

Meeting Summary

Sara Wright from the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability (BPS) conducted a discussion of one aspect of the code related to notification the city is looking at updating. Specifically code (33.700.025) which currently requires developments meeting a specific criteria and threshold to offer to be shared with neighborhood associations (see LUTC Handouts on webpage for detailed code language). Sara mentioned limitations to this in practice today and the group discusses current challenges and opportunities to improve this process and exchange between developers and the neighborhood associations. Additionally, Sara stated that data on the effectiveness of the current process (i.e. how many NAs are reached, how many are able to take advantage of the opportunity) does not exist because it falls outside the application process and the city is not able to track it. Two changes she is anticipating will come from this process is that the certified mail as a method of contact will go away and second, there will likely be a requirement for developments to display signage at the site to notify the public. Additional changes, and specifics around those are both to be determined as the process continues.

Next, Jody Yates from PBOT reviewed the Neighborhood Streets Program (NSP) framework, which includes four program elements that address different aspects of Portland's deficient neighborhood streets infrastructure. Jody would like neighbors and neighborhood associations to weigh in on, and support if they feel appropriate, the: Allocation methodology; maintenance of gravel streets, and LTIC maximums. The full PowerPoint presentation is on the SE Uplift LUTC webpage here.

Lastly, Sandra Wood and Shannon Buono, from BPS shared the timeline for the Residential Infill Project (RIP) before reviewing the highlights of the Discussion Draft proposal by staff. See project updates for more information on the RIP. Questions from the group were both around the proposed zoning changes (e.g. height limits that would potentially create uniformity in neighborhoods (cookie-cutter homes) and limit property owner's ability to honor historic architectural features), as well as questions about process changes from what the previous Mayor and City Council had charged staff to do (e.g. create 3 different maps) and an altered direction resulting from current leadership (e.g. one proposed map). In this phase, Discussion Draft, staff is very interested in hearing from the community regarding the methodology for the map and any comments regarding the map and draft in general.