

# Better Housing by Design Project

## Decisions and Follow-Up from October 9th PSC Work Session

### Topic 1: Eastern Portland deep rear setbacks

- PSC supports staff proposal.
- Follow-up: Some concern about whether the regulation providing an exception for large common areas elsewhere on sites (such as central courtyards) is practical and clearly written. Staff will do some code modeling of the regulation and will solicit commissioner Schultz's input on how the clarity of the regulation could be improved.

### Topic 2: Eastern Portland minimum site frontage requirements

- PSC supports staff proposal.
- Follow-up: Undertake analysis to identify how many narrow/deep properties are already developed or flanked by properties that are substantially developed. Confirm extent to which the regulations would have a real impact (not so useful if the requirement is mapped in areas where they would apply to only a small number of properties that are likely to develop). Also, consider what can be done to provide incentives to encourage small lots to be consolidated.
- Follow-up with PBOT: Some concern about effectiveness of the related street connectivity approaches. Concern that the approaches are too haphazard and opportunistic, with uncertainty as to how long it will take for incremental street dedications to result in complete connections. Knowing an area has been identified as needing new street connections could be a deterrent to developers who will want to avoid being the "first one in" and subject to street dedication requirements. Can more be done to make it attractive for developers to provide a street, such as less expensive requirements or funding?

### Topic 3: Reduced minimum parking requirements and accessible parking issues

- PSC supports staff proposal (small site parking exemption and reduced parking ratios on larger sites).
- Follow-up with PBOT: Consider allowing on-street disabled parking spaces to be requested by other people besides just property owners, such as residents. What are the reasons for not allowing an on-street disabled parking space to be reserved for a particular individual?  
  
Consider whether TDM requirements could be applied more broadly, to areas outside frequent transit buffers that are fairly close to transit (such as Jade District multi-dwelling areas, which are surrounded by frequent transit corridors (82<sup>nd</sup>, Division, Powell).

### Topic 4: Small site thresholds

- Increase the small site threshold from 7,500 SF to 10,000 SF (applies to regulations for parking, accessory structures, setback landscaping).

**Topic 5: Consistency between multi-dwelling and commercial zone parking requirements**

- Amend the commercial/mixed use zones parking requirements outside frequent transit areas to be consistent with the multi-dwelling zone proposals:
  - Change the small site threshold to 10,000 SF
  - Reduce the minimum required parking ratio on larger sites to 1 space for every 2 units

**Other requests or follow-up items:**

1. Regarding SDC waivers for affordable housing, would like to know if these were figured into inclusionary housing economic feasibility modeling.