

# PSC Work Session on 8/28/18

Proposal	Potential Amendments Identified by PSC	Comments received from PSC
<b>11. Revise rules for the R2.5 zone.</b>		
11.4 Create rules for small flag lots that: a. restrict the size of the new house to 1,000 square feet b. limit height to 20 feet; and c. require exterior design elements.	1. <b>Allow Historically Narrow Lots in R5 to be confirmed and use the R2.5 small flag lot PLA provision</b> (Spevak)	<u>Staff Response:</u> With the PSC’s direction to allow historically narrow lots to be confirmed for attached houses in R5 zones, staff is supportive of extending the small flag lot provision to these lots. <u>Need to confirm:</u> • On 8/14 the PSC directed that the lower (20’) height limit not be applied to the structure on the flag lot in R2.5 zones. Should the lower flag lot height limit apply in the R5 zone? • FAR on the front lot will frequently be exceeded. Staff recommends an exception to FAR for the existing house when applying for the Property Line Adjustment. Does the PSC agree?
Other topics	Potential Amendments Identified by PSC	Comments
<b>Other potential amendments (outside the scope of the Proposed Draft)</b>		
<b>Tree code</b>	1. <b>Remove the tree code exemption (at 11.50.040.A) on sites less than 5,000 square feet in area. Require all sites that are 2,500 square feet and larger to comply with the tree preservation standards.</b> (Houck)	<u>Staff Response:</u> Staff does not support this amendment. It is a substantial change that has not been evaluated or discussed with property owners or stakeholders. Of notable concern, on lots smaller than 5,000 s.f. the ability to construct around and adequately protect trees 12” and larger becomes increasingly difficult. These sites are already subject to tree planting requirements, so in effect, this proposed change would largely not increase tree retention but rather result in payments to the Tree Fund and increase the cost to build: \$1200 per 12-20” tree; \$2400 per 21-35” tree; \$325/caliper inch per 36”+ tree (\$11,700 and up)
<b>Floodplain.</b>	1. <del>Measure building height from 100-year floodplain (as opposed to lowest point)</del> (Schultz) 2. <del>Exclude above-ground basement area in flood plains.</del> (Schultz)	<b>THESE AMENDMENTS WITHDRAWN BY COMM. SCHULTZ.</b>
<b>Driveway spacing</b>	1. <b>Amend T33 to require driveway spacing</b>  The proposed standard would generally state: “The location of the driveway at the street lot line must be at least 22 feet from a driveway on abutting lots on either side. Alternatively, a driveway may be a maximum of 5 feet from a side lot line, when the driveway is not greater than 10 feet wide and is at least 22 feet from driveways on the opposite side”	<u>Staff Response:</u> Staff does not support the amendment to driveway spacing standards. A similar standard was removed from the zoning code in 2009 due to inherent conflicts between zoning standards and the City Engineer’s requirements. Whereas the zoning code must rely on clear an objective (numerical) standards for building permit reviews, the City Engineer retains professional discretion to apply Title 17 driveway requirements to balance multiple, and sometimes competing objectives including safety and on street parking retention: <b>17.28.110.D.</b> The Director of the Bureau of Transportation may refer any driveway permit application to the City Traffic Engineer and/or the Oregon Department of Transportation as appropriate, for a review of the location and width. The City Traffic Engineer shall recommend such conditions and limitations regarding the location and operation of driveways as are found necessary to insure the safe and orderly flow of pedestrian, bicycles and vehicular traffic and preserve on-street parking.

Proposal	Potential Amendments Identified by PSC	Comments
<b>8. Cottage Clusters</b> (These amendments replace those in 6/26 worksheet proposed by Comm. Schultz)		
8.1 Allow for an ADU to be built with each house on a cottage cluster site.	<p><b>Density.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the R10, R20, and RF zones, allow 1 ADU for each detached primary unit.</li> <li>In the R2.5, R5 and R7 zones, allow an equivalent number of units that would be allowed through a land division.</li> </ul> <p><b>For example:</b> On a 25,000 sq. ft. R5 site, 5 lots could be created through a land division. Each of those lots could accommodate a fourplex. Therefore 5 lots at 4 units each equals 20 units.</p>	<p><b>Staff Response:</b> Staff is supportive of aligning the Planned Development rules so that they are more on par with what is achievable through a land division.</p>
	<p><b>Requirements for additional units</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>When proposing more than 2 units per each equivalent land division lot, require than 1/3 of all the units be visitable.</li> </ul> <p><b>For example:</b> if an R5 site could be divided into 5 lots, and 10 units were proposed, no visitability requirements would apply. If more than 10 units were proposed, then one out every three units would need to meet the visitability standards.</p>	<p><b>Staff Response:</b> Staff is supportive of aligning the Planned Development rules so that they are more on par with what is achievable through a land division.</p>
8.2 Require at least half of the units to be oriented around a common open space.	<p><b>Open Area.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Require adequate open area, but remove criteria for “common” open area and unit orientation i.e. strike “50% of units oriented toward common open area”</li> </ul>	<p><b>Staff Response:</b> Staff can support this.</p>
8.3 Reduce the procedure type for some cottage cluster reviews from Type III to Type IIX.	<p><b>Review process.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review PD as a Type IIX, when an equivalent number of units would be allowed through a Type IIX land division.</li> <li>A type III review would still be required when multi-dwelling structures (4 or more units in a single building) are proposed.</li> </ul> <p><b>For example:</b> For a land division, up to 10 lots can be reviewed as a Type IIX. In the R5 zone, each of those lots could accommodate up to a fourplex. Therefore, up to 40 units on a PD site can be reviewed through a Type IIX.</p>	<p><b>Staff Response:</b> Staff is supportive of aligning the Planned Development rules so that they are more on par with what is achievable through a land division.</p>

	<p><b>Building coverage.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allow building coverage limits that would be more consistent with typical subdivided lot sizes in the zone. Cap building coverage at the greater of Table 110-4 or 35% of site area.</li> </ul> <table border="1" data-bbox="493 373 1096 565"> <thead> <tr> <th>Lot size</th> <th>Building Coverage Allowance (based on Table 110-4)</th> <th>Proposed PD Coverage</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2,500 sq ft</td> <td>50%</td> <td>50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5,000 sq ft</td> <td>45%</td> <td>45%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7,000 sq ft</td> <td>35%</td> <td rowspan="4">35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10,000 sq ft</td> <td>25%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>20,000 sq ft</td> <td>22%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1 acre</td> <td>15%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Lot size	Building Coverage Allowance (based on Table 110-4)	Proposed PD Coverage	2,500 sq ft	50%	50%	5,000 sq ft	45%	45%	7,000 sq ft	35%	35%	10,000 sq ft	25%	20,000 sq ft	22%	1 acre	15%	<p><b>Staff Response:</b> Staff is generally supportive.</p>																
Lot size	Building Coverage Allowance (based on Table 110-4)	Proposed PD Coverage																																		
2,500 sq ft	50%	50%																																		
5,000 sq ft	45%	45%																																		
7,000 sq ft	35%	35%																																		
10,000 sq ft	25%																																			
20,000 sq ft	22%																																			
1 acre	15%																																			
	<p><b>FAR.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allow FAR to match allowed FAR for an equivalent number of units on land division lots. <b>For example:</b> if an R5 site could be divided into 5 lots, and 5 units were proposed, the FAR would be 0.5. If 10 units were proposed, the FAR would be 0.6. And if more than 15 units were proposed, the FAR would be 0.7.</li> <li>Allow +0.1 bonus FAR when 25% of the units are affordable</li> </ul> <table border="1" data-bbox="493 792 1050 1076"> <thead> <tr> <th>Zone</th> <th>Number of units per each equivalent land division lot</th> <th>FAR for site</th> <th>FAR with affordability bonus</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="3">R7</td> <td>1</td> <td>.4</td> <td>.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>.5</td> <td>.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3-4</td> <td>.6</td> <td>.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="3">R5</td> <td>1</td> <td>.5</td> <td>.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>.6</td> <td>.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3-4</td> <td>.7</td> <td>.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="3">R2.5</td> <td>1</td> <td>.7</td> <td>.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>.8</td> <td>.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3-4</td> <td>.9</td> <td>1.0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Zone	Number of units per each equivalent land division lot	FAR for site	FAR with affordability bonus	R7	1	.4	.5	2	.5	.6	3-4	.6	.7	R5	1	.5	.6	2	.6	.7	3-4	.7	.8	R2.5	1	.7	.8	2	.8	.9	3-4	.9	1.0	<p><b>Staff Response:</b> Staff is supportive of aligning the Planned Development rules so that they are more on par with what is achievable through a land division.</p>
Zone	Number of units per each equivalent land division lot	FAR for site	FAR with affordability bonus																																	
R7	1	.4	.5																																	
	2	.5	.6																																	
	3-4	.6	.7																																	
R5	1	.5	.6																																	
	2	.6	.7																																	
	3-4	.7	.8																																	
R2.5	1	.7	.8																																	
	2	.8	.9																																	
	3-4	.9	1.0																																	