



Hosford-Abernethy Neighborhood District
Board Meeting
March 20, 2018

Attendees:

Board members: Chris Eykamp, Linda Nettekoven, Joanne Stainbrook, Jon Adams, Paul Jaeger, Jessica Engelman, Mark Linehan, Daniel Amoni, Michelle Sprague, Charlene Zaharakis
Visitors: Bill Cunningham (Bureau of Planning and Sustainability), Teresa Boyle (City of Portland), Brenda Martin (TriMet), Muz Afzal (SE Uplift), Gerson Robby, Jeff Rames, Ingrid Hoffman, Jeff Bromwell, Laura Rogers, Dan Naughton

7:07 Chris (acting chair) called meeting to order

7:08 Introductions

7:10 Better Housing by Design: Bill Cunningham, Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability, presenting

- Project focused on updating multi-dwelling residential zoning code; HAND has some on Hawthorne, Division, near Clinton MAX (east side of SE 12th; west of 12th is Central City)
- Project will not be making zoning changes; focused on areas already zoned for multi-dwelling (R3, R2, R1, RH) outside the Central City; not focused on mixed-use zones
- In the wake of finishing the Comprehensive Plan, we've been updating our zoning codes to better accommodate the policies featured in the Comp Plan
- Residential Infill Project focuses on single-dwelling zones (R10, R7, R2.5); some overlap with the R2.5 zone; e.g. both can have townhouses
- Currently on the Discussion Draft stage; comments will be accepted through March 19 (yesterday); HAND board can comment on proposed draft and recommended draft
- Comp Plan and mapping changes will become official May 24th, 2018 (but this is a separate effort)
- We've had similar projects focused on development in East Portland, around MAX station; we'd developed a long list of desires relating to housing
- Multi-family residential 9% of city's area; 80% of future growth likely to happen in mixed use and multi-family zoning
- Key goal: narrow gap between our aspirations, and regulations and what's happening on the ground
- Concept report: July 2017 featuring ideas on how to improve multi-family zoning
- January 2018: zoning code language discussion draft released

- Go to website www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/betterhousing ; Vol 1 is a 40 page summary; Vol 2 is a 200 page in-depth document
- Covers a variety of topics, such as building design, open spaces, housing diversity and affordability, etc
- Multi-family zoning can address “missing middle” housing; looking at zoning code to see if it allows that type of housing
- Older neighborhoods used to have more multi-family zoning pre-war; many such housing units still exist (but could not be built today)
- Most common multi-family is R2; duplex is the only building that could legally be constructed here. We regulate by unit count currently, rather than by size.
- Proposal: RM1 zone (R2+R3); regulate by building scale, with flexibility for what happens inside (e.g. four-plex instead of just a duplex); FAR 1:1, 35’ building height (down from 40’), require visitable (accessible for people with mobility limitations/wanting to age in their home) units (at least 20% of units) with larger developments
- Rename zones to “Residential Multi-Dwelling” (since we’re moving away from regulating by units toward regulating by size) : RM1 (R3+R2); RM2 (R1); RM3 (RH 2:1 FAR); RM4 (RH 4:1 FAR) (see proposal for more details)
- HAND would have RM2, RM1, RM4, and RM3 with design overlay (in order of frequency, most to least)
- No changes to “close to transit” parking allowances/requirements
- There is potential for bonus 50%-100% floor area; currently variety of features can provide bonus; proposal: just get bonus for providing affordability (see proposal for details). This was a response to feedback that new townhouses are not affordable (need to be 3+ units before affordability can be achieved).
- Also potential for transferring bonus to another project for protecting affordability in another property (unused development potential), also for if large trees are preserved instead of fully developing site (historic and tree preservation transfers: 2mi limit)
- Debate over whether bonuses should add to height or to lot coverage
- Question: what about other benefits, such as lowered development fees (allowing a cheaper development, rather than a larger development)? Answer: there has been a lot of discussion about inclusionary housing and the requirements, agreement is that there will be more scale given in exchange
- Currently: (amenity bonuses & transfers from historic properties), proposing to remove many of the amenity bonuses and limit total bonuses so that you could never get more than 50% (except for “special bonus for deeper housing affordability,” which provides 100%)
- Some of the heavier bonuses don’t apply to historic districts
- Proposal: allowances for small commercial uses in multi-dwelling zones along major corridors and near light rail stations (out of concern for poor livability near arterial streets); limited to ground floor and just a small percentage of the total property, would still need to provide minimal housing requirement
- Question: are there limitations on type of use? Answer: not specifically, just a size restriction (but there are other limits; marijuana dispensaries not allowed in residential zones)
- Proposal: require outdoor space in RM3 and RM4 (not currently required)
- Proposal: shared outdoor space for large sites (20,000 sqft+), at least 10% of total site area; up to half could be an indoor common area; could be provided via rooftop area
- Proposal: allow urban green options (ecoroofs, raised courtyards and stormwater planters) to meet landscaping requirements
- Proposal: limit paved vehicle area (parking + driveway) to 30% of site area

- Proposal: parking minimums; none for <7500 sqft; no parking required up to 30 units; other sites require 1 space per 2 units (not applicable to HAND, which is within the transit area)
- Proposal: require Transportation and Demand Management (TDM) for RM2-RX (instead of requiring parking), only for the first round of tenants (pretty pricey at \$1,100/unit)
- Question: what about neighborhood permit parking? Answer: this is happening in parallel, but not part of this project
- Other topics: building design and scale (pedestrian-oriented frontages, front garages limit, require parking from alleys, tuck under parking, front entrances, 10' front setbacks with exceptions for raised ground floors/existing setbacks/ground-floor commercial, scale step-down next to single-family zones, breaking facade up instead of blocky buildings)
- Proposed draft: May 2018; planning and sustainability commission in summer 2018 (June?)
- Question: can we submit deadlines beyond the deadline (since we got a late presentation?) Answer: I wouldn't throw them out, but they would be past deadline; I would recommend waiting for the proposed draft
- Feedback: I like it! Good job
- Question: Possibility for automatic D overlay any time there is a 100% bonus given? Since that's so large. Answer: could be considered: in mixed-use zones projects considered bonus w/ affordable housing, they ended up applying d' overlay to all close-in mixed-use (because concern about design overlay being a larger burden on affordable housing)
- Question: regarding impacts on neighbors, if I live next to multi-family, could I apply for rezoning my property to also take advantage of the potential benefits (a way to offset burden)? Answer: interesting; there's something similar with mixed-use zones, this is something we could consider
- Question: change to RM; currently limits unit to sq ft, does this get carried through? Answer: we'd completely shift away from units per sqft to size of the building per sqft (shift to FAR from counting units)
- Comment: regarding small commercial on first floor: things like garbage collection coming late at night, other disruptions to neighbors; would strongly suggest figuring out ways to limit these types of disruptions (similar to the existing CR zone), since people living in apartments deserve same protections as single-family residents
- Comment: regarding including green roofs, if the greenspace is on the roof, it doesn't provide the same community benefit as ground-floor landscaping. Response: there would still be 50% requirements for ground-level development
- Comment: I think this is a step in the right direction, would like to see it go further.
- Question: how much will the proposed draft change from the discussion draft? Answer: we're hearing a lot from completely opposite directions and opinions; much of what's in the proposal is close to what was in our concept report, so I suspect many of the controversial points we'll bring to the PSC to decide based on data and models and such, but much of proposed draft should be similar to discussion draft
- Controversial spots: shifting from units to size of building; allowing commercial uses; parking; limitations on front garages (concern from developers); has not been too much official pushback on bonuses. Seattle sees a mix of townhouses and multiplex in permissive zones (which is good; we want diversity in future development).

8:13 Brenda Martin TriMet, Teresa Boyle PBOT, Gideon Overcrossing

- Ped/bike bridge to be the last added element of the Orange MAX
- The project is funded

- There was a pedestrian crossing built in the 70s; was eliminated when the Orange Line was built; there were plans to reconstruct it, but funding issue with the feds required deferment of a number of items, including this bridge; been trying to use remaining light rail funds to build this bridge
- There's a limited window of time to design and build due to federal sunset; target: built by fall 2019
- Part of the Clinton to the River project (not just about connecting the neighborhoods, or to the MAX station)
- Would be location 100' east of the Clinton Station at 13th PI on the south side and 14th on the north side
- Consideration given to future development in Clinton Triangle area; high demand for the new crossing
- Current safety concern: people traveling over freight trains stopped at SE 11th/12th freight intersection; a major reason we were able to secure funds for this crossing
- Will be a large and visible bridge from most angles
- Required 24' (?) clearance over freight lines and over MAX lines
- Working with industrial neighbors on SE 14th side to reduce impact (they have freight loading)
- Elevators on North and South sides of bridge, plus stairs (ramps would have too much impact; require too much space) that both face west; looking at bike gutters
- At 10% design right now; many design elements still up in the air
- Bridge type: pratt truss bridge and vierendeel truss both feasible; do not want to require column in the middle; bridge is straight; smallest length crossing possible
- Elevators: could accommodate bike with trailer; would enter one side, exit one side (no need to turn around inside the elevator)
- Question: regarding security and maintenance with elevators, who is responsible? Answer: bridge will be constructed by TriMet but owned by the city of portland (PBOT) and managed by PBOT; need to figure out how to make the most resilient structure possible. We don't do security cameras.
- Question: wayfinding on residential side. Answer: we'll need to sign, get it on the bike routes, etc.
- Question: on south side, looks like there could be room to put a ramp rather than stairs? Answer: when we looked at the amount of ramp that was needed, the runout was really extreme. Response from peanut gallery: but we have to cover that distance if coming from 12th/the station anyway. Answer: since the original elevator-less ramp calculations, we haven't looked at the ramp again, but we'll consider it
- Question: what permissions are needed from railroad? Answer: aerial easement, construction agreement for installation
- Question: UPRR does not want the people going over their trains; are they working with you? Answer: they are, to the extent that they work with anyone, but they are supportive (they're not going to fund it, but they're not fighting it)
- Comment: when we're talking about bike gutters, the ones on the Lafayette Bridge are nearly unusable because they're tucked under the railings; can you do something better here? Maybe a center gutter? Answer: we don't have the solution yet for the bike gutters; we acknowledge difficulty with gutters that require tipping the bike; we haven't done much research into center gutters; stairs are 8' wide. Bike side of PBOT is very interested in building a more bike-friendly staircase.
- Comment: there can be UPRR trains under where the bridge will be idling for 6-10 hours; air quality concern. Answer: I was aware of train-building, but not of idling trains. Thank you for mentioning this. We've been focused on the switching action in the yard.
- Comment: more support for ramps over elevators.

- Question: is elevator an ADA thing? Answer: yes, and we'd have to make any ramps ADA-compliant too (which means ramp-landing-ramp-landing, not just a straight ramp)
- Issue of too much glass creating a greenhouse effect (bad for mechanics); might be more cement than other designs, but still desire for openness
- Spring 2018: select final design, select contractor; spring 2018-spring 2019: final design and confirm with UPRR; early 2019: begin construction
- Question: is there an advisory committee? Answer: no, that's why we're here now. We're coming to BAC/PAC, Brooklyn, HAND.
- Comment: I'm interested in ways to involve neighboring industrial properties. Response: we're currently working with two properties on 14th; need to reach out to other properties on 14th.
- Comment: please do not dismiss need for security, graffiti problems.
- Comment: elevator vs ramp, what do people with disability advocates say? Also accessibility for new Clinton Triangle development (issue of a ramp that requires long detour). Is it possible to consider a sidewalk on north side between 12th and 14th if/when properties there redevelop? Discussion pros and cons of ramps vs elevators. Interest in a walking tour of the site. There are old designs for the bridge; will pass them along to PBOT/TriMet.
- Mark moves, Linda seconds: Write a letter with seven points(Look into ramp on the south side; issue of idling trains and exhaust plume; potential of a design committee; need for addressing security concerns; requesting a walking tour of the site; request bridge designers coordinate with the Green Loop designers; construction of more bike-friendly gutters on stairs).
 - Amendment by Paul, second Jon: that it be approved at exec committee (unanimous).
 - Vote on writing letter (unanimous).

9:06 Jeff Rames, neighbor at SE 15th

- Issue of trains idling for 6-10 hours around SE 15th
- Air, noise quality concerns for neighboring residences
- Have not made much headway talking with Union Pacific (although neighbors are making efforts to contact them via mail and phone), including the headquarters
- Local residents meeting with Sen Merkley's office, other local representatives
- Mayor Wheeler expressed some interest during his campaign; looking to get him involved again
- Request: stop idling the trains near our homes; use Brooklyn Yard (or even just moving them 75'); stop doing crew changes there; please build a sound wall between SE 12th and Powell Viaduct
- Jeff wants to see if the neighborhood association can't combine multiple issues of trains blocking intersections and idling near neighbors and put more pressure on UPRR. Also keep inviting Hunt (UPRR rep) back to meetings
- Comment: have you looked into connecting with other local groups? Neighbors for Clean Air, DEQ, other local air quality groups? Response: yes. Difficult to get local orgs to make headway; repeatedly told it's a federal issue.
- Comment: have you been making this issue quantitative? Recording when the issues happen, for how long, etc. Response: we've been doing that.

9:18 Consent agenda: approving February Board Meeting minutes, Exec/Rapid Response Meeting minutes, Rapid Response Meeting actions, and Treasurer's Report

- Mark moves we approve with minor amendments (mentioned online); Linda seconds (7 in favor; 1 abstention; 0 against)

Minutes by Jessica Engelman



Executive Meeting called to order 7:05 pm March 20, 2017 at St Philip Neri's Carvlin Hall.

Attendees: Sue Pearce, Jon Adams, Linda Nettekoven, Jessica Engelman, Mark Linehan and Michelle Sprague. Guest Patricia Dresler.

Patricia Dresler asked HAND for assistance with the stop demolition process for 2905 SE 19th Ave, the filing deadline is April 13, 2018. A meeting was setup for April 3, 2018.

Possible April Agenda Items: Central City in Motion (CCIM), Sara Wright Neighborhood Notification Contact Code, Better Housing by Design recap, Unreinforced Masonry (URM) Structures examples are schools and churches, Crescent Park Budget.

Neighborhood Notification & Code Contact, Linda will write a letter on how the process differs. No vote was held for this letter.

The Neighborhood Clean Up will need to be in the next fiscal year, Jon said possibly September. Linda will work with DCBA (Division Clinton Business Assoc.) and SOLVE on a Graffiti and liter clean up. Michelle said Central City may be able to schedule a Clean up for the CEID end of Division.

Mark received an email the Art Teacher at Hosford Middle School, a student has 2 designs for the proposed Diversity banner. He checked with the PTSA for their opinions and found it had not been acted on.

At 8:55 pm the Rapid Response Committee was called to order

United Against Hate letter was asked to be adopted by HAND, Mark moved, Linda seconded, vote 3 in favor, 1 opposed.

Jon proposed changing HAND's CD account to an interest checking account. Jon moved, Linda seconded, discussion: the change would yield a higher interest, vote unanimous

Two proposed letters: the TriMet peds/bike bridge and Fire Department funding.

Adjourn: 9:15 pm

Minutes by Michelle Sprague

