



Collaboration Corvallis
Neighborhood Planning Work Group
Summary Meeting Notes
Osborn Aquatic Center
June 11, 2013

Present: Frank Hann, Lyn Larson, Tony Howell, Trish Daniels, Betty Griffiths, Mike Middleton, Dan Larson, John Corden, Michael Pope

Staff: Ken Gibb, Eric Adams, Bob Richardson

Meeting begins 5:30 PM

Introductions:

All present work group members and project staff introduce themselves to the meeting audience.

Public Comment:

NONE.

Review of Summary Minutes:

Trish Daniels: Does anyone have any changes to minutes from the May 14 meeting? If not, I'll entertain a motion to approve.

Frank Hann: I'll move to approve.

Betty Griffiths: Second.

TD: It's been moved and seconded that the May 14 minutes be approved. All those in favor say "aye". The minutes stand approved.

Discussion Items:

1. Briefing on June 4 Steering Committee Meeting

TD: Eric, why don't you start with the briefing and I'll add any other thoughts as needed.

Eric Adams: The meeting went well. All of the recommendations from the Neighborhood Planning Work Group were accepted as part of the consent agenda. There were a few questions about some procedural issues concerning how the proposed development standard amendments and regulatory mechanisms would move forward. Jock Mills, OSU's Vice President for Government Relations, asked a couple questions about how the proposed recommendations might have potentially improved recent infill development, had the recommendations already been in place. But, overall, the committee was supportive of the recommendations.

The singular recommendation from the Neighborhood Livability Work Group to form a Community Relations Advisory Body was also accepted as part of the consent agenda. Since that recommendation, and the items from the Neighborhood Planning Work Group are partially or entirely within the purview of the City, it will now be up to the City Council to decide how quickly action will be taken on those items. Each of you was provided copy this evening of a recent policy directive that was adopted by the City Council for how they will consider all new recommendations from the Steering Committee, including the batch that was just accepted.

Ken Gibb: There was a discussion at that Council meeting that the recommendations concerning amendments to the Land Development Code would go before the Planning Commission rather than one of the other standing Council committees.

TD: I'm glad to hear that they've reached a consensus on how to further consider the recommendations in the future. It was apparent to me at an earlier Council meeting that there was some confusion on what the appropriate process should be for handling that.

BG: I wanted to note that, in response to testimony offered to the Steering Committee, it's my understanding that the mayor is in the process of identifying potential neighborhood association representatives to serve on the forthcoming Housing Work Group.

EA: Yes, thank you for mentioning that. The other main topic of discussion at the Steering Committee meeting was review of a draft scope of work for the Housing Work Group, as well as general stakeholders that might be represented on that group. The Steering Committee didn't make any suggestions to modify the draft scope of work, and they seemed to agree with the list of potential stakeholder representatives, including one or more from neighborhood associations.

On that point, project staff had identified the need for neighborhood association representation during our early discussions on that topic in preparation for the Steering Committee meeting. But, somehow, through the process of revising the

subject memo to the Steering Committee, that suggestion was inadvertently omitted. So it was beneficial that members of the community testified about the importance of including that representation.

Because of the issues that Housing Work Group will be addressing, some of which go beyond the geographic boundaries of the Collaboration project to effect the entire region, it is likely the group will have more members to account for that broader spectrum. We're also thinking they will meet only once a month so as to give the group and project staff more time to prepare and analyze the types of research we're anticipating will be necessary for their discussions.

Michael Pope: What's the timeline going to be for this group's length of service?

EA: It's likely to be at least 12 months.

KG: I'd say it will probably be even longer than that – possibly 12 to 18 months. And we identified in the memo to the Steering Committee that additional financial and staffing resources, beyond those originally identified for the Collaboration, may be necessary from both the City and OSU to support that group's work.

TD: I was glad to hear many of the Steering Committee members recognize that it's an issue that spans the region with ties to the economy, transportation, and several other community planning elements. So hopefully a commitment to funding will be supported on both sides.

Lyn Larson: How will the neighborhood representatives be chosen, and what's the best way for someone to express interest in serving?

KG: I would recommend contacting the Mayor. But appointments will be made jointly by the Mayor and President Ray, as they were with the other work groups.

TD: I wanted to mention, also, that the questions raised about the design standards concept during the Steering Committee meeting really made it easy provide better context for what it could achieve, because they referenced the Tyler Street Townhomes, which we looked at regularly as an example. Basically, they wanted to know how the design of that project might have been different. So the time we spent considering that question, among others, does appear to have a "real world" connection for those who are not on this work group.

I also wanted to make note that Eric intentionally mentioned how important the information from the Neighborhood Photo Survey was in helping to formulate our recent recommendations, as well as how significant the volunteer effort behind that project has been.

Was there anything else we needed to mention?

EA: Just that the next Steering Committee meeting will likely be in the first part of September. So that will be our rough deadline for completing recommendations on rezoning.

TD: While we didn't discuss this at the Steering Committee meeting, given that we're nearing the end of our scope of work, Eric and I have discussed the possibility of holding another community-wide forum – much like what was done at the beginning of the project – to give people an idea of what to expect moving forward.

2. Discussion of Property Demolition Regulations and Permitting

TD: Okay, so now we'll move on to our second item on the agenda.

Actually, before we do, I wanted to offer a few points for the last discussion item on rezoning, as I'll need to leave the meeting before we get to that. As background, you may remember last fall when we conducted an exercise to identify and categorize issues related to our scope of work. We've moved through most of those categories to this point, except for "Neighborhood Identity" and "Student Housing Distribution". I'm going to take a moment and read a few of the issues identified for each of those categories.

- Limits and thresholds for absorbing higher densities and/or larger projects
- How to sustain a mixed neighborhood – mix of housing sizes, types, and mix of incomes.
- Can other residential areas within the City absorb small increases in density to share the burden of growth?
- Non-residential areas that could absorb high density housing – transit corridors, Major and Minor Neighborhood Centers.

These items logically fall into this larger discussion we're going to have over the coming months on the pros and cons of rezoning.

Okay, so let's move on to discuss demolition. At the May 14 meeting, you may remember we received a proposal from BA Beierle and Roz Keeney about how the City handles demolition permits, and how those might be changed. Betty prepared a draft outline for a motion that is based on their proposal and presented it to the group. In preparation for our discussion, the City Attorney's Office prepared and presented to us a memo on potential legal issues arising from their proposal, which was distributed at the May 30 meeting.

Those are the background materials we have. Are there any other items we need to be aware of before discussing this further?

EA: I don't have any else at this point.

KG: We may have some thoughts on how a potential recommendation should be handled moving forward. But those can wait until after your initial discussions.

TD: Betty, do you want to give us an overview of what you'd prepared?

BG: So what I did was assemble the various points of the proposal from Roz and BA into a draft motion, and then made adjustments to that based on the comments we received from the City Attorney. The most important change was removing the threshold for applying this to structures that are 50 years old and older, which was a change made in light of the City Attorney's concerns. Beyond that, the motion would specify an increased fee, as well as photo documentation of the structure, both of which are consistent with Benton County's requirements. Based on my research, the City of Salem charges a fee of \$72 over and above their plan review fee. I don't think Corvallis charges for anything other than the plan review fee. Salem also charges a 13% fee for long range planning. So based on what those jurisdictions are doing for fees, I offered a flat rate that would be supplemented by an additional per square-foot charge to cover the costs of reviewing and issuing the permits.

The motion also includes a 35-day working notice to all properties within 500 feet of a proposed demolition. Portland has a similar provision that requires a 35-day delay to allow other parties and neighborhood associations an opportunity to buy or move the structure so it's not demolished.

The last element would require the property owner to demonstrate that denial of a demolition permit would cause an undue hardship. The aspects of how an undue hardship would be substantiated are similar to those from Chapter 2.9 of the Land Development Code, which regulates listed historic properties. Included with that would be a requirement for the property to be listed for sale, and documentation of any bids that were received and why they were rejected.

If the demolition permit is issued, then the property owner would be required to salvage, reuse, or recycle 51% of the building materials remaining after those requiring abatement were removed. All materials requiring abatement would be addressed consistent with applicable DEQ regulations.

EA: So for those of you who were not at the last meeting, I have extra copies of Betty's draft and the memo from the City Attorney.

LL: Betty, do you think the requirement of reusing 51% of the building materials, do you think that would solve the problem of renovations that take an existing building down to its foundation?

BG: I didn't consider that issue. My intent was to simply incorporate the elements that BA and Roz had offered for our consideration.

MP: So we recently demolished a detached garage on my property, but before doing so, had to offer it for purchase in order to comply with Chapter 2.9. One of the concerns I had was the potential liability associated with allow people to come on to your property and expose themselves to a potentially dangerous building so they could determine whether or not purchasing it made sense. How could we address that issue through the concepts Betty has forwarded?

BG: It seems to me that it would be a matter between two private entities, and not something the City would need to concern itself with. I assume any liability issues would be covered by either the property owner's insurance or the purchaser's.

MP: So what about a scenario where the buyer didn't have liability insurance and the seller wasn't willing to take on the potential liability, is there a way to encourage some flexibility in that regard.

BG: I think the fourth bullet from the proposal regarding information related to why a potential purchase offer was rejected or accepted would provide that opportunity.

John Corden: I have some concerns about the requirement to reuse 51% of the salvageable building materials. The liability associated with that effort could be prohibitive, not to mention the additional labor cost of demolishing a building in a manner that would allow 51% of the materials to be viable for reuse.

BG: I'm not sure I understand your concern. Are you talking about the difference between using heavy equipment to demolish a house versus taking it down board by board?

JC: Well, you're not going to recycle the plaster, and that has to be separated from the other potentially salvageable materials in order for them to be salvageable. The additional labor associated with that effort is going to be significant, as will the additional liability associated with having workers directly exposed to potentially caustic materials.

Dan Larson: I'm not sure I understand what the intent of reclaiming a portion of the building would be. If it's to retain some of the historic integrity of what's going to replace the original – meaning you're going to incorporate those materials into the design of the new structure – versus simply recycling 51% of the building. If it's for historic purposes, it seems like it may be problematic to always be able to incorporate 51% of the original materials in the new design.

TD: But the limitation of applying this to only historic properties was intentionally removed.

DL: But that's my point. If this is in the context of historic preservation, you want to have some of the old building made a part of the new building, but it may be

problematic to specify a certain percentage that would be achievable in all instances.

BG: I'm guessing BA put that in there for sustainability concerns.

TD: Which would be consistent with the City Council's sustainability goals.

DL: I think it would be important then to clearly articulate the underlying purpose of that requirement, and use clear language so a builder understands what's being asked of them. Reclaiming is different from recycling.

TD: What do you think is the difference?

DL: When we do a renovation on campus, in order to get LEED credit, a certain amount of the materials has to be diverted from the landfill. That's different from using those materials again in a new or renovated structure.

TD: So your preference would be for the third bullet to specify that 51% of the building materials, after accounting for hazardous substances, must be diverted from the landfill?

DL: Yes. And if there's a sustainability value that the City has, I think that should be mentioned.

JC: I have a question for Ken. On the DEQ requirements for abatement, doesn't the City use those same standards?

KG: Yes, we require applicants to meet the same regulatory standards through permit conditions. And, when there's a fuel oil tank involved, the City Fire Department has its own requirements for disposal.

TH: So we had a small residential structure "deconstructed" by Heritage House Parts. Much of the subfloor timber was offered for use as a hog fuel. They paid a metal recycler to take what was viable. It was a lot of labor for not much resale value for them. Although something like what BA has proposed might create a market for salvage materials, it's hard to know that would occur. We never got bids to see what it would cost to simply bulldoze the building, but, arguably, it would have been less expensive. It seems to me that there would need to be some incentive to encourage people to take the same path we did, like a discounted permit fee in compensation for having to wait longer to receive the permit.

Another issue we might explore with regard to incentives are barriers that make it difficult to move a house. There may be some regulatory constraints that, if they were more flexible, could be enough to encourage houses to be moved more often.

TD: I had a question regarding the hazmat requirements. When you say that the City's requirements are the same as the State's...?

KG: We don't have our own requirements – we simply inform the applicant that they need to get the necessary permits from DEQ.

TD: How is that monitored?

KG: It's the contractor's responsibility to get those permits. We don't monitor whether they have or not, with the exception of fuel tanks.

TD: So I've seen instances of demolition when the contractor hadn't obtained the required permits as was doing work.

That's a concern, as we're talking about demolition activities happening in established neighborhoods where people could be unknowingly exposed to hazardous materials. So if we get to the permit cost issue, I think it would be important to address whether there's a way to fund local enforcement that would monitor those situations.

KG: I would rather build a mechanism into the existing permit issuance process where the applicant is required to show us proof of obtaining DEQ permits prior to us issuing the local permits.

JC: In my experience, just because you have a permit doesn't mean you're going to do the work correctly. I think you'd need to have a certificate of some sort to confirm that the house has been looked at by DEQ and they've confirmed that all hazardous materials have been removed.

KG: Sure. My concern is employing City staff in a manner that requires expertise they do not have.

MP: I had a question about whether two weeks would be enough time to coordinate moving a structure. Should it maybe be longer?

BG: Well, the motion includes a 35 working day notice, so you could make the moving time period be the same, I guess.

TD: So are you suggesting that the two would run concurrently or one after the other?

BG: I think it would be concurrent.

DL: On a different item...undue hardship. Would a property owner who is wanting to demolish an existing structure to redevelop at a higher density, which might

bring increased financial benefits, be able to rely on being denied that opportunity as part of the undue hardship assessment?

BG: That's part of item two.

FH: I have several points. First, I wonder if our discussions are starting to wander into the realm of writing code, and we're being too specific. When the Planning Commission reviewed and adopted the current provisions for demolition in Chapter 2.9, we tried to incorporate some percentage thresholds in order to establish undue hardship, and it likely ended up working against us to encourage "demolition by neglect." So we might want to keep this concept more general for now. I think it would be more appropriate to establish a purpose, but also require an applicant to come up with a plan for how the building is going to be salvaged if it can't be kept, and perhaps that plan has goals for reusing 51% of the materials, etc. But, I also think those aspirations are more appropriate for historic structures and not for a dwelling that was built more recently.

The other thing to keep in mind is that finding a market for used building materials is not easy. Habitat for Humanity has very strict limitations on what they will and won't accept.

We should keep in mind that contractors are required to provide safe working environments, and have to obtain DEQ certification for sites prior to allowing their crews to begin work. And while not everyone follows those rules, I think adding another layer of regulation is unnecessary.

JC: Is the concept that unless you can show there's an undue hardship, you wouldn't be allowed to demolish a building?

TD: Yes, I think that's correct.

JC: I have major reservations about that approach. There are likely many building that are more than 50 years old that people want to keep. You could have a situation where a couple has been in a dwelling for years and years and it's now functionally obsolete. The renovations needed to resolve those issues with the existing structure can often times be more expensive than if you simply tear it down and start over.

BG: I think you could provide flexibility to account for those situations. But, I'm going to suggest that the motion be reframed in light of the comments made by the group to simply say that the City require increased requirements for demolition of residential structures, including examining the following considerations. So the sense of what's noted already gets moved on, but the motion is not overly detailed.

TD: That seems to be a viable approach.

TH: Some of these concepts were built on the assumption that they'd apply to historic structures, where you'd want to be more mindful of opportunities to reuse some of the original materials. And even the hardship issue is really aimed at discouraging demolition of historic dwellings that could be renovated. When applied to all residential structures, you may have instances where, for reasons of compatibility or otherwise, it might actually be better the existing structure to be removed. But even in those instances, we'd still want them to divert materials from the landfill when possible. So perhaps one approach would be to offer permit cost incentives for diverting waste or moving a structure – a higher monetary value for diverting waste than for moving. That way you don't have to worry about how many days they have to find someone to move it, it just depends on how motivated the property owner is to obtain the permit discount.

TD: Okay. Anyone else have comments? Ken, and then Michael.

KG: I just wanted to briefly go over the memo staff presented to you at the last meeting. The changes that were made to the motion to address concerns over limiting application to only historic properties are helpful. There is still a concern about the additional staffing resources that would be necessary to administer more restrictive regulations for demolition permits. In response to Tony's comments, we do have maintain a direct relationship between the cost for a permit and the extent of services or time required to issue the permit. So we'd have to be thoughtful about how to structure an incentives program so it's fair to the applicants.

Procedurally, this seems to be a concept that should include a public forum to gather feedback, just like what was done for the proposed property maintenance code and parking districts. There was a similar, albeit more limited, proposal before the City Council to require photographs of structures prior to demolition, which garnered some opposition from the development community. The Council ultimately did not endorse that approach. Given the additional requirements that this proposal includes, it seems appropriate to provide an opportunity to hear those concerns it can be demonstrated to the Council, and others, that the work group took those matters into consideration.

TD: Okay, Michael.

MP: If the primary goal is to protect historic buildings that would otherwise be torn down, and perhaps the best option is to move them off site, maybe there's a way to incentivize moving them.

I'm also concerned about hazardous materials abatement. I think the house Trish mentioned earlier was the one torn down behind my house, and I'd agree that there didn't seem to be any steps taken to deal with those types of materials.

FH: I think what we're trying to do is preserve the character of these existing neighborhoods, which has been the main thrust of the Neighborhood Photo Survey.

Perhaps there's a way to integrate the two by creating a special category for dwellings that contribute toward neighborhood character to which the proposed regulations would apply.

BG: I think that could be complicated.

EA: The historic preservation lite concept could accomplish exactly that, but it would still be on a voluntary basis.

The other issue I want to raise about recycling or reusing building materials, beyond the logistical considerations of how to separate and market those items, it would seem challenging for City staff to actually track whether a certain percentage of materials was recycled or reused. I understand the intent, but there do seem to be some limitations on whether the City could determine how effective those requirements were over time.

TD: So I'd like to suggest that Betty revise motion based on the comments we've heard, maybe by restructuring it to capture more of a general purpose, as Frank suggested, among other issues.

BG: I can work with Eric on that, as he's been taking notes. However, I'm somewhat reluctant to make it too general prior to providing a focused opportunity for public comment. After that's happened, we can make adjustments based on whatever feedback we've received.

EA: One last item to take into consideration is that the current fees for demolition permits are based on a sliding scale tied to the value of the building. There isn't a static base fee that the City charges at the moment.

TD: Okay, let's move on to the next topic. I'm going to leave now and Betty will take over as Chair.

BG: Eric, are you ready to start our discussion on the process for considering zoning changes? We didn't get a memo on that, right?

EA: No, and I intentionally chose not to provide one, as I wanted to get direction from the group on how you'd like to proceed. I do have a general framework in mind, however.

Several months ago now, we decided to focus on determining what changes could be made to the development code in order to address infill development compatibility, and that those changes should be identified prior to making any changes to zoning. Since then we've compiled a substantial list of potential code amendments, and I've provided you with a summary list of those recommendations this evening. So, the first question I'd like to group to consider is whether there is still a need for modifying the zoning in some areas in light of these recommendations.

If the answer to that question is “yes”, then the next step could be to establish expected outcomes or goals for why certain zoning changes should be made. Based on those goals, we could craft decision criteria for determining which portions of the Project Area may need to be rezoned to address compatibility issues – whether that be “down-zoning” or “up-zoning”.

The last piece would be to identify what the trade-offs of those decisions might be, as require by the project scope of work.

So, how does the group feel about that approach?

BG: Does the group still believe adjustments to zoning are necessary?

TH: One of our goals was to maintain neighborhoods that are still mixed neighborhoods. The new standards should bring about higher quality conversion to higher density, such that a single family development that is zoned for RS-12, the new standards should mitigate some of the impacts of converting to higher density. In some cases, there may be fewer financial incentives for converting because of the new standards. But I think there are still areas that I think we should consider making zoning changes.

For example, the existing historic districts, where the zoning is in conflict with maintaining the historic structures because of differences in allowed density, those would be a fairly logical change. Another category might be existing lots that wouldn't facilitate development of minimum density without getting approval of a Lot Development Option or other variance.

There's also the potential to look at areas where the existing development pattern is predominantly single family, but the underlying zoning is for medium-high to high density; specifically those neighborhoods north of campus. It may be possible to reduce the density potential in some of those areas and recapture it elsewhere in areas that are close to major transportation corridors. In general, that connection between higher density development and the transportation system needs to be reassessed, in my opinion, as there are currently areas of higher density zoning that are somewhat distant from major streets and transit lines. That relationship, and opportunities for recapturing density elsewhere, would need to be done City-wide, as I don't think there's enough potential within the Project Area.

BG: Any other comments from the group?

FH: I think we've discussed before that there are some portions of the Project Area where the density balance has already shifted and probably can't be reversed. But there are likely other areas currently at risk of making that transition, which could be saved through some degree of rezoning.

I think we should also look at “islands” of non-residential zoning that are not consistent with the predominant pattern of zoning in the surrounding areas. For example, the industrial zoning in the general vicinity of SW 10th and SW ‘A’ Avenue.

Lastly, if there are large properties currently developed with substandard housing that are further away from the central city, up-zoning those to encourage redevelopment might be an effective way of recapturing density potential that is lost within the Project Area because of down-zoning.

MP: For me, the zoning issue is the main reason I’m here. In my neighborhood, there’s a sense that the density balance has tipped and that the diversity of housing has been diminished by an increase in multifamily housing. While there’s still an underlying matrix of single family housing, there hasn’t been a new single family home built in my neighborhood in over 50 years. It’s a neighborhood that really epitomizes the historic single family development pattern established immediately adjacent to the downtown core, and while we were able to get a majority of that area reduced to RS-12 from RS-20 through the last update to the Comprehensive Plan, I think rezoning to an even less dense zone would protect the character of my neighborhood and others like it.

BG: I agree that we need to look at zoning adjustments, and would add to Tony’s list the potential to introduce zoning transitions, such that we don’t have areas zoned RS-20 immediately adjacent to medium or low density zones. And, as part of that, we might want to review the definitions for “adjacent” and “abutting” in the context of how zoning patterns along the periphery of existing historic districts can impact their integrity.

TH: One more consideration...at earlier meetings, I think I’d mentioned the concept of taking a defined neighborhood area and establishing an average density limit so that, on a block by block basis, some blocks could have higher than average density but that would need to be balanced by other blocks with lower than average density. I’m not sure if that approach is viable without a Planned Development Overlay, but it would be one way to maintain, over time, a mixture of housing and density within these neighborhoods.

FH: So I think we’ve established that there’s an interest in proceeding with consideration of potential opportunities to rezone portions of the Project Area and elsewhere. I wonder if we could talk about how best to conduct that review? For me, I’m a visual thinker, and would appreciate looking at some maps of the Project Area to identify the various areas Tony and others have mentioned.

BG: I think it would also be helpful for the list of concepts to be compiled and maybe prioritized.

EA: Agreed. And Frank’s comment is a good segue to talking about some exercises we could do to discern where and what type of zoning changes might be necessary.

However, understand that, ultimately, the entire community is going to need to participate in those discussions, as the trade-offs associated with them will have an impact on areas inside and outside of the Collaboration boundary.

MP: I'd like to have a better understanding of what you mean by trade-offs.

EA: I'm not assigning any qualitative measure to the term "trade-off", simply that there's going to be reaction from make those types of changes, and it is part of the work group's task to identify what those might be.

KG: On that point, I'd add that we recognize there's a need to update the Buildable Lands Inventory to have a better understanding of what the current demand for housing may mean in terms of an optimal zoning configuration for the city.

BG: When the last update to the Comprehensive Plan occurred, there was an intentional decision to provide the opportunity for higher density in areas closer to the University. Unfortunately, we didn't anticipate what some of the potential outcomes of those decisions would be.

It seems to me that there might be categories of potential rezoning, such as adjustments to historic districts, which might be easier to address initially, and then transition to more complex areas.

KG: Absolutely. And those "low hanging fruit" might be easier to justify with DLCD.

EA: As a "guidepost" for that effort, you might look at a minimum density threshold for a given lot size, where if an existing single family house wasn't enough to satisfy minimum density for that zone, then down-zoning to create that result might be warranted.

LL: Do you know if the Parking and Traffic Work Group is dealing with zoning at all? In our neighborhood, the number of cars and increased traffic is a real concern.

EA: Yes, since the Steering Committee meeting March, that group has been exploring potential transportation planning strategies that could help mitigate those issues. The connection between zoning and transportation is a part of that, but they're focusing their efforts on potential policy-level recommendations that would be incorporated with future updates to the City's Transportation Master Plan and the OSU's Campus Master Plan. For example, what makes the most sense in terms of distribution of population in relation to transportation facilities, the University, and other employment centers, and are there strategies to facilitate having higher density in close proximity to those areas that alleviate the traffic impacts being experienced currently.

LL: So it sounds like they're not really looking at zoning.

EA: Yes and no. They're sensitive to areas of the city where zoning designations may not necessarily align with the actual physical improvements of a street, despite its functional classification. Harrison Boulevard is a perfect example where you have a concentration of medium to high density zoning within immediate proximity of a street that's classified as an Arterial street – but there's little opportunity to expand the traffic volume capacity because of limited right-of-way.

MP: I know that spot zoning is typically discouraged, but there are some smaller enclaves of historic homes that really should be saved with the Project Area if we're going to be serious about preserving neighborhood character.

BG: So that sounds like a good goal to start of our discussions on that topic. What might some others be?

TH: Maintaining mixed neighborhoods.

BG: Do you mean a variety of housing types?

TH: Yes.

FH: And variety in the sense of diverse populations made up of various household types and ages.

BG: So maybe a diversity of residences?

MP: As part of that, I think we need to encourage the potential for a diversity of uses in a neighborhood that allows for a mix of commercial, residential, and so forth. Much like they were formed before zoning even existed.

LL: Another goal I've thought of would be slowing down the pace of redevelopment.

BG: How would that be accomplished through looking at rezoning some areas? It seems more like a byproduct of that effort.

LL: It just seems like there should be some focus on how quickly these types of changes are allowed to take place.

FH: In a lot of ways, what you're talking about is simply related to market factors that combined to take advantage of zoning designations put in place years ago. Until that combination occurred, the zoning on its own couldn't have caused the pace of redevelopment we've experienced. So it seems like a goal might be balancing the distribution of housing density so that one or two specific areas don't have to carry all of the burden when conditions are favorable.

MP: Another issue is the gradual change in the percentage of owner-occupied homes. It seems like 15 years ago, the mixture was roughly 60 percent owner-

occupied and 40 percent rental. Now, I think those percentages have been reversed. But I'm not sure if you could address that through zoning.

EA: Probably not.

KG: It might be possible through a particular set of development standards that encourage a type of dwelling that was more conducive to owner-occupied housing.

EA: Like I said before, the current zoning designations are not the root cause of redevelopment in these neighborhoods – it is market forces resulting for an increased demand for a particular type of housing.

With that in mind, it may be prudent to look at the housing goals from the Comprehensive Plan; especially the one encouraging 50 percent of OSU's student population to be housed within a ½-mile of campus, as that policy was crafted with enrollment projections that were substantially less than what exists today.

BG: Do we know how many students are within that distance of campus?

KG: No, it's a difficult question to answer because of how OSU tracks student residency.

MM: I don't want to lose sight of Tony's average zoning concept. Does that need to be memorialized in a goal?

TH: I think it's more of technique than a goal.

BG: So it seems like we have a good list of goals to start with, as well as an initial list of potential categories of rezoning to work from. Is that enough to carry forward to our next meeting?

EA: I think so. This should give us a good basis for establishing some decision-making criteria, as well as a potential framework for exercises that could help with that analysis.

MP: It would be great if we could have a map of where the historic structures are located.

EA: Agreed. I've made a note to contact the Neighborhood Photo Survey volunteers to ask if that data might be available for our use.

FH: Having some landmarks noted on the map would also be useful. I'm always able to have a clearer understanding of what's in a particular area of town if I can relate it to a unique building.

BG: Okay. Any other requests of Eric?

EA: So for next time, Betty and I will work on refining the demolition recommendation based on the comments made this evening. And we'll also have a memo that compiles all of your comments on the topic of rezoning.

Right now, our next meeting is scheduled for June 27, but I was hoping that we might be able to move it to June 24. But I'll send out an email to the group to figure that out.

BG: Okay, we're adjourned.

Meeting Adjourns