

PSC Amendment Topics		Staff Position																																																							
1. Allow more housing types																																																									
1	<p>Amendment: Retain current provisions that allow attached houses on vacant R5 lots in the Albina Plan District (33.505.230) [Schultz]</p> <p>Rationale: This retains current allowances for dividing vacant lots for pairs of attached houses, increasing the potential for more ownership options (attached houses versus duplexes)</p>	Staff is supportive of this change																																																							
2	<p>Amendment: Delete requirement for larger lot sizes for 3 or 4 units. (33.110.265.E.2) [Smith]</p> <p>Rationale: Removing this limitation enables more lots to provide triplexes and fourplexes. Unit sizes should be determined by the market.</p>	<p>Staff does not support this change</p> <p>Lot dimension regulations ensure that each lot has enough room for a reasonably-sized primary structure and accessory structure; that they are of a size that development meet the development standards including room for a small outdoor area and sufficient frontage to provide access for utilities and services.</p> <p>The larger triplex and fourplex lot sizes were designed in consideration of the proposed FARs and ensure that average unit sizes are not unreasonably small or create development expectations that cannot meet development standards.</p>																																																							
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2"># of Units</th> <th rowspan="2">Housing Type</th> <th colspan="3">R7</th> <th colspan="3">R5</th> <th colspan="3">R2.5</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Min lot size</th> <th>Base FAR</th> <th>Average unit sizes</th> <th>Min lot size</th> <th>Base FAR</th> <th>Average unit sizes</th> <th>Min lot size</th> <th>Base FAR</th> <th>Average unit sizes</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>House</td> <td rowspan="2">4,200</td> <td>0.4</td> <td>1,680</td> <td rowspan="2">3,000</td> <td>0.5</td> <td>1,500</td> <td rowspan="2">1,600</td> <td>0.7</td> <td>1,120</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>House + ADU, or Duplex</td> <td>0.5</td> <td>1,050</td> <td>0.6</td> <td>900</td> <td>0.8</td> <td>640</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>House + 2 ADUs Duplex + ADU, or Triplex</td> <td rowspan="2">5,000</td> <td rowspan="2">0.6</td> <td>1,000</td> <td rowspan="2">4,500</td> <td rowspan="2">0.7</td> <td rowspan="2">1,050</td> <td rowspan="2">3,200</td> <td rowspan="2">0.9</td> <td>960</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>Fourplex</td> <td>750</td> <td>788</td> <td>720</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			# of Units	Housing Type	R7			R5			R2.5			Min lot size	Base FAR	Average unit sizes	Min lot size	Base FAR	Average unit sizes	Min lot size	Base FAR	Average unit sizes	1	House	4,200	0.4	1,680	3,000	0.5	1,500	1,600	0.7	1,120	2	House + ADU, or Duplex	0.5	1,050	0.6	900	0.8	640	3	House + 2 ADUs Duplex + ADU, or Triplex	5,000	0.6	1,000	4,500	0.7	1,050	3,200	0.9	960	4	Fourplex	750	788	720
# of Units	Housing Type	R7			R5			R2.5																																																	
		Min lot size	Base FAR	Average unit sizes	Min lot size	Base FAR	Average unit sizes	Min lot size	Base FAR	Average unit sizes																																															
1	House	4,200	0.4	1,680	3,000	0.5	1,500	1,600	0.7	1,120																																															
2	House + ADU, or Duplex		0.5	1,050		0.6	900		0.8	640																																															
3	House + 2 ADUs Duplex + ADU, or Triplex	5,000	0.6	1,000	4,500	0.7	1,050	3,200	0.9	960																																															
4	Fourplex			750						788	720																																														

<p>3</p>	<p>Amendment: Base the size of the detached ADU on the larger, not smaller, duplex unit. (33.205.040.C.2) [Smith]</p> <p>Rationale: As proposed, the ADU size is based on the living area of the smaller duplex unit. This is a greater limitation that a detached ADU would have with a house.</p>	<p>Staff is supportive of this change.</p>
<p>2. Limit the overall size of buildings</p>		
<p>4</p>	<p>Amendment: Add allowance for one addition up to 250 square feet in each 5-year period without having to show compliance with the maximum FAR. (33.110.210) [Smith, St. Martin]</p> <p>Rationale: This enables small additions without having to document the total FAR on a site. It also permits more adaptability over time for structures that may be at or already above the maximum FAR.</p>	<p>Staff is supportive of this change</p>
<p>5</p>	<p>Amendment: Provide an exception to FAR maximums when adding a detached ADU to sites with existing large houses (33.110.210). [Smith, Spevak]</p> <p>Rationale: When an existing house is already at or above the FAR allowed for a 2nd (or 3rd) unit, this change will permit additional square footage to provide a detached ADU.</p>	<p>Staff does not support this change.</p> <p>This was part of the discussion in September when the Commission gave staff the recommendation to combine FAR for the site. In staff’s proposal, separate FAR was specified for the primary structure (house) and accessory structure (e.g. ADU). This ensured that FAR would be available for the detached ADU. The Commission opted for the added flexibility to combine or “float” the FAR between structures on the site.</p> <p>Moreover, <i>existing</i> square footage may be <i>converted</i> to create an ADU (either in the house or in an existing detached accessory structure).</p>


6	<p>Amendment: Add allowance for 250 square feet for a garage, above FAR max (33.110.210). [Bachrach]</p> <p>Rationale: The proposed FAR in the R5 zone of 0.5 for a single house - a 2,500 square-foot house on a standard 5,000 sq foot lot - is a significant reduction over what is currently allowed. The proposal to allow garages up to 250 square feet to not count as part of the FAR calculation is intended to provide a modest accommodation for home buyers wanting a garage, either to accommodate a car or additional storage.</p>	<p>Staff does not support this change.</p> <p>This creates an incentive to build off-street parking, counter to parking management policies 9.55 through 9.60, which generally call for encouraging lower rates of private vehicle use, and discouraging parking subsidies.</p>
----------	--	---

3. Visitability for 3 or 4 units

7	<p>Amendment: Maintain the visitable standard that addresses the zero-step entrance to the unit, but delete the other three standards that address the interior design of the unit. (33.110.265.E.3., 33.205.040.C.5, 33.270.200) [Bachrach]</p> <p>Rationale: The interior standards may discourage development of a third or fourth unit in some situations, and it sets an inappropriate precedent to have those types of interior design standards regulated by the zoning code rather than the building code.</p>	<p>Staff does not support this change.</p> <p>Goal 5.B Equitable access to housing, and Policy 5.7 Physically-accessible housing call to support a supply of housing to meet the needs of older adults and people with disabilities. Ideally these standards would be in the building code, but they are not. The PSC has discussed including advocacy for changes to the State Building code as a topic for consideration in the transmittal memo. In the meantime, requiring this in the zoning code will create more visitable units in the city.</p>
----------	--	--

5. R5 Historically Narrow Lots

8	<p>Amendment: Allow a 1,500 s.f. minimum base (or 0.6 FAR) for R5 historically narrow lot development. (33.110.260) [Bachrach]</p> <p>Rationale: The proposed FAR for R5 is 0.5 for a single house. On 2,500 square foot lots, this equals 1,250 square feet, which is inadequate for a 3-bedroom house.</p>	<p>Staff does not support this change.</p> <p>The main regulatory benefit of rezoning historically narrow lots from R5 to R2.5 is to provide clarity about development allowances and expectations. The PSC directed staff to create two variations on the theme: R2.5 for half the lots and R5 with the ability to confirm lot lines for the other half the lots. This amendment creates a third variation: R5 with a different FAR limit. With this amendment, the remaining difference between the R5 and R2.5 zones for the historically narrow lots is 250 square feet of floor area, and a 5-foot lower height limit (30 vs 35 feet).</p>
----------	--	---

7. and 11.b Small Flag Lots and Alleys		
<p>9</p>	<p>Amendment: Create an exception for property line adjustments that create a small flag lot to remove alley frontage for an existing house (33.677.100.A and D.) [Spevak]</p> <p>Rationale: On lots that have alley access, the proposed regulation that restricts property line adjustments from removing alley access can limit the ability for the small flag lot to be created.</p>	<p>Staff is supportive of this change.</p> 
10. Address building features and articulation		
<p>10</p>	<p>Amendment: Limit the current window matching requirement on attached houses (in the R20-R5 zones) to street facing windows only. (33.110.265.C.1.d) [Spevak]</p> <p>Rationale: Provides greater flexibility for building design for attached house facades that are less visible to the street</p>	<p>Staff does not support this change. These standards ensure that both halves of the attached house are complementary with each other and appear as a single unified structure. Well-designed infill has a greater community acceptance.</p>
11. Modify parking rules		
<p>11</p>	<p>Amendment: Move “fourplexes” from “all other use parking standards” to the “parking development standards for houses, duplexes, and triplexes” (33.266.130). [Spevak]</p> <p>Rationale: Puts all of the parking standards that are applicable to allowed housing types in single dwelling zones in one place.</p>	<p>Staff is supportive of this change.</p>

Miscellaneous Technical Code Amendments		
12	<p>Amendment: Miscellaneous technical fixes. [Spevak]</p> <p>Rationale: Correct commentary and code for consistency, clarity, or accuracy.</p>	Staff is supportive of these fixes. Specific revisions will be presented with final package of amendments.
Topics for Transmittal Letter to City Council		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Advocate for parking permit program support (restrict permits for sites with off street parking) 2. Develop a curb cut fee/curb tax proposal 3. Pursue a local exception to State building code to allow Portland to require visitability on all new single dwellings. 4. Consider SDC waivers as they apply to ADUs/smaller units in light of the new housing options being proposed. (max SDC waiver = 2 ADUs) 5. Direct BPS to initiate a project to create a streamlined, less costly partition process. 6. Evaluate additional changes to the Tree Code to better address small lot development. 	