

Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

Tuesday, February 9, 2016

12:30 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

Commissioners Present: Jeff Bachrach, Mike Houck, Katie Larsell, Gary Oxman, Michelle Rudd, Katherine Schultz, Chris Smith, Eli Spevak, Teresa St Martin, Maggie Tallmadge

Commissioners Absent: Andre' Baugh

City Staff Presenting: Susan Anderson, Deborah Stein; Art Pearce, Denver Igarta, Courtney Duke, Peter Hurley (PBOT)

Other presenters: Daniel Parolek

Chair Schultz called the meeting to order at 12:33 p.m. and gave an overview of the agenda.

Items of Interest from Commissioners

- *Commissioner Spevak* noted that at 6-8 p.m. today at The Zipper building is a free public session with developers who are working on the missing middle concepts that Daniel Parolek will be sharing today.
- *Commissioner Houck:* Yesterday's urban ecology symposium was great. The keynote was Eric Sanderson. It was well-attended with very inspiring conversations.
- *Commissioner St Martin* commented on the Residential Infill Project. The Mayor has asked us to speed up some of our processes, and we'll have an update about the project shortly.

Director's Report

Susan Anderson

- The PSC retreat will be on February 29 at 1-5 p.m. The purpose is to ground you in responsibilities, look at goals for the Commission and get to know the new members a bit more.
- BPS has hired a new Historic Resources planner, Brandon Spencer-Hartle, joining the bureau on February 22. We had to cut this position in past budgets, but we are pleased that we can make this a priority again.

Documents and Presentations for today's meeting

The Missing Middle Housing Strategy

Briefing: Daniel Parolek

Presentation

Deborah Stein introduced Daniel. We met at an AARP conference on age-friendly cities last year. This concept is so perfect when we talk about age-friendly cities; it's really about how we make neighborhoods adaptable for everyone at every phase of life.

Daniel is an urban designer and architect. I am the founder of Opticos Design, based in Berkeley. One of the primary reasons the concept of the missing middle has taken off is because it's about reframing the conversation about housing. Typically we talk about "density" and "infill" and "more multifamily". But "missing middle housing" starts a healthy conversation about the dramatic shift in the demand for a variety of housing types.

The concept started 19 years ago-project in Santa Barbara County, at Isla Vista, which is adjacent to UC Santa Barbara. The advisory group didn't want more than 18 units/acre initially. But the form they ended up liking was about 34 units/acre.

There is a dramatic mismatch between people who want to live in walkable urban neighborhood compared to those who actually do. Places like Portland show a spike in demand for walkable living; these are also places where we're seeing housing and affordability issues.

By 2025, it's projected that 75-85 percent of households will not have children, which is a huge demographic shift from our current single-family housing structure in many cities. We do need to be worried about housing for families, but looking at this statistic shows we need to more so think about people who will be looking for a smaller housing type. Another issue is that density-based zoning cannot effectively regulate pre-WWII neighborhoods.

Missing middle housing are the types "in between": the duplex, fourplex, bungalow court, and live-work building. There haven't been many of these built in the last 30-40 years, and builders are typically not focused on this range of options. The great thing about this is that they are multi-unit, but they never get bigger than the size of a house, which is a reassuring point.

Missing middle housing enhances neighborhood character; creates walkable living; offers more diverse housing options and choices and affordability; and provides enough rooftops to support local businesses and transit. Housing is easily adjusted/adapted for local climate and culture.

The range in types is extensive: side-by-side duplexes; stacked duplex; bungalow court; carriage house; fourplex; small multiplex (5-8 units); townhouse (up to 30 units/acre); live-work places; and courtyard apartments. These types of buildings tend to be sprinkled throughout neighborhoods, side-by-side with single-family homes. Or they may be along a primary or secondary corridor or in the transition area from single-family to higher-density neighborhoods.

Characteristics:

- Walkable context
- Lower perceived density
- Small footprint buildings
- Small, well-designed units
- Fewer off-street parking spaces
- Simple construction
- Creates community

Affordability is created by the design instead of by heavy subsidies.

In thinking about housing choices and zoning, we often graphically assess the existing code and regulations for each base zoning district. Instead we can use those sizes to test missing middle housing types to determine what zoning code changes are needed to accommodate them. Base zones need to allow for a mix of housing types without adding additional layers or regulations.

The most important concepts to encourage missing middle housing include:

- Enable small footprint density
 - Directly allow building types within zone districts
 - Regulate maximum building footprint (width and depth)

- Cap heights at 2.5 stories for desired zones
 - Do not cap density
- Do not treat all unit sizes equally
 - Allow more smaller units inside same building form
 - Require less off-street parking for smaller units
 - Adjust impact fees for smaller units
 - Consider treating a 650 square foot unit as half a unit
- Encourage blended densities
- Reduce parking requirements
- Make new walkable communities legal

Building types are the ingredients of neighborhoods. Each neighborhood has a different “recipe” that includes different ranges and types of mm housing. Then for each type, there may be supplemental form standards, for example, a bungalow court might be shorter in height, but the unit size is smaller too.

Nashville is using missing middle housing as a tool in their Comprehensive Plan. The State of Michigan’s MiPlace is using missing middle housing as an implementation tool – they are requiring communities asking for state grant funding to do targeted market analysis to see the market demand shift and address it. In Austin’s code update, we created a missing middle affordable housing density bonus for achieving desired prescribed affordable housing mix.

More information is available on the [missing middle website](#). Think carefully about defining land uses as small footprint and medium density in the zoning code. Portland has begun to pick up this concept. I want communities to use this tool to meet the market demand and help to deal with affordability.

“It’s time to rethink and evolve, reinvent and renew.” [What’s Next, ULI]

Discussion

Commissioner Smith asked about the TDM non-profit Daniel mentioned.

- It’s called Transform. Green Trip is the program.

Commissioner Smith: How do you get from where we are to this vision? How do you get this infill into a single-family neighborhood – not just in character, but taking a large home down to build smaller?

- We mostly do this in an infill context. It is easier in a greenfield of course. There isn’t a one-size-fits-all strategy. Part if education and taking time to assess. Have a conversation about the range of housing types that would be appropriate and the scale of those types. There is an element of degree of change, which are important parts of the conversation as well.
- In terms of conversation from single-family housing stock, this is a good possibility. We need to be careful about it to not have detrimental impacts to the neighborhood. Maybe you make a single-family a duplex with an ancillary unit in the back if the lot is large enough.

Commissioner Houck: Thank you for the message about not starting the conversation with the word “density”. But I don’t see ADUs in this schematic. Is that because they are smaller? Also, one of Portland’s most significant green infrastructure components is tree canopy. How compatible is this type of housing scheme with Portland’s goal of 30 percent tree canopy?

- The carriage house and ancillary house can be similar to an ADU. It does fit with this pallet of housing types.
- We’re dealing with the tree canopy question in Austin. The good thing about these housing types is that they retain quite a bit of land on each lot and pervious surfaces.

Susan: *Commissioner Smith* noted the huge desire to keep the homes we have. There is a connection to those homes, so we need ideas for how we can keep the “shells” looking the same while looking to increase the number units within them. It’s less about construction and more about the rooming house

idea. This has to do more with the social construct. Are there financing and legal tools for various housing types to make that normal is a big shift?

- It is an important part of the conversation, especially in terms of historic preservation and sustainability of building. In terms of thinking creatively about how to address non-related people who live in a house and how you can introduce multiple units in a single-family home, there isn't lots of research about this yet. It's time based on this shift to understand how we can do this well.

Commissioner Spevak: Portland has lots of housing options at this density. If we start making it easier to build, we need to deal with the parking issues and not building parking or incentivizing it.

Commissioner Bachrach: In terms of the zoning code and transition from the traditional version, are you reducing the quantity of regulations? Or just a different focus?

- The goal is to make it smaller and provide more clarity with graphics. We want to try to make sure all the information is in the same one or two code sections.

Commissioner Oxman asked about what the most successful communities have had in place to achieve compatibility with existing housing stock.

- It varies by community. Architectural standards are key; not necessarily by style, but to establish a bar for quality. Design review committees are important. And for example, Austin has a great design culture.

Task 5: Transportation System Plan

Briefing: Art Pearce, Denver Igarta, Courtney Duke, Peter Hurley (PBOT)

Presentation

Art introduced the project, which is considered Stage 2 of the TSP. There is a relationship between state requirements, the TSP and the Comp Plan that come together as part of our periodic review expectations. Other processes are integrated into this effort as well.

In the near-term, there are a number of other related projects, including CC2035, Citywide Parking Strategy, Vision Zero; and the Comp Plan implementation projects.

Denver provided an overview of the components of the TSP. Stage 1 items are identified in blue, and these are the only parts of the TSP that have already come through the PSC via the Comp Plan hearings. Stage 2 items (orange highlighted boxes) are what we're discussing today. Items in green are not required to complete the Comp Plan update; but these items will ultimately follow the same legislative process. Stage 3 will be completing and repackaging the TSP into something more accessible and streamlined.

The CC2035 Plan will include all changes included for the Central City.

The TSP Discussion Draft was released in October and informed the Proposed Draft that's before the PSC now. The first hearing is on March 8.

We've had an advisory Transportation Expert Group (TEG) throughout this process. It started in January 2014, and *Commissioner Smith* has served on this group to help come up with the proposal in the current draft. There have been 900+ interested parties who we've kept informed about the proposal as well. We uploaded a number of street classification layers to the Map App with this Proposed Draft so people can see and comment on them in the app. Additionally, staff presented Stage 2 of the TSP Update for 33 unique groups and events throughout the entire city between October 2015 and this month, directly reaching approximately 600 attendees.

Groups of items staff scoped to be part of this State 2 update:

- Required items for periodic review
- Plans that have been adopted since we last updated the TSP
- Initial steps: items that we are advancing to implement the Comp Plan to address changes in, for example, policy objectives

TSP Objectives review was to:

- Help assess progress towards goals and policies
- Limited changes proposed in this phase
 - Objectives elevated to Comp Plan policy removed
 - Acknowledge new Comp Plan Centers + Corridors
 - Remove barriers to new Comp Plan direction
 - Updates to bureau name and design guides

To address requirements in the Council-approved Periodic Review work plan, remove inconsistencies with new 2035 Comp Plan, incorporate plans adopted by Council since the last TSP Update, and take initial steps towards implementing 2035 Comp Plan direction.

Peter introduced three key performance measures that are recommended to be added to the TSP. Council has already adopted these in other plans:

- 70 percent commute trips taken by transit, bicycle, walking, carpooling, or working from home.
- 50 percent reduction in transportation related carbon emissions from 1990 levels

Additionally, but not yet adopted by Council, we are proposing to add:

- 25 percent of residents in mixed-use buildings car-free (to reduce parking and traffic impacts)

We do intend to propose additional measures are part of Stage 3 (e.g. a safety performance measure).

State law says we have to accommodate 20 years of projected growth. We are expecting 120,000 new jobs and 260,000 new households, and our system is already strained.

Transportation Demand Management (TDM) includes:

- Education/encouragement (SmartTrips)
- Transit passes
- Bike share memberships
- Car share memberships
- Financial incentives to walk, bike, carpool, telecommute
- Parking management

Generally, Portland is behind the curve in terms of using TDM compared to other West Coast cities. Lower- and middle-income workers benefit from TDM programs since they aim to lower transportation costs.

This proposal includes a recommendation to add verbiage to Title 17 to establish what should be included in a TDM plan. This complements the Title 33 changes that are proposed, for example in the Campus Institutions project.

Regarding Mixed Use parking, the PSC will hear about this at the February 23 meeting as part of the Citywide Parking Strategy briefing.

Commissioner Oxman asked about the chart that shows demand and the gap. My observation is that the transportation system is becoming saturated at more and more hours of the day. So even if we held things flat, the system would still be saturated in the future.

- Yes, in certain places at certain times we are seeing this overflow. This is likely to continue. As part of modeling we've done, we have found parts of the city without this saturation. We are focusing investments in areas where we see there will be more and increased saturation to

address peaking. We are looking to expand person-carrying capacity and the capacity to move goods.

Commissioner Smith: To reframe the questions, as we add trips in the city, where will that be observed? We've seen bicycle use rates plateau in this decade, and some of that is because we need more bike infrastructure. If we aren't going to see our streets congested, we need to get closer to that 25 percent bike mode share split as in the Bicycle Master Plan.

Chair Schultz: As transportation commute times tend to increase, do you find that people tend to get more encouraged to ride transit?

- We'd have to look at individual routes. We definitely want to be sure we improve transit signal priorities. If someone has a choice, we want to be sure transit service is frequent and reliable.

Commissioner St Martin asked about other cities that have been successful at implementing TDM.

- Arlington County, VA had a big expansion of jobs for about 30 years, right when they (Washington DC) were building their Metro system. The system has been able to accommodate substantial growth without seeing a substantial increase in traffic. Financial incentives, carpooling options and additional land use changes have helped.

Chair Schultz: Are you getting better cooperation from ODOT to create more, safer bike routes along state highways?

- We are working with ODOT on important corridors in a number of places to give people more and better options. BPS, PBOT and TriMet recently signed an agreement to ensure we work closely over the next 20 years so each org is doing their part to improve frequency and reliability.

Commissioner Smith: ODOT just released their statewide bike plan, and the language around bike infrastructure on orphaned highways is less aggressive than in the current plan (e.g. Barbur).

Commissioner Spevak: Are bicycling districts defined on any maps? When and where will our first protected intersection be?

- We do have protected facilities, and we are going to be providing protected facilities where ever we can. This plays to the importance of getting "interested but concerned" riders biking. We have narrow streets, which make protected intersections difficult. One option may be W Burnside by PGE Park.
- *Commissioner Smith:* In terms of bicycle districts, we don't have any outside the Central City.
- Courtney Duke: The Bicycle Plan called out districts, but they haven't been mapped yet. We put Comp Plan policies in these districts too. We haven't yet decided on the boundaries, but there has been conversation started about Lloyd Ecodistrict and Central City to see if districts would be needed.

Commissioner Larsell asked about requiring people to use transit and bicycle. How much of the connection with TriMet will be part of the work we're recommending?

- We can share the letter of intent that has been signed. The attempt is to work with our partners at multiple levels simultaneously.

Courtney highlighted the list of refinement plans and studies. We've added and modified these to update the TSP program and project list as well as policies in the Comp Plan. We removed studies that have become TSP projects, have been completed, or are no longer needed or required. There is a list at the front of the chapter highlighting these changes.

Master Street Plans are required to show we are meeting our connectivity needs. We are incorporating the local street plans that have been adopted since the last 2007 TSP amendments.

We've updated the bicycle classifications and objectives, mainly related to the 2030 Bicycle Master Plan that Council adopted in February 2010. As part of this work, we had a joint modal committee that has met since October 2014 to work on some issues including the bicycle classifications. We looked at freight and transit overlap with this group as well.

We have 7 design classifications for the streets in the city. These are related to land use and design of the street. We've made changes to design classifications to incorporate centers and corridors and the urban design framework in the new Comp Plan. There are still lots of classifications, and they may be difficult to distinguish easily, so we put together a reference chart (slide 27) to highlight the differences. Working closely with Metro on these changes since they are also required for the region.

Changes to the community involvement objectives in the TSP have been made to be consistent with Chapter 2 of the new Comp Plan.

Street vacations have been reviewed on creating in the TSP and Comp Plan. During this update, we now have a broader policy in the Comp Plan and have new Title 17 code language. We also want to revise policy 8.48 to make sure community uses are considered (since they are a new use type) when recommending a street vacation.

Commissioner Rudd asked about the broader policy and the addition of community uses. *Commissioner Rudd* said she looked at this in the context of constitutional restrictions on how much the City can require a property owner to dedicate for a street. The constitutional limit is based on the underlying need being created by the property owner's project. The property owner's project does not create the need for community uses so the road area should be returned to the property owner when it is no longer needed for transportation agreement.

- We're proposing it just as a consideration.

Commissioner Rudd said she disagreed with the policy change but we would hear about the proposed changes in public testimony. She asked what the limit was on "temporary" uses.

- Staff replied that temporary reflected that the use was allowed pursuant to a license and that there was no deadline. Asked if a temporary use could be a hundred years or three months, staff indicated that the range was possible.

Further TSP maintenance includes:

- We've updated the introduction and the glossary to reflect changes, what's happening today and what we're expecting in the future. We've edited the glossary to make sure terms are as defined in the new Comp Plan.
- Area studies: proposed to delete.
- South Waterfront and Water Ave classifications: changes were made in 2012 as part of the Milwaukie Light Rail, adopted by ordinance, so now we're including them in the TSP.

Commissioner Houck thanked Denver, who gave a presentation yesterday with a BES staff about Tryon Creek. Is there anything explicit in the TSP that relates to integration of work between/among bureaus in terms of urban canopy?

- In Chapter 8 in the Comp Plan, there is a coordination policy. There are policies about uses in the right-of-way and about trees in the right-of-way.

Stage 3 of the process will be to create a "new" TSP. This includes a number of things outside the Comp Plan umbrella that we are either required to do or will help in cleaning up the document:

TSP Objectives

- Geographically specific (district) policies:
pattern areas and action items
- New objectives for new 2035 Policies
- Additional Performance Measures

Street Classifications

- Emergency Response

- Evaluate other classification needs
- References to Modal Plans
Implementation Strategies
- Codes and Standards (e.g. bike parking)
- Regional Transportation Plan Compliance
Administrative Rule – Transportation Demand Management

This Stage 3 will come through the PSC before going to Council as all other parts of the Comp Plan update have or will.

Commissioner Smith: Obviously there is great work that has gone into this, and I commend staff. But there are a number of concerns about the ability of citizens to understand this all. Some things we can do to help mitigate this issue:

- The document needs more publicity. It was released between Christmas and New Years, so we should provide further materials before our hearing.
- We discussed the Objectives section. Since they were removed from the Comp Plan chapter, they are still referencing numbers in the old Comp Plan. There is an appendix at the back of the document as a cross-walk, but this should be brought forward.
- Issue with the maps: in this document, we have maps for the new street and bicycle classifications, but in the paper version, you have the maps chopped up page-by-page. PBOT and BPS staff are working to get the maps integrated in the app.
- The advisory group (TEG) has its last meeting this month since they were only chartered to help staff. But I think they should have a role through our hearing process to help inform the PSC in our hearing process.
- The refinement studies section includes things we've recommended for some studies that should happen.
- I'd request that we issue some sort of "reader's guide" to the TSP... objectives with cross-walk, street classification comparison. This would help to give the public tools to review the plan and provide input. Substance is good. I'm the liaison to the bike-parking group that is starting up, and I've given staff language about autonomous vehicles that we can look to incorporate.

Commissioner Rudd asked about carbon pricing study. Will that be coordinated with the state?

- Yes (and if not currently stated, we can add it).

Commissioner Bachrach noted the proposed TDM language page. We would adopt this as part of the TSP work? And how does this related to mixed use and Central City?

- The intent is that it all comes together. Title 33 land use code will direct where TDMs would be required. We're attempting to point it to the same places in Title 33 and Title 17. It's all in the same place regardless of the zone it applies to.
- The PSC will be asked to make interim recommendations for the various projects, including the TSP (April 12); later on mixed use. But before it goes to Council, it will all be packaged and shared with the PSC to review to make sure you like how they all fit together.
- In the TDM section, we are providing options for large sites (e.g. campuses) as opposed to smaller sites where the "off the shelf" plan would be standardized.

Commissioner Smith added that TDM and parking management are two sides of one coin, but they are going through different processes. For centers and corridors, we'll hear about that at our February 23 meeting, and we'll recommend some during the mixed use process.

The February 23 briefing is about the citywide parking strategy, including the differences between centers and corridors and the Central City.

Adjourn

Chair Schultz adjourned the meeting at 3:03 p.m.

Submitted by Julie Ocken, PSC Coordinator