



Lower Southeast Rising Area Plan Project Advisory Committee Meeting #11 April 4, 2023 | 6:30 – 8:00 pm

Meeting Notes

Meeting started at 6:35pm (recording 6:42pm)

Attendance:

Committee Members:

Nancy Chapin, Nick Sauvie, Ben Waterhouse, Pam Hodge, Julie Garner, Anna Weichel, Scott Goodman, Valeria McWilliams, Meesa Long, Tim Williams, Michael Kennedy

City Staff:

Bill Cunningham, BPS; Shane Valle, PBOT; Harrison Husting, BPS; Blessie Saoit, BPS

Guests:

Introductions:

Name, Pronouns, and Ice Breaker: What's blooming near you?

Public Comments:

No public comment

Project Updates:

Bill Cunningham (BPS) presented

Bill provided a review of project goals, updates, and timeline. The PAC and TAC received the Early Review Draft so that the advisory groups can provide feedback that staff will use to refine the plan and produce the Discussion Draft, which will be released to the Public by late April – early May.

Anna Weichsel- Asked for clarification when the plan can be shared with their Neighborhood Association groups and the other members of the public. Bill clarified that the intention is for the plan to be shared with other members of the public during the Discussion Draft phase.

Scott Goodman – Asked if PAC members can be part of the outreach. Bill stated that it would be great if PAC members could help spread the word.

Pam Hodge (from chat) – “The 82nd Avenue parade is on April 29th if you have a group interested in being in it, check out 82RosesCEC.com for an entry form.”

Overview of Early Review Draft – Part 1

Bill Cunningham (BPS) presented.

Bill reviewed of Part 1 of the Review Draft, highlighting material that has is new or revised. Part 1 contains the land use and community development components of the plan, as well as the background for the area and overview of the work that has been conducted during this planning process. BPS decided to scale back the proposed Commercial/Mixed Use (CM2) zoning changes on 82nd Ave, out of concern about losing Employment (EG1) zoned land. Bill asked if there were any comments or initial thoughts for those who had a chance to look at the Review Draft.

Pam Hodge (from chat) – “Can we get access to the appendices e.g., Health Assessment memo (Appendix X)?” Bill said that it is still a draft but will be shared with the PAC.

Meesa Long – Stated that as a resident of Brentwood-Darlington, its hard that Brentwood-Darlington is lumped together with the other neighborhoods in the plan. Brentwood-Darlington has different needs, in terms of infrastructure and business, and Meesa wanted to reiterate that Brentwood-Darlington is the focus area. Bill reaffirmed this statement and mentioned the map at the beginning of the plan that highlights Brentwood-Darlington to convey it as a core focus area.

Nick Sauvie – Encouraged more density of multifamily. As a long-range plan its important to consider what the neighborhood will look like in 20-30 years from now – the plan needs to go bigger with zoning for multifamily. There is also an opportunity around the southern areas around 82nd, near the Springwater Corridor, to be a bike/walk friendly area, but the current Employment (EG1/EG2) zoning doesn’t contribute to this. Bill stated that the zoning in the area mentioned has been a key issue. There is hesitancy to roll back any Employment (EG1/EG2) because of the need for employment land in the city. BPS is being conservative to up zoning to RM1 on 72nd Ave due to the lack of transit service currently there, and because there are no future plans for frequent-service transit, but going to the larger-scale RM2 zone remains a possibility.

Bill Cunningham (BPS) proposed a question to the group. “Do we stick with two to three story scale of multifamily zoning (RM1) on 72nd Ave, or do we go with three to story scale (RM2)?” What are the thoughts of the group?

Julie Garner (from chat) – “If bigger means more commercial retail space, then YES!”

Scott Goodman (from chat) – “Given the long-term plan nature of this plan, I really think planning for more housing capacity makes long term sense, given how bad our housing shortage is right now”

Michael Kennedy – There is a good argument for more density. If there is an opportunity, we should take it now. About the Employment Zoning: Is there a reason why it has to be hemmed in to one area and can’t just be broad? Bill clarified that CM2 zoning on 82nd was trimmed back to be more tightly around Flavel because of the concern of loss of Employment (EG1) land. When you allow for housing type development, residential development tends to outbid employment type development.

Anna Weichsel – Stated that more density along 72nd is really important. Housing density is needed to support more commercial/business opportunities. Anna also stated that there is a lot more that could be included to help build up neighborhood-serving businesses in the area. What else could be part of the development strategy for small business? Bill stated that the best tool has been the Neighborhood Prosperity Initiative, which supports small business retention and development where it is located. This is one of the recommendations for future actions.

Meesa Long (from chat) – “Would the larger sized apts/housing have a parking requirement?” Bill clarified that apartments that met affordability criteria do not need off-street parking. For large sites that are not near transit there are some requirements for parking.

Pam Hodge (from chat) – “With respect to employment focus, is it possible to consider Precision Castparts and the other industrial employers along Johnson Creek (just south of our study area)?” Bill clarified that Employment land is more of a city-wide concern, so it doesn’t matter if there are other employment land nearby. One reason to have a commercial hub at 82nd and Flavel was to serve the many manufactured home parks in the area.

Pam Hodge (from chat) – “With respect to affordable business incubator space, suggest looking at the White Stag building on Harney Drive. Lots of square footage at lower rates.”

Michael (from chat) – “Is there a way to work in disincentives to creating vast areas for parking and incentives converting the existing vast parking lots into housing for people rather than free parking for cars? This would help further housing goals and climate goals if we can begin the process of breaking our car addiction and create a space for humans.”

Bill Cunningham, BPS (response from chat) – “We don't really have an incentive for building housing on parking lots, although our zoning regulations allow building housing on parking lots in commercial or multi-dwelling zones and don't require off-street parking for affordable housing and for small sites (which some cities don't allow unless parking is replaced).”

Early Review Draft – Part 2

Shane Valle, PBOT presented.

Shane provided an overview of part 2. This section is transportation focused, and even though the two sections are separate, they inform each other. The introduction and overview sections are nearly identical. After setting the table with reviewing existing conditions, this section provides project recommendations categorized as either a corridor improvement or neighborhood greenways. Additionally, each project is prioritized with a less than 5 year or greater than 5 timelines. Shane also provided an explanation of the bus network recommendations, and how it has informed TriMet’s Forward Together service update plan.

Meesa Long – Shared frustration with having a Green Line station on Flavel, but no straight bus connection to get to it. There should be a bus on Flavel that take residents to the Green Line. Shane shared that even though new TriMet service is proposed to be added to the area (per Forward Together), that would still not be continuous service on Flavel. It is one of the transit recommendations in the plan for potential future implementation.

Anna Weichsel – Stated that it takes forever to get to downtown from Woodstock. How is TriMet measuring these changes to consider travel time? Shane clarified that the city uses a model that showed the plan’s recommendations improves access. However, TriMet didn’t include all the project’s recommendations in their Forward Together plan.

Shane provided an overview of other program recommendations, including intersection visibility, local street improvements, and Portland in the Streets. The Transportation System Plan classification updates section is under development and will be updated with any land use changes. Additionally, there is a section that discusses funding strategies.

Pam Hodge (from chat) – “With respect to potential future funding sources - LID’s (p. 67), consider deferred payback period (POS) like the current Errol Heights LID.”

Pam Hodge (from chat) – “Finally, with respect to potential future funding sources, why is there no consideration of the creation of a Tax Increment Financing District (TIF) like the approach that was recently approved for Cully? This is needed to fast-track implementation of the study recommendations.”

Nancy Chapin – Shared that the buses don’t serve people who work on the other side of town. As the population of this area is aging, we need to realize that there is still a need for cars. The way that roads are set up are dangerous. The community is getting older. In the names of equity, take into account aging populations who may not be able to bicycle. There aren’t essential services on 82nd Ave for folks who need to walk.

Tim Williams – Asked for clarification about how much influence these recommendations have over TriMet. Shane clarified that this is a place where they can point to for TriMet when they have extra money/service changes.

Anna Weichsel – Shared that there is also a large teenage population that needs to get around on public transportation, and that it is important to keep this population in mind. Anna also asked about any attempts to bring carshare programs into the area. Shane stated that he would need to get back about the carshare.

Julie Garner – Asked for clarification about the future for the streetcar concept plan, and how does that play into transportation planning in this area. Shane shared a link to the concept plan, and that PBOT takes this into consideration when planning for multiple modes of transportation.

Michael Kennedy (from chat) – This used to be a streetcar community. Shame we can’t be again.

Public Engagement Approach for Discussion Draft

Bill Cunningham (BPS) presented.

Bill provided a summary of the public engagement approach, and tools that will be utilized for the Discussion Draft in late April to early June. Bill asked the group about the best ways to ways to reach the community.

Scott Goodman – School engagement with kids. There hasn’t been much engagement with kids

Meesa Long – There are very active social media groups. Brentwood Darlington Connected Families and two others.

Julie Garner (from chat) – “Local farmers markets?”

Anna Weichsel – The ideas of farmers market is really great. Have some material for people to hand out during block parties. This is when people gather and can discuss the future. Also, Woodstock Business Association always has events that bring people out.

Pam Hodge (from chat) – “Other social media (Facebook groups): BD Community Watch, BD Where the Sidewalks End, BD Net Group.”

Scott Goodman – Parks can be a great. BD Community Center doesn’t get a lot of foot traffic, but Brentwood Park gets more foot traffic.

Ben Waterhouse (from chat) – “The Portland Pickles opening day is May 30.”

Julie Garner (from chat) – “Pickles games would be great!”

Meesa Long (from chat) – “Yes, Pam- thanks for writing those. The other one is FB Brentwood-Darlington Connected Neighbors”

Next Steps

- Staff will refine Draft plan based on PAC and TACT input
- Public release of Discussion Draft (late April)
- Discussion Draft Public engagement (late April – early June)
- Next Pac meeting possibly in June to review public feedback.

Sponge City and Rainwater Typologies – PSU Design Studio

Anna Weichsel presented

Anna provided an overview student work from the Portland State graduate architecture design studio from 2021 and 2022. There were seven projects that were highlighted, that used the Lower Southeast Rising. In 2021 the focus was on 52nd and 72nd, and in 2022 the focus was on connecting greenspace. The project varied in design and concepts that included canopy development, rainwater capture, food production, permaculture, green streets, seasonal community centers, biodiversity, and co-habitation.

Pam Hodge (in chat) – “Excellent ideas, Anna. Bill, is there a way to include these ideas in the LSE Area Rising report vis-a-vis the City’s climate action policies?”

Bill Cunningham (response in chat) – “We can look into the idea of including the students' ideas in the plan in some way, perhaps as an appendix.”

Meeting ended at 8:20 pm