

Decisions and Follow-Up from September 25th PSC Work Session

Topic 1: Multi-dwelling zone FAR and scale

- PSC supports staff proposals

Topic 2: Historic district bonuses and transfers

- Amend proposal to not exclude historic or conservation districts from any of the bonuses or FAR transfer provisions (including the deeper housing affordability bonus).
- Follow-up: ask PSC about whether they want to provide consistency by also allowing bonuses and FAR transfers in historic districts in the commercial/mixed use zones (where currently not allowed). *Address during November 13th work session.*
- Need broader conversation about historic district bonuses and scale allowances (Historic Resources Code Project? Discussion with Landmarks Commission?)

Topic 3: RM4 zone 100' height

- Expand the RM4 100' building height allowance, which applies to locations within 1,000 feet of transit stations, to also apply within 500 feet of streets with frequent transit service (20-minute peak hour service), but exclude historic/conservation districts.
- Follow-up: confirm with PSC if historic/conservation districts are to be entirely excluded from the 100' height allowance, or if their intention is to continue allowing 100' height in historic districts within 1,000 feet of transit stations. *Address during November 13th work session.*

Topic 4: Pre-existing density transfers

- Amendment request pulled by commissioner Spevak.
- Follow-up: look into how many properties with previously approved unit density transfers are affected by the change to FAR, get clarity from City Attorney about the status of these transfer covenants, and notify affected property owners of the changes (*post adoption*).

Topic 5: Minimum density requirements

- Modify the minimum density requirements to reduce minimum required density by two units when an existing residential structure (house?) is being preserved.
- Follow-up: Is the original proposal to allow units to be added to an existing structure without coming into full conformance with minimum density still needed (what about a house-to-duplex conversion on a site with a minimum density of 5 units)? Or, is this situation addressed by the new proposed minimum density requirement? *Address during October 9th (time permitting) or November 13th work session.*

Other requests or follow-up items:

1. Need follow-up project(s) to reconsider mapping of the multi-dwelling zones. Concerned that the zones are not always in the right places. There should be more RM1 and RM2 zoning in inner areas (will be very helpful for accommodating affordable housing).
2. Want the November meeting to consider the possibility of not requiring side setbacks for multi-dwelling zone properties adjacent to mixed-use zoning along corridors.
3. Would like future projects to work on making sure that locations with multi-dwelling zoning in East Portland will be close to services.
4. Need future monitoring of where the FAR transfers end up being used. Concerned about some locations ending up with concentrations of larger buildings.