable policies and practices, disparities may be recognized in both access to services and in outcomes." While the city has stated they are now prioritizing the SW region, we remain very skeptical. There is no better example to support our skepticism than the lack of follow through in building required infrastructure on many of our neighborhood connectors and arterials, which puts our neighbors in danger to walk just about anywhere in our region. Or the twenty year commitment to improve Capital Highway, the lack of infrastructure on Taylor's Ferry Road, or even basic pedestrian access to our schools and parks. Even if our skepticism is unfounded and the city begins to address the deficiencies, we are still years from having adequate facilities and services to achieve even a moderate rating of neighborhood completeness."

"SW Portland has many areas without sidewalks, on very hilly terrain, and most areas are not walkable due to terrain and barriers like I-5, parks and open spaces. Because of the lack of infrastructure and our unique geography in the southwest, we are very concerned about the impact of adding some of the more dense multifamily (stacked flats) solutions into our residential zoned neighborhoods. These dense houses could work great in areas where the neighborhood completeness is identified as moderate or high, but certainly shouldn't be considered in a residential area where access to basic levels of service do not exist. This is again another reason why we are opposed to a one solution approach and implore the

RIP SAC to consider ways to allow for differences in the way this code is applied throughout the city. Please reconsidered some type of overlay or other solution(s) to provide neighborhood context based on criteria like infrastructure, neighborhood character, and geography.”

“To be clear, this problem created by a lack of infrastructure is not imaginary. This last month we had a neighborhood resident, a fifteen year old young man, struck by two cars trying to cross Taylors Ferry road from a Trimet bus stop trying to get home after a day at school. This young man is still in critical condition and may never fully recover from this accident. This portion of Taylors Ferry Road, to quote the liaison officer speaking to the news crews after the accident “is a rural part of Portland.” So, this is not an imaginary problem and the decisions to add density to a undeveloped portions of Portland can have grave consequences. “

“Thank you, Robert Lennox, Portland, OR” [address and phone number omitted by BPS staff].

Provided by Margaret Davis via public comment form on 3/15/16:

“The earlier survey was flawed and therefor discounted. If another survey is attempted, I would hope that its format be approved by a wide variety of stakeholders, and the validity/credibility questions of the first survey be resolved and fixed for this one.”

Provided by Terry Parker via public comment form on 3/15/16:

“Zoning needs to dictate the density of infill. Affluent neighborhoods need to take their share of infill and not expect working class neighborhoods to take up the slack.”

END OF SUMMARY MINUTES