City of Portland Preliminary comments on the April MMC IDP --- 5.2.2017

Below please find the combined comments of City Staff relating to the draft IDP:

1. **Existing Conditions**
   - Tables 2.3 and 3.3: Daily Census: Does this include volunteers serving in the hospital?
   - Figure 2.3 Map of MMC Owned parcels: Note that South parking lot, and maybe one other parking lot on Brackett Street, are not shown.
   - Figure 3.4: Please revise to show correct location for the Gilman Street Garage.
   - Public engagement in IDP: Please expand list of concerns to include that addressed later in IDP, such as heights and construction impacts.

2. **Comprehensive Plan Analysis:** Please update to reflect the latest version of the Comprehensive Plan.

3. **Transportation**
   - ***Alternative Modes and TDM:***
     - *Existing Conditions Analysis:* Please expand existing conditions analysis to more fully describe the range of existing access options, particularly re pedestrians, cycling and public transit, for example:
       - The IDP should include a broader description of walking and conditions for walking (e.g. this might be the place to reference the need for ADA improvements and sidewalk materials);
       - Figure 2.6: Could this be widened to address non-car access by adding bus stops;
       - Are the quoted transit costs weekly?
       - Figure 2.8: Include actual data from "Getting on Board" re mode split (even if data collection is not perfect, survey data seems to be under-representing bike share
     - *Future TDM Strategies:*
       - Please provide the TRIMMS Model spreadsheets regarding trip reduction estimates;
       - The IDP will need to reevaluate the TDM target based on existing mode split, model, and comps, confirm the target date, and clarify how progress will be monitored to feed into future parking need/adjustments to parking provision;
       - Table 2.9: This graphic could be clarified to provide a better understanding the headings/legend etc.
       - See *Attachment 1* **(**comments re MMC TDM Concepts).
   - ***Parking:***
     - *Alternative locations for new parking garage(s):* Please flesh out discussion of Gilman garage/St. John garage options, including what will happen on the Gilman Street site if the garage on St Johns is constructed.
     - *Parking Data Requests:*
       - The IDP would benefit from additional data on existing parking utilization. We understand that a windshield survey was performed, but formal parking occupancy counts were not performed. We suggest that parking occupancy surveys be performed.
       - Please explain how existing and future parking need was derived (i.e. provide the back-up calculations on the current and future projected parking demand estimates (including findings from TRIMMS)?
       - If showing comparables, add some regional examples which seem more 'comparable.' Can comps be shown with different metric (e.g. spaces /employee)?
   - ***Traffic Generation:*** See *Attachment 2* (comments re Traffic (counts and associated data))(Assume Traffic Study Analysis and proposals to be added and reviewed in next submission.)

4. **Infrastructure**
   - ***Stormwater and Sewer Capacity:*** Please expand and clarify analysis to reflect the fact that there are existing capacity concerns in the combined sewer system, and that any increase in the sewer flow will impact the ability to handle stormwater flows. Given this issue, the IDP should include strategies to achieve a substantial reduction in the anticipated volume of discharge into this system, including:
     - Routing of stormwater to the separated system, where possible;
     - Incorporation of storage infrastructure (e.g. Gilman Garage likely to be required to incorporate a subsurface chamber system with a pump system to discharge into A Street storm drain system);

    - Green infrastructure (e.g. green roofing; removal of impervious area, and subsurface chamber system), particularly where the discharge is to a combined system;
    - Reduction in sanitary flows to provide capacity for increases in stormwater flows (e.g.sanitary demands and pollutant loads could be reduced by composting food waste instead of using the current grinder system, installing grease interceptors (large volume or many small) as part of overall upgrades to the system).
    - Note that changing the location of the discharge points would not provide any benefit to the combined system; may have to relocate or install another Downstream Defender or possibly connect to the separated system.
- ***Detailed Data Requests:***
    - Figure 2.15: Can the figure show the general delineation where the 6.3 acres of the campus has been separated and drains to A Street?
    - Figure 2.15: Consider adding the 5 sampling locations in the Industrial Pre-treatment Permit (IPT) with the City of Portland. Is it possible to identify unknown sewer connections at this time? If not, can these be addressed through future planning efforts?
- ***Other Utilities****:* Address water supply and Unitil's SURE program (they plan significant work in the area for 2020-2022).
- ***Operational Impacts:*** Consider expanding to clarify the potential impacts or issues that may need to be addressed, including:
    - IPT program and sampling locations may need additional sampling points;
    - Other Impacts to City Infrastructure: Cross reference to other infrastructure covered elsewhere (e.g. roads, sidewalks);
    - Traffic signal systems and pre-emption for emergency vehicles.
- ***Street Lighting:*** Expand to note that Congress from St. John to State is included in the Downtown Lighting District, and that MMC may need to install additional Downtown District special street lights when sites (e.g. Gilman Street block) within the IOZ are redeveloped. Mention potential collaboration regarding the City's LED Street Light conversion project.
- ***Sustainable Operations:*** Consider adding a section regarding proposals for capital investment in sustainable features or goals for energy reduction as part of the expansion program (e.g.reflecting various references to green roofs, possibly solar panels, and LEED accredited buildings).

Historic Resources

- ***Western Promenade:*** Please clarify how the campus will integrate with/enhance the Western Prom, which abuts the "Upper Campus" (e.g. proposals include building heights that imply new development over what are also identified as protected open spaces around an historic building; the original hospital is shown as "continued investment cautioned" on Figure 2.2 and this is a concern). The Western Promenade is a well-used amenity for the hospital, and the city's objective is to enhance this area including showcasing of existing distant views.
- ***Vaughan Street Parking Lot:*** Please include this lot in the long term plan (Figure 3.4) and indicate intentions for this site.
- ***Detail/data requests:***
    - Include analysis of how proposed buildings will impact views from the Western Promenade to the west and northwest, based on the proposed maximum building heights;
    - Figure 2.2: Labelling buildings would be helpful;
    - Note that the West End Historic District and Western Promenade Historic Landscape District are designated both nationally and locally.

Design

- See Urban Design comments in *Attachment 3.*
- ***Neighborhood Transitions:*** Clarify the location of "East Upper Campus"; and "Upper Campus" abuts the West End Historic District.
- ***CPTED:*** Please expand CPTED discussion to fully address local issues and public comments (e.g. loitering etc.) Note that lighting within the campus, and between the campus and any more remote parking facilities, is important.

- ***Landscape:*** Please add discussion of landscape framework (e.g. Figure 6.2: how will a series of landscape spaces play out in reality?)

Neighborhood Engagement

- ***Ongoing engagement***
  - Consider exploring additional mechanisms to promote healthy relationships with neighbors.
  - Consider strategies for communication around acquisition and divestment).
  - Please expand snow ban parking discussion to refer to how current situation under Contract Zone will be continued.
- ***Construction engagement***
  - Please include a commitment to meeting with businesses early to consider how to mitigate impacts.
  - Define 'MFP Project,' as this is the first time this language is introduced.
  - Consider ways to mitigate construction impacts and economic hardship for neighbors and businesses.

Regulatory Framework

- ***Comments/questions re proposed provisions:***

IDP Regulatory Framework No.	***Subject***	***Comments***
1	***Boundary***	Since housing areas are now within the boundaries, IDP should address intent, also address divestment of existing (formerly) residential properties.
Table 2.1:	***Thresholds for Plan amendments***	What is the basis of the 800KSF threshold? Is this whichever is first? TDM updates and monitoring (proposed at 5 years for both) are too infrequent and discussion on p. 61 should explain.
3	***Uses***	Suggest further discussion on extent to which (for example) residential apartments would be limited to medical students only and how uses are linked to current zoning options (eg re guest houses).
Table 4.1	***Dimensional Requirements***	Is 40 feet on Congress Street too great a build-to line? What is the basis of the 70% of façade facing congress Street? Transition Zones (iii) should include height as well? Also see the *Preliminary Design Comments* attached.
Map 4.1	***Building Heights map***	Doublecheck McGeechy Hall height.
Maps 4.1 and 4.2	***Building heights and Transition Zones***	Look carefully at Gilman height/transition. Public comment pointed out that St John and Valley Street labelling is incorrect to north of Congress.
5 Ai:	***Sidewalk material***	Define 'alternative material substantially similar to that used along sidewalks abutting Bramhall Street entrance?'
5B	***TDM Trip Reduction Target***	Target of 65 (presumably SOV) trips in three years needs reconsideration; note PB urging rethink of car culture- MMC leadership re TDM. Strategic initiatives might be mentioned.
5D	***Parking provision***	Parking numbers should match the demonstrated need shown in the IDP. Perhaps express these as a ratio? Or provide a range?
6	***Site Plan review items***	As written this could imply that other "usual" site plan requirements would not be considered by the Planning Board during the review.
7A	***Other Requirements***	Helipad Requirements- these have not been mentioned in the main part of the IDP except re potential issue of noise. How do these regulations relate to the existing ones and are there any issues that have come out of the flight monitoring (required in Contract Zone) that need to be addressed when its relocated?
7	***Other Requirements***	Does this include all other Contract Zone commitments that might reasonably be brought forward?

- ***Other items suggested to be added/addressed, with specificity and or references back to IDP sections or plans:***
    - Landscape strategy
    - Commitment to activations of Congress St through ground floor mixed uses that serve community and MMC
    - Design standards
    - Clarification of how MMC has RTI re partnerships that construct parking or other facilities for their use
    - Intentions re Chadwick, West, Vaughan/Bramhall where IDP indicates they should be given "additional consideration"
    - Commitment re Construction Mitigation and Communication
    - Commitment to engagement with neighborhood residents and local businesses

MMC TDM Comments (4/28/17)

The IDP should consider a phased approach to TDM that will allow Maine Med to build and modify the TDM program over time based on sound data and respond to evolving regional thinking on TDM. The goal of the first phase could be to prioritize a few short-term actions meant to build solid baseline data on the hospital population's current travel characteristics, immediately enhance travel options in and around the hospital, and reduce demand for single-occupancy vehicles.

The first phase could build on the prior work of the Get On Board program and include the following:

1. **The hiring of a full-time TDM coordinator** to oversee data collection and promote the TDM program (This appears in the IDP, but the plan does not specify a full-time position.)
2. A comprehensive, continuous effort **to collect and analyze data** on:
    a. employee, patient, and visitor travel characteristics
    b. parking demand and utilization, and
    c. the potential for changes in travel behavior
3. **Improved parking management**, including modified employee pricing to better align with the actual cost of parking and the development of a cash-out option (which provides an incentive not to use parking)
4. **A program to encourage METRO ridership,** including:
    a. support for service adjustments (e.g. to improve headways or extend hours of operation)
    b. enhanced employee subsidies
    c. the development of services that facilitate use (e.g. kiosks in the hospital displaying real time bus information, premium shelter at new hospital entrance, and marketing and promotion)
5. **Infrastructure improvements that support walking and bicycling**, such as:
    a. the development of bikeways identified in the city's long-range plans
    b. the integration of additional covered bicycle parking
    c. and sidewalk, crosswalk, and streetscape improvements on key pedestrian routes

In addition to these, the hospital should review opportunities to enhance carpool/vanpool matching (see the existing IDP language), telecommuting options, satellite parking options, and the Guaranteed Ride Home system (how does this currently work?).

Lastly, the Regulatory Framework should include language that requires reporting within a specified period following implementation of this first phase of the TDM plan, with subsequent plan modification and review.

Comments Related to Traffic Information Provided by Randy Dunton on April 20, 2017

- Please document the duration of the AM and PM peak period counts that were used to determine the peak hours noted.
- The information on reassignment of employee trips only accounts for trips associated with those to be shifted from the employee parking garage. The assignment should be conducted for all parking sources for MMC. If consolidation of parking facilities is occurring (Gateway Garage and surface lots) those should also be included.
- The employee traffic levels at the garage are low considering employee figures. We recognize that shift times are a major factor and the turning movement volumes reflect adjacent street traffic peak volumes conditions, which is an acceptable method. With that said we would like to fully understand employee trip generation over the shift time periods, inclusive of all parking supply locations. We suspect this information has not been collected and would be labor intensive to collect. A method for providing this information should be suggested for review and approval by City staff. Please correlate/cross-check the data of traffic entering and exiting the employee garage with known employee shift data and drive mode share.
- Related to the comment regarding employee garage data for entering/exiting traffic from the employee garage, we'd like to get a better understanding of visitor entering/exiting traffic levels during the AM and PM peak hours. As with employees, visitor traffic levels during the AM and PM peak hours seems low and may reflect specific appointment time variation. Some discussion on how visitor traffic varies throughout the day is suggested. Please correlate this visitor garage traffic data with the other known data on fluctuations of visitor/patients to the hospital.
- Additional counts will be required to address seasonal traffic volume adjustments. As previously discussed, the locations to be re-counted will be identified by City staff following acceptance of an approved trip generation re-assignment exercise. Please provide information to indicate <u>all</u> intersections that meet the TMP-specific thresholds for traffic analysis to be included in the analysis.

MMC draft IDP – Preliminary Design Comments 4.27.17
Caitlin Cameron, Urban Designer

Design Goals and Vision

- Design goals listed in draft IDP – Staff supports these goals; they are logical given the context and specific site conditions.
    - A campus that belongs in Maine and engages the surrounding community
    - Natural environment is an important source of inspiration for the campus design – the future campus will create a seamless transition between the bucolic character of Western Promenade and the urban condition
    - The campus extends its reach down from the top of the hill to engage with the community along Congress Street
    - Holistic design approach that gives coherence to the overall campus
    - Site plan will give special attention to the neighborhood context
- Because of its topography, building scale, and geographic location, MMC site plays de facto gateway role on two scales – the approach to the city from 295 and the eastbound Congress Street approach. Staff would like to see a goal that acknowledges this gateway function for future design thinking.
- Planning Board commented on the desire to have design goals clearly expressed in the document and lead to resulting regulating framework. Specifically recommended was a goal around quality of design.

Site analysis

- Context Defined - Four contexts identified in draft IDP:
    - Congress Street
    - Valley Street
    - East Upper Campus
    - Upper Campus
- Analysis: Staff is in the process of evaluating the proposed dimensional regulations – most important is the relationship of potential new development in relationship to the West End neighborhood, Gilman Street, and Congress Street contexts.
- Impacts: Compare existing vs. proposed impacts (height, wind, shadow)
- Issues: Identify any current site or design issues (safety, lighting, grading, circulation/access, sidewalk conditions, etc.) that future plans might address and state them as design goals.

Regulating Framework

- More explicitly describe how the goals and site analysis lead to the design regulatory framework. Include more explanation – visual or written – on how the heights, setbacks, and transition zones were arrived at. Applicant will provide typical sections at Congress, Gilman, and West End South Lot to better explain these height and massing relationships to the context.
- In the instances where existing historic buildings will remain, confirm the heights shown or revert to existing zoning height maximums.

- Clarify the status of the private "Protected Open Spaces" shown in the document and consistently show them in the regulatory framework graphics. Are these spaces never to be built on or is there a different label to describe them?
- Design guidelines: Staff proposes the following strategy for design guidelines to the IOZ:
    - Developments relating to the West End historic district will be subject to the existing Historic Preservation Board design review process
    - Staff will work with the applicant to develop design guidelines for developments relating to residential context not protected by the historic district that ensure sensitive transitions. The height, transition areas, and setbacks will be the primary regulations for this context.
    - Staff will work with the applicant to develop design guidelines for developments relating to Congress Street that meet the goals and intent of the Downtown Vision Plan and Urban Design Guidelines. Staff agrees with applicant that activation of Congress Street frontage is an important goal. There is concern from the Planning Board regarding the placement of several parking structures on Congress Street which should be the most active of the campus' frontages.

Order 221-16/17
Amended to delete, in Section 14-281(g), "Amendments brought forth by the city will require a supermajority of the City Council to take effect.": 9-0 on 5/1/2017
Passage as amended: 9-0 on 5/1/2017 Effective 5/31/2017

ETHAN K. STRIMLING (MAYOR)
BELINDA S. RAY (1)
SPENCER R. THIBODEAU (2)
BRIAN E. BATSON (3)
JUSTIN COSTA (4)

CITY OF PORTLAND
IN THE CITY COUNCIL

DAVID H. BRENERMAN (5)
JILL C. DUSON (A/L)
PIOUS ALI (A/L)
NICHOLAS M. MAVODONES, JR (A/L)

AMENDMENT TO PORTLAND CITY CODE
CHAPTER 14
Re: INSTITUTIONAL OVERLAY ZONE

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, MAINE IN CITY COUNCIL ASSEMBLED AS FOLLOWS:

That Chapter 14, Sections 14-277 to 14-282 of the Portland City Code are hereby amended as follows:

Art. I. In General, § 14-1--14-15
Art. II. Planning Board, § 14-16--14-45
Art. III. Zoning, § 14-46--14-490

...

Div. 16. Waynflete School Overlay Zone, § 14-276—-14-276.10
Div. 16.1. Institutional Overlay Zone (IOZ), § 14-277—-14-293
Div. 17. B-7 Mixed Development District Zone, § 14-294—14-304

...

DIVISION 16.1. INSTITUTIONAL OVERLAY ZONE (IOZ)

14-277. ~~Reserved.~~ Purpose of the Institutional Overlay Zone

The Institutional Overlay Zone (IOZ) designation provides a regulatory mechanism available to the city's four major medical and higher education campuses where an improved regulatory structure is needed to facilitate a consistent, predictable, and clear growth management process. The purposes of the Institutional Overlay Zone are to:

(a) Acknowledge that the city's major academic and medical institutions play a prominent role in the health and well-being of

the local and regional community, and in order to sustain that role, these institutions need flexibility to change and grow;

(b) Encourage proactive planning for institutional change and growth which identifies and addresses likely long-term institutional needs and cumulative impacts while leveraging potential benefits at the neighborhood, city, and regional level;

(c) Ensure that institutional change and growth both complements and, as appropriate, integrates adjacent or surrounding neighborhoods through carefully planned transitions;

(d) Support the formation and continuation of mutually beneficial public-private cooperation;

(e) Support an ongoing public engagement process that benefits both the institutions and nearby neighborhoods;

(f) Reflect Comprehensive Plan and other policy objectives; and

(g) Provide a consistent regulatory approach to all major institutions which allows unique regulatory requirements that balance the particular needs of institutions with the needs of the surrounding neighborhood and wider community.

14-278. ~~Reserved.~~ Location and Applicability

The city's four primary medical and higher education institutions are eligible to apply for designation as Institutional Overlay Zones. The Eligible Institutions are the two major hospital institutions of Maine Medical Center and Mercy Hospital and the two major academic institutions of University of Southern Maine and University of New England, their successors and assigns. Designation as an IOZ is the preferred mechanism where the Eligible Institution's proposed development is inconsistent with the existing zoning.

14-279. ~~Reserved.~~ Establishment of an Institutional Overlay Zone

(a) Application for an Institutional Overlay Zone. Where the Eligible Institution seeks designation as an IOZ, they shall submit a zone change application consisting of two components:

1. An Institutional Development Plan (IDP) (see Section 14-280).
2. A Regulatory Framework (see Section 14-281) that would, when and if adopted, be the text and map amendment to the City's Land Use Code and Zoning Map.

(b) Required Public Involvement. At least two neighborhood meetings shall be required. The first shall be held prior to the formal submission of a zone change application for an Institutional

Overlay Zone and the second shall be held during the City's review. Meetings shall identify the concerns, if any, of affected residents and property owners, and inform the development of the Institutional Development Plan (IDP) and Regulatory Framework. Meetings shall be held in a convenient location proximate to the institution. The applicant shall provide written notification to property owners of record within 500 feet of the proposed IOZ boundary at least ten days prior to the meeting dates and maintain written records of the meetings.

(c) Required Scoping Meeting. The Eligible Institution shall meet with the Planning Authority after the first required neighborhood meeting and prior to submission of the zone change application to confirm the focus of the Institutional Development Plan (IDP) and Regulatory Framework, including associated study areas that may be outside of the proposed IOZ boundary. The IDP and Regulatory Framework will vary in detail and focus depending on the Eligible Institution and its particular context. The content requirements in Sections 14-280 and 14-281 and the comments from neighborhood meeting(s) shall provide direction for the content of the IDP. The Planning Authority or Planning Board may require additional information or modify content requirements as is relevant to the Eligible Institution (see Section 14-280(c)).

(d) Reviewing Authority.

1. The Planning Board shall review the zone change application, including the IDP and Regulatory Framework. At least one public workshop and a public hearing before the Planning Board are required.
2. Upon recommendation of the Planning Board, the City Council shall review and consider adoption of the Institutional Overlay Zone and the accompanying Regulatory Framework as an amendment to the city's code of ordinances.

(e) Future Institutional Development.

1. All new development by the Eligible Institution within the boundary of the IOZ shall be compliant with the IOZ and accompanying Regulatory Framework, consistent with the IDP, consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, and meet applicable site plan standards, unless such standards are superseded by the Regulatory Framework.
2. Any use/development proposed by the Eligible Institution outside the IOZ boundary that complies with the zoning for permitted uses in that location shall be reviewed under the standards of that zone. Any use/development proposed by an Eligible Institution outside of the IOZ boundary that is

proposed in a residential zone and is functionally related to the operations within the IOZ shall be addressed by the IDP and require an amendment to the IDP.

14-280. ~~Reserved.~~ Institutional Development Plan *(IDP)*

(a) Purpose. Any use conducted by an Eligible Institution and any construction by an Eligible Institution in an Institutional Overlay Zone shall be consistent with an Institutional Development Plan (IDP) approved by the Planning Board in accordance with this ordinance. The purpose of the IDP is to establish baseline data about institutional land uses, facilities, and services and measure, analyze, and address the anticipated or potential impacts of planned institutional growth and change. The IDP shall serve as a background document that supports the proposed Regulatory Framework and frames subsequent site plan review(s).

(b) Planning Horizon. An IDP shall provide the city and abutting neighborhoods with a clear outline of the anticipated or potential growth and change of the Eligible Institution for the short- to medium-term (e.g. 1-5 and 5-10 years respectively), as well as a conceptual growth plan for the long-term (e.g. 10 years or more); however, the specific planning horizons for each institution will be determined as part of the IDP approval process.

(c) Content. The IDP submission shall address the following elements unless specifically modified by the Planning Authority or Planning Board, with the scope and level of detail to be clarified at the required Scoping Meeting:

1. Context Information
   a. The institution's adopted mission, vision, or purpose statement
   b. A summary of relevant baseline data on the institution, including:
      i. A neighborhood context plan;
      ii. An inventory of current programs and services;
      iii. A current census of the number of people using the institution (e.g., employees, enrollment, patients), with an indication of maximums and minimums over time;
      iv. An inventory and/or plan of all existing property holdings within the main campus

and within the City of Portland, including an indication of functional land use links between off-campus properties and the main campus (e.g. remote parking);

v. An inventory and/or plan of existing facilities, including data on use, floor area, and any existing functional connections between facilities.

c. A summary of the baseline characteristics of the existing campus and context of the institution, based on identified study areas, including:

i. A summary of existing resources, such as historic, open space, and natural resources;

ii. A summary of the existing transportation system, including vehicular, pedestrian, transit, bicycle, and parking supply, demand, and utilization;

iii. A summary of existing public infrastructure supporting the institution, including demand, utilization and any capacity issues;

iv. Relevant municipal plans, projects, and studies that may influence the IDP study area and opportunities for integrating institutional growth.

d. A summary of public involvement in the development of the IDP, including major areas of public concern.

2. Assessment of Future Institutional Growth and Change

a. A description of institutional needs and areas of future institutional growth and change, including:

i. Projected census of users (e.g., enrollment /employment/patient/visitor figures and anticipated variations over time);

ii. Institutional objectives for property both within and outside the IOZ boundary (e.g. acquisition and/or disposition), including an indication of any functional land use connection for sites outside the IOZ boundary to the main campus; and

iii. A Development Plan addressing anticipated or potential institutional needs and

physical improvements, including the proposed boundary of the IOZ and any phasing of the development.

b. Analysis and associated plans that address the following elements in terms of anticipated growth or potential impacts within the identified study area, and support the development parameters as set out in the Regulatory Framework:

i. Transportation and access

a. An analysis of the projected changes in parking demand, supply, and impacts to the off-street and on-street parking capacity, including an explanation of the proposed parking plan;

b. An analysis of the projected changes in vehicular, pedestrian, transit, and bicycle access routes and facilities, their capacity, and safety;

c. A transportation, access, and circulation plan, representing the synthesis of the analysis, and including a program of potential improvements or set of guidelines to address access deficiencies to and within the IOZ. The plan should outline proposed mechanisms and potential strategies to meet transportation objectives, including transportation demand management, phasing, and when a Traffic Movement Permit (TMP) may be required.

ii. Environment

a. An analysis of potential cumulative impacts on natural resources and open spaces;

b. An analysis of projected energy consumption, hazardous materials generation, noise generation, and similar issues as relevant;

c. An environmental plan, representing the synthesis of the analysis and including a proposed program or set of guidelines for future preservation,

enhancement, conservation, and/or mitigation.

iii. Infrastructure

a. An analysis of projected public utility demand and the capacity of associated infrastructure;

b. An analysis of projected public safety needs and projected impacts to the capacity of these services;

c. An infrastructure plan, representing the synthesis of the analysis and including a proposed program or set of guidelines to support sustainable growth.

iv. Design

a. An analysis of projected impacts to neighboring properties and public spaces, including potential shadow, wind, and lighting impacts, impacts of height and massing, and impacts to historic resources;

b. An analysis of transition areas between the institution and adjoining neighborhoods, including identification of key character defining components of the surrounding context;

c. An analysis of existing Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design issues and identification of how these principles would be addressed as part of the proposed campus development;

d. A conceptual built environment/public realm plan, representing the synthesis of the analysis and including a set of guidelines for urban design, landscape, open space, and streetscape treatments, with particular attention to the treatment of edges (both within and abutting the IOZ boundary) to achieve compatible transitions.

v. Neighborhood Engagement

a. A plan for ongoing community engagement that represents best

practices, promotes collaborative problem solving around community concerns, fosters transparency, and identifies mechanisms for neighborhood feedback and institutional accountability;

b. A property management framework that identifies the institution's process for handling operational property issues with neighbors;

c. Strategies for assuring communication pertaining to property acquisition and disposition in surrounding neighborhoods;

d. A set of construction management principles, to apply to all institutional construction, that represent best practice, aim to minimize short- and long-term construction impacts on surrounding residents and businesses, and ensure a clear communication strategy is in place in advance of construction.

(d) Standards of Review. The IDP shall:

1. Address all content requirements, unless explicitly modified by the Planning Authority or Planning Board;
2. Reflect the issues/topics identified in the required public process;
3. Demonstrate consistency with the city's Comprehensive Plan and the purpose of this ordinance;
4. Demonstrate how the property ownership, proposed growth, and requested Regulatory Framework relate to the institution's mission;
5. Demonstrate that traffic and parking impacts have been anticipated and that the proposed parking provision is justified as based on an assessment of options for reducing traffic and parking demands;
6. Outline an approach to open space, natural, and historic resources that supports preservation and enhancement.
7. Demonstrate that potential cumulative environmental impacts have been anticipated and can be minimized or satisfactorily mitigated;

8. Demonstrate that utility impacts have been anticipated and can be minimized or satisfactorily mitigated;

9. Reflect a comprehensive design approach that ensures appropriate transitions with the existing or future scale and character of the neighboring urban fabric;

10. Promote compatibility with existing or future uses in adjacent neighborhoods, maintain housing, and support local amenities;

11. Anticipate future off-site improvements that would support the integration of the institution into the community and city-wide infrastructure;

12. Conform with Portland's Historic Preservation Ordinance standards for designated landmarks or for properties within designated historic districts or designated historic landscapes, if applicable. When proposed adjacent to or within one hundred (100) feet of designated landmarks, historic districts, or historic landscapes, the IDP shall be generally compatible with the major character-defining elements of the landmark or portion of the district in the immediate vicinity; and

13. Incorporate strategies to support clear communication and ongoing public engagement between institutions and nearby neighbors.

(e) Approval. Upon finding that an Eligible Institution's IDP meets the standards of review, the Planning Board shall approve, approve with conditions, or deny an IDP.

(f) Monitoring. The IDP shall establish a schedule for reporting on IDP implementation at regular intervals of not more than ten years from the date of approval of the initial or amended IDP, and identify thresholds for IDP amendments;

(g) Amendments. An approved IDP shall guide campus development unless and until amended. If at any time the Eligible Institutions request minor amendments to an approved IDP, the Planning Authority may approve such minor amendments, provided that they do not constitute a substantial alteration of the IDP and do not affect any condition or requirement of the Planning Board. The applicant shall apply with a written statement of the proposed amendment and proposed amended IDP to the Planning Authority, whose decision as to whether the amendment is minor shall be final. Major amendments shall be reviewed by the Planning Board. When the IDP is amended, the baseline data in the IDP shall be updated as appropriate.

14-281. Regulatory Framework

(a) Purpose. The Regulatory Framework translates the IDP into a set of clear and specific zoning requirements for the IOZ that constitute the text and map amendments to the City's Land Use Code and Zoning Map. The zoning requirements are anticipated to include parameters that guide the growth and change of the institution as well as broad strategies to address potential impacts, with– plans and details to be developed under site plan review.

(b) Applicability. The Regulatory Framework shall apply only to properties that are within the IOZ boundary and to which the Eligible Institution holds right, title, or interest. For these properties, the Institutional Overlay Zone shall supersede the underlying zoning, and all new institutional development shall be conducted in compliance with the Regulatory Framework and the approved Institutional Development Plan. Properties located within the Institutional Overlay Zone not subject to right, title, or interest of the Eligible Institution shall continue to be governed by the regulations of the underlying zoning designation.

(c) Uses. Institutional uses, including hospitals and higher education facilities, shall be permitted, as shall uses that are functionally integrated with, ancillary to, and/or substantively related to supporting the primary institutional use, consistent with the applicable approved IDP.

(d) Content. The Regulatory Framework shall reflect the information and analysis of the IDP. The content shall be tailored to address the particular issues associated with the institution and its neighborhoods. The Regulatory Framework should be succinct and use tables and graphics as possible to address the following, if applicable:

1. *Zoning boundary of the IOZ*: The area to which the regulations apply, as shown on the zoning map, subject to other provisions of this ordinance (i.e. the map amendment to the City's Zoning Map);
2. *Phasing and schedules:* Requirements that relate to particular proposed phases; a chart showing the schedule or thresholds for submitting an amended IDP (or elements of an IDP, such as a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan);
3. *Uses:* Clarification, as necessary, on permitted uses.
4. *Dimensional Requirements*: Graphics, sketches, or standards, including details for transition zones within the IOZ boundary;
5. *Transportation*: Elements such as TDM trip reduction targets or contribution to area-wide TDM measures; broad parameters for ensuring pedestrian, vehicular, bicycle and transit access and safety; parking ratios

and management strategies; thresholds for access improvements;

6. *Environment:* The approach to the inclusion of open space and preservation of environmentally-sensitive areas;

7. *Mitigation measures*: The broad approach to identified mitigation measures, which would be addressed in greater detail in the site plan review process; thresholds for addressing deficiencies; goals for preservation/protection;

8. *Design*: Graphics and standards to clarify building placement and envelope (height and massing); guidelines for integration of site features; required treatments for transition zones and treatment for all edges (both within and abutting the IOZ boundary); guidelines for establishing campus identity; and

9. *Neighborhood Integration:* Thresholds and strategies for neighborhood engagement; mitigation of impacts on neighboring properties, including construction impacts; buffering requirements; objectives for pedestrian linkages and safety; other requirements that address community concerns.

10. *Monitoring:* A schedule for regular monitoring reports on IDP implementation in accordance with the IDP.

(e) Standards of Review: The Regulatory Framework shall:

1. Be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the Institutional Development Plan;

2. Provide a clear zoning framework, using graphics and tables as appropriate, to apply to future site plan reviews;

3. Provide specific regulatory statements as appropriate that respond to concerns raised during the required public involvement; and

4. Outline measurable goals and thresholds for improvements or other actions identified in the IDP to be advanced in subsequent site plan applications.

(f) Approval/Adoption. The Planning Board shall review the proposed Regulatory Framework against the standards of review and make a recommendation on the institution's IOZ designation and Regulatory Framework to the City Council for adoption as part of this zoning ordinance.

(g) Amendments. A Regulatory Framework and IOZ boundary as adopted by the City Council shall remain in force unless and until amended. Amendments to a Regulatory Framework and/or IOZ boundary may be brought forth by the city or Eligible Institution. Proposed

amendments to the IOZ boundary or Regulatory Framework shall be reviewed by the Planning Board and adopted by the City Council subject to the provisions of this ordinance.

14-282. Reserved.

* Editor's note. Order No. -16/17, adopted May , 2017, provided that the Regulatory Frameworks, as they are adopted by the City Council for each Eligible Institution, shall be codified within this section.