

**PORTLAND PLANNING COMMISSION  
SUMMARY MINUTES**

July 23, 1996

Members Present: Steve Abel, Rick Holt, Richard Michaelson, Paul Schuback, Ruth Scott.

Members Absent: Sarah ffitch, Bruce Fong, and Noell Webb.

Staff Present: David Knowles, Susan Gregory, Cary Pinard, Robin McIntyre.

Richard Michaelson, President, called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM at the Portland Building in Meeting Room C, 1120 SW Fifth Avenue.

**Director's Report:**

- Governor's Community Solutions Team - Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. revitalization - a lot of the ACP action items may be implemented because the State is providing resources. The plan is to take out the median in a couple test areas, add on-street parking, fund off-street parking lot, and other pilot projects. There is high potential for good things happening.
- The first and second meetings of the sign code task force have been held in the last two weeks, with the goal of examining the impacts of the adopted code amendments on the special interest groups and problem solving.

**Consent Agenda:**

- **Street Vacation – portions of N. Sumner and N. Missouri.**  
Without discussion, the Commission voted 5 to 0 to approve the street vacation request, as recommended in the Staff Report and Recommendation to the Planning Commission, dated July 23, 1996 (included in the agenda). (Aye: Abel, Holt, Schuback, Scott, Michaelson; Absent: ffitch, Fong, Webb)
- **Approval of four minor corrections to the Outer Southeast Community Plan.**  
Without discussion, the Commission voted 5 to 0 to approve the four minor corrections to the Outer Southeast Community Plan, as recommended in the Staff Report and Recommendation to the Planning Commission, dated July 10, 1996, (included in the agenda). (Aye: Abel, Holt, Schuback, Scott, Michaelson; Absent: ffitch, Fong, Webb)

**1. Transportation Planning Rule**

Michaelson explained that the Commission is considering the Transportation Planning Rule in two pieces - building orientation first, and then bicycle parking. Cary Pinard, staff, briefed the Commission on the map packet and responded to questions generated at the meeting on May 28th, 1996.

**Building Orientation - Public Testimony**

- Mark Whitlow, Retail Task Force, 222 SW Columbia #1400, Portland 97204, passed out a handout with colored maps suggesting an alternative to the staff recommendation (attached). Three point proposal: 1) Except for special areas defined in paragraph 3)

(below), do not apply building orientation regulations to transit streets otherwise designated as major city traffic streets or regional trafficways. 2) Except for special areas defined in paragraph 3) (below), apply building orientation regulations on all other transit streets, subject to an adjustment process. 3) Apply building orientation regulations with no or limited opportunity for adjustment to all existing transit commercial zones, in all existing and future pedestrian districts and in light rail station areas.

- Keith Bartholomew, 1000 Friends of Oregon, 534 SW 3rd #300, Portland 97204. Supports staff report. Feels the purpose of the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) is to change the status quo in difficult places by evolution. Since the TPR affects primarily new development, it will take time to see any results, need to start now. The 2040 plan is calling for Portland's population to grow by 50,000 households - Portland needs to prepare for growth and still have an attractive pedestrian environment. Feels the TPR is good way to accomplish this end.
- Steven Hill, Miller, Nash, Wiener, Hager & Carlsen, 111 SW 5th #3400, Portland 97204 Submitted written testimony supporting the Retail Task Force's proposal (attached), which encourages auto-oriented development along major city traffic streets and discourages such development on transit streets that are not major city traffic streets. Their client's biggest concern is moving buildings closer to the street. They feel there are other things you can do to provide a pedestrian environment without moving the building, which makes it more inconvenient for their customers arriving by car.

Hill requested clarification of big box option definition. Pinard responded: single retail stores of 100,000 sq. ft or more (one business) can use the "big box option"; if 100,000 sq. ft building, but several businesses, they need to go through an adjustment (if they follow the design criteria) in order to qualify for the big box option.

- Thomasina Gabriele, Institutional Facilities Coalition, 3334 NW Vaughn, Portland 97210 Submitted written testimony with color maps (attached). Concerned how campuses will meet the intent of the TPR goals, since their boundaries tend to orient internally, instead of externally. OHSU and PSU have a transit street go through their campus. Five campuses are in pedestrian districts. Most campuses already have a firmly established internal pedestrian circulation system either linked to an internal bus route or linking to their edges; however, they do not necessarily comply with the transit street designation relating to main entrances, setbacks, or parking between the transit street and the building.
- Doug Klotz, Willamette Pedestrian Coalition, 2630 SE 43<sup>rd</sup>, Portland 97206. Supports staff proposal. Agrees that action needs to be taken now to stage in a better pedestrian atmosphere as new construction occurs. The problem with excepting major traffic streets (Whitlow's proposal) is that is where the majority of the commercial zoning is in the city - particularly in SW Portland.
- Peter Fry, 722 SW 2<sup>nd</sup> #330, Portland 97204. Feels our strategic timing is backwards. If buildings are required to locate on the property line, it will be difficult to expand the right-of-way in the future if it is decided to add bike lanes, etc. Urged staff to clarify the purpose statements, felt they were not clear. Mentioned that there is little difference between a typical plan and the preferred plan, felt it should not be in the zoning code.

Public testimony on building orientation closed.

Commission discussion:

Scott felt it would be difficult to get an adjustment because the purpose statements are too tightly written. She expressed concern about how institutional facilities would get adjustments.

Holt shares concern about purpose statements, but supports the direction the Commission is going in. Concerned that we strike the right balance between pedestrian and car prioritization, without leaning too far in one direction. Not every street that falls into the building orientation should necessarily be categorized that way. This staff report does not address that item as well as he would like, but feels it is a step in the right direction.

Abel generally supports the proposal. Concerned about purpose statement - it becomes the key to work around those cases where we need adjustments. Feels statement about the maximum setbacks along transit streets (i.e. page 95) can be read as a directive, should be amended to read the maximum setback requirements do ... Makes purpose statement become more aspirational than directive. Also has issue with 100,000 sq. ft. exception - needs clarification about the single user limitation and what it accomplishes.

Schuback agreed with the questions about the 100,000 sq. ft. exception. Agreed with Fry's comments about potential trouble with locating buildings right on the property line - stated example of his building located on Powell, and the dangers with putting too many amenities in too little right-of-way space.

Michaelson felt that staff's map sets general City policy and direction for having building orientation wherever it works, thinks exempting city traffic streets would exempt too many streets where building orientation would work. Felt that in the majority of the cases it will really add to the character of our City, although in a very few cases it might actually be counter-productive to our goals. Very important that purpose statement and the criteria for adjusting it be clarified to give more guidance to staff and the applicant. Indicated that in the past we have regulated buildings, not uses. Expressed concern if we adopt the 100,000 sq. ft. exception and a big box gets divided in the future it will become a nonconforming use.

There was general discussion about the feasibility of institutions using the master plan process to address the building orientation requirements.

The Commission and staff discussed at length the types of items that should be included in the purpose statements. It was agreed to form a subcommittee to review the revised purpose statement to be proposed by staff, have the Planning Commission consider that new statement as a consent item, and send it on to Council.

### **Bicycle Parking**

Staff presented information from their July 15, 1996 memo to the Planning Commission (attached), summarizing the changes made to the last draft. The major change, proposed as a temporary measure, is that bike parking regulations would not be required for existing uses, but would be applied to new development. Another new recommendation is that the required bicycle parking ratio for preservation parking facilities in the Central City Plan district would

change from 1 bicycle parking space per 20 auto spaces to 1 bicycle parking space per 14 auto spaces. Another amendment is to not require bike racks when bicycle parking is provided inside a dwelling or dormitory unit.

**Public Testimony on Bicycle Parking**

- Rick Williams, Lloyd District Transportation Mgt. Assn., 825 NE Multnomah, Portland 97232. Supports staff's present proposal. Agrees with taking non-conforming development threshold off the table, feels it is a bad mechanism to implement the bike rule. Supports preservation parking as a mechanism for implementing bicycle rule for existing buildings. Agrees that citizens advisory committee should be reinstated. Feels strongly that the code must be enforced. Signs and directions to existing bike parking is needed.
- Jim Mark, Melvin Mark Companies, 111 SW Columbia, Suite 1380, Portland 97201. Suggested the City offer a .5 FAR bonus for providing shower and locker facilities. Supports the concept of providing incentives to developers, but feel the bonus needs to be worth pursuing.
- Eric Barker, Bicycle Transportation Alliance, 1922 NE 12<sup>th</sup>, Portland 97212. Submitted written testimony (attached). The BTA does not support the staff report because they feel the requirements fail to meet the needs of the City, and do not meet the spirit of the Transportation Planning Rule.
- Robin White, BOMA, 1211 SW 5<sup>th</sup> #2722, Portland 97204. She feels the long term numbers are workable, and supports the six year review, and the preservation parking aspect. She handed out a matrix sheet titled Bicycle Usage (attached). She believes the matrix shows the existing inventory is not being used. Suggested that staff delete the short term requirements. She is particularly concerned about security requirements. Suggested that Class C buildings be exempted from the proposal - if a building doesn't provide auto parking they shouldn't be required to provide bike parking.
- Rick Browning, Bike Advisory Committee, 1903 NW 27<sup>th</sup>, Portland 97210. Supports the portion of the proposal that deals with new buildings. Thinks there has been enough study and citizen participation, but feels their volunteer efforts were not appreciated or considered. Concerned that we keep building orientation and bicycle parking as one agenda item for City Council. Suggests staff drop the cost to business portion.
- Matt Klein, Association for Portland Progress, 520 SW Yamhill #1000, Portland 97204. Supports the goals and objectives regarding bicycles. Generally supports the draft report - as long as a bike parking strategy that all stakeholders can endorse is achieved. Does not feel process has been participatory. Have serious concerns about several aspects of the proposed implementation strategy: onerous and confusing mechanism to make old and historic buildings comply with bike parking standards; security and covered parking are too expensive; increased requirement for short term bike parking is onerous; doesn't feel FAR incentive accomplishes its goal; growing nonconforming development list.

Have philosophical agreement with bike policy, but diverge on how the policy gets implemented.

- Kerry Hampton, Portland Public Schools, 501 N. Dixon, Portland 97227. Submitted written testimony (attached). The school district does not support covered parking, indicates cost would be prohibitive. Suggested that their survey be the basis for developing demand based bike parking standard. Feel it's reasonable to provide bike parking to 1% overall of their student body.

There was discussion about the following subjects: whether the school district would settle for 2%; pursuing a master plan approach; whether the schools that have covered racks have higher usage; what the school district is willing to do to encourage staff/students to use bikes and other alternative transportation modes; safety/education/encouragement programs.

- Randy Albright, 2609 SE Stephens, Portland 97214. Member of the City's Bicycle Advisory Committee, Bicycle Transportation Alliance, member of 1994 task force. Feels the issue is primarily in the downtown area. Concerned about changes regarding the non-conforming use issue being made without input from those who have been actively involved in this ongoing issue. Feels that bicycle advocates haven't been listened to. Urged the Commission to not adopt this version - if they take action tonight, they should adopt the May 10th version.
- Thomasina Gabriele, Institutional Facilities Coalition, 3334 NW Vaughn, Portland 97210. Submitted written testimony. Supports parking requirements listed for colleges and medical centers. Thinks distribution of parking needs to be clarified. Would like long term parking allowed to be provided inside offices (particularly existing buildings).
- Chuck Martin, Alliance of Portland Neighborhood Business Assoc., 2637 SW Patton Ct, Portland 97201. Applauded the BTA for their effective dissemination of information, felt they were kept abreast of changes as they were made. They find the current proposal acceptable, a great improvement over past versions.
- Chris Pierce, 4334 NE 32<sup>nd</sup> Pl, Portland 97211. Submitted written letter (attached). Feels the proposed policy is a positive first step. Feels school district should cooperate and take the lead in promoting bicycle riding. Understands providing bike parking would be inconvenient and provide a cost to existing businesses, but feels it is worth while. Need to make it easier to ride bicycles.

#### Public Testimony on Bike Parking Closed

There was discussion about how the administration of the nonconforming situation list would be impacted by including existing buildings in the bicycle parking requirements.

Michaelson asked Mia Birk of the Portland Bicycle program for her response to the testimony given by the Portland Public Schools. The City of Portland Bicycle program offered to provide bike parking free of charge to the public schools that requested it - over 25 schools requested bike parking. Where there is good bike parking available it seems to be

used to capacity at schools, covered parking is definitely preferred. Birk is concerned that the school district seems to resist providing bike parking at schools.

Scott suggested we bring the CAC back together and see if we can get consensus. Abel felt the Commission should move forward on something tonight - at least regarding new buildings. Michaelson indicated that at least interim measures for new buildings and preservation parking should be determined tonight. Holt felt that it would be appropriate to act now, and then if necessary fix any component of the regulations that isn't working as well as anticipated.

There was discussion about the existing bonus provisions and whether they have been effective. Staff indicated they would feel comfortable proposing 2 sq. ft for every 1 sq. ft. Jim Mark said it wasn't workable. Abel felt we should offer incentives that would ensure they are used.

Holt suggested a logo or graphic be provided to indicate where bike parking is offered.

There was much discussion on the following topics:

- how to require adequate bicycle parking without singling out any specific area (Central City) with additional regulations,
- basing the number of required parking spaces on something that can be determined on a site plan (i.e. using square footage as opposed to enrollment in schools),
- whether having bicycle parking on the nonconforming use would accomplish the desired result, and where it should be located if it is on the list,
- the possibility of adding the bicycle parking regulations to the CCTMP,
- how to make a clear and simple and workable system and yet have it work within the Oregon land use system.

Holt recommended that the Commission deal with existing buildings through a working task force, and go forward tonight with the staff position.

**Motion on bicycle parking:** The Commission voted 4 to 1 to adopt the staff recommendation with the following amendments:

- The base for school bike parking ratio be 2 per classroom, grades 4-12, with 50% covered, with 125% availability
- .5 FAR related to \$100,000 cost (ratio) on shower/locker facilities (this would mirror the water feature approach)
- Bike parking logo provided for parking locations

(Aye: Abel, Holt, Schuback, Scott; No: Michaelson; Absent: ffitch, Fong, Webb)

The Commission was asked for suggested amendments to the resolution. Scott requested clarification to the specification of regulations for existing parking. Placing a period after "existing development" would take care of her concern.

**Motion on bicycle parking:** The Commission voted 5 to 0 to recommend that Council adopt the resolution as amended. (Aye: Abel, Holt, Schuback, Scott; Michaelson; Absent: ffitch, Fong, Webb)

**Motion on building orientation:** Michaelson summarized the Commission's position on building orientation, recommending to:

- use the proposed staff map but form a subcommittee to review the revised adjustment and purpose statement language;
- change the 100,000 sq. ft. exception to apply to single buildings instead of single uses;
- Change parking area restriction for large retailer setback exception along internal streets from 25 to 75 feet from the transit street intersection;
- Change pedestrian district minimum setback to 15 feet instead of 12.

The Commission voted 5 to 0 to accept the staff recommendation as amended above. (Aye: Abel, Holt, Schuback, Scott; Michaelson; Absent: ffitch, Fong, Webb)

Michaelson adjourned the meeting at 10:45 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan D. Gregory  
Secretary