

Staff Proposal	PSC Preliminary Direction
<p>1. Limit the size of houses (R7, R5, and R2.5 zones).</p>	
<p>1.1 Establish a limit on house size by zone that is proportional to lot size using a floor area ratio (FAR) calculation.</p>	<p><u>What size for a single house?</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No change – retain current code Apply existing height and building coverage limits (BIG HOUSE – e.g. 6,750 sf house in R5 on 5k sf lot) 2. Staff proposal – reduce house size Reduce house size based on zone and lot size (SMALLER HOUSE – e.g. 2,500 sf house in R5 on 5k sf lot) 5 PSC members support 3. Reduce house sizes even more Amend proposal. Reduce house size even smaller than staff’s proposal (EVEN SMALLER HOUSE – e.g. 2,000 sf house in R5 on 5k sf lot) 4. Reduce house sizes, but not as much as staff proposed Amend proposal. Reduce house size from current code, but not as small as staff proposed (MEDIUM HOUSE – e.g. 3,500 sf house) 4 PSC members support 5. Reduce house sizes, but vary by some measure on neighborhood context <p><u>What size for a building with more than one unit?</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Staff proposal (same FAR for site, regardless of units). One size box, regardless of number of units.

	<p>7. Increase the allowed size of the structure as the number of units increases Provide a small increase with additional units. For example: R5 -- House (.5), house with ADU (.5), duplex (.6), triplex (.7). R5 -- House (.4), house with ADU (.4), duplex (.5), triplex (.6). 5 PSC members support: size increases for 2nd and 3rd unit 7 PSC members support: .1 FAR for 2nd and 3rd unit 6 PSC members support: paying to increase house size 5 PSC members support: an upper limit on increases (e.g., house, +.1 for duplex, +.1 for triplex and more) 6 PSC members support: internal ADUs count as a unit (e.g., house, +.1 for house +.ADU)</p> <p><u>How to measure the size of buildings?</u></p> <p>8. Staff proposal (FAR). Use floor area ratio based on zone (e.g., R5 5,000 s.f. lot @ .5 FAR = 2,500 sf house), allow existing houses to add small (250 sf) additions w/o meeting FAR</p> <p>9. No FAR. Use building coverage and height limits. Calibrate building coverage limits to height. (e.g. single-story house has greater building coverage, two-story house has less building coverage)</p> <p>10. No FAR. Combination of building coverage, height, size of street-facing façade and building depth. <i>PSC scale subcommittee will consider</i></p> <p>11. Apply FAR limits to new construction. Apply other limits to existing houses. <i>PSC scale subcommittee will consider</i></p>
<p>1.2 Exclude attics and basements from house size limits.</p>	<p><u>POTENTIAL AMENDMENTS (Bortolazzo):</u></p> <p>1. Exclude wall thickness beyond 6" towards FAR calculation. [change from current practice of measuring to exterior of walls] A majority of PSC members support</p>

	<p>2. Exclude sloped attic space below 8’ towards FAR calculation. [change from staff proposed 6’8” height] Withdrawn</p> <p>3. Exclude basement up to 2’-6” above average ground towards FAR calculation. [change from staff proposed 50% of combined wall area below ground] Withdrawn</p> <p><u>POTENTIAL AMENDMENT (Schultz):</u></p> <p>4. Exclude basement area below the flood plain (as opposed to basement 50% below grade). Staff to return with more info about floodplain rules</p>
<p>1.3 Allow an additional .15 FAR for detached accessory structures (e.g. garages, sheds and accessory dwelling units).</p>	<p><u>POTENTIAL AMENDMENT (Spevak):</u></p> <p>1. Allow FAR to be floated between the main house and detached accessory structures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apply a separate FAR cap on the primary house (to ensure it doesn’t get too large). • Rely on existing regulations for living area, height and lot coverage to ensure detached accessory structures don’t get too large. <p>PSC scale subcommittee will consider</p>
<p>2. Revise how height is measured (all zones).</p>	
<p>2.1 Measure height from the <i>lowest</i> point near the house, not the <i>highest</i> point.</p>	<p><u>POTENTIAL AMENDMENT (Bortolazzo):</u></p> <p>1. Calculate building height by averaging high/low point. Not enough PSC support to move forward</p> <p><u>POTENTIAL AMENDMENT (Oswill):</u></p> <p>2. Allow greater building height for houses in flood plain Staff to return with more info about floodplain rules</p>

2.2 Clarify that small dormers are excluded from the height measurement.	No changes proposed
2.3 Continue to allow 2½ story houses (30 feet high) on standard lots.	No changes proposed
3. Improve front setbacks to better reflect those of adjacent houses.	
3.1 Increase front setbacks from 10 feet to 15 feet in the R5 zone.	<u>POTENTIAL AMENDMENT (Houck):</u> 1. Maintain the existing 10 ft setback in R5 zone; do not increase to 15 ft. A majority of PSC members supported
3.2 Allow a front setback reduction to align with the house next door in R7, R5 and R2.5 zones.	<u>POTENTIAL AMENDMENT (Baugh):</u> 1. Allow this reduction only in R7 zone and limit reduction to 10 ft. min. Not enough PSC support to move forward
4. Improve building design (R10, R7, R5 and R2.5 zones).	
Miscellaneous: Require an 8 sf covered entry for main entrances to additional units. Current code requires that for corner lot duplexes, each unit’s entry must face a separate street.	<u>POTENTIAL AMENDMENTS (Spevak):</u> 1. Delete covered entry requirements for all housing types A majority of PSC members supported 2. Delete requirements that main entry doors on corner duplexes face different streets A majority of PSC members supported
4.1 Limit how high the front door can be above the ground.	<u>POTENTIAL AMENDMENTS (Schultz):</u> 1. Exempt houses in the floodplain from this standard OR require houses in the floodplain to have their front door no more than 4’ above flood level (instead of grade). Staff agrees with the exemption. More info about floodplain rules is available in the 6/26 Staff response to PSC questions
4.2 Allow eaves to project up to 2 feet into setbacks.	No changes proposed

4.3 On a lot abutting an alley, require access from the alley.	See parking proposals below.
---	------------------------------

Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)	
<p><u>Current rules:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ADUs are accessory to a house or attached house ▪ Maximum 800 sf of living area or 75% the living area of the house, whichever is less ▪ Detached ADUs are treated the same as other detached accessory structures (for height, setback, building coverage). <p><u>Staff proposal affecting ADU scale:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All the above, plus: ▪ Exempt basements in older houses that are converted to ADUs from ADU size limit (800 sf/75%) ▪ FAR limit on detached accessory structure limits the size of detached ADUs. 	<p><u>POTENTIAL AMENDMENTS (Spevak):</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Delete proposed additional height limit of 4’ more than height of primary dwelling for ADUs (but preserve universal ADU height cap of 20’) 6 PSC members support 2. Allow any combination of internal and detached ADUs, so long as they comply with FAR caps and other base zone regulations. 5 PSC members support 3. Delete requirement that internal ADUs can only have one door facing the street 6 PSC members support 4. Allow basement ADUs to match size of entire floor in all zones, not just within the “a” overlay Withdrawn 5. Revise definition of “Accessory Dwelling Unit” to change language stating that they are ‘always smaller’ than primary unit to ‘generally smaller’, since they can be equal to the size of the main house if it’s a 1-story house with an ADU basement. Support among PSC <p><u>POTENTIAL AMENDMENT (Bortolazzo):</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Remove .15 FAR limit and retain current 75% or 800 sf max size limit. 8 PSC members support

Parking

Current rules:

One space per unit, except:

- Within 500' of "peak service"
- ADUs
- Historically narrow lots

Proposed additional exceptions:

- No parking required for lots abutting alleys. If parking is provided, parking access must be from alley

- No parking required inside 'a' overlay for:
 - House w/2 ADUs
 - Duplex
 - Duplex w/ADU
 - Triplex

- Parking and driveways on narrow lots are prohibited between the building and the street

Commission supported staff's proposal

POTENTIAL AMENDMENTS:

1. Eliminate minimum parking requirements for residential uses in single dwelling zones.

5 PSC members support (none opposed)

2. Attach requirements to non-required parking.

- a. When parking is provided, restrict width of curb cut, and require driveway to accommodate at least two cars.
- b. When parking is provided, the site is not eligible for parking permits (where parking program permits are in use)

See PSC parking subcommittee summary

5. Create a new Additional Housing Options overlay zone – the new ‘a’ overlay zone.

5.1

Allow the following additional housing types in the new ‘a’ overlay if one of the units is “visitable”:

- House with two accessory dwelling units (ADUs), one attached and one detached
- Duplex
- Duplex with one detached ADU
- Triplex on corner lots

How many units should be allowed?

1. **Allow 3 units on all lots:**
 - on internal lots this is limited to house w/ 2 ADUs or a duplex w/ one ADU.
 - on corner lots this can also be a triplex. (Staff proposal)

2 PSC members support
2. **Allow 3 units on internal lots and 4 on corner lots.** (Bortolazzo)
4 PSC members support
3. **Allow 4 units on all lots.** (Houck)
4 PSC members support

What should be the minimum lot size for more units?

1. **Allow larger minimum lot sizes for multiple units (Staff proposal)**

Lot size by zone	House, House + ADU, historic conversions	House + 2 ADUs, Duplex + 1 ADU, Corner Triplex
R2.5	1,600 sq. ft.	3,200 sq. ft.
R5	3,000 sq. ft.	4,500 sq. ft.
R7	4,200 sq. ft.	6,300 sq. ft.

3 PSC members support

2. **Change R7 minimum lot size from 6,300 sf to 5,000 sf.** (Spevak)
4 PSC members support
3. **No increased lot sizes for different housing types**
3 PSC members support


In what building form(s)?

See diagrams below: #7-13 for four units

Among the 4-unit options, PSC members support:

Scheme # in diagram below	Location of Lot		
	Internal Lot	Corner Lot	
#7	9 support	7 support	OK on internal lots
#8	9 support	8 support	OK on internal lots
#9	5 support	6 support	Least preferred
#10	7 support	6 support	OK on internal lots
#11	8 support	9 support	OK on corner lots
#12	7 support	8 support	OK on corner lots
#13	5 support	6 support	Least preferred

Variations on four units



Staff Proposal (affordability bonus)

Allow additional units by-right or require some other public benefit? *See the Incentives Table proposal 7.1 – 7.3 for discussion of allowing additional units in return for some other public benefit.*

1. Staff proposal:

- a. 3rd unit must be visitable
- b. 4th unit must be affordable (proposal 7.2)

2. How many units by right.

Allow up to 4 units with or without some strings attached?

8 PSC members support

Require 1 unit be visitable

4 PSC members support

Require 1 affordable

2 PSC members support

Allow 4 units with no strings attached


6 PSC members support

3. Require 1 of 3 (or 1 of 4 if 4 is max. units) to be visitable

On 6/26, 6 PSC members support. On 7/10 the PSC supported NOT requiring visitability, but providing additional FAR as an incentive for visitability. See “Incentives for providing public benefits” (7.1-7.3)

4. Draft letter to study imposing visitability on ALL new single-family houses, through a building code amendment

7 PSC members support

<p>Fee simple units</p> <p>There is no proposal for dividing duplexes or triplexes into attached houses. Currently corner lot duplexes may be divided as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lots in the R5 – R20 zones must meet the minimum lot dimension standards of the R2.5 zone (i.e. 1,600 sq. ft.) 2. Lots in the R2.5 Zone have no minimum lot dimension standards for the new lots. 	<p><u>POTENTIAL AMENDMENT (Spevak):</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Allow duplexes on internal lots and triplexes on corner lots to be divided to create individual lots for attached units.  <p>6 PSC members support directing staff to study and develop proposals for allowing these land divisions; to be discussed on 8/14</p>
<p>5.2</p> <p>Require the following visitability features for one unit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a no-step entry, • wider halls and doors, and • living space and bathroom on the ground floor. 	<p><u>POTENTIAL AMENDMENTS (Spevak):</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Exempt properties with 20-degree slope between front lot line and main entry to primary dwelling from visitability requirement. Withdrawn (no longer necessary if visitability is an incentive) 2. Allow fee-in-lieu in some cases, with funds going towards existing programs to help low-income residents modify homes for accessibility. Withdrawn
<p>5.3</p> <p>Do not require parking for additional housing types.</p>	<p>See parking proposals above.</p>
<p>5.4</p> <p>Allow the FAR for all structures to be combined for triplexes on corner lot</p>	<p>See Incentives Table (7.1-7.3) for Bortolazzo' s amendment regarding increased flexibility for existing houses.</p>

6. Apply the new 'a' overlay zone in select areas.

6.1

Apply the new 'a' overlay to properties zoned R7, R5 and R2.5 within:

- ¼ mile of centers
- ¼ mile of corridors with 15-minute bus service
- ¼ mile of MAX stations; and/or
- Higher opportunity housing areas (with services, amenities, jobs, schools and parks).

6.2

Reduce the new 'a' overlay based on infrastructure and environmental constraints.

6.3

Reduce the new 'a' overlay in areas with concentrations of vulnerable populations until programs are available to mitigate displacement risk.

6.4

Expand the new 'a' overlay based on proximity to amenities, such as community centers, parks, schools and multiple bus lines.

Where should the additional housing types be allowed?

1. The 'a' overlay boundary proposed by staff

2. A redrawn 'a' overlay boundary using Map 9

The PSC supported staff's proposal to remove the following areas from overlay eligibility:

- RF, R20, and R10 zoned parcels **10 PSC members support**
- 100-year floodplain **9 PSC members support**
- Steep slopes with landslide history **8 PSC members support**
- Sewer constrained availability **8 PSC members support**
- Stormwater **6 PSC members supported considering, 2 PSC members support as one strike**
- Northwest Hills Plan District **8 PSC members support**
- Natural Resource Inventory (Med/high value) **8 PSC members support**

The PSC disagreed with staff's proposal to remove the following areas:

- Improved private streets **8 PSC members**
- PDX Airport Noise Impact Overlay Zone **8 PSC members**
- Glendoveer Plan District - R7 parcels* **8 PSC members**
- Johnson Creek Plan District **8 PSC members**
- Farther from frequent transit **8 PSC members (2 PSC members supported staff's proposal)**
- Housing opportunity areas (Low/med low) **7 PSC members (3 PSC members supported staff's proposal)**
- Displacement Risk Areas **7 PSC members (3 PSC members supported staff's proposal)**

3. Alternative Overlay Geography (Baugh)

Boundary defined by the river to the west, Fremont to the north, 80th Ave to

	<p>the east to Lincoln, then Lincoln to 52nd. 52nd to the southern city limits, and returning to the river (see map)</p> <p>2 PSC members support</p>
<p>Transition Sites</p> <p>There is no proposal for allowing further increases in units for transition sites. Currently lots in R20-R2.5 with side lot lines that abut the CM2, CM3, CE, CX, E, I, or CI zones. These lots are allowed one additional unit, as either a duplex or divided into a pair of attached house.</p>	<p><u>POTENTIAL AMENDMENT (Spevak):</u></p> <p>1. Expand transition site allowances.</p> <p>a. Allow one additional unit for sites that abut (side and/or rear lot lines?) RM2, RM3, RM4, RX.</p> <p>b. Allow one additional unit for sites across street from “urban parks”</p> <p>No straw poll was taken</p> <p><u>Additional considerations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does the transition site proposal intersect with the areas now included with the revised mapping in Proposal 6.2? • Consider how this relates to the Incentives Table (Proposal 7.1-7.3)
<p>6.5 Remove the <i>existing</i> ‘a’ overlay zone and code provisions</p>	<p>No changes proposed by PSC</p>
<p>Incentives for providing public benefits</p> <p>7.1 Allow a bonus of 0.1 FAR when providing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ An affordable unit (up to 80 percent of Median Family Income) on site or ▪ Payment in lieu of providing an affordable unit on site. <p>7.2 Allow a triplex and an ADU (and +.15 FAR) on corner lots when one unit is affordable</p> <p>7.3 Promote preservation of historic resources when adding units through incentives such as flexibility in housing types and the ability to combine FAR for all structures on the lot.one unit is affordable.</p>	<p>See “Incentives Table” on following page for PSC direction</p>

INCENTIVES TABLE – The table below summarizes the choices regarding incentives for providing a public benefit. The PSC has expressed interest in looking at bonuses for providing more units, visitable units, affordable units and historic preservation. Most of the focus has been on two types of incentives – allowing more development in terms of size and/or allowing more dwelling units to be developed.

	For Providing More Units	For Providing a Visitable Unit	For Providing Affordable Housing		Internal Conversions
			(1 unit @80%MFI)	(Pay fee in lieu)	
BUILDING SIZE BONUS	<p>Proposal: NONE</p> <p>PSC supported allowing more FAR for more units: ~2,500 SF for 1 DU ~3,000 SF for 2 DUs ~3,500 SF for 3 or 4 DUs</p> <p>PSC supported treating the 4th unit the same as visitable or affordable (i.e., FAR increase)</p>	<p>Proposal: NONE</p> <p>PSC supported providing additional FAR as an incentive but not requiring visitability.</p>	<p>Proposal: Add .1 FAR when there will be 3 units on the site.</p> <p>PSC supported providing additional FAR as an incentive but not requiring affordability.</p>	<p>Proposal: Add .1 FAR when there will be 3 units on the site.</p> <p>PSC supported a fee in lieu option</p> <p><i>Staff note: To provide for the possibility to request adjustments to FAR, staff recommends removing the fee-in-lieu option.</i></p>	<p>Proposal: NONE (Note: the FAR can be moved between primary and accessory structures.)</p> <p><u>POTENTIAL AMENDMENTS (Bortolazzo):</u> Allow greater flexibility within existing structures to expand and/or split into multiple units. Limit the degree of exterior alteration.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Additional square footage allowance (e.g. +15% more than new construction) Height/coverage/reduced setbacks (e.g. 10% less than new construction) Allow up to a certain max. percentage of exterior walls to change. Allow up to a certain max. percentage of front elevation to change. <p>PSC supports providing additional FAR and unit potential as an incentive, with restrictions on degree of exterior alterations (see below as well)</p>

	For Providing More Units	For Providing a Visitable Unit	For Providing Affordable Housing		Internal Conversions
			(1 unit @80%MFI)	(Pay fee in lieu)	
NUMBER OF UNITS BONUS	Not applicable; PSC supports allowing 4 units by-right with no strings attached.	Not applicable; PSC supports allowing 4 units by-right with no strings attached.	Not applicable; PSC supports allowing 4 units by-right with no strings attached.	Not applicable; PSC supports allowing 4 units by-right with no strings attached.	<p>Proposal: NONE</p> <p><u>POTENTIAL AMENDMENT (Bortolazzo):</u> Allow additional density (e.g. +1 du) for internal conversion of existing structures into multiple units. Limit the degree of exterior alteration. To be discussed after scale is resolved</p> <p><u>POTENTIAL AMENDMENT (Spevak):</u> For historic resource homes, allow internal conversions up to 1 unit per 1,000 sf of site area (as is currently allowed for Historic and Conservation Landmarks). 6 PSC members supported allowing existing homes to be converted to 5 units</p>

POTENTIAL AMENDMENT (Baugh):

Remove the word affordable for the RIP document in its entirety and all references thereof.

No straw poll was taken

POTENTIAL AMENDMENT (Spevak):

Provide a density bonus in situations where the developer has to physically construct streets or other improvements

No straw poll was taken, but this amendment conflicts with concerns about allowing more than 4 units on a lot (unless retaining existing houses)