

Concept		Details / Issues	Geography
Site Design / Outdoor Spaces			
1	Require residential outdoor space in the RH zone, using similar approach to MUZ zones (48 sq. ft. per unit, 36 sq. ft. for small sites).	Consistent with standards in other multi-dwelling and mixed-use zones. Outdoor space requirements could be met by any combination of private outdoor spaces (such as balconies), shared outdoor space, or indoor community spaces.	Citywide
2	Require shared outdoor space for large sites (20,000 sq. ft. in size or larger).	Percentage of site area to be shared outdoor space to be determined during code development (potentially 5 to 10% of site area). Also consider requirement for a percentage of units to front onto shared outdoor spaces or street frontages.	Citywide
3a	Landscaping alternatives. Allow raised stormwater planters to apply toward meeting landscaping requirements (currently required to be at ground level).	Also consider allowing other alternative approaches, such as eco-roofs or raised courtyards with landscaping, to meet a portion of landscaping requirements. Retain existing Title 11 tree planting requirements.	Citywide
3b	Limit impervious surfaces (such as surface parking lots and driveways), potentially to no more than 30% of site area.	Further analysis/discussion needed on appropriate limit, and whether this would apply only to vehicle areas or to all ground-level impervious surfaces. Linked to policies and research on urban heat island impacts.	Citywide
4	East Portland mid-block open areas. Keep mid-block areas as less built up and with more open space, with development focused along perimeters of blocks.	Determine how this would be regulated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large rear setbacks? • Require development to be built in front 2/3rds of property? • Require buildings to be within a certain distance of street (150'?)? Further discussion needed on merits of mid-block approach versus locating open space central to housing units. Perimeter development preserves existing rear yard pattern, could preserve existing large trees. However, focusing outdoor space at rear of lots makes green space less visible and convenient for units compared to centralized open space.	Eastern
Street Frontages			
7	Limit garages along street frontages to 50% of ground levels of buildings/units. Require parking to be accessed from alleys, where existing. For structured parking garages serving multiple units, this standard would apply to one street frontage (highest transit classification).	Coordinate with Residential Infill Project, which is considering a similar approach. Limitation would apply to all types of development, including multi-dwelling development (such as apartment buildings) and single-dwelling development (such as rowhouses).	Citywide

Comments can be handed to BPS staff or emailed to betterhousing@portlandoregon.gov. The final Concept Report will be released at the beginning of July 2017. **If you wish your comments to be reviewed before the report is completed, please submit them by June 12.**

Better Housing by Design

6/1/17 Draft Code Concepts

	Provide options for alternative garage arrangements that limit impacts on the pedestrian environment, such as partially-excavated garages at raised basement level.		
8	Require buildings along street frontages to have entrances oriented to public streets or pathways , or to courtyards connected to public streets.	Also provide options for entrances to front onto a porch, instead of facing the street, as is allowed for attached houses and duplexes.	Citywide
9	Require 10' front setbacks in R1 and RH zones (excluding RH zoning with 4:1 FAR), for privacy and residential neighborhood character.	Allow shallower front setbacks to match those of adjacent properties in order to continue established patterns.	Citywide
5	Limited commercial uses. Provide allowances for limited commercial uses near light rail stations and along major corridors (designated Civic Corridors or appropriate transit street classification).	Make small commercial uses in RH zone a limited use versus a conditional use near LRT stations, and allow small commercial / live-work arrangements along major corridors (specific size limit TBD). Consider appropriate classification for the corridor allowance, and what zones to apply allowance (all multi-dwelling zones or only R1/RH?). Determine if will apply only to East Portland, or citywide (E PDX has more multi-dwelling zoning along major corridors than do other areas).	Eastern, or Citywide?
Development Scale / Intensity			
6a	Regulate development intensity by scale/FAR, instead of unit density. In the R2 zone, match this density flexibility with greater limitations on building scale (35' height instead of current 40').	If basing on floor-to-area-ratios (FAR), need to determine appropriate ratios. Initial ideas are FARs of 1.5 to 1 in R1 zone, 1 to 1 in R2 zone, and .75 to 1 in R3 zone. Need to calibrate base FARs with consideration of development bonuses for affordable housing. Need to consider impacts to production of larger family-sized units (some community concern regarding this).	Citywide
6b	Accessibility. Require that projects beyond a certain density have 25% of units be visitable or accessible (TBD). Possibly apply to projects with densities greater than 1 unit per 2,000 sq. ft. of site area (corresponds to additional density in R2 zone provided by scale/FAR-based approach).	Needs more discussion and could follow lead of the Residential Infill Project, which is considering requirements for visitable/accessible units in conjunction with allowances for additional units.	Citywide
10	Require building height step-downs and 10' setbacks adjacent to single-dwelling zoning (apply to R1 and RH zones, which allow 4+ stories).	Use same approach as Mixed Use zones, which limits building height to 35' within a 25' distance of abutting single-dwelling zones. Consider only requiring the 10' setback if building is more than 35' tall.	Citywide

Comments can be handed to BPS staff or emailed to betterhousing@portlandoregon.gov. The final Concept Report will be released at the beginning of July 2017. **If you wish your comments to be reviewed before the report is completed, please submit them by June 12.**

11	Simplify approach for side/rear setbacks , reducing requirement to 5’ as with SFR zones, to accommodate development on small sites. Also allow small accessory structures within setback areas (as in SFR zones).	As part of an approach to reducing barriers to development on small sites, also consider exempting small sites (7,500 or smaller) from landscaping standards (as is the case with houses/duplexes/attached houses - difficult to fit required trees in small setbacks), and from off-street parking requirements (as with Mixed Use Zones).	Citywide
Development Bonuses / TDR			
12	Prioritize affordable housing by increasing inclusionary housing development bonus beyond current 25% density increase (possibly to 50%), and by eliminating all the other development bonuses. Also consider if a larger bonus should be made available to proposals for 100% affordable housing (geared toward non-profit builders).	Need to determine the amount of inclusionary housing development bonus (50% would be more comparable to the 60%+ bonus in Mixed Use Zones). Elimination of 3-bedroom/family housing bonus may be of concern to some community stakeholders.	Citywide
13	Tree preservation. Provide a transfer of development rights (TDR) allowance for tree preservation.	Also, eliminate existing allowance for TDR within a block in order to prioritize historic and tree preservation.	Citywide
Street Connections			
14	Development allowances and street connections. Change regulations so that providing street connection does not cause loss of development potential.	Determine if development allowances will be calculated before street dedications reduce site area (meaning no loss of development potential), or to use the 15% reduction methodology used now for land divisions.	Citywide
15	Connection Opportunity Areas - Minimum lot size/street frontage requirements. In specified areas within centers that do not meet street connectivity standards, require minimum site sizes or street frontage dimensions to make it more practical to obtain new street connections. Also, potentially require shared driveway arrangements for smaller sites.	Determine whether this approach would be based on site size or street frontage dimensions (narrow lots are often a greater constraint to providing street connections than site size). Need to determine applicability of this requirement– potentially by mapping areas in designated centers where street connections are needed. Determine whether Connection Opportunity Area requirements will be accompanied by other implementation approaches and incentives (Transportation SDC approaches, etc.).	Centers – locations that do not meet street connectivity standards.
16	Connection Opportunity Areas – Requirements for right of way dedication or public easements. In specified areas within centers that do not meet street connectivity standards, strengthen requirements for property dedication or easements to facilitate future connections through incremental development.	Determine if these requirements and street connectivity review procedures will be added to existing requirements in Titles 33 or 17. Figure out how the applicability of this requirement will be determined – potentially by mapping of areas in designated centers where street connections are needed. Provide reference in Chapter 33.120 to Title 17 street connectivity standards.	Centers – locations that do not meet street connectivity standards.

Comments can be handed to BPS staff or emailed to betterhousing@portlandoregon.gov . The final Concept Report will be released at the beginning of July 2017. If you wish your comments to be reviewed before the report is completed, please submit them by June 12.