

SMILE LAND USE COMMITTEE

Meeting Notes

April 4, 2018

Land Use Committee members present: David Schoellhamer, Miriam Erb, Vikki DeGaa, Francisco Salgado, Rocky Johnson, and Shari Gilevich. The meeting was attended by four area residents. Chair Schoellhamer called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM.

Discussion on Residential Infill Project, April 2018 summary

David provided an update of the Residential Infill Project (RIP), the April 2018 Project Summary, and noted changes from the October 2017 summary. (*Link to Residential Infill Project Summary: <https://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/678802> .*)

The meeting attendees discussed the 11 elements in the Summary.

1.) *Limit the size of structures while maintaining flexibility in the R7, R5 and R2.5 zones.*

We continue to support the building size limits, but have questions about how the FAR standards apply for development on larger lots that are zoned R2.5.

New comment: In the table about FAR standards on page 2, we recommend that a column be added under the R2.5 zone to illustrate how the FAR standards apply on a 5,000 square foot lot that is zoned R2.5.

2.) *Revisions to how the height of structures is measured.*

We continue to support the proposals.

3.) *Improve front setbacks to better reflect those of adjacent houses (R7, R5 and R2.5 zones).*

We continue to support the proposals.

4.) *Improve Building Design (R10, R7, R5 and R2.5 zones).*

The proposal had language changes from the Oct. 2017 version, and now limit how high the front door can be above the ground. The proposal for front façade building articulation was deleted.

We support the revised proposals.

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

This proposal provides for one additional unit on a site if one of the units is "visitable." For example, a parcel could have one house and two ADUs, instead of one ADU. The requirement for a "visitable" unit was amended to require a "no step" entry (the "low step entry" phrase was deleted). The combined FAR allowed for all structures on a site can be used for a triplex; this clarified the language from the October draft.

A new proposal in this section is that onsite parking is not required for any of the "additional housing types" listed. David discussed this proposal with City staff who clarified that this means that one parking space is still required for a development of one house, or one house and one ADU, but that no parking is required for one house and two ADUs, a duplex, a duplex with a detached ADU, or a triplex.

The group discussed the trade-off that by eliminating the driveway for an on-site parking space, an on-street parking space is preserved. The general sense is that the City is pushing for increased housing density and not requiring on-site parking supports that goal. Some members said that there still needs to be a balance on where and how parking should be required or provided.

We support the revised proposals.

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

Our previous comments had some positive effect: the City removed the 'a' overlay from properties along the bluff because of environmental issues (landslide topography). The City also created *Appendix F: Map Refinements to 'a' Overlay by District* to provide additional information about the areas that will be added or removed from the new 'a' overlay boundary.

However, the City did not respond to our request for analysis of the cumulative impact on services and infrastructure of the forecasted growth.

Rocky Johnson volunteered to write a statement about the need to evaluate these impacts and provide the statement to David for our comment. We want to emphasize the need for thorough analyses of the cumulative impact of forecasted growth on city services and infrastructure.

7.) Provide incentives for affordable housing and historic preservation (new 'a' overlay zone).

The proposal is for a bonus FAR of 0.1 if one unit is affordable (this provision replaced the original 'bonus unit' language), or if payment is made in lieu of providing an on-site affordable unit. For example, a corner lot triplex development could also have an ADU if a unit meets the "affordable" standards.

The group had questions about the definition and regulations of affordable housing. David said that the code regulating affordable development is part of the Inclusionary Housing zoning rules.

We continue to support these proposals.

New comment: We request that a description of affordable housing standards, such as rent level and duration that a unit is affordable, be added to the summary document so people can readily understand the requirements to meet affordable standards.

8.) Encourage Cottage Cluster development in all single-dwelling zones.

We continue to support these proposals.

9.) Rezone some historically narrow lots from R5 to R2.5

No comment.

10.) Improve Building design for all narrow lots (less than 32 feet wide)

The proposal continues to state a height limit for detached house and requirement for attached houses on lots 25 feet wide or narrower. However, a major change from the October 2017 discussion draft is that driveways and on-site parking will now be prohibited between a building and a street, while parking behind the building will continue to be

allowed. Access may be located from an alley or, on a corner lot, to the rear of the property. The provision for "tuck-under" garages on attached houses was deleted.

We support these revised proposals for building design on narrow lots.

11.) *Revise rules for the R2.5 zone.* (Note: These 4 proposals were item #12 in the Oct. 2017 document.)

We continue to support these proposals.

Requirement for Neighborhood Contact Meetings

David described the proposed changes: if a development will be greater than 40,000 square feet, then the developer is responsible to host a neighborhood meeting and post an informational sign about the proposal on the site. If a development is between 10,000 square feet and 40,000 square feet, the developer is required only to post an informational sign on the site.

To put that in context for development in our neighborhood, David reviewed development since 2015. He said there were 5 developments greater than 40,000 square feet; under existing contact rules, one development had a required meeting, another development was invited to and attended a neighborhood meeting, and the other three had no meetings. During that period, 11 projects would have required only a sign.

The neighborhood is getting an increase 'd' (design) overlay next month, but the requirement for neighborhood contact meetings because of the overlay are going away.

Vikki and David attended a city meeting about the contact rules and emphasized the reasons to maintain required neighborhood contact meetings because of the 'd' overlay. The City is trying to simplify the process and noted that for many neighborhood groups, the meeting requirement is difficult to manage.

The group discussion was that the neighborhood meetings often are quite productive and result in improvements to development.

Rocky Johnson volunteered to write a statement about the importance and value of the neighborhood contact meeting and will provide that to David.

New comment: We request that the development threshold to require neighborhood contact meetings be set at 10,000 square feet. This threshold would be applied in all zones.

SMILE open house on April 29th: Vikki, Francisco and Shari will staff the land use table. Miriam, David and Vikki are working on materials, such as information on the new zoning that will be effect May 24th.

Shari updated recent development: there is an Early Assist application for K&K Color Lab property with a proposed mixed-use building (ground floor retail, and 19 apartments in 2nd-4th floors).

The comments from the Land Use Committee about the RIP proposals will be presented to the SMILE Board for review and approval at its April 18th meeting. Comments are due to the City by May 15, 2018.

Meeting adjourned at 7:20 PM.