

SCALE		
	FAR	
1	<p>Clarify “Floor area ratio”:</p> <p>The maximum FAR allowed for a duplex in the R2.5 zone is the same as for attached houses in the R2.5 zone.” (V.2 p. 93. 33.110.270.E.4)</p> <p>how does this relate to duplexes in R2.5 (corners, mid-block). (Spevak)</p>	<p>FAR in the R2.5 zone is 0.5 for detached houses.</p> <p>This was intended to address the large number of 5,000 sf lots that are being rezoned to R2.5 which would allow a single 3,250 sf house.</p> <p>The FAR is 0.7 for attached houses, as these are generally on smaller (~2,500 sf) lots.</p> <p>The code includes clarification that duplexes (allowed on lots larger than 3,200 s.f. including corner lots) are permitted the higher FAR, as these are ostensibly the same as two attached houses each on smaller lots.</p>
2	<p>What happens to existing homes that are larger than the FAR limits?</p> <p>Do they become "non-conforming" in some way? What are the implications? (Smith)</p>	<p>Existing homes that exceed FAR limits are considered “non-conforming development” and can be rebuilt if destroyed by fire, etc. in the same footprint as the original structure.</p> <p>The proposal also allows a single addition up to 250 sf in every 5-year period regardless of FAR to simplify implementation, especially for small additions, and allow for flexibility and adaptability of houses over time.</p>
3	<p>There are concerns about the number of additional units that would be created under residential infill. In particular there are concerns that the financial incentive to build multiple units is too small.</p> <p>Could we see models of how reducing the FAR for single family homes might change the financial incentive? (Oswill)</p>	<p>We have conducted the feasibility analysis on the Proposed Draft and thus do not have prototypes evaluated to review for a smaller single family structure relative to two-unit or three-unit prototypes. However, the likelihood of development outcomes (single family, duplex, triplex) is most closely correlated to total FAR allowance, not unit allowances. Therefore, if the proposed FAR allowance for a single family structure were to decrease while maintaining the proposed FAR allowance for a duplex or triplex, then the likelihood of development for the duplex or triplex would increase even more.</p>

<p>4</p>	<p>How do the FAR limits for accessory structures impact ADU size?</p> <p>a. If 800 sq ft is the current maximum ADU size. Would the proposal reduce that in any cases?</p> <p>b. Would FAR limits make ADUs above garages virtually impossible? (Smith)</p>	<p>Under current code, several provisions combine to regulate the maximum size of a detached ADU:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An external ADU may be 75% of the living area of the primary structure or 800 s.f. whichever is less. • The total lot coverage for all accessory detached structures (ADU, garage, studio, etc) may be no more than 15% of total lot area. • Maximum height is limited to 20 feet, when the structure is outside the required setbacks. <p>Under these current rules, if the house is less than 1,066 sf or the lot is less than 2,666 sf, the detached ADU would be smaller than 800 sf.</p> <p>Under the proposed FAR rules, the size of an ADU still depends on the living area of the primary structure, but the total size of accessory structures (ADU, garage, studio, etc.) is effectively cut in half. (rather than 15% building coverage x 2 stories tall, the square footage is limited to 15% of the lot size).</p> <p>The proposed code calculates the amount of accessory structures allowed based on “floor area” rather than “living area”. This can also have the effect of reducing the size of ADUs below what is allowed today. The differences are summarized in the table below.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="989 1008 1824 1304"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">What is counted in Floor Area vs Living Area</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th>Floor Area</th> <th>Living Area</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Exterior walls</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Basements</td> <td>No</td> <td>Not if less than 6’8”</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Attics</td> <td>Not if less than 6’8”</td> <td>Not if less than 5’</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Garages</td> <td>Yes, if not in basement</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Area not accessible by stairway</td> <td>Yes, if taller than 6’8”</td> <td>No</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	What is counted in Floor Area vs Living Area				Floor Area	Living Area	Exterior walls	Yes	No	Basements	No	Not if less than 6’8”	Attics	Not if less than 6’8”	Not if less than 5’	Garages	Yes, if not in basement	No	Area not accessible by stairway	Yes, if taller than 6’8”	No
What is counted in Floor Area vs Living Area																							
	Floor Area	Living Area																					
Exterior walls	Yes	No																					
Basements	No	Not if less than 6’8”																					
Attics	Not if less than 6’8”	Not if less than 5’																					
Garages	Yes, if not in basement	No																					
Area not accessible by stairway	Yes, if taller than 6’8”	No																					

Height		
5	How is height measured for zero-lot-line gabled houses, where each unit technically has a shed roof and ridge lies on the property line? V. 2, p. 75. 33.110.260.C. (Spevak)	The code measurement is based on the roof type (gable roof, shed roof), not the housing type (detached house, attached house). A property line that divides a single structure along the roof line of a gable roof does not change that structure's type of roof to two connected shed roofs.
Setbacks		
6	What's the difference between Figure 920-18. B & J? (figure V2 p. 231) (Spevak)	Figure 920-18 B shows setback <i>averaging</i> (midpoint distance between farther setback house and closer house). Figure 920-18 J shows setback <i>matching</i> (closest distance between farther setback house and closer house)
Main entrance		
7	Is new work required to bring non-conforming development into compliance? If the primary dwelling's main entrance doesn't comply with C1 (V.2. p. 45) and you want to add a basement or 2 nd floor ADU, would that trigger a requirement to bring the primary dwelling's main entrance into compliance? (Spevak)	No. The main entrance would be non-conforming. So long as the main entrance is not being altered, it would not be required to be brought into conformance.
8	How is "Solid" defined for porch roofs (V.1, p. 45. 33.110.235 C.)? For example, would clear twin-wall plastic or other translucent material count? A roof with skylight (to let light through)? (Spevak)	A "solid" porch roof is one that is not permeable to water. "Solid" does not mean opaque to light in this case.

<i>Impervious surface limits</i>		
9	<p>One piece of testimony addressed the issue of impervious surface. Is there anything in the current proposal that specifically regulates impervious surface? If not, what if any existing regulations would apply? (Smith)</p>	<p>No, the proposal does not include new restrictions on impervious area limits. Impervious area is partly limited by building coverage standards (but not entirely)</p> <p>This question of whether to add new limits was raised with BES and our environmental planning section. While there is growing interest in establishing a standard, the issue is very complex, and is further complicated by problems of ensuring compliance.</p> <p>Staff felt that starting with multi-dwelling zones was more appropriate.</p>
HOUSING CHOICE		RESPONSE
<i>Additional Housing Types</i>		
10	<p>I noticed, in testimony, many references to how Seattle is addressing residential infill.</p> <p>I'd like to know a bit more about that proposal, and ideally hear about any initial feedback if available. (Bortollazo)</p>	<p>Most likely, these are references to the Housing Affordability and Livability Agenda (HALA). This was different in that it encompassed more than just zoning tools. And, its zoning proposals for single-dwelling zoned areas focused on up-zoning land in the vicinity of their version of "centers" (a.k.a."villages").</p> <p>For example, R7 becomes R5, R5 becomes R2.5, R2.5 becomes R2, etc. In exchange for the additional development entitlement, <u>all</u> development would pay a CET per square foot for affordable housing.</p> <p>A link to the HALA proposal: http://www.seattle.gov/hala And the Mandatory Housing Affordability proposal (MHA): http://www.seattle.gov/Documents/Departments/HALA/Policy/MHA_Overview.pdf</p>

<p>11</p>	<p>Has the potential impact on utilities of having a bigger house and/or more units been evaluated and discussed with utilities? (Baugh)</p>	<p>We consulted with the utility bureaus. For stormwater, the BES uses impervious area and building coverage as the most significant indicators of impact. The proposal does not change building coverage requirements. It does reduce parking requirements, which lessens the need for adding impervious area (~840 s.f. for 3 cars).</p> <p>Sewer is a function of the number of fixtures and amount of usage. BES notes that sanitary flows from residential single family lots represents a minor portion of the flows on any given pipe.</p> <p>Water service is also a function of fixtures and usage. The water bureau notes that they size service based on the needs for fire flows (fire hydrants), and that residential usage is also a minor portion of their service.</p> <p>Transportation modeling indicates that the reallocation of units from farther out locations to areas better served by transit improves system function, with minor impacts in a few key road segments.</p> <p>See attached letters from Service Bureaus</p>
<p>12</p>	<p>Council just made the SDC waivers for ADUs permanent (at least for those not used for short-term rentals).</p> <p>Has any consideration been given to whether SDC waivers for some types of development in the current proposal could help produce more small units? (Smith)</p>	<p>We have not evaluated SDC waivers as an incentive for production of additional units under RIP. There have been some changes in SDC structure for parks and PBOT that recognizes the distinction between smaller and larger units. SDCs for water and BES are based on fixtures which are typically fewer in smaller units.</p>
<p>13</p>	<p>How are “additional housing options” expected to play out in R3, R2, R1 zones (p. 145 33.405.030) (Spevak)</p>	<p>These existing options from the old ‘a’ are being incorporated into the new ‘a’ overlay, until the Better Housing by Design project proposes to replace them with base zone provisions.</p>

14	Why are [duplexes, attached duplexes, triplexes, and multi-dwelling development] prohibited through PDs in Pleasant Valley when allowed elsewhere in Portland (p.175. 33.564.360)? (Spevak)	The Pleasant Valley Neighborhood Plan was adopted in 1996 and the Plan District Regulations were adopted in 2004. The regulations apply other techniques to encourage housing variety (transfer of development rights and additional land division criteria). Changes to the neighborhood plan foundation and resulting regulations were not evaluated as part of the RIP code update.
15	Do we have any sense of on average or by mode, how many people live in each ADU? Does an ADU generally house 1 person? 2? (Rudd)	According to a survey (http://www.oregon.gov/deq/FilterDocs/ADU-surveyinterpret.pdf) conducted by DEQ: 60% of Portland ADUs were occupied by 1 person, 35% by 2 people, and only 5% by 3 or more. The mean household size was 1.45 overall ADUs, 1.39 in detached ADUs, and 1.52 in attached ADUs
16	What is the policy concern against more than one internal ADU? (Rudd)	<p>We don't have a policy issue with two internal ADU's, apart from the blurred line between what is a house versus a triplex.</p> <p>Of greater impact is that the state building code considers a house with two internal ADUs to be a triplex. Only in the rare case where the units are arranged in a row side-by-side, could they be reviewed as "townhouses" under the 1&2 dwelling building codes.</p> <p>Meeting commercial construction requirements adds considerable expense for both the materials used, as well as fire protection and increased water service (a separate meter is required for fire sprinklers). This seemed out of reach for most homeowners, and staff did not feel it would be utilized frequently.</p>

17	What is staff's response to the comment that under RIP one house will be replaced with two \$800k houses? (Rudd)	<p>The FAR limitation of an interior lot for each unit in a duplex would be 1,250 square feet. As noted in the report on RIP development economics, limiting the size of infill buildings affects land value almost as much as increasing the number of units on a lot. If the value of a new 2,500 sf single dwelling on a lot is \$800,000, this is approximately \$320/sf.</p> <p>At \$800,000 a unit in a duplex would have to sell for \$640 per square foot. From Q1 2013 through Q1 2019 there were 43,471 transactions for detached single family, attached single family and townhouse units, only 25 of these sold for over \$600 per square foot. This means that only .06% of all single family residential transactions in the last 9 years sold at the price point necessary to support an \$800,000 duplex unit of the size being proposed.</p>
Visitability		
18	How would the visitability provisions play out in the flood plain? (Rudd)	As proposed visitability only applies when a 3 rd unit is proposed (i.e. triplex, duplex +ADU, or House with 2 nd ADU). The floodplain is excluded from the proposed 'a', so the visitability requirements never intersect with the floodplain.
19	Have we considered a bonus size allowance in ADU's if the unit is visitable to accommodate the extra SF required for bath/hallways etc? (St. Martin)	This was not considered and is not currently part of the proposal.

	<i>Overlay Map</i>	
20	Concerns about excluding 100-year floodplain outright in Lents and other areas. Could this project provide assistance to homeowners living in the floodplain? (Oswill)	<p>City policy is to reduce and not to encourage development in the floodplain. We expect that there will be more strict limitations on this that result from the final agreement on the BiOP related to the court decision related to reconciling FEMA and ESA requirements.</p> <p>Portland, a National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) participating community, must update local practices to comply with forthcoming rules, or risk exclusion from the NFIP. Participation in the NFIP is necessary to make federally-backed flood insurance available to Portland residents and businesses.</p> <p>The Floodplain Management Update Program is responsible for developing, recommending, and implementing regulations and programs that respond to new FEMA guidance and support ESA-compliant floodplain management, consistent with City goals. Given the importance of current and future NFIP-compliance, it is recommended that development allowances in the floodplain not be amended at this time.</p>
21	Would like to see a map of 'a' overlay and other zoning. (Spevak)	See attached zoning and proposed overlay map

<p>22</p>	<p>Can you tell us what the fire code (or other code) says about dead-end streets and what restrictions that might place on density? (Smith)</p>	<p>The Fire Code (Title 31) provides the Fire Chief authority to establish access standards and requirements. The land division code (Title 33) includes right of way criteria. The provisions of both of these titles apply during street dedication and street construction, not to existing streets.</p> <p>PCC 31.30.010 gives the Fire Chief the ability to increase minimum street widths for adequate fire operations. This standard also specifies that “Dead-end fire department access roads more than 300 feet in length shall include provisions for turning around fire department apparatus within 150 feet of the closed end.”</p> <p>The right of way provisions in the land division code, 33.654.110.B.2, state “In OS, R, C, and E zones, dead-end streets may be provided where through streets are not required. Dead-end streets should <i>generally</i> not exceed 200 feet in length, and should <i>generally</i> not serve more than 18 dwelling units.” (emphasis added).</p> <p>See attached map for location of dead end streets in the City.</p>
<p>23</p>	<p>With regard to the "West Hills" testimony, I looked at the zoning and I see a mixture of R5, R7 and R10. So presumably this is mostly a question (in R5 and R7) about where to apply the a-overlay? Am I understanding that correctly? (Smith)</p>	<p>Correct, the factors used to define the overlay boundary affected which parts of the West Hill areas would be allowed to use RIP housing options</p> <p>The overlay proposal reflects R2.5, R5, and R7 zoning that was within a ¼ mile of frequent transit and/or centers, etc.</p> <p>Though there is a mix of all single dwelling zones in the West Hills (R2.5 – RF), there are only two frequent transit routes (Barbur/B-H highway) and only a few centers with nearby single dwelling zoning (Multnomah, Hillsdale, and West Portland)</p> <p>See attached transit buffer map.</p>

<p>24</p>	<p>What would be the pros and cons of extending RIP to R10 and R20 on the basis of treating ALL single-family zones the same? (Smith)</p>	<p>The lower density single dwelling zones (R10-RF) have traditionally been utilized as tools to reduce development intensity and density in areas with infrastructure or natural resource or hazard constraints. The comp plan recently applied several deliberate down zones in areas susceptible to these issues.</p> <p>If these areas were to be included in the RIP proposal, FARs would need to be evaluated and established. Providing for additional housing types within current development allowances (i.e. no FAR limit) could significantly affect the pace and intensity of proposed new development in these areas.</p> <p>If utilizing the mapping methodology that has been established in the Proposed Draft, careful review of specific overlay boundary determinations would be needed to incorporate these properties.</p> <p>For reference, the following shows RF-R2.5 zoned lots and their proportion of the total single dwelling zones:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="905 764 1780 906"> <thead> <tr> <th>Zone</th> <th>Lots</th> <th>% of SFR</th> <th>Zone</th> <th>Lots</th> <th>% of SFR</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>RF</td> <td>887</td> <td>1%</td> <td>R7</td> <td>32,839</td> <td>22%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>R20</td> <td>2,697</td> <td>2%</td> <td>R5</td> <td>79,911</td> <td>54%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>R10</td> <td>13,073</td> <td>9%</td> <td>R2.5</td> <td>19,804</td> <td>13%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Zone	Lots	% of SFR	Zone	Lots	% of SFR	RF	887	1%	R7	32,839	22%	R20	2,697	2%	R5	79,911	54%	R10	13,073	9%	R2.5	19,804	13%
Zone	Lots	% of SFR	Zone	Lots	% of SFR																					
RF	887	1%	R7	32,839	22%																					
R20	2,697	2%	R5	79,911	54%																					
R10	13,073	9%	R2.5	19,804	13%																					
<p>25</p>	<p>How does the presence of CC&Rs (Covenants, Conditions, and Restriction's) affect the proposals for added housing types?</p> <p>CC&Rs may restrict properties to one dwelling unit per lot. Has the City or Johnson's analysis, incorporated area where property owners would still not be able to use the overlay because of deed restrictions? (Rudd)</p>	<p>CC&R's are private agreements between owners of property in a specified area. To the extent that these covenants are constitutionally valid, they could potentially affect/restrict a property owner's ability to utilize the extra allowances.</p> <p>There is no easy way to identify the active CC&R's across the city and whether or not they would specifically affect the proposed additional housing allowances.</p>																								

Affordability Bonus		
26	<p>How will PHB administer thousands of affordable units? What standards will property owners have to meet? How often will they be reviewed to ensure they're still habitable? (Baugh)</p> <p>How is long term affordability ensured? (Rudd)</p>	<p>PHB is not anticipating thousands of units to be generated through the proposed bonuses. Nevertheless, staff is looking at ways to make the program scalable to address increased demand. With new construction, initial habitability is ensured through the permit and inspection process. Longer term habitability is addressed through a complaint basis.</p> <p>Long term affordability is ensured through deed restrictions and compliance agreements with the Housing Bureau</p>
27	<p>What are the financial/feasibility implications of 80 versus 60% MFI requirement? (Baugh)</p>	<p>Outreach and engagement with affordable housing providers indicated that 80%-100% MFI were the appropriate income targets for ownership units in the bonus structure. These MFI levels are also aligned with PHB financial incentives for affordable homeownership that include the HOLTE program and SDC waivers.</p> <p>Generally, a reduction in affordability targets from 80% to 60% would decrease feasibility by approximately 27%. Setting the MFI target for the RIP affordability bonus at 60% would decrease utilization of the bonus.</p>
28	<p>Reviewing the summary of affordability incentives (Vol 1, p 27) Does this mean that there aren't affordability provisions for the flag lots or development on skinny lots etc. parts of RIP? (Rudd)</p>	<p>Lots must be a minimum size to qualify for the additional RIP housing types. (R2.5 3,200sf; R5 4,500sf; R7 6,300 sf) If they are not, then the affordability bonuses are likewise not available. But it is not specific to narrow or flag lots, just lot size.</p>
29	<p>Is there an ability to get a simulation showing an elevation view of the triplex with an ADU on a corner concept? To the extent the second ADU is inside the main dwelling I think people can envision that based on existing developments. The triplex with ADUS is harder to visualize. (Rudd)</p>	<p>See attached Triplex with ADU example.</p>
30	<p>Wants to see a more robust set of incentives and programs to fold into this proposal and expand the opportunity to those areas, especially on the east side of town (Bortolazzo).</p>	<p>Staff anticipates that this will be a topic of much discussion amongst commission members. The proposal reflects staff's thinking about what may be feasible given current economic, programmatic, and funding constraints</p>

31	<p>I don't get the policy logic of the affordability bonus clause (p. 159 33. 405.070.B.).</p> <p>It seems to say that if you build 2 ADUs, the primary structure gets to be larger than would otherwise be allowed. I can see the argument for bonus FAR, but not why it could <u>only</u> be used for the primary structure. (Spevak)</p>	<p>The bonus area allowed for affordable units would encourage larger affordable units in the primary structure and help maintain the form of the primary structure being larger than accessory structures. Moreover, the size of the ADU can't get much larger without maxing out at 800 s.f.</p> <p>Some jurisdictions allow for "tandem houses" (i.e. two primary structures located back to back on a lot), but this is not part of the additional housing types being proposed.</p>
32	<p>What is the duration of the affordability requirement? (Spevak)</p>	<p>There are two different tenure scenarios to consider: ownership (generally shorter duration) and rentals (generally longer duration). PHB is still evaluating this question to determine the appropriate requirement.</p>
33	<p>What is staff's position on the argument that you need four units to make affordability pencil? (Rudd)</p>	<p>It is the combination of FAR allowances and unit allowances that get the affordability bonus to work. The affordability bonus on the corner lots is related to both the 4 unit allowance as well as the additional .15 extra FAR entitlement. If we were to allow four units within a restricted FAR on the interior R5 lots, that may still not make development feasible for the affordability bonus. FAR is the biggest driver of development feasibility, not unit allowances.</p>
<i>Displacement mitigation</i>		
34	<p>When you don't lead with equity and anti-displacement it's hard for it to show up later. In the previous briefings we heard direct examples from past about starting with investments about then following up with programs that didn't materialize successfully. Saying we'll add something later without a detailed funding plan seems difficult. (Oswill)</p> <p>Noting Andre's comment at the 4/24 meeting, I'd like to add to my comment that both a funding as well as more thorough program strategy are needed for anti-displacement. (Oswill)</p>	<p>Agreed. This is the reason for staff's cautious approach.</p> <p>There are some existing programs, but these are either tailored to multifamily renters (vs homeowners or single-family home renters) or they are not sufficiently funded to account for the current demand. Other program proposals are new and would need to be developed.</p> <p>Our obligation is to meet the policies of the comprehensive plan which call for identifying displacement risk and proposing strategies to mitigate for the increased displacement potential.</p> <p>The RIP proposal is an attempt to "avoid" changes in vulnerable areas, since we lack a more robust set of tools to mitigate, until or unless those programs become reality.</p>
35	<p>Unimproved streets – trying to understand if PBOT would still require improvements for new</p>	<p>The property owner has the choice of constructing improvements to current City standards or pay the Local Transpiration Improvement Charge (LTIC) as a condition</p>

	<p>development (e.g., flag lot, ADU), and if so, concerned that having enough redevelopment on a street puts you in a Local Improvement District situation that could push people out because its expensive. (Baugh)</p>	<p>of building permit approval or a partition final plat for new single-family construction in single-family zones of three or fewer lots (partitions included) on streets without curbs and sidewalks classified as Local Traffic Streets.</p> <p>PBOT had previously required Waivers of Remonstrance when standard improvements were not constructed. When a majority of property owners in the LID boundary agree to participate in (or have waived their right to remonstrate against) the LID, then an LID may be formed. While, the waiver obligated the owner to participate, even when 51% of property owners in the boundary support the LID with waivers, owners would still protest the cost at council hearings. That is why the LTIC was established, in order to put the costs up front, rather than at some future date.</p> <p>Current ADU practice is to ask for improvements if there is adequate ROW, but not to seek ROW dedications. The LTIC is not currently an option for these situations.</p>
<p><i>Cottage Clusters</i></p>		
<p>36</p>	<p>The Commentary (V.2, p. 116) says that there’s language “adding clarification to align the proposals that allow accessory dwelling units (ADUs) in conjunction with detached units in multi-dwelling development PDs as well as the provision to allow a detached ADU with a duplex in a revised “a” overlay zone”, but I couldn’t find code language that actually does this (particularly the 2nd part), at least in the referenced code section on the opposite page. (Spevak)</p>	<p>This commentary is incorrect and should have been deleted. The provisions to allow a second ADU are provided in the overlay chapter, and were not needed in this chapter (33.205 – Accessory Dwelling Units).</p>

<p>37</p>	<p>What is the trigger in Planned Developments (PDs) to apply Multi-Dwelling internal circulation standards (path widths, connectivity to all structures on the property and to property entrances...) to PD development in Single-Dwelling zones?</p> <p>I see that this has been added to some of the evaluation criteria, perhaps because it wasn't clear enough before? (Spevak)</p>	<p>In the RF through R2.5 zones there are no standards related to internal pedestrian circulation, as there are in the multi-dwelling or mixed-use base zones. When non-single dwelling development is proposed through a PD in these single dwelling zones, there is insufficient criteria to address the lack of circulation standards.</p> <p>The proposed PD criterion calls for “an accessible route”. This is defined in the zoning code as: “A route that can be used by a disabled person using a wheelchair and that is also safe for and usable by people with other disabilities.”</p> <p>Specifics of path widths, materials, and length of connections that are specified in the multi-dwelling and mixed-use zones are not part of this criterion.</p>
-----------	--	--

NARROW LOTS

<p><i>R2.5 rules</i></p>		
<p>38</p>	<p>Regarding the small flag lot house size restriction: Why not let someone build two full size homes on the site? If house in back is too small, people could still take main house down and build two houses on it. (Spevak)</p>	<p>Some jurisdictions allow “tandem houses” like you describe. The RIP approach uses structure size to mediate how infill fits into an existing development pattern. Two side-by-side “attached houses” sit toward the front of the lot, maintaining a larger open back yard area consistent with more traditional single dwelling development.</p> <p>Flag lots allow for additional housing, true, but come with less desirable separation and isolation of the home from the public realm and adjacent neighbors. They can also negatively affect privacy of adjacent lots.</p> <p>As ADU’s have become more prevalent, there has been a growing acceptance of the backyard dwelling units, but not without concerns about structure size and privacy impacts. The proposal attempts to provide for a similar unit type as ADU’s and maintain the form relationship of the larger primary structure to the smaller accessory structure.</p>

39	<p>Why don't we consider R2.5 zone as part of the multi-dwelling zone code update? It would be simpler.</p> <p>The idea that R2.5 is a single-family zone isn't the case anymore. It should be in the same code chapter as multi-dwelling. (Spevak)</p>	<p>R2.5 was originally designed to be an attached single dwelling zone, to transition into rowhouses and other attached dwellings. It's possible that some areas currently zoned R2.5 may be appropriate for the new multi-dwelling zones.</p> <p>This would take a legislative project and public process separate from RIP. It is probably best to start a discussion like this once the new R2.5 and the new multi-dwelling zone definitions and standards are completed.</p>
PARKING		
40	How many lots are served by alleys? (Bachrach)	There are approximately 12,500 lots that abut alleys in the city. Of those, about 10,000 are in the R2.5, R5 and R7 zones See attached map.
41	Please provide a one-pager that describes the parking rules for all the single-dwelling zones and maybe multi-dwelling. (Bachrach)	See attached parking summary.
41	At a certain price point, do we see garages generally included in the PDX single family house market? (Rudd)	<p>Construction of garages in the single dwelling zones has been a function of builder preference and market demand. Site constraints including building coverage maximums and setback requirements on smaller lots have been the driver of single family new development without parking as long as the builder perceives sufficient market demand in locations where parking is not required.</p> <p>With further restrictions on building size, garages would be utilizing more valuable living space square footage, and become less profitable to build.</p>

<p>43</p>	<p>The proposal removes required parking except for 1:1 redevelopment.</p> <p>How would removal of all required parking in the affected zones further or detract from the proposal's goals?</p> <p>How would it further or detract from Comp Plan goals? (Smith)</p>	<p>Project Goals – Removal of minimum parking requirements could reduce the size of infill buildings or increase the amount of usable sf in new houses, and reduce housing development costs.</p> <p>Here are the relevant comp plan parking policies:</p> <p>Comp Plan Policy 4.8 Alleys. Encourage the continued use of alleys for parking access, while preserving pedestrian access. Expand the number of alley-facing accessory dwelling units.</p> <p>Comp Plan Policy 9.58 Off-street parking. Limit the development of new parking spaces to achieve land use, transportation, and environmental goals, especially in locations with frequent transit service. Regulate off-street parking to achieve mode share objectives, promote compact and walkable urban form, encourage lower rates of car ownership, and promote the vitality of commercial and employment areas. Use transportation demand management and pricing of parking in areas with high parking demand. Strive to provide adequate but not excessive off-street parking where needed, consistent with the preceding practices.</p> <p>Comp Plan Policy 9.59 Share space and resources. Encourage the shared use of parking and vehicles to maximize the efficient use of limited urban space.</p>
-----------	--	---

<p>44</p>	<p>What do we know about on-street parking capacity city wide?</p> <p>I get the argument that houses had more occupants in the past. But, adding more independent dwelling units could mean adding more adult residents potentially with cars. (Rudd)</p>	<p>We do not have an inventory of on-street parking citywide.</p> <p>The addition of more households could shift the dynamic of who and how many drivers reside on a particular street. However, there are a number of variables at play. For instance, rideshare has significantly expanded options for households that don't wish to have a car. Autonomous vehicles may have an even larger disruption on car ownership.</p> <p>Additionally, as rents rise we have observed larger houses being occupied by multiple adults as a way to share costs and address increasing rents. So a house with three bedrooms occupied by three couples versus three households each occupied by one couple are ostensibly equivalent.</p> <p>The proposal is not built around an expectation that nobody will drive, but it does prioritize housing for people above housing for automobiles. The city and region have added significant investment in transit and active transportation. We do not want to be planning for a city that affords the greatest convenience to single occupant vehicles. Our infrastructure and dollars cannot support it. This is one of the reasons why transit is a key component of the overlay mapping.</p>
<p>45</p>	<p>a. Electric Car charging and curb cuts/garages and street parking - how can these all co-exist?</p> <p>b. Are there rules for running electric cords across the sidewalk to charge your car?</p> <p>c. What are the rules for installing charging stations in the public right of way? (St. Martin)</p>	<p>a. As autonomous vehicles come online, the charging infrastructure locations will look very different then they do now. Cars will be able to charge themselves in an off-site location. Induction charging automatically charges the vehicle as the car goes over a specific area on the street is starting to be rolled out. There are also a growing number of charging stations being added to workplace and commercial parking garages. Additionally, changes in battery technology will make longer trips between charging possible.</p> <p>b. Trip hazards like extension cords are not allowed in the right of way.</p> <p>c. PBOT is currently evaluating and developing proposed rules to add charging stations in the right of way.</p>

MISCELLANEOUS		
	<i>Economic Report</i>	
46	<p>I'd be interested in sitting down with the appropriate staff to go through the economic modelling in more detail? (Smith)</p> <p>Can I get a link to the Johnson economic report? (Rudd)</p>	<p>We will include a more detailed discussion of the economic analysis as part of the PSC worksessions.</p> <p>See the Johnson Economic Report here: https://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/678769</p>
	<i>Zoned capacity/growth scenarios</i>	
47	<p>In written testimony I'm hearing a theme emerge that we have "sufficient zoned capacity" to meet our housing needs.</p> <p>Of course zoned capacity is only an upper limit on what the market and other driving forces will actually build. I suppose someone could make the counter-argument "just add one more story to every CM zone and you'll get the same number of units".</p> <p>What evidence do we have that RIP will tap into different development motivations or pools of capital than multi-family or mixed-use development will so that this is really incremental? (Smith)</p>	<p>The 2015 Growth Scenarios Report found that there is adequate zoned capacity to meet our projected housing need, <i>in terms of having a sufficient supply of land to support the needed supply of residential units</i>. The comp plan provides capacity for 267,000 units.</p> <p>The Growth Scenarios Report also notes that while there is sufficient capacity, there is <i>a lack of housing type and choice</i> provided by the plan.</p> <p>The vast majority of this zoned capacity (89%) is in only 15% of the city land area - mixed-use and multi-dwelling zoned areas. The remaining 11% capacity is spread throughout the single dwelling zones, which account for 43% of the city land area.</p> <p>The Growth Scenarios report advises adding more zoning to allow for duplexes, townhomes and low density multi-dwelling development types through subsequent planning efforts.</p> <p>RIP accomplishes this while simultaneously easing constrained capacity within the single dwelling zoned area of the city, which will be ever more important in future planning periods.</p>

<p>48</p>	<p>Did the Comp Plan look at housing choice and how we did on supply of single family housing for people with that preference?</p> <p>I understand that our Comprehensive Plan analysis looked at amount of needed housing but did not look at housing choice (i.e. x new residents are anticipated and y% would like to live in single family housing.)</p> <p>Since we don't have a locally specific number is there some generally accepted/scholarly percentage we could reasonably assume in the absence of a local number? (Rudd)</p>	<p>The Comp Plan looked at housing variety and choice. The 2015 Growth Scenarios report included information about projected households across 8 various income groups. The housing types that are affordable to each of these income groups is also evaluated. There is a forecast demand for about 26,000 single family units (including townhouses and rowhouses). See pages 49-53 in the report for more information: https://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/531170</p>
<p><i>Project Goal</i></p>		
<p>49</p>	<p>What does staff believe success under RIP will look like in 5 years? 10? (Rudd)</p>	<p>The stated goal of the project is to update the single dwelling zoning rules to better meet the changing housing needs of current and future residents.</p> <p>This means increasing housing options, especially in locations that are already well-served by services and amenities, to accommodate our changing demographics – aging population, reduced household sizes – in addition to the growing number of people seeking housing at a wider variety of price points.</p> <p>It also means limiting the size of houses so that they better fit into and complement the general scale of development in existing neighborhoods.</p>