

THE CITY OF
PORTLAND



OREGON

OFFICE OF
PUBLIC SAFETY

CHARLES JORDAN
COMMISSIONER

1220 S.W. FIFTH AVE.
PORTLAND, OR. 97204
503 248-4682

MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 23, 1975

TO: Commissioner Charles Jordan

FROM: Ms. Jan L. Batiste *Jan*

SUBJECT: Planning Commission Staff Report on the Model
Cities Comprehensive Policy Plan

The Staff report prepared by Dennis Wilde of the Planning Commission staff is based on the original Model Cities Comprehensive Plan completed in June 1973 by Dennis Wilde. Dennis was under contract for \$25,000. The staff report has caused concern in the Model Neighborhood in terms of the Planning Commissions procedures for addressing non Land Use policies. Policies of Social Services, recreation and Law and Justice were deferred by the Planning Commission staff to the appropriate City bureaus. The Model Cities Citizens Planning Board opposed the practice of excluding all non Land Use policies from the Model Cities District Plan. The Citizens Planning Board also opposed the process of elimination policies without justification. It was of general consensus that the Planning Commission recommendations to the Council should include all of the original policies of the Model Cities Plan with the recommendation that all non Land Use policies be referred by Council to the appropriate City agency.

The Planning Commission resolved the issue of the loss of comprehensiveness intended by neighborhoods by instructing the Planning Commission staff to address all policies and to make recommendations to adopt, eliminate or to defer to specific City agencies. A recommendation to eliminate must include justification. The primary issue has been preserving the comprehensiveness intended by the CP Board and Neighborhood Model Associations.

Policy 5 as recommended by the Planning Commission staff was of concern to homeowners and residents who would like to see greater homeownership in the area. Residents support preserving single family dwellings. Commercial developers support increased density in the Model Neighborhood. Increased density is necessary for increased commercial development specifically along the Union Avenue Corridor. It was felt that Policy 5 is inconsistent with current zoning practices in the neighborhoods. The Planning Commission instructed the staff to revise Policy 5 to reflect greater flexibility for preserving homeownership in some areas and increased density in other areas of the Model Neighborhood that experience little homeownership.

The original policies proposed are in areas of Citizen participation in planning, amendments to comprehensive plans, access of information, youth programs, day care facilities, Portland Public Schools, citizens participation and planning for community schools, health services, senior citizens services, recreation, community facility, Law and Justice, continuation of existing Model Cities funded programs, land use, housing development, relocation and housing replacement, economic development, affirmative action, manpower, transportation and the development of Union Avenue.

The recommended seven policies of the Planning Commission staff are in areas of neighborhood planning and yearly review procedures, amendments to the District Plan in land use areas, proposed facility location, housing development, housing and commercial rehabilitation and the establishment of an office of Small and Minority Business Enterprises.

Areas of transportation such as Streets programs and the concept of "Q" Zone to protest against incompatible development were recommended as areas for further study.

It is my recommendation, Commissioner that all policies of the original plan be submitted to the City Council for consideration with recommendation to defer non Land Use policies to specific bureaus for disposition.

JLB:mb

MEMORANDUM

TO: Charles Jordan
FROM: Jan Batiste 
RE: Model Cities Comprehensive Plan

The proposed policies of the Model Cities Plan adopted by the planning commission cover areas of social, economic and physical issues. Policies range from affirmative action in city hiring to day care, Social Programs for Youth and Senior Citizens and neighborhood rehabilitation and stabilization. The intent of this plan is to "act as a district framework for neighborhood planning". It is the intent of the Planning Commission that this plan provide direction for future city activities in the area. The draft plan was published in June 1973 and submitted to the Planning Commission for review and recommendation to council. See page 11, paragraph 2 for a brief discussion of events between its submission in June 1973 to today. The Planning Commission recommends adoption of 19 policies and refers the remaining 52 for consideration by the council. Originally a total of 87 policies were recommended.

Following is my analysis and recommendation of each policy statement.

Policy A: It is my understanding that for any district plan in the event of a deviation from the adopted policy the Neighborhood Organization is consulted and public hearing may be held. Therefore, this policy statement may be unnecessary. If not, it should probably be a city-wide policy pertaining to all neighborhoods. It may best be dropped and addressed in city-wide goals of the comprehensive plan.

Policy B: The city currently implements Citizens Budget task forces.

Rec: This Policy Statement should have been eliminated by the Planning Commission.

Page 2

Policy C: This Policy calling for public notification of hearing is unnecessary. This is required by LCD for the Comprehensive Plan and is a general practice and policy of council. It is redundant.

Policy D: Given the cost of Day Care and the slow rate of industrial expansion in the area I would hate to see industry discouraged by such a policy.

Policy E: The Eliot II Housing Site is the Senior Housing Project proposed for that area and takes into account these concerns.

Policy F: This is already being done. During 1975 a survey was conducted assessing neighborhood park needs. Also, in preparation for upcoming HCD Programming a need study was conducted through the neighborhood areas to assess need. This policy is irrelevant.

Policy G: I question whether or not the need still exists given numerous park improvement under the HCD Program. Albina, and Dawson Parks have been improved, the Matt Dishman Center and King facility are also available as a recreational resource.

Policy H: I am unaware of any new facilities for the area. A question to be asked is are there any proposed plans for new city facilities in the model neighborhood area.

Policy I: The purpose of a land use plan is to provide direction for decisions. In instances where decisions are made in N. W. the planning staff includes a statement of consistency with adopted policy. This should be included in the purpose statement of the document. Along with this, Policy A refers in revisions, modifications, changes and directives from the plan which should also be referred to in the statement of purpose and application of policy plan.

Policy J: I do not feel that this policy belongs in this document. The question of representation can be dealt with out side of the city council. The N. E. coalition has already been recognized.

Policy K: Speaks to the Union Avenue and neighborhood Plan as a guide for housing development and calls for the establishment of housing needs on a district basis.

It should be the intent of this document to guide all development housing transportation etc. and should be stated as such in the Statement of Intent.

Policy L: This policy calls for increased housing densities. The neighborhood plans call for increased densities in specific areas. This policy will raise issues in areas where the present use and trends may be inconsistent with housing. The neighborhood plans call for increased densities in the Woodlawn area (OK); west on Union between Dekum to Webster Court to 8th (OK) between Skidmore to Schuyler St. between Williams and 7th (OK). An issue which may come up is increasing densities between Knott to Hancock and Williams to Union. The Planning Commission has not looked at current uses, evaluating the impact, or the probability of further housing in this area. This area is suggested by Society for Industrial Realtors for further industrial development.

Down zoning is proposed for areas east of Union to 13th south of King School to Freemont. Also for along Alberta Street. The Planning Staff in its recommendation has not provided council with an analysis of the number of units effected for current uses in the area. In my opinion action to Down zone or increase densities should call for at least a cursory assessment of the current uses.

Policy M: This policy calls for community rehabilitation programs. The city has made a substantial committment in this area over the last two years through its HCD Program to make improvements to stabilize and rehabilitate the neighborhood in terms of public services, housing and commercial rehabilitation. This policy is really unnecessary and is only a statement of what is occurring.

Policy N: Provides conditions for development causing residential displacement. This policy statement can pertain city wide given our desire to maintain good sound housing.

Policy O: This policy calls for a commitment for capital improvements to allow for increased densities. This policy is necessary if increased densities will cause a severe overload in the area. A good question to ask is does the city plan to make any further capital investment in this area of this type, i.e., sewer, water, etc. Were sewer improvements made in the area proposed for increased density under the HCD Program?

Policy P: This policy is intended to commit the council to developing city-wide housing policies. This will be done under the LCDC Comprehensive Plan process. I wonder if it's appropriate that an area plan dictate city-wide policy??

Policy Q: The intent of this policy is to get the city to promote public assistance housing throughout the city. It calls for the development of criteria, the location of housing, and incentives to encourage low and moderate income housing. Waivering utility hook up fees is proposed as an incentive. This policy can be applied city wide and is not specific to the model neighborhood area. The Planning Commission recommends adoption without the benefit of an assessment of the impact of such an incentive. A question to be asked is whether or not waiver of fees limited to the model neighborhood is possible even though the policy promotes housing city wide. I wonder whether or not this is a loss to the city in revenues? If so, how much? What is the cost/benefit.

Policy R: This policy calls for equal opportunity in housing. It calls for the creation of a housing agency to meet special needs of people, a program for implementing housing equal opportunity objectives and for MHRC to monitor equal opportunity.

This policy again is city wide and should be included in the city's housing policies.

Policy S: The intent of this policy is to commit the city to establish an office of small and minority business assistance. Problems and needs of small and minority businesses are city-wide concerns and should be a part of the city's economic development program. This concern can best be addressed in the comprehensive plan when addressing issues of economic development.

Policy T: This policy is intended to exclude the Rose City Freeway from consideration when making land use decisions in that area. The council should defer transportation policies to the arterial streets policy for the area. This is consistent with treatment given to N. W. when addressing transportation issues.

Policy U: Defers all transportation policies to the arterial streets policy.

SUMMARY

Policies, G--Recreation development as a requirement of all future development; E--recreation facility inclusion in senior housing development; D--a requirement for day care facility in new developments; L--increased housing densities in some areas, and U--deferring transportation planning to the arterial streets policy as the only policies specific to the area. Policies A, C, I, J, K all address issues of neighborhood input and the intent of the plan. This could be stated in a statement of purpose. Policy B is already accomplished by the city. F is done through the HCD process. Policies F, H, M, N, O, P, Q, R, S, are all policies which should be addressed city wide. They do not address an issue specific to the area model cities. The only true policy for adoption is L--increase housing densities. I feel that you are not provided with an assessment of impact nor a description of boundaries, etc. The remaining thirty-one policies are referred to the council for consideration but were not adopted by the Planning Commission.

Page 6

The Commission felt that they were outside of its ability to enforce.

Commissioner it is my recommendation that this document be referred back to the Planning Commission with instruction to look at landuse issues specific to the community and recommend policy for future action. It seems a great waste of public time and money to recommend a document with irrelevant policies or policies unable to implement. Most policies are city wide and have not been narrowed down to this area. Some are currently practice by the city through previous action. These issues if still important in the neighborhoods can be brought up again in the neighborhood issues paper and addressed during the comprehensive plan process. Attached is the document for your review.

cc: Jim McKillip