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## Plan Summary

The Plan Summary provides an overview of the St. Johns/Lombard Plan, including its purpose, key findings, and recommendations. It is intended to help stakeholders understand the context and priorities of the plan.

## Plan Adoption Process

The Plan Adoption Process outlines the steps taken to develop and adopt the St. Johns/Lombard Plan. This includes public engagement, stakeholder input, and formal approval through the planning process.

## 1. Introduction

The introduction sets the stage for the plan by providing background information and setting the context for the plan's development.

## 2. Background

The background section provides context about the area, including historical, social, and economic factors that have shaped the current conditions.

## 3. Plan Elements

These elements are the core of the plan and include:

- **Vision Statement**: Provides a clear and concise statement of the desired future of the area.
- **Planning Goals**: Outlines specific outcomes that the plan aims to achieve.
- **Urban Development Concept**: Details the overall strategy for urban growth and development.

## 4. Policies and Actions

These sections detail the policies and actions that will guide future development and decision-making:

1. **Land Use and Placemaking**: Strategies for land use and public space creation.
2. **History and Identity**: Preservation and enhancement of local history and cultural identity.
3. **Transportation**: Improvements to transportation networks and systems.
4. **Economic Development**: Initiatives to support economic growth and prosperity.
5. **Housing**: Policies and actions to promote affordable and sustainable housing.
6. **Environment**: Measures to protect and enhance the natural environment.
7. **Willamette Riverfront**: Strategies for the riverfront area.
8. **Community Involvement and Services**: Initiatives to support community engagement and services.

## 5. Implementation Tools and Guidance

This section describes the tools and guidance to support the implementation of the plan:

- **Comprehensive Plan Map**: A visual representation of the plan's content.
- **Transportation Implementation Tools**: Guidance for transportation improvements.
- **Community Design Guideline Amendments**: Updates to design guidelines.
- **Zoning Map and Code Amendments**: Amendments to zoning regulations.

## Appendix A: Ordinance and Resolution

This appendix contains the ordinances and resolutions associated with the plan's adoption and implementation.

## Appendix B: Outreach Log

This appendix records the outreach activities and communication efforts.

## Appendix C: Documents Under Separate Cover

Documents under separate cover include:

- Results of the Open House
- Existing Conditions Reports
- Neighborhood Walks Summaries
- Latino and Hmong Outreach Report
- Urban Development Concept Report
- Land Use Evaluation Reports
- Transportation Alternatives Evaluation
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Plan Summary

The St. Johns/Lombard Plan is designed to set the framework for creating a more complete and vibrant St. Johns town center and North Lombard main street area over the next 20 years. The plan focuses on land use and transportation issues, and was initiated in the fall of 2001 as a cooperative effort supported by the community and the City of Portland.

The plan responds to community aspirations, as well as public policy directives. The community desires a more livable and economically viable town center and main street, with a broader spectrum of neighborhood serving uses. City and regional goals call for creating a sustainable and complete community where change, growth, and development are expected to occur, while maintaining livability.

The St. Johns/Lombard Plan addresses these broad objectives by recommending:

1. **Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and zoning maps, and Zoning Code regulations.** These amendments will result in changes to the area’s development pattern over time, and are designed to:
   - Create distinctive, identifiable places for pedestrian-oriented retailing, neighborhood-scaled retail and mixed use, and areas that accommodate automobiles.
   - Provide places for additional housing and mixed-use development in downtown St. Johns, near the river, and along the main street to help support community-serving businesses and further the plan’s housing goals.
   - Improve the design quality of new development around the St. Johns town center to build upon the existing small town character of the community, and strengthen its relationship with the Willamette River.
   - Retain places for employment and industrial land uses that contribute to the regional economy and provide jobs.

2. **Balanced transportation improvements** designed to improve circulation and safety of pedestrians, bicyclists, vehicles, and transit users. The improvements emphasize a better pedestrian environment, while facilitating traffic flow and freight movement in a way that furthers the area’s livability.

3. **A series of ongoing and future actions** to strengthen economic development, environmental quality, community amenities, and the sense of history, community, and identity already evident in the area.

4. **Recommendations for subsequent planning efforts** to evaluate environmental resources and development patterns and potential near the Willamette River, an asset to both the peninsula community and the city.
Plan Adoption Process

Portland Planning Commission
The Portland Planning Commission held a public hearing and four work sessions on the plan between September 2003 and January 2004, and made the following recommendations to City Council:

1. **Adopt an ordinance that:**
   a. Approves the Recommended St. Johns/Lombard Plan ("the report") and its appendices;
   b. Amends the Comprehensive Plan to include the vision statement and the planning goals and policies contained in the report;
   c. Amends the Comprehensive Plan Map as shown in the report;
   d. Amends the Master Street Plan Map as shown in the report; and
   e. Amends the Portland Zoning Code and Zoning Map as shown in the report.

2. **Adopt a resolution that approves the urban development concept and action charts contained in the report.**

3. **Direct the Bureau of Planning staff to work with implementing agencies to identify funding sources and develop strategies that implement the projects, programs, and activities identified in the action charts contained in the report.**

Portland Design Commission
The Portland Design Commission held a public hearing and two work sessions on the plan between September 2003 and January 2004, and made the following recommendations to City Council:

The City of Portland Design Commission recommends that City Council adopt an ordinance that amends the Community Design Guidelines to include the “Desired Characteristics and Traditions Statements” and other supporting statements contained in the report.

Portland City Council
1. Introduction

What is the St. Johns/Lombard Plan?

The *St. Johns/Lombard Plan* is designed to articulate the community’s vision for the area over the next 20 years. It focuses on two Metro Region 2040 mixed-use areas: the St. Johns town center and the North Lombard main street. The Bureau of Planning conducted this planning effort in collaboration with the Portland Office of Transportation and the North Portland community. The effort, which began in the fall of 2001, focuses on issues such as land use, transportation, housing, and commercial and economic vitality.

A key element of the St. Johns/Lombard planning process was identification of local community desires and needs, to be balanced with adopted city and regional plans and policies. The planning process included a review of existing conditions to identify issues that can affect realization of the vision for the plan area. When adopted by City Council, the plan will provide a shared vision for the future of the plan area and a framework for development.

Plan Area

The St. Johns/Lombard plan area includes the St. Johns town center (downtown St. Johns, the hillside of Cathedral Park, and the Willamette riverfront), and North Lombard Street from Columbia Park to downtown St. Johns.

The plan area encompasses parts of four neighborhood associations: the Friends of Cathedral Park, The Community Association of Portsmouth, St. Johns, and University Park. Together, these neighborhoods make up the area often called “the peninsula.” In addition, the plan covers areas claimed by two business groups: the St. Johns Boosters and the North Portland Business Association.

![St. Johns/Lombard Plan Area](image_url)
Organization of this Document

The *St. Johns Lombard Plan* contains several components.

**Chapter 1, Introduction**, briefly describes the intent of the plan, the plan area, and organization of the plan document.

**Chapter 2, Background**, details the public process for developing the plan, provides information gathered from the public, gives an overview of public policies guiding plan development, and contains an overview of existing conditions considered in plan development.

**Chapter 3, Plan Elements**, contains the community’s vision for the plan area, and planning goals that were developed with the community. This section also contains a description of the urban development concept for the area. The urban development concept describes a desired future development pattern and sets the framework for land use, transportation and design implementation tools.

**Chapter 4, Policies and Implementation Actions**, lists the policies guiding topical areas, and provides an overview of actions to implement the plan. Policies are adopted by ordinance, while the actions are adopted by resolution.

**Chapter 5, Implementation Tools and Guidance**, is a further extension of implementation actions. This section includes the proposed *Comprehensive Plan* map, design guidelines that affect future development, transportation maps and details that will be considered as projects move toward implementation, and proposed amendments to the Portland zoning map and code for the plan area.
2. Background

Planning Process

The St. Johns/Lombard Plan was developed over a two-year period, beginning in Autumn 2001. A graphic depicting the overall planning process is shown below.
Community Involvement

The planning process included extensive input from the community. This section documents the major public input opportunities that occurred during the planning process. A complete list of public involvement activities is included in the appendix.

Kickoff Workshop
Over 100 community members attended a kickoff open house for the St. Johns/Lombard Plan, held October 18, 2001. Community members provided feedback to questions about transportation, the built environment (buildings, plazas, etc.), and natural and recreational areas. Common community priorities included a desire to support and enhance local business activity and to address vehicle and pedestrian transportation concerns in the area.

Community Vision Workshop
A community vision workshop, attended by over 75 people, was held April 3, 2002. Facilitated by City staff and LCA Town Planning and Architecture (LCA), participants were asked to respond to a series of preliminary vision ideas that were, in part, developed from citizen input at the open house. These ideas addressed community identity and livability, transportation, commercial areas, housing, riverfront and river view areas, industrial uses, natural and recreational areas, and social and community services. Responses from these workshops were integrated into the vision statement for the St. Johns/Lombard Plan by staff, consultants, and the plan’s citizen working group. The vision statement has also helped shape the foundation for the plan’s goals, which can be found in Chapter 3.

Neighborhood Walks
The vision workshop was followed by a series of four neighborhood walks in the spring of 2002, each held in a different segment of the plan area: Lombard Street East; Lombard Street Central; Downtown St. Johns; and Cathedral Park/Riverfront. Nearly 100 people participated in these walks facilitated by City staff and Zimmer, Gunsul, Frasca Partnership (ZGF). Participants identified issues and concerns, and shared observations and ideas about the area. Their ideas and observations were recorded by plan staff and sketched by designers from ZGF and LCA. From the recordings and sketches, the following five themes emerged:

- Foster compatible development
- Improve the public realm
- Improve the transportation system
- Encourage housing and mixed-use development
- Improve existing development

In addition, themes unique to each individual area emerged; these played a significant role in the development of the vision statement for the St. Johns/Lombard Plan, as well as the conceptual urban development scenarios prepared for the first and second urban design workshops (below). A wrap-up meeting, designed to share the vision statement and findings from the neighborhood walks, was held in June 2002, and was attended by about 50 people.
Urban Design Workshops
Over 100 people attended two urban design workshops in the fall of 2002 to share ideas about future development scenarios for Lombard Street, downtown St. Johns, the Cathedral Park hillside, and the Willamette riverfront. In the two workshops participants expressed preferences for land uses, intensity of development, and key transportation needs in the plan area. The results of these workshops led to the creation of the St. Johns/Lombard Plan urban development concept. A detailed description of the process and outcomes of the workshops is included in the St. Johns/Lombard Plan Urban Development Concept Report, May 2002.

Discussion Draft Open House
Over 100 people attended the discussion draft open house in May 2003. Participants reviewed and commented on the plan’s urban development concept, as well as implementation strategies for land use and transportation. Strategies offered for comment included changes to the Comprehensive Plan map and zoning map, changes to the zoning code (plan district and overlay concepts), and a range of transportation improvements.

Additional Public Involvement Activities
In addition to the major public involvement milestones noted above, additional specialized outreach activities were also held.

Business Open Houses
Two half-day open houses for business people were held on February 20 and February 21, 2003, to provide information and an update on the planning process. Although lightly attended, the open houses provided an opportunity for one-on-one conversations between business people and planners about the plan area, ideas developed in previous workshops, and business people’s thoughts for the future.

An open house was held on January 26, 2004, to update the business community on the Planning Commission’s recommendation to City Council. Over 30 people attended the event.
Latino and Hmong Community Outreach
Informing and establishing relationships with a wide range of groups is a planning goal that is particularly meaningful for North Portland, the city’s most racially and ethnically diverse community.

The Latino and Hmong communities represent two of the area’s most populous ethnic groups. City staff from Planning, Transportation and North Portland Neighborhood Services (NPNS), worked with St. Johns in the 21st Century, Frente Comun, the Hmong-American Unity of Oregon, and the Latino Network to conduct outreach to these groups in their own language.

Several focus group forums were conducted with the Latino and Hmong communities in August and September 2002. The forums represented the first effort in the process to establish relationships with the Hmong and Latino communities, and provided an opportunity for these communities to share their aspirations and perspectives on planning issues. For most participants, this effort was an introduction to the St. Johns/Lombard planning process, as well as to city planning and civic participation in general.

The forums were partially funded by a Project Interwoven Tapestry grant. A report that details the outcomes of this effort is available under separate cover.

Student Projects and Activities
Two presentations were conducted at James John Elementary School where children learned about the history of the area and participated in visioning exercises for how they would like their community to be in the future. They expressed their ideas in drawings as well as verbally.

Staff met with African-American students at Roosevelt High School. A written survey and impromptu conversation informed staff of their general use and impressions of the area. The students also noted what they would like to see improved in the near future.

Schrunk Tower Outreach
A forum was held with residents of the Schrunk Tower, a Housing Authority of Portland facility in St. Johns. Staff updated residents about the plan, and learned about issues affecting residents and other seniors in the area. A written survey was conducted and an active discussion took place regarding transportation issues, as well as the use of the St. Johns Plaza, the retail areas, and Cathedral Park and the riverfront.
Citizen Working Group

A citizens working group (CWG), made up of residents and business people from the plan area, served as an advisory body to consider the diverse interests of the community and represent a range of perspectives on planning issues. While not a decision-making body, the CWG provided feedback and ideas on information provided by staff, associations and other community groups. The CWG brought insight based on personal knowledge of the study area, and played a significant role in shaping the plan.

The CWG held monthly meetings beginning in March of 2002, up to the Planning Commission public hearing in September of 2003. The group continued to meet informally during the Planning Commission’s work sessions from October 2003 through February 2004. The list of members is included in the acknowledgements section of this report.

Technical Advisory Group

A technical advisory group (TAG), composed of representatives from government agencies and City bureaus helped evaluate the technical feasibility of plan proposals. The TAG also kept the planning team informed of related projects and policies that affect implementation of the plan. A list of members is included in the acknowledgements section of this report.
Background

Public Policy Framework

A planning policy framework guided development of the St. Johns/Lombard Plan. This framework can be thought of as a hierarchy in which plans for smaller jurisdictions or geographic areas must comply with those for larger jurisdictions.

Planning for the St. Johns/Lombard area must be consistent with the City of Portland’s adopted plans and policies, which must be consistent with regional plans and policies, which in turn must be consistent with state goals and related regulations. A summary of the major rules, plans and policies that guide the St. Johns/Lombard Plan are described in the St. Johns/Lombard Plan Existing Conditions Report (available under separate cover). Below is a graphic depicting the structure and hierarchy of planning.
Some of the key policy framework items are:

**Oregon Statewide Planning Goals and Rules**
The statewide planning goals direct planning in Oregon. Among the 19 goals is Goal 1, Citizen Involvement, which calls for providing sufficient opportunities for public involvement in planning. In addition to state goals, two administrative rules are also key for plans in Portland. They are: 1) the Metropolitan Housing Rule which generally calls for ensuring a sufficient supply of buildable land for multidwelling housing, and 2) the Transportation Planning Rule, which generally calls for fostering a land use pattern that reduces reliance on automobiles for travel.

**Metro Region 2040 Growth Concept.**
The Region 2040 Growth Concept establishes a general policy direction for managing growth in the region through the year 2040. The Growth Concept indicates the preferred form of regional growth and development, what densities should characterize different areas, how to protect open spaces and natural resources, and how to maintain air and water quality. To accommodate future growth, the concept designates a number of mixed-use development areas or “design types.” The St. Johns/Lombard Plan has the following design types within its boundaries.

St. Johns is a designated “town center.” Town centers are envisioned as areas with concentrations of employment and housing that provide access to a variety of goods and services. They are walkable areas, with mixed residential and commercial land uses and frequent transit service. They are intended to provide shopping and employment opportunities within a local market area, serving several thousand people.

Lombard is a designated “main street.” Main streets are envisioned as mixed-use corridors that provide neighborhood shopping with residential and some commercial and office uses along a street or at intersections. Main streets are walkable areas with frequent transit service.

**Portland Comprehensive Plan**
In 1980, the Portland City Council adopted its Comprehensive Plan for the city, including goals, policies, objectives and a plan map, to guide the city’s future development and redevelopment over a 20-year period. Since adoption, the goals, policies, and objectives of the plan have been amended in response to new circumstances, special studies, new technology, and changes in state, regional and local plans and mandates. The adopted St. Johns/ Lombard Plan results in updates to the Comprehensive Plan text and map.

**Area and Neighborhood Plans**
Area and neighborhood plans offer more specific guidance for specific areas within the city. When adopted, area and neighborhood plans may become a component of the Portland Comprehensive Plan. The St. Johns/Lombard Plan is an area plan. Components of the adopted St. Johns/Lombard Plan will become part of Portland’s Comprehensive Plan.
Ongoing Programs and Recently Completed Plans

River Renaissance is a citywide partnership to revitalize the Willamette River in Portland. This comprehensive new approach to river health and vitality combines a shared vision and strategy to integrate the natural, recreational, urban and economic roles that make the Willamette River vital to Portland and the region. River Renaissance was created to optimize city efforts, forge public-private partnerships, leverage resources, and mobilize the community to revitalize the river.

The goals, policies, and objectives of the adopted Portsmouth Neighborhood Plan are in conformance with the goals, policies, and map designations of the Portland Comprehensive Plan. The policies of the Portsmouth Neighborhood Plan regarding Lombard Street were considered in developing the St. Johns/Lombard Plan.
Existing Conditions Overview

A detailed inventory and assessment of existing conditions in the plan area was developed and published in April 2003. These reports are available under separate cover. Some highlights from the reports are summarized below.

Public Policy Framework

- Regional planning initiatives largely direct new growth and development into existing urban areas to limit development of farm and forest resource lands. Strategies that encourage new development at opportunity sites within the study area are essential to meet this directive.

- City policies address the need to accommodate a fair share of regional population and employment growth within existing urbanized areas, while maintaining and enhancing livability. The St. Johns/Lombard Plan should develop tools to encourage housing and employment in the study area, while maintaining livability.

- State, regional and local policies recognize the need to provide a variety of transportation options, with a focus on reducing automobile reliance and associated congestion and air pollution. Strategies to accomplish this should be included in the St. Johns/Lombard planning effort.

Community Identity and Resources

- St. Johns’ history as an independent city is evident today. Numerous historic buildings and sites are located throughout the study area and contribute to the character of the area. Planning efforts should recognize and respond to this character.

Demographics

- Over the last 20 years, the study area has experienced roughly an eight percent increase in population growth. The area has a relatively high average household size, indicating larger family household sizes overall. However, Cathedral Park has a relatively low number of persons per household and was the only area neighborhood to experience a decrease in household size between 1990 and 2000.

- The St. Johns/Lombard area is an ethnically and racially diverse place. In 2000, roughly 32 percent of the area population considered themselves nonwhite. This is a significant change from 1980, when 87 percent of the population was white.

- The Hispanic community experienced a significant increase in population in the peninsula area. Hispanics now comprise 14 percent of the area population, an 11 percent increase since 1980.

Market Conditions

- Downtown St. Johns has a pedestrian friendly retail area. The area’s ability to capture increased market share rests partly upon its ability to create a positive sense of place and an active street presence. It must attract and accommodate customers from the market area and beyond.
Background

• St. Johns and Lombard Street commercial areas have fewer people and less aggregate income than some other commercial areas. However, market area demographics currently support a greater diversity of retailers than at present, particularly in the apparel, household furnishings, and book categories. A significant amount of buying power is “leaking out” of the area.

Land Use

• Land use patterns have evolved over time from a historic pre-streetcar era development pattern to a more auto-accommodating pattern. This is partially a result of land use and zoning designations. Changes to land use and zoning designations are necessary to foster development that is less oriented to the automobile and more pedestrian-friendly in key locations.

• Lombard Street is a mix of pedestrian oriented and auto accommodating commercial land uses and housing. Some clustering of uses and types of development occur. Revitalization efforts need to focus on nodes in order to produce the maximum benefit.

• Underutilized lands near the Willamette River and key sites in downtown St. Johns and on Lombard Street provide an opportunity for redevelopment that can help support more vital town center and main street areas.

• The St. Johns/Lombard area has amenities that make it an attractive place to live. Additional housing and mixed-use development near public transit could help reduce auto usage, encourage more pedestrian activity, and provide additional customer base for local businesses.

Transportation

• The plan area’s transportation system is generally well served by all modes of travel. Capacity modeling indicates that most intersections on the arterial network will provide adequate levels of service within the next 20 years. Deficiencies in the system include a lack of safe pedestrian crossings and lack of an interconnected bicycle network.

• While most of the street network is well connected, there are missing connections between the riverfront area and the town center.

• The St Johns Bridge carries a significant amount of freight traffic that creates conflicts with circulation of other modes within the town center. Freight traffic on Fessenden and St Louis is also an issue.

Parks, Open Space, and Public Facilities

• While there is generally an adequate number and distribution of parks and recreation sites in the area, there is a need for improvements to existing facilities to meet current and future demands. The area’s proximity to trails and natural resources such as Smith and Bybee Lakes, the 40-Mile Loop Trail, the Willamette River, and Kelley Point Park are key assets.
• The St. Johns Community Garden is a valued community asset that is well used by residents, including minority groups. The garden provides a space for growing vegetables and also functions as a gathering space.

• The plan area is generally well served by public safety facilities: the North Police Precinct is located in the historic St. Johns City Hall at 7214 N. Philadelphia.; fire station #22 is located at 7025 N. Alta, and fire station #26 is located at 5247 N. Lombard.
3. Plan Elements

**Vision Statement**

The vision for the **St. Johns/Lombard Plan** area is a description of the desired future for the area. The statement, developed through an interactive process involving neighbors, businesspeople, plan staff and consultants, guided development of the plan goals, urban development concept, and ultimately the **Comprehensive Plan** map and transportation maps.

**A Vision for the St. Johns and Lombard Street Area**

**St. Johns** is a small town within a city that serves as the focus of community life, and is defined by the rich history of its buildings, bridge, and unique geographic location between two rivers.

**Lombard Street**, a district collector, is the local main street for the adjoining neighborhoods of North Portland, serving the everyday needs of area residents. Lombard is defined by pedestrian-oriented retail centers, linked by tree-lined segments featuring attractive housing and land uses that serve the peninsula.

**An image of community life**

A genuine hometown atmosphere within the city is distinctly evident in the St. Johns town center and along the Lombard main street. Community members value its rich history and actively work toward improving the quality of daily life. It is a place where people are comfortable walking the streets and spending time in public places; they have a sense of knowing and caring for each other. A robust St. Johns business district is the center of economic and civic life for the peninsula, and a wide range of housing options is available within close walking distance of its shops and services. Lombard Street has a strong identity and draws people from around the city. Its appealing sidewalk environment is accentuated by small community gathering places, and an array of retailers, restaurants, and services for the surrounding neighborhoods.
Civic institutions are prominent and celebrated community resources. The James John Elementary School, the St. Johns Library and Community Center are linked visually and are places where the diverse population of the peninsula comes together to share common interests. Religious institutions are a valued presence along Lombard Street and in the town center, and are actively engaged in community activities.

The St. Johns Bridge is designated on the National Registry of Historic Places, and many other significant historic resources are recognized and protected. These historic places are familiar landmarks that connect the community with its rich past.

Streets, plazas, parks, residences, and businesses are well designed and maintained. Local clean up and beautification efforts greatly improve the aesthetics and continue to foster a sense of community pride. Partnerships between police and community organizations, and well-lit streets, ensure a safe environment day and night.

Cathedral Park is connected to the daily lives of community members and is recognized citywide for its history, music and cultural festivals, and beautiful views. Many visit the park during summer months when lifeguards are present, spending the day enjoying the expansive beach and swimming in the Willamette River.

Social service, not-for-profit, religious, and governmental organizations have a strong working relationship with the community; together they serve the needs of local residents. Community members participate in the siting, planning and designing of new social service facilities. Social service providers engage the community about the social, cultural, and economic qualities of the area’s population.

A safe, reliable, and efficient system of travel

Residents and businesses of the town center and Lombard Street are linked together with nearby natural areas, the greater peninsula, downtown Portland, and the metropolitan area by a multifaceted transportation system. Of the many transportation options, transit is popular, due to its convenience and reliability.

The budding Lombard business nodes are connected by frequent transit service, boosting their economic vitality. Transit stops are conveniently located for easy pedestrian access from nearby residential areas. They are clean, well-maintained, and have adequate lighting for safety, visibility, and aesthetic quality. Transit service to New Columbia, MAX, and downtown Portland is provided frequently throughout the day and into the evening. In the short term, transit service consists primarily of buses. In the long term, and with community support and strong economic conditions, trolleys are introduced into the system.

Walking is safe and convenient - it is the preferred means of travel between local destinations for many residents. Traffic moves slowly, smoothly, and safely along Lombard Street and through the town center area. Crosswalks along Lombard are visible and provide safe access to shops and services. Sidewalks are lined with street trees, decorative lighting, benches, and bike racks.
Bicycle routes are direct and safe and do not conflict with on-street parking. Bicycle parking is conveniently located near the main street, at public institutions, and in mixed-use developments.

Impacts of truck traffic are minimized through the careful design of transportation improvements and configuration of land uses. Truck traffic does not create a barrier to access and circulation by pedestrians, bicyclists, and other vehicles.

Canoes, kayaks, and water taxis are available for hire at Cathedral Park, Smith and Bybee Lakes, and Kelley Point Park. Their primary use is recreational, but some residents also rely on them for their daily commute to work.

Adequate parking for residents and visitors is appropriately located and managed to support retail viability and a high quality pedestrian environment. Parking areas placed behind buildings, abundant on-street spaces, and convenient transit service have reduced the need for large parking lots.

A diverse population, an eclectic mix of housing, commerce, and industry

For many decades North Portland has been the most ethnically diverse area in Portland. The blending of affordable housing and stable middle class neighborhoods continues to attract diverse groups, including people with a wide range of incomes and ages. Ethnic businesses along Lombard Street are supported by the local community and are thriving; they enrich the area by making available new products, cuisines, and services. Many immigrants have grown comfortable with North Portland’s cultural diversity and have elected to remain here as they’ve moved up the economic ladder.

Locally-owned businesses are particularly successful throughout the area. New shops in formerly vacant commercial spaces with revitalized storefronts consistently attract diverse customers from around the city. A weekly neighborhood farmers’ market caters to the tastes of a variety of cultures, and supplements the local grocery store offerings. Flourishing arts and entertainment-oriented uses help maintain an active and safe street environment.

Many buildings in the town center and along the main street accommodate a variety of uses and provide options for combined live/work spaces. Auto-oriented businesses do not overshadow the smaller businesses in number, and are designed to complement the area’s pedestrian emphasis.
St. Johns has an important role in the regional economy through its industrial businesses, many of which are recognized for innovative and sustainable business practices. Many residents of the area have high quality jobs with these businesses and rely on the safe and efficient transit system for their daily commute.

The St Johns riverfront is a thriving, dynamic place. North of Cathedral Park, land uses focus on industry and employment. The area has diverse businesses that include green technology and small manufacturing firms, cottage industries, as well as live-work spaces for a growing community of artisans.

The St. Johns riverfront south of Cathedral Park makes the St. Johns town center unique in the region. It is well connected to the St. Johns commercial core, and includes a mix of activities - housing, “new” industry, limited office and retail, and other community-serving uses. New development is well designed and compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. The area has a “sense of place” that adds vitality to the town center and riverfront.

A strong physical and visual connection along Burlington Street can link the St. Johns commercial area to the Willamette River.

Residences connected to work places
The quality, variety, and affordability of housing in the town center and along the main street reflect a wide range of preferences. Employment options are abundant in the town center and in nearby industrial areas, making it easy to live near work. The area’s multi-use buildings successfully incorporate housing, commercial uses, and office space; they complement the street environment and are compatible with the area’s historic character. Most importantly, they are well designed and human in scale, drawing inspiration from the positive characteristics of the adjacent established neighborhoods.

Townhouses, apartments, and older single-dwelling homes are interspersed among businesses along the main street and in the town center. Larger buildings are designed to complement and respect the smaller scale of the homes in the surrounding established neighborhoods.

Natural areas are a unifying feature
The Willamette riverfront, easily accessible by bike and on foot from the St. Johns town center, is central to the lives of area residents. It serves as a neighborhood gathering place and recreation area, as well as a wildlife habitat. River clean-up efforts have allowed swimming at Cathedral Park to become a popular activity on hot summer days. Bicyclists, pedestrians, wheelchair users, skaters, and horse drawn
carriages can be found along the river’s greenway path; they congregate at Cathedral Park, where food vendors and musicians enliven the space.

Parks and open spaces are popular and well-maintained. Regional trails connect the peninsula with the rest of the city and outlying areas, and provide both recreation and transportation options for residents. From Cathedral Park, a bicycle/pedestrian path leads south to the East Bank Esplanade. Direct access to Forest Park and Northwest Portland is possible via enhanced connections over the Willamette River.

Kelley Point Park and Smith and Bybee Lakes are recognized nationally and internationally as high quality, accessible urban wildlife habitat and viewing areas. A network of bikeways and trails weave through the Rivergate industrial area and connect to and around the Smith and Bybee Lakes Nature Area.
Planning Goals

Planning goals were developed as a synthesis of the community-driven vision statements and local and regional planning policies. The goals are followed by several objectives. The goals and objectives were used to evaluate plan concepts and implementation efforts to ensure that objectives of the community and city and regional planning policies are balanced. The goals were used as a starting point for policies in Section 5.

Enhance the Identity of the St. Johns and Lombard Area

- Celebrate citizens, local history, and distinctive architecture
- Respect the unique characteristics of the St. Johns town center and Lombard main street, and emphasize human scale in new development
- Support efforts to establish in the town center an institution or business(es) that serves as an attractor and enriches the area’s identity within the city

Implement the Region 2040 Town Center and Main Street Designations in this Area

- Create a complete community by providing opportunities for housing, shopping, and employment within the area
- Strive to retain and attract family-wage jobs on the peninsula

Foster Revitalized St. Johns and Lombard Street Commercial Areas

- Enhance opportunities for residents to walk or bike to shops or leisure facilities
- Promote locally-owned and community-oriented businesses
- Support efforts to establish businesses that are catalysts for community revitalization
- Provide for adequate parking opportunities

Provide Opportunities for New Housing Along the Lombard Main Street and Near the St. Johns Town Center

- Promote compatible and high quality housing design
- Provide for a broad range of housing choices for residents of all ages, income levels, and abilities
**Provide for a Balanced Multimodal Transportation System**

- Enhance the safety, convenience and attractiveness of walking, using transit, and bicycling
- Improve circulation on the main street and in the town center while calming traffic
- Reduce reliance on autos, and make transit, walking and bicycling the preferred modes of travel to and from the town center and main street
- Strive for freight movement solutions that improve livability, safety, and efficiency
- Support policies to study the development of a future river crossing to reduce regional truck traffic in the town center

**Unify the Community with Safe, Accessible, and Attractive Parks and Open Spaces**

- Strengthen connections between the town center and the Willamette and Columbia Rivers
- Respect the diverse ecology, wildlife and landscape features of the rivers and nearby natural areas

**Promote Sustainable Development Practices and Environmental Quality**

- Support efforts to improve watershed conditions in the Willamette River and Columbia Slough
- Promote the preservation of tracts of native vegetation and the protection and expansion of the urban forest on the peninsula
- Promote the development and redevelopment of a built environment utilizing sustainable development techniques and practices
Urban Development Concept

The St. Johns/Lombard Plan urban development concept represents a synthesis of the concepts developed throughout the planning effort and reflects extensive public input. The urban development concept represents a “big-picture” vision for future land use, transportation, and open space within the plan area, and identifies places of special interest for the community. It encompasses the goals of the plan, which address community identity, commercial revitalization, housing, transportation, open space, and environmental quality. The concept provides guidance for the Comprehensive Plan map, transportation plans and other implementation strategies.

Map Symbols and Area Descriptions

Gateways
Gateways are located at key places or intersections and identify the entrance to a district or area. Development adjacent to gateways should contribute to the sense of entry and level of importance through signature architecture, appropriate building scale, character, and orientation. Right-of-way features such as landscaping, public art, landmarks or special signage, lighting or paving may be used to help signify gateways.

Attraction/Focal Point
This symbol indicates an area or place that draws people from nearby neighborhoods as well as citywide. The retail/civic area of downtown St. Johns, Cathedral Park, the Willamette riverfront, and the Peninsula Crossing Trail are attractions/focal points in the plan area. Focal points may have special architectural or landscape features, and may incorporate public art.

Community Corners
Community corners are active pedestrian places located at key crossroads along Lombard Street. They are the primary pedestrian crossing locations. The cross streets serve as the main routes to significant places north and south of Lombard, such as the University of Portland (at Portsmouth) and Roosevelt High School (at Ida), as well as to and from the neighborhoods. Community corners should be architecturally reinforced as significant places by promoting pedestrian-oriented storefront development. They accommodate community services such as restaurants, pubs, cleaners/laundry, and corner stores. The public realm at community corners may have enhanced treatment, consistent with other important pedestrian locations in the plan area.
Primary Framework Streets
Primary framework streets are the key streets that provide identity in core pedestrian and retail area in downtown St. Johns and on the Lombard main street. These multimodal streets are important places within the plan area and may be the focus of more intense land uses. Primary framework streets may receive the highest level of public realm amenities within the area.

Secondary Framework Streets
Secondary framework streets serve as important routes for pedestrian and vehicle activity in the plan area, and may be the focus of more intense land use activity. These streets may receive a higher level of public realm amenities than other streets in the area.

Enhanced Pedestrian Connections
Enhanced pedestrian connections are envisioned as key links between downtown St. Johns and the Willamette riverfront where pedestrian movement is a priority. These connections may be developed with innovative designs, provide stormwater benefits, or feature other amenities such as enhanced street tree treatments or special paving.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Trails
Existing or planned trails linking to the regional trail system.
Lombard Main Street

Lombard Street is the local main street for the adjoining neighborhoods of North Portland, serving the everyday needs of area residents. In the future, Lombard becomes a street made up of defined segments, described below, each with a different characteristic.

**Full Main Street:** built-up areas that feature urban commercial buildings, with retail and housing, and a high-quality pedestrian environment.

**Residential Focus Areas:** pedestrian friendly areas where housing is desired, along with compatible neighborhood-scale commercial uses.

**Partial Main Street (not labeled on map):** the balance of areas on Lombard, where auto-accommodating activities that serve the peninsula are mixed with other land uses.

**Woolsey to Fiske: residential focus area**
The easternmost segment of this subarea, bounded by Fiske and Woolsey, is envisioned to become a residential focus area that includes a mix of housing and compatible small-scale commercial uses. This area offers locations for new housing in the future, whose residents will help support commercial activity in adjacent sections of the Lombard main street. To improve compatibility with residential and mixed use development, new land uses and developments that can create conflicts with housing should be limited.

**Fiske to Van Houten: full main street**
The area between Fiske and Van Houten is conceptualized as a location for pedestrian-friendly retail activity and housing. This area is the heart of the Lombard main street, a place where neighbors shop and socialize. To encourage and maintain this neighborly, pedestrian-oriented environment, some
incompatible and auto-related land uses, such as new drive-through restaurants and quick vehicle servicing establishments, are not allowed in this area.

Higher levels of design and building quality are desired for this area to enhance its special quality as a center of community activity. Buildings meet the sidewalk to create a continuous building frontage in this area, making walking a more interesting experience. The preferred location for parking in this area is at the rear of buildings, accessed via alleys.

Van Houten to Ida: partial main street

The central portion of the Lombard main street is envisioned to become more pedestrian-friendly over time, with an increase in housing and commercial activity. Within this area, the community corners at Wall and Ida are envisioned as places with the most pedestrian-friendly development, ideally in mixed-use.
buildings. However, the area will continue to be a place where neighbors and passersby can access convenience and auto-oriented retailers and services. This area will provide opportunities for automobile sales and servicing, businesses with drive-throughs, and other land uses and activities that could conflict with areas of the most intense pedestrian activity.

**Portsmouth Cut: gateway**
The Portsmouth Cut is a distinguished feature, which could better serve as a gateway in the area. New development should take advantage of location near this attribute, which offers unique corridor views. The bridge over the Portsmouth Cut could be visually improved to help create a gateway between adjacent neighborhoods. The Peninsula Crossing Trail runs along the cut and intersects Lombard just east of the cut, creating an opportunity to further celebrate the cut with a marker in conjunction with the bridge crossing.

**Ida to Buchanan: residential focus area**
This portion of the Lombard main street is envisioned as becoming more pedestrian-friendly, with an increase in housing over time. Within this area, the community corners at Ida and Buchanan are envisioned as places with pedestrian-friendly development, ideally in mixed-use buildings. The area around Ida is envisioned to remain a focus of commercial activity in the future. New development will be oriented to the sidewalk, providing a more pleasing streetscape and easier accessibility from transit.

West of Ida, Lombard narrows, providing an intimately scaled streetscape that serves as the entry into downtown St. Johns. New, moderately scaled apartments and row houses are encouraged in the residential focus area between Ida and Buchanan, providing housing opportunities and an increased customer-base for local retailers. Businesses in this area will be small-scale and compatible with nearby housing. To improve compatibility with residential and mixed use development, new land uses and developments that can create conflicts with housing should be limited.
Buchanan to Mohawk: partial main street
The western portion of the Lombard main street is envisioned as becoming more pedestrian-friendly over time. In the near term the area will continue to be a place where neighbors and passersby can access convenience and auto-oriented retailers and services. This area will provide opportunities for automobile sales and servicing, businesses with drive-throughs, and other land uses and activities that could conflict with areas of the most intense pedestrian activity.

Conceptual drawing of the partial main street areas.
St. Johns Town Center

In the future, the St. Johns town center solidifies its position as the center of community civic and commercial activity on the peninsula. The town center offers new housing opportunities that support community retail and civic uses, and creates a more vibrant small town center within Portland. The area is conceptually divided into the following three geographic subareas:

**Downtown St. Johns:** the heart of the St. Johns town center featuring a retail and civic core area, supported by nearby housing.

**Hillside Neighborhood:** a residential neighborhood of detached houses, and well-designed rowhouses and medium size apartments.

**Willamette Riverfront:** an eclectic mixed-use area that takes advantage of its unique location near the Willamette River. The southern section offers opportunity for future change to allow a broader array of land uses to support the town center. The northern section focuses on employment and industrial activities along with other compatible uses.

Downtown St. Johns

Downtown St. Johns features a broad mix of commercial activities, community services, and housing opportunities, and is the heart of the St. Johns town center. A core area featuring retail and civic uses is envisioned as the hub of downtown St. Johns. Lombard, the historic streetcar-era main street, features a strong, pedestrian-oriented retail environment that serves local needs, and also acts as a destination shopping and dining area for visitors.

To the north of Lombard is a civic area that includes the St. Johns Community Center and Park, James John School, St. Johns Branch Library and Portland Racquet Center. In the future this area will be bolstered with additional housing, and the location of additional community-serving activities. The retail/civic focus area is surrounded by residential and community-serving land uses (churches, social services, recreation, etc.) that support the town center.

South of Lombard along Ivanhoe, development becomes more pedestrian friendly and urban over time, while still providing sites for larger buildings that may need auto access. Key opportunity sites, such as the existing superblock areas, offer an opportunity to provide infill housing and mixed-use commercial development, and the ability to re-establish pedestrian connections.
Concepts for Downtown St. Johns

Downtown St. Johns retains much of the small town scale and character that is valued by the community. Lombard is the focus of retail activity serving the area, surrounded by mixed-use development and housing. This creates a more vibrant center overall and a stronger customer base for retail.

Scenario A is a conceptual drawing that shows downtown with an enhanced plaza that could retain its current location and perhaps “spill over” Philadelphia Avenue into adjacent spaces.

The drawing also shows redevelopment of key opportunity sites along Burlington. In this concept scenario, the Racquet Center is retained and augmented with other uses.

Scenario B is a conceptual drawing of a long-range vision that could be developed if present-day traffic circulation issues are resolved by creating a new North Willamette crossing. It illustrates reconfigured Burlington and Philadelphia Streets leading into downtown St. Johns to enhance visual and functional connections to the hillside and Willamette River. The scenario also shows alternate concepts for the development of key sites.

Both concepts show areas along west Ivanhoe as shared parking opportunity areas, compatible with the current volume of heavy vehicle traffic in this corridor.
Plaza Area

The St. Johns plaza area provides space for community gathering in the center of downtown St. Johns. Several alternative plans were considered for improving the plaza space and Philadelphia Avenue gateway to downtown St. Johns.

A long term alternative considered realigning Burlington and Philadelphia Streets. This plan would provide better public space and align streets to provide visual and pedestrian access to connect downtown St. Johns and the riverfront. However, traffic analysis indicates that realignment of streets and reconfiguration of the plaza may create unacceptable traffic congestion. In the future, traffic congestion may be resolved if a North Willamette River Crossing is built, allowing this alternative to be realized.
In the short term, the plaza area could be enhanced in several ways: addition of landscaping could provide better views into the plaza area from Philadelphia; storefront improvements on adjacent and nearby properties could provide more aesthetic design and use of this area; bollards could be added to improve pedestrian safety; and new paving surfaces could be integrated to unite the plaza, Philadelphia Street, and possibly the adjacent parking area. With these improvements, the area could be used by the community for large-scale gatherings in combination with temporary closures of Philadelphia.
Lombard/Richmond Intersection

Several alternative plans were considered for improving the Lombard/Richmond intersection. The main objectives of the redesign were to create a stronger gateway to the business district, calm traffic, and enhance safety for children and other pedestrians crossing Lombard.

The preferred alternative keeps primary traffic flow on Richmond and Ivanhoe. A signal is installed at the intersection of Lombard at Richmond to slow traffic, increase pedestrian safety, and improve visibility for the downtown St. Johns commercial core. The newly created space can function as a plaza, and offers an opportunity to create an enhanced gateway to the downtown business district.

The preferred redesign of the Lombard/Richmond intersection enhances visibility of downtown St. Johns and improves pedestrian safety.
In this concept alternative, traffic on the existing slip lane is “calmed,” but a pedestrian hazard remains at Charleston Street. The design also does little to signal entrance to downtown St. Johns.
In this concept alternative, the primary traffic flow on Lombard was routed downtown. This results in additional bridge-bound traffic downtown, creating congestion and decreasing pedestrian safety.
Hillside Neighborhood

The Hillside neighborhood portion of the town center supports the town center with additional housing. The neighborhood is a mix of moderately scaled multidwelling housing (apartments and condos), and single-dwelling attached and detached houses. North Burlington Avenue functions as a key street, providing a clear pedestrian link between downtown St. Johns and the riverfront area. Enhanced pedestrian environments and features that provide stormwater benefits and green space amenities are proposed for several key streets.
Willamette Riverfront

St. Johns has the unique potential to be a regional town center with a vibrant riverfront. It can be a town center whose riverfront embodies the best of the community’s past, present and future.

Jobs are an important component of the riverfront. The area north of the St. Johns Bridge and adjacent to the Port of Portland is viable for new employment, as well as traditional industrial uses. The area can continue to support manufacturers and river-related industries that have traditionally located on the St. Johns riverfront. The area between Cathedral Park and New York and Edison Streets will allow for a broader definition of employment uses that can help attract new types of businesses to St. Johns while providing clear protection for the adjacent industrial sanctuary lands. In this buffer area, limited office and live-work facilities complement industrial uses. Northwest of this area, the Industrial Sanctuary provides ongoing opportunity for traditional heavy industrial and port-related activities.

The town center riverfront can also enliven the neighborhood. While the area is home to industry now, the 20-year vision for the area south of the St. Johns Bridge sees the area evolving from an underutilized industrial area to a vibrant mixed-use area. The riverfront area offers particularly attractive amenities for new housing, including surprising views of the river and Forest Park and access to Cathedral Park and the river. New mixed-use development will likely begin in the area next to Cathedral Park and grow toward the riverfront. The vitality brought by new residential and mixed-use development attracted to St. Johns in this new riverfront district will be a key component of revitalizing the St Johns town center commercial district.
The riverfront will evolve with the market. The vision for the area south of the St. Johns Bridge does not preclude continued employment uses mixed with residences. Such uses could range from small commercial and offices, to light industrial uses that are integrated into the district through thoughtful building design and attention to streetscapes. Market forces, increasing land value, and the area’s limited truck access, will push the character of the employment uses toward lighter impact, but possibly more job intensive uses. However, in the near term, the riverfront land can continue in traditional industrial use. Also, while the riverfront location offers many amenities, the freight railroad line along the waterfront may present challenges for and affect the form of some types of development.

The riverfront will feature uniquely attractive open space. Along the Willamette River, a publicly accessible greenway will eventually stretch from Cathedral Park to beyond Willamette Cove. The greenway is envisioned as a publicly accessible open space providing connections to the riverfront trail system, places for public open space and recreation, and opportunities for wildlife habitat and environmental restoration. The open space on the St. Johns town center riverfront can be an amenity that benefits the immediate neighborhood, the town center, the North Portland peninsula, and the vitality of the Willamette River.

These conceptual drawings show a potential relationship between new development at the riverfront and a greenway that provides public access and amenity as well as environmental benefits.
View of St. Johns - 20 Year Vision

This concept illustration of the riverfront and hillside areas shows a possible build out with a mix of housing, employment and small commercial uses. The drawing also shows a substantial riverfront greenway linking open space and park land along the Willamette River.
4. Policies and Implementation Actions

The policies and implementation actions for the Lombard main street and St. Johns town center are designed to help achieve the goals of the plan and implement the urban development concept. They reflect community input from workshops, open houses, neighborhood walks, and surveys. A study of the existing conditions, ranging from land use to market conditions, helped identify the issues of particular importance.

The policies are adopted by ordinance and become part of the Portland Comprehensive Plan. These policies, along with the plan goals and objectives, will be used to evaluate future land use changes in the St. Johns/Lombard area. Both the goals and policies are balancing – they do not have to individually be met but must be considered in relation to each other and must be weighed with the balancing policies of the Comprehensive Plan.

The plan’s implementation actions are designed to realize the vision, goals, urban development concept, and policies of the plan. They are adopted by resolution, meaning that they are advisory only and do not carry the weight of an ordinance. Potential implementors are identified. Implementors may be assist or partner in implementation.

The policies and implementation actions are organized by topic area:

1. Land Use and Placemaking
2. History and Identity
3. Transportation
4. Economic Development
5. Housing
6. Environment
7. Willamette Riverfront
8. Community Involvement and Services

Implementation action charts include regulations for each topic area.

Note: Policies are separated into distinct topic areas, but all are interrelated and should not be considered in isolation. For example, community identity measures affect economic development, land use, and urban form. Correspondingly actions are also connected. For conciseness and clarity, each action is generally noted in one topic area chart, although it may have relevance to other topic areas.
## Guide to Implementors

### Neighborhood Associations

| NA  | Neighborhood Associations                        |
| TCAP | The Community Association of Portsmouth         |
| FOCP | Friends of Cathedral Park                       |
| SJNA | St. Johns Neighborhood Association              |
| UPNA | University Park Neighborhood Association        |

### Business Associations

| BA  | Business Associations                          |
| NPBA | North Portland Business Association           |
| SJB  | St. Johns Boosters                            |

### Key Stakeholders and Community Groups

| PO  | Property Owners                               |
| SJHA | St. Johns Heritage Association               |
| SJ21 | St. Johns in the 21st Century                |

### City Agencies

| City | City of Portland                              |
| BOP  | Bureau of Planning                            |
| PDC  | Portland Development Commission              |
| BDS  | Bureau of Development Services               |
| BES  | Bureau of Environmental Services             |
| Fire | Portland Fire and Safety                     |
| BHCD | Bureau of Housing and Community Development  |
| OMF  | Office of Management and Finance             |
| NPNS | North Portland Neighborhood Services         |
| Parks | Bureau of Parks and Recreation              |
| Police | Portland Police Bureau                        |
| PDOT | Portland Office of Transportation            |
| OSD  | Office of Sustainable Development            |

### Schools

| PPS | Portland Public Schools                     |

### Regional Government and Services

| Metro | Metro |
| TriMet | TriMet |

### State Government

| ODOT | Oregon Department of Transportation |

---
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Policy 1: Land Use and Placemaking

Accommodate growth and change in a manner that fosters the area’s sense of place as a small town and main street within the city. Take advantage of its unique setting near the Willamette River, and support development of vital commercial areas.

Discussion

The land use and placemaking policy and implementation actions are intended to implement the urban development concept for the St. Johns/Lombard Plan. The actions include an update of the Comprehensive Plan map for the plan area and key changes to the Zoning Code and map.

The urban development concept calls for strengthening Lombard Street’s qualities as a place, a location for development, and a corridor by better defining its structure in terms of distinct subareas. Parts of the street will be more clearly defined as neighborhood-serving main street retail areas. Community corners that provide for neighborhood shopping and gathering are defined at key intersections. In other areas on Lombard, housing is emphasized with compatible commercial uses. Auto-accommodating retail areas for businesses that serve a wider market area are also identified.

The St. Johns town center is composed of downtown St. Johns, Hillside Neighborhood, and Willamette Riverfront. The urban development concept calls for strengthening downtown St. Johns’ role as the center of activity on the peninsula. Space for community-serving retail and civic uses is provided. Viability of the area is strengthened with opportunities for new housing and mixed-use development in and around the downtown core area.

The Hillside neighborhood is composed of detached houses, rowhouses and medium scale apartments that offer a variety of housing options and support the vitality of the downtown retail area.

The Willamette riverfront offers opportunities for new housing that can take advantage of river, west hills, and bridge views and other amenities, such as riverfront open space and Cathedral Park. The mixed-use area includes continuing opportunity for employment and is supported by limited community-scale commercial development.

The proposed Comprehensive Plan map and Zoning Code and map amendments can be found in Chapter 5.
Land Use and Placemaking Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>LAND USE AND PLACEMAKING ACTIONS</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adopt</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLACEMAKING</td>
<td></td>
<td>With Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU 1</td>
<td>Mark the entry points into the downtown St. Johns through development of “gateway” streetscape features at the Lombard/Richmond and the Philadelphia/Ivanhoe intersections.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU 2</td>
<td>Develop a design to improve the St. Johns Plaza and make it a more comfortable community space; augment the plaza and integrate adjacent space through property redevelopment or right-of-way improvements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU 3</td>
<td>Pursue a gateway feature at the Portsmouth Cut and beautify the Peninsula Crossing Trail where it intersects with Lombard.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU 4</td>
<td>Concentrate new community service and public uses north of Lombard near James John Elementary School, the library, and community center, to foster a civic center area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGULATIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU 5</td>
<td>Adopt changes to the Comprehensive Plan map and zoning map to implement the St. Johns/Lombard Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| LU 6 | Establish a St. Johns Plan District to:  
- promote mixed-use development,  
- address the scale and character of development, and  
- enhance the pedestrian environment |          | ✦          |              |               | BOP            |
| LU 7 | Apply main street overlay zones and modify to:  
- encourage housing and mixed uses at community corners and along the main streets,  
- address design issues associated with transition between single dwelling and multidwelling zones, and  
- address the scale and character of commercial uses. |          | ✦          |              |               | BOP            |
| LU 8 | Apply the design overlay zone (“d”) to key areas in the town center to promote desired characteristics. |          | ✦          |              |               | BOP            |
| LU 9 | Adopt the Open Space (OS) Comprehensive Plan map and zoning designation on the Willamette Cove site. |          | ✦          |              |               | BOP            |
| LU 10 | Monitor R1 zone development sites subject to minimum density requirements of the St. Johns plan district and main street overlay zone. Report findings to the Planning Commission two years after the plan’s adoption. |          |           |              | ✦               | BOP            |
| LU 11 | Consider replacing relevant St. Johns plan district and main street corridor overlay provisions if R1 zone minimum density requirements are revised citywide in the future. |          |           |              | ✦               | BOP            |
| LU 12 | Evaluate the effectiveness and implementation of the St. Johns/Lombard Plan land use regulations. |          |           |              | ✦               | BOP            |
Policy 2: History and Identity

*Strengthen the identity of the St. Johns and Lombard Street areas through development and community activities that integrate and build on the area’s distinctive history and architecture.*

**Discussion**

The following actions support implementation of the plan’s goals and urban development concept. Key to this implementation is the application of the design overlay zone over much of the St. Johns town center. Character statements are proposed for this area to inform the design review process about the local context and the desired form of development, with the goal of achieving attractive and compatible infill development.

Throughout the plan process, residents expressed their desire to maintain the small-town character of St. Johns. This characterization is rooted in its history as an independent city early in the twentieth century. Prominent civic and commercial buildings from this era are noteworthy from an architectural and historical reference. Most of these buildings are recognized locally but not nationally. Listing in the National Register of Historic Places heightens public awareness and pride and improves the likelihood for preservation. This designation should be pursued for the area’s most treasured buildings.

Acknowledgement and preservation of history can also take other forms. The St. Johns Heritage Association preserves the stories of St. Johns’ citizens, and wishes to pass this heritage onto future generations through creating an educational program for students. Efforts of this group should be publicized in the community, through wider distribution of its existing and future oral history documents.

The built environment can provide clues and give meaning to an area’s origins and citizens. Such clues exist today but much history remains hidden. Campsites of Native Americans and of Lewis and Clark and the original store and ferry sites associated with James John are unmarked. The history of the rail development and the Portsmouth Cut should be made known. Simple but effective means of conveying pieces of history may take the form of a plaque, impression, or other physical element placed within the public realm. Additionally, the area’s natural environment and public spaces are opportunity sites for major art installations or historical references.
## History and Identity Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>HISTORY AND IDENTITY ACTIONS</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adopt</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI 1</td>
<td>Prepare a nomination for the historic St. Johns City Hall for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>♦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BOP, SJHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI 2</td>
<td>Prepare a multiple property submission to the National Register of Historic Places for the St. Johns business district.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>♦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SJHA, BA, BOP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI 3</td>
<td>Work with property owner during redevelopment of the site at N. Ivanhoe and Richmond to preserve historical impressions located in the sidewalk on the south side of Ivanhoe Street.</td>
<td></td>
<td>♦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PDOT, BDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI 4</td>
<td>Search for community grant funds for a St. Johns heritage education program, to include publishing and distribution of existing and future volumes of oral histories.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>♦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SJHA, NPNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENHANCING IDENTITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI 5</td>
<td>Promote the installation of plaques, historic markers, artwork or decorative elements in public spaces, such as the St. Johns Plaza or Willamette riverfront, and as part of private development, that informs people of the history and natural environment of St. Johns and Lombard Street.</td>
<td></td>
<td>♦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA, BA, SJHA, BDS, PDOT, BOP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI 6</td>
<td>Promote a memorial project for the three bridge crossings over the Portsmouth Cut. Explore means for restoring the bridges’ historic iron railings.</td>
<td></td>
<td>♦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA, BA, SJHA, ODOT, PDOT, BOP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI 7</td>
<td>Participate in the city’s Heritage Tree Program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI 8</td>
<td>Form a committee to coordinate with the Regional Arts Council the siting of a major artwork (mitigation funding from Wapato Jail).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SJNA, FOCP, SJB, NPBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI 9</td>
<td>Continue to support the annual St. Johns Parade.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA, BA, NPNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REGULATIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI 10</td>
<td>Amend the <em>Community Design Guidelines</em> to include statements about valued architectural and urban design characteristics of the St. Johns town center to provide guidance in design review.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>♦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BOP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy 3: Transportation

Provide for a balanced multimodal transportation system that supports the urban development concept and land use vision for the town center and main street.

Discussion

The following transportation actions have been identified to support implementation of the urban development concept. Throughout the plan area the main intent of the transportation actions is to ensure that the area is served by a well-balanced multimodal transportation system. Overall, the existing street network is generally well scaled to the projected needs of the land use vision and urban development concept. The width of the streets and allocation of right-of-way to travel lanes, on-street parking, and sidewalks fits the small town character desired by the urban development concept while supporting Region 2040 Concept policy for town centers and main streets. The recommendations emphasize localized transportation system improvements necessary to optimize the balance between modes.

Creating a stronger multimodal environment along Lombard Street and within the St Johns town center is central to achieving several overall plan goals, from revitalizing commercial areas to helping preserve the area's small town character and scale. A major issue is improving pedestrian access and circulation with safer, more convenient crossing locations. The plan suggests several locations to be improved with curb extensions and/or medians to improve pedestrian crossing safety and convenience. The locations chosen reinforce the activity areas identified in the urban development concept and improve access to transit service. Pedestrian scale lighting will also help to strengthen the identity and attractiveness of the pedestrian environment within key urban development concept areas.

Transit is envisioned to play a significant role in supporting redevelopment opportunities within the plan area by improving access and the overall people moving capacity of the transportation system serving St Johns. An efficient, effective transit system will also help maintain the desired scale of the existing street network by reducing the need to expand traffic capacity. The actions focus on improving the speed of travel times to regional destinations, safe access to service, and comfort at stops. Frequent service, transit priority signal system upgrades, stop consolidation, curb extensions at transit stops, and express service recommendations will all help to improve travel times within the plan area and the convenience of using transit. Pedestrian crossing improvements coordinated with stops will enhance safe access to transit service, while improvements to transit stops with shelters, schedule information, lighting and supporting amenities will enhance the comfort of using transit. In the long run, through both the land use and transportation elements, it is the intent of the plan to encourage the return of a streetcar-type transit system to serve St Johns and better connect it with the region.

To improve bicycle access and circulation, the plan recommends several improvements to link the town center and main street to the established bicycle network that serves North Portland.

To retain the desired scale of the street network, while at the same time address the future capacity needs at key intersections, the plan focuses on optimizing the signal system to improve efficiency instead
of removing on-street parking and acquiring additional right-of-way. A street master plan is provided to improve street connectivity where links are missing and to support redevelopment opportunities with improved access and circulation, particularly in the Hillside neighborhood and Willamette riverfront areas. Actions to improve access to the town center core at the key gateway locations are recommended. These rely upon improving visual access and pedestrian safety to provide more inviting entrances into the retail core to support commercial revitalization.

Freight movement plays a significant role in North Portland as well as the regional economy, with the St. Johns Bridge serving as an important link in the regional freight system. As a result, the bridge carries a significant amount of regional and local truck traffic that is routed through the town center along Ivanhoe and Lombard Streets, west of Philadelphia Avenue. The conflict between freight movement and other town center access and circulation needs is a long-standing issue within the community that needs to be reduced to the extent possible. To address this issue in advance of the St. Johns Lombard Plan, the Portland Office of Transportation completed the St. Johns Truck Strategy in 2000, which provides a package of near term improvements to reduce these conflicts. These improvements are specifically intended to discourage use of N. Fessenden Street as a truck route and reduce the barrier effect to other modes that trucks create moving along N. Ivanhoe, N. Lombard, and N. St Louis. The recommendations support implementation of the action in a manner that addresses community concerns about truck speeds. The long-term strategy is to remove the conflict by supporting existing policy in the Regional Transportation Plan to study the location of a new bridge crossing west of the St Johns Bridge.

All actions that propose specific capital improvement projects will be forwarded to the Transportation System Plan for placement on either the project list or reference list for funding. All capital improvement items will require additional engineering analysis and in some cases will also need to meet more specific traffic warrants before they can move forward to construction. All capital improvement actions will also include a public involvement process to ensure community input on project or program design decisions.
A conceptual idea for increasing the utility of the existing plaza calls for landscaping the parking lot adjacent to Philadelphia Street to match the plaza, and using it for special events. This may be done in conjunction with temporary closure of this section of Philadelphia.
## Transportation Action Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>TRANSPORTATION ACTIONS</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adopt Ongoing Next 5 Years 6 to 10 Years 11 to 20 Years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS 1</td>
<td>Lombard, Woolsey to Oswego: optimize traffic signal timing and coordination, consider increase traffic signal cycle length.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PDOT, ODOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS 2</td>
<td>Ida/ Lombard: consider modifying the eastbound-westbound left turn signal phasing to protected/permitted and construct a separate southbound left turn lane.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PDOT, ODOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS 3</td>
<td>Support access management measures to increase on-street parking supply and improve safety by limiting the size and number of driveways through the building permit process, street improvements and redevelopment.</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>PDOT, ODOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS 4</td>
<td>Support the improvement and extension of existing alleyways and access to off-street parking access via alleyways adjacent to Lombard.</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>PDOT, BDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS 5</td>
<td>Support existing policy in the Transportation System Plan to shift the US 30 Bypass designation from Lombard to east of the St Johns Bridge to Lombard west of the bridge to Columbia Blvd.</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS 6</td>
<td>Support planned frequent bus improvements to the #75 bus line to improve service headways and stop amenities.</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>TriMet, PDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS 7</td>
<td>Add bus shelters with schedule information and lighting where warranted by stop activity.</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>TriMet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS 8</td>
<td>Evaluate the use of priority (limited stop) bus service during peak hours. Use the urban design concept (community corners and full main street sections) and pedestrian crossing improvements to prioritize locations.</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>TriMet, PDOT, ODOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS 9</td>
<td>Evaluate the consolidation or relocation of existing transit stops. Use the urban design concept (community corners and full main street sections) and pedestrian crossing improvements to prioritize locations.</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>TriMet, PDOT, ODOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS 10</td>
<td>Support the eventual transition to a streetcar-type transit system serving Lombard and St Johns through supporting land use redevelopment and community involvement.</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>NA, BA, PDOT, ODOT, BOP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS 11</td>
<td>Provide curb extensions at the following eight Lombard intersections (priorities): Newman/Huron, Fiske, Haven, Van Houten, Westanna, Gilbert, Burr, and Tyler. When placing curb extensions at transit stops, bus zones should be placed periodically within the sequence of transit stops to reduce impacts to traffic flow. Use design guidelines listed in Section 5B, Transportation Implementation Tools.</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>PDOT, ODOT, NA, BA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TRANSPORTATION ACTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>LOMBARD MAIN STREET, continued</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS 12</td>
<td>Evaluate the future potential for adding curb extensions at the following Lombard main street intersections: Hodge and Stanford.</td>
<td>Next 5 Years</td>
<td>NA, BA, PDOT, ODOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS 13</td>
<td>Consider pedestrian refuge islands at the following Lombard intersections: Huron, Westanna and Gilbert.</td>
<td>Next 5 Years</td>
<td>NA, BA, PDOT, ODOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS 14</td>
<td>Provide pedestrian-scale ornamental street lighting between Fiske and Portsmouth and at community corners.</td>
<td>Next 5 Years</td>
<td>PDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS 15</td>
<td>Provide curb ramps at all corners where they are currently missing.</td>
<td>Next 5 Years</td>
<td>PDOT, ODOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS 16</td>
<td>Provide bicycle lanes on Lombard from approximately Van Houton to Ida.</td>
<td>Next 5 Years</td>
<td>PDOT, ODOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS 17</td>
<td>Develop a parallel bicycle boulevard on Oberlin between Portsmouth and Woolsey. Consider extending bicycle lanes from Portsmouth to Woolsey if redevelopment from an auto-oriented to more transit- and pedestrian-oriented environment eliminates the need for the center turn lane.</td>
<td>Next 5 Years</td>
<td>PDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS 18</td>
<td>Evaluate how to implement the city bikeway designation for Lombard and complete the connection to the regional bikeway system east of Woolsey.</td>
<td>Next 5 Years</td>
<td>PDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS 19</td>
<td>Until the Freight Master Plan is adopted, accommodate over-dimensional freight needs in design of improvements to Lombard, including height requirements, curb-to-curb dimensions, planting plans, median locations, light fixture placement, street signs and turning radius as part of the engineering process.</td>
<td>Next 5 Years</td>
<td>PDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ST JOHNS TOWN CENTER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC 1</td>
<td>Richmond/Ivanhoe: add full traffic signal.</td>
<td>Next 5 Years</td>
<td>PDOT, ODOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC 2</td>
<td>Coordinate traffic signals between Lombard/Richmond and Philadelphia/Ivanhoe.</td>
<td>Next 5 Years</td>
<td>PDOT, ODOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC 3</td>
<td>Richmond, Ivanhoe to Lombard: consider an additional northbound travel lane within existing right-of-way to improve capacity.</td>
<td>Next 5 Years</td>
<td>PDOT, ODOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC 4</td>
<td>Baltimore/Ivanhoe: evaluate upgrading the existing traffic signal to improve traffic access and circulation from the riverfront.</td>
<td>Next 5 Years</td>
<td>PDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC 5</td>
<td>Lombard/Richmond/Jersey: consider shifting the traffic island to the north to improve sight lines and slow entering traffic while encouraging shoppers into the district.</td>
<td>Next 5 Years</td>
<td>PDOT, ODOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>TRANSPORTATION ACTIONS</td>
<td>TIMEFRAME</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTORS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ST JOHNS TOWN CENTER, continued</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC 6</td>
<td>Truck access to the St Johns Bridge - short term: support implementation of the entire <em>St Johns Truck Strategy</em>. The improvements should control vehicle speeds consistent with the posted speed limit and ensure adequate signage to control trucks near Reno/Lombard pedestrian crossing. Evaluate potential for special surface treatments and signage to direct freight traffic to appropriate routes. Ensure the completion of the St Johns Truck Strategy projects to improve freight capacity (TCI 1 and 2 and improvements to the Burgard Bridge) on the designated Lombard/Burgard/Columbia Blvd freight route to handle volume and physical loads before implementing traffic calming and safety elements (TC/S 2 and 3) of the St Johns Truck Strategy.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PDOT, NA, BA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC 7</td>
<td>Truck access to the St Johns Bridge - long term: support existing <em>Transportation System Plan</em> and <em>Regional Transportation Plan</em> policy to study the location of a new bridge crossing west of the St Johns Bridge.</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA, BA, PDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC 8</td>
<td>Evaluate on-street parking regulations to maximize supply within the commercial core area.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC 9</td>
<td>Amend the <em>Transportation System Plan</em> and implement the master street plan for new street and pedestrian/bicycle connections within the town center as redevelopment occurs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC 10</td>
<td>Provide 4-way stop control at the intersection of Willamette/Richmond to improve safety.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC 11</td>
<td>Provide bus shelters with schedule information and lighting where warranted by stop activity.</td>
<td></td>
<td>TriMet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC 12</td>
<td>Develop a transit routing plan for the town center core to concentrate and simplify access to the bus lines that serve the town center.</td>
<td></td>
<td>TriMet, PDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC 13</td>
<td>Encourage improved transit service between the town center and downtown Portland by increasing express service, adding weekend service, and expanding hours and frequency on routes 16, 17, and 40.</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA, BA, TriMet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC 14</td>
<td>Provide curb extensions at the following town center priority intersections along Ivanhoe: Richmond, John (or Charleston), and New York; and at St. Louis/Central (consider a refuge island). When placing curb extensions at transit stops, bus zones should be placed periodically within the sequence of transit stops to reduce impacts to traffic flow. Use the design guidelines listed in Section 5B, Transportation Implementation Tools.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PDOT, ODOT, NA, BA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>TRANSPORTATION ACTIONS</td>
<td>TIMEFRAME</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTORS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ST JOHNS TOWN CENTER, continued</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC 15</td>
<td>Evaluate the potential for curb extensions at the following town center intersections: Ivanhoe/Charleston (or John), Ivanhoe/Chicago, Richmond/Willamette, and Charleston between James John School and the library. Also evaluate Lombard/Charleston if TC5 is implemented. Evaluate curb extensions at Lombard/John and Lombard/Leavitt, if they are not placed at transit stops and there is no resulting on-street parking loss. Consider a raised crosswalk on Charleston Street between the school and the library. When placing curb extensions at transit stops, bus zones should be placed periodically within the sequence of transit stops to reduce impacts to traffic flow. Use the design guidelines listed in Section B, Transportation Implementation Tools.</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA, BA, PDOT, ODOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC 16</td>
<td>Evaluate the potential for improving pedestrian crossings at Philadelphia/Ivanhoe as part of any intersection improvements, particularly across Philadelphia west of Ivanhoe. Provide an improved, direct pedestrian connection from the plaza to the Philadelphia/Ivanhoe intersection as part of any intersection redesign work (coordinate with HR5).</td>
<td></td>
<td>PDOT, ODOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC 17</td>
<td>Provide pedestrian-scale ornamental street lighting on Lombard and Ivanhoe between Richmond and St Louis.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PDOT, ODOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC 18</td>
<td>Provide curb ramps at all corners where they are currently missing.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PDOT, ODOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC 19</td>
<td>Develop and implement a bicycle boulevard project on Central from Ida to St. Louis and on Jersey from Ida to Richmond.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC 20</td>
<td>Include bicycle access at Richmond/ Lombard/ Jersey when intersection is redesigned (TC 5) to provide safe connection from Jersey to Lombard into downtown St. Johns.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PDOT, ODOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC 21</td>
<td>Support extension of existing bicycle lanes on Willamette, west of Ida.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>HILLSIDE AND RIVERFRONT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR 1</td>
<td>Signalize Richmond/Ivanhoe and Baltimore/Ivanhoe (TC 1 &amp; 4), and improve Richmond, Crawford and Baltimore to City standards for drainage and sidewalks as development occurs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PDOT, BES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR 2</td>
<td>Policy: Reclassify the collector roadway streets (Richmond, Crawford and Baltimore) as neighborhood collectors in the Transportation System Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>TRANSPORTATION ACTIONS</td>
<td>TIMEFRAME</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTORS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adopt</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HILLSIDE AND RIVERFRONT, continued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR 3</td>
<td>Amend the Transportation System Plan to implement the master street plan as redevelopment occurs for unimproved streets between Princeton and Crawford, and between Burlington and Richmond.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR 4</td>
<td>Encourage TriMet to provide service to the riverfront area along Richmond, Crawford, and Baltimore when redevelopment activity warrants extension of existing lines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR 5</td>
<td>Develop special streetscape design treatments along either Burlington and/or Philadelphia streets to create a strong pedestrian connection between downtown St. Johns and the riverfront. Consider pedestrian enhancements on Philadelphia, Pittsburg, and John to provide additional connections to the riverfront.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR 6</td>
<td>Consider using local improvement districts to facilitate street infrastructure development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy 4: Economic Development

Build vital commercial areas in St. Johns and on Lombard Street by strengthening existing businesses, attracting new businesses that foster a positive identity for the areas, and encouraging housing to support retail and other community amenities.

Discussion

During the growth years of the 1990s, the St. Johns town center and Lombard main street areas did not experience as much development and growth in the neighborhood and specialty retail sector as some other parts of inner Portland. Many in the community desire a more diverse choice in goods and services in the area, with higher quality offerings in addition to everyday goods. Factors that may contribute to the lack of retail development include a relatively small primary market area population, moderate income levels, and a relatively isolated geographic location.

An essential part of enhancing the viability of retail sales and service activities in the area is to foster additional housing. A complementary strategy is to create a stronger sense of place and positive identity through strategic investments in the public right-of-way, coupled with quality private development. Actions that promote additional housing, implement design standards, and improve the safety, efficiency, and appearance of transportation system facilities are addressed in Policies 1 – 3.

Policy 4 addresses the additional economic development assistance that is necessary to create meaningful change in the near term. Specific actions in this section call for exploration and implementation of alternative funding sources to help facilitate development that will provide additional housing, jobs, and services in the areas. Throughout the plan area, economic development tools and alternative funding may bridge financing gaps in certain types of development.

Actions also include City involvement in the redevelopment of key properties in the St. Johns town center and Lombard main street. Redevelopment of key opportunity sites in downtown St. Johns could be a catalyst for broader change. In the riverfront area, the lack of complete street infrastructure, ownership patterns, environmental issues, and access constraints suggest the need for strategic public participation to achieve the plan vision and goals.

Additional actions call for public and private actions to attract key developments and activities that will make the areas a destination for visitors.
### Economic Development Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACTIONS</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adopt With Plan</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED 1</td>
<td>Work to develop a community market or farmers’ market in the St. Johns town center.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED 2</td>
<td>Organize a volunteer committee to study and recruit grocery stores, restaurants, and other desirable businesses currently lacking in the business districts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED 3</td>
<td>Pursue business development activities, including retailing and marketing seminars.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED 4</td>
<td>Create a shared parking program utilizing existing surface parking lots for use by local business customers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>DESTINATION AND MARKETING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>FUNDING PROGRAMS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED 5</td>
<td>Pursue funding for continuing storefront improvement grants and loans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED 6</td>
<td>Consider applying the transit-oriented development (TOD) property tax abatement for developments that foster benefits as specified in the TOD program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED 7</td>
<td>Explore alternative financing sources, including possibility of designation as an urban renewal district, to assist in development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>OPPORTUNITY SITES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED 8</td>
<td>Work with property owners on a long-term strategy for redevelopment of riverfront area sites south of the St. Johns bridge (known as the Crawford Street properties), including recreation, housing, and commercial uses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED 9</td>
<td>Work with the property owner on a strategy for redevelopment of the “old” Safeway site at Burlington and Kellogg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED 10</td>
<td>Consider vacant publicly owned property on Lombard in St. Johns for future development opportunity, or for use as a public facility that supports the business district.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED 11</td>
<td>Explore city participation in redevelopment of key opportunity sites in the St. Johns town center to facilitate development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED 12</td>
<td>Explore city participation in redevelopment of key large opportunity sites in the full main street area on Lombard.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy 5: Housing

Provide for a broad range of well-designed and compatible housing to accommodate local and regional housing needs, and to support development of vital town center and main street commercial areas.

Discussion
The following actions are intended to help foster a range of well-designed housing choices to serve current and future residents in the St. Johns town center and Lombard main street areas. The actions will encourage residential development at density levels that are appropriate for town center and main street areas and support economic development, without overburdening the area’s systems and services.

Housing action items specifically call for:

- Supporting neighborhood stability by reducing the potential for major redevelopment in formerly RH-designated residential areas near the town center;
- Fostering additional housing development on key sites in downtown St. Johns and the Lombard main street by providing incentives for new residential and mixed-use development;
- Facilitating additional housing and mixed-use development by creating plan district regulations that allow residential development in the Willamette Riverfront area through use of the EX zone;
- Fostering neighborhood growth through infill development by allowing marginal increases in allowed density; and
- Supporting residential development by conducting studies and working with property owners on key sites, and investigating alternative funding sources for housing development.
## Housing Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>HOUSING ACTIONS</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adopt On-</td>
<td>Next 5 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>going</td>
<td>Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARKETING AND FUNDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 1</td>
<td>Work with developers, including local community development corporations, to develop housing and mixed-use projects that serve community needs and foster viability of commercial areas.</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 2</td>
<td>Provide information on funding sources to assist in development of housing to support town center and main street areas.</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGULATIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 3</td>
<td>Update the Comprehensive Plan map and zoning map to provide for new housing opportunities by using a combination of R1 and R2 multidwelling designations, and the R 2.5 attached residential designation in selected areas.</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 4</td>
<td>Apply a main street overlay zone and plan district to allow increased height and building coverage for residential development on key commercial sites.</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 5</td>
<td>Use Central Employment (EX) Comprehensive Plan map and zoning designations in select town center areas near the Willamette River to allow residential uses.</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy 6: Environment

*Promote the development of a built environment that fosters ecological quality and uses sustainable development practices.*

**Discussion**

The North Portland peninsula is commonly referred to as the “Gateway to Nature.” The St. Johns/Lombard Plan builds upon this ideal by promoting sustainable development practices and ecological stewardship. The protection and enhancement of the city’s unique ecological resources can be addressed in a number of ways. Natural areas with habitat value can be preserved and restored, creative stormwater management techniques can be employed, native landscaping can be incorporated into the urban forest, and buildings can be constructed and renovated to use recycled materials and to reduce energy inputs and usage of potable water.

An example of sustainable development can be found in the design and operation of the Bureau of Environmental Services’ (BES) Water Pollution Control Lab. This facility is designed to reduce energy usage and incorporates a unique stormwater management system that is efficient and aesthetically pleasing. Through this plan BES desires to see sustainable development practices expanded throughout the St. Johns area. Specifically, BES would like to reduce reliance on existing regional stormwater ponds and facilities as St. Johns grows by utilizing “on-site” stormwater management techniques (such as those contained in the *Stormwater Management Manual*) and by implementing “green street” design concepts when access ways are constructed and redeveloped.

The St. Johns/Lombard Plan further promotes sustainability and ecological stewardship through actions that promote sustainable development practices as part of public and private development projects, preservation of habitat areas, and the promotion of environmental educational and stewardship. Specifically, the actions proposed pursue:

- The incorporation of green street standards when new streets or new street segments are developed. The green street standards promoted will be those developed by the Bureau of Environmental Services and Portland Office of Transportation addressing the green street goal of the *Metro 2040 Growth Concept* and the *Regional Transportation Plan*.

- The incorporation of green development practices, such as Leadership in Environmental and Energy Design (LEED) standards and LEED certification, for the development of new buildings by the public and private sectors on the North Portland peninsula. Bureaus involved in the promotion, funding, planning, and review of new buildings will work with architects, landscape architects, engineers, and developers to promote the incorporation of green development practices in the redevelopment of existing buildings and in the development of new structures.

- The establishment of habitat enhancement and restoration projects to preserve tracts of remnant native vegetation along the river’s edge. Such projects will help to preserve and expand habitat for wildlife in the area, will improve the general environmental and aesthetic quality of the riverfront, and will improve the livability of residents, workers, and visitors of the riverfront.
- Expand public open space areas within the city and support efforts to improve existing public open space by placing the “open space” designation on publicly owned land set aside for future park development.

- Public outreach and education programs designed to involve the public in efforts conducted by the Bureau of Environmental Services (BES) and her sister bureaus to promote environmental stewardship throughout the community. Efforts may address landscaping with native plants, downspout disconnecting, and watershed enhancement efforts.
A present-day view of the hillside area northwest of the St. Johns Bridge.
## Environment Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>ENVIRONMENT ACTIONS</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adopt Wish Plan</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EV 1</td>
<td>Consider “green” and environmentally sustainable alternatives to PDOT street standards on Pittsburg, Leavitt, Salem, and Charleston rights-of-way in Cathedral Park.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EV 2</td>
<td>Work with developers to promote green building techniques and to address LEED (Leadership in Environmental and Energy Design) standards and demonstration projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EV 3</td>
<td>Pursue vegetation enhancement and restoration projects along the greenway, especially within the greenway area, to increase habitat, and improve the general environmental and aesthetic quality of the river’s edge.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EV 4</td>
<td>Pursue greenway trail improvements to improve greenway circulation and to promote multimodal transportation along the North Portland Peninsula.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SUSTAINABILITY AND ENHANCEMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EV 5</td>
<td>Take advantage of the presence of the facilities at BES’ Water Pollution Control Lab to incorporate public education programs about stormwater management and naturescaping.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EV 6</td>
<td>Pursue stewardship programs with local industries, businesses and homeowners to encourage pollution prevention and on-site stormwater management, such as porous pavement in spillover parking and sidewalks, cisterns for water reuse, stormwater planters, ecoroofs and downspout disconnection.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>EDUCATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EV 7</td>
<td>Place the OS designation and zone on Willamette Cove property currently in IG designation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EV 8</td>
<td>Assess the resource value of the Edison Street forest for appropriate zoning overlay designations as part of future river and environmental planning projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>REGULATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy 7: Willamette Riverfront

*Develop the Willamette Riverfront as an active mixed-use area containing housing and opportunities for local employment, supported by community oriented retail services and a network of open space areas including an expanded greenway trail and other public amenities.*

**Discussion**

St. Johns is distinctive in the City of Portland in that it is one of the few communities that has direct access to the Willamette River. Because the riverfront area is within walking distance of downtown St. Johns, it is considered a significant element of the town center and an area where numerous opportunities exist for additional housing, employment, and recreational development. This area is also unique in that it contains two large publicly owned recreational facilities and significant tracts of riverfront native vegetation and river beach areas.

Although the St. Johns riverfront contains a mix of uses complemented by sections of public trails and recreational facilities, as well as commanding views of the Willamette River, the St. Johns Bridge, and Forest Park, the full potential of this area has yet to be realized. The St. Johns/Lombard Plan, through the following actions, seeks to encourage redevelopment through public and private investment throughout the riverfront area in an effort to maximize the potential of this area and its ability to contribute to the larger town center. Specifically, the actions encourage:

- Expansion of the Willamette greenway trail from Cathedral Park to Willamette Cove with eventual connections extending to the University of Portland, Swan Island, and the Eastbank Esplanade.
- Development of a greenway buffer extending at least 100 feet from the river that includes restored or enhanced habitat areas, bicycle and pedestrian trails, viewpoints, and other public amenities.
- Future evolution of the riverfront south of the St. Johns Bridge to an area with a mix of uses that celebrate the unique qualities and attributes of the riverfront and reinforce the public enjoyment and investment in the Willamette greenway.

The plan also proposes the rezoning of Willamette Cove to an open space land use designation. This is proposed as an initial step in its transition into a more established public riverfront park.

The plan further proposes the retention of industrial and employment-based zoning designations along specific sections of the riverfront in an effort to preserve the industrial sanctuary located north of the St. Johns Bridge. However, the plan directs additional analysis of this industrial area as part of Portland’s “River Renaissance” planning effort. That effort will determine if this area is better suited to other uses, especially when other riverfront areas are considered and as the St. Johns riverfront evolves.
A present-day view of the Willamette riverfront area southeast of the St. Johns Bridge. The Water Pollution Control Laboratory is in the foreground.
## Willamette Riverfront Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>WILLAMETTE RIVERFRONT ACTIONS</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adopt</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REGULATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR 1</td>
<td>Place the Open Space (OS) designation and zone on the publicly owned Willamette Cove properties.</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR 2</td>
<td>Create design guidance and character statements for the Central Employment (EX) designated properties south of St. Johns Bridge to ensure that redevelopment projects along the river are attractive and of a compatible design quality.</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUTURE PLANNING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR 3</td>
<td>Reevaluate uses, river setbacks, and greenway treatments on Mixed Employment (ME) designated properties between the St. Johns Bridge and Richmond Avenue as part of Willamette River planning.</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR 4</td>
<td>Reevaluate uses, river setbacks, and greenway treatments on industrial sanctuary and Mixed Employment (ME) designated properties north of the St. Johns Bridge as part of ongoing Willamette River planning.</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR 5</td>
<td>Evaluate and develop restoration and enhancement options for riparian and upland vegetation along river’s edge.</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR 6</td>
<td>Evaluate applying Recreation Trail designation to Decatur Street rather than Edison Street north and west of Baltimore Street as part of river and greenway planning.</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RIVERFRONT DEVELOPMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR 7</td>
<td>Pursue a focal point feature or public attractor, and enhanced street terminus at the end of Burlington Avenue at the riverfront.</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR 8</td>
<td>Work with property owners along the riverbank to explore opportunities to develop missing segments of the Willamette greenway trail and create other public gathering spaces at river’s edge.</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR 9</td>
<td>Pursue funding sources to create additional public open space areas along the riverbank and expanded riverfront recreational opportunities.</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy 8: Community Involvement and Services

Support and enhance the St. Johns town center and Lombard main street with a mix of public and private community services. Continue the high level of community involvement in project and program activities recommended in this plan.

Discussion
Much community discussion centered on ways to revitalize Lombard Street and downtown St. Johns. The planning process brought together residents and businesspeople in this discussion. The work of these groups should continue and focus on specific actions to improve the commercial areas and civic functions.

Further community discussion was directed at establishing new recreational services and making better use of existing facilities. The city should examine the area’s future need for recreation facilities and services, as well as the most appropriate locations for them.

Public safety is a key component to creation of a sustainable town center and main street. The plan area is currently well served by police, fire and emergency services. These essential public services should be maintained or enhanced as the area grows and changes. Additionally, public safety may be enhanced as the area changes through more “eyes on the street” and an enhanced sense of community.

Another significant goal of the plan is to provide a framework for coordinating planning efforts of community organizations and city bureaus. Establishment of a district planner position for North Portland will ensure continuation of this role after the St. Johns/Lombard Plan is adopted.
# Community Involvement and Service Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT AND SERVICE ACTIONS</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adopt Plan</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 1</td>
<td>Consider locations for an aquatic center in and near the St. Johns/Lombard plan area to serve the peninsula.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parks, NA, BA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 2</td>
<td>Conduct a use and redevelopment feasibility study of the St. Johns Racquet Center.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parks, BOP, PDC, SJNA, SJB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 3</td>
<td>Coordinate with Portland Public Schools (PPS) on use of James John School grounds for future community events, such as a fair or farmers' market.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PPS, SJNA, BA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 4</td>
<td>Continue to provide adequate levels of public safety by maintaining police and fire stations in or near the plan area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Police, Fire, OMF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 5</td>
<td>Continue to provide community garden space in the St. Johns area at the current location. Should a future development proposal compel relocation, work with garden users, interested parties, and the community on selecting an appropriate replacement site in the area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parks, NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 6</td>
<td>Consider the need for an additional boat launch when conducting an evaluation of future recreation needs in the town center.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 7</td>
<td>Create a district liaison position for North Portland to assist in coordinating planning projects and city bureau activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BOP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 8</td>
<td>Form a group of neighborhood residents and local businessespeople to develop strategies for community reinvestment, using the St. Johns/Lombard Plan as a framework.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NA, BA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Implementation Tools and Guidance

A. Comprehensive Plan Map
This section contains the updates to the Comprehensive Plan map for the St. Johns/Lombard plan area. For reference, the former Comprehensive Plan map is shown, along with the adopted Comprehensive Plan map.

B. Transportation Implementation Tools
This section contains St. Johns/Lombard Plan transportation maps that detail locations of future desired streets, and includes discussion that provides additional guidance for other public-right-of-way improvements.

C. Community Design Guideline Amendments
This section contains updates to the Community Design Guidelines for the St. Johns plan district. Desired design character statements are proposed for guidance when development is subject to a quasi-judicial design review process.

D. Zoning Map and Code Amendments
This section contains the updates to the zoning map for the St. Johns/Lombard Plan area. The zoning map is followed by amendments to the Zoning Code. Code commentary is included along with code language to describe legislative intent.
Comprehensive Plan Map

Areas of Change to Previous Comprehensive Plan Map

The St. Johns/Lombard Comprehensive Plan map (p. 79) is the refinement of the urban development concept into Comprehensive Plan designations. The Comprehensive Plan map for the St. Johns/Lombard area becomes a component of the citywide Comprehensive Plan map effective on July 10, 2004. The map on page 81 shows the previous Comprehensive Plan map and the areas changed by the St. Johns/Lombard Plan.

The Portland Comprehensive Plan map guides land use and development patterns. It specifies, by site, where various land uses can be located in the future. The Comprehensive Plan map designations both protect community livability and provide certainty for those wishing to develop or redevelop their land. The designations are tied to policy statements in the Comprehensive Plan.

Each Comprehensive Plan map designation corresponds with one or more “zones,” which are defined in Title 33: Planning and Zoning Code. Zoning is a tool that helps implement the Comprehensive Plan map. The zoning code contains regulations that specify the permitted development type, scale, and density on a given site. Zones include provisions that regulate the use of land and some aspects of design. Like the Comprehensive Plan map, there is also a zoning map that specifies which zone is applied to every site within the city. The Comprehensive Plan map is “superior” to the zoning map, meaning the zoning map should not allow development that is more intensive or different than that allowed by Comprehensive Plan map designations.

In addition to the “base” Comprehensive Plan map and zoning designations, sites may have further regulations through the application of “overlay” zones or plan districts. These regulations supersede the “base” designations, and may be more or less restrictive than the base designation. Overlay zones apply to specific circumstances rather than specific areas of the city and may deal with issues like design review, buffers, scenic resources, and environmentally sensitive areas. In contrast, a plan district is created and applied in only one area of the city to address unique characteristics and development issues. The St. Johns/Lombard Plan uses overlay zones as well as a plan district to implement the community’s vision for the area.

The zoning map, and plan district and overlay zoning codes for the St. John/Lombard Plan are located in the section 5D, titled “Zoning Map and Code Amendments.”
Comprehensive Plan Map Designations

Residential Designations

**High Density Single-Dwelling.** This designation continues Portland’s most common pattern of single-dwelling development. It is intended for areas with good public services and no development constraints. Single-dwelling residential is intended to be the primary use. The maximum density is generally 8.7 units per acre and the corresponding zone is R5.

**Attached Residential.** This designation is intended for areas with complete public services and without development constraints. It allows a mixture of housing types of a single-dwelling character, including attached houses. Allowed densities for attached houses are higher than for detached housing. The maximum density is generally 17.4 units per acre for attached housing. To allow the fulfillment of these densities, the allowed scale of these projects should be allowed to be greater than for other single-dwelling housing structure types. The corresponding zone is R2.5.

**Low Density Multidwelling.** This designation continues a common development pattern for low-density multidwelling mixed with single-dwelling housing types. It is intended for areas with good public services and no development constraints. It may be used on larger development sites, or on smaller sites near arterials, transit service, or commercial areas. The maximum density is generally 21.8 units per acre, but may go up to 32 units per acre in some situations. The allowed scale of the development is greater than for single-dwelling housing. The corresponding zone is R2.

**Medium Density Multidwelling.** This designation continues a common development pattern for medium density apartments. It is intended for areas with good public services, including transit, and no development constraints. It may be used for lands near arterials, transit streets, or commercial areas. The maximum density is generally 43 units per acre, but may go up to 65 units per acre in some situations. The scale of development is intended to reflect the allowed densities while being compatible with nearby single-dwelling areas. The corresponding zone is R1.

Commercial Designations

**Neighborhood Commercial.** This designation is intended to allow neighborhood-oriented commercial uses in and adjacent to residential areas. In more densely developed neighborhoods, development should be oriented to pedestrians. In less densely developed neighborhoods, development may be more auto-oriented. In both cases, the allowed intensity of development is low to maintain compatibility with the residential areas, and development is oriented to pedestrians, bicycles, and transit where high quality transit service is available. The corresponding zones are Neighborhood Commercial 1 (CN1) and Neighborhood Commercial 2 (CN2).

**Urban Commercial.** This designation is intended for more developed parts of the city near relatively dense residential areas. A full range of retail, service, and business uses are allowed serving a local and a larger market area. It is intended primarily for areas that are served by transit. Development should have a strong orientation to pedestrians. It is also intended to allow commercial development in some
areas while maintaining housing opportunities. The corresponding zones are Mixed Commercial/Residential (CM) and Storefront Commercial (CS).

**General Commercial.** This designation allows a full range of commercial uses having a local or regional market. Development will mostly have an auto-orientation, but along streets where high quality transit service is available, development will also be oriented to pedestrians, bicycles, and transit. It is intended for arterial streets and to be used for developing areas and for larger, older areas that already have an auto-oriented development style. The corresponding zone is General Commercial (CG).

**Employment and Industrial Designations**

**Central Employment.** This designation is intended to provide for mixed-use areas in an overall industrial-type setting. The designation is intended for very developed parts of the city which have the highest levels of public services. It allows a full range of industrial and commercial uses. Residential uses are allowed but should be compatible with the surrounding nonresidential development. The intensity of development will be higher than in other employment designations and most commercial designations. The corresponding zone is EX. The design overlay zone will be applied in conjunction with the EX zone.

**Mixed Employment.** This designation is intended for areas where a wide variety of employment opportunities are encouraged in an industrial-type setting. Industrial uses are allowed with few limitations. Commercial uses are allowed, but are limited in intensity as not to overburden public services and to maintain adequate industrial development opportunities. Residential development is restricted to prevent conflicts with the other uses. The corresponding zones are General Employment 1 (EG1) and General Employment 2 (EG2).

**Industrial Sanctuary.** This designation is intended for areas where City policy is to reserve land for existing and future industrial development. A full range of industrial uses are permitted and encouraged. Nonindustrial uses are limited to prevent land use conflicts and to preserve land for industry. The corresponding zones are General Industrial 1 (IG1), General Industrial 2 (IG2), and Heavy Industrial (IH).

**Other Designations**

**Open Space.** This designation is intended for lands that serve an open space function, primarily public lands, but also some private areas. Lands intended for open space designation include parks, natural areas, golf courses, and cemeteries. The corresponding zone is OS.
5B. Transportation Implementation Tools

St. Johns Town Center Master Street Plan

The master street plan is intended to provide a well-connected street network within the town center to support redevelopment and multimodal access between the riverfront and town center core. The plan extends the basic grid pattern in areas where there are currently a number of unimproved public rights-of-way and large superblocks that create barriers to multimodal circulation. It also establishes Richmond, Crawford and Baltimore Streets as the main collector routes to and from the riverfront area.

Local streets designated as “primary” are intended to be designed and serve all modes, while those designated as “secondary” may be designed for bicycle and pedestrian use only. The plan also promotes the use of enhanced “green” techniques to manage stormwater. The final design of all streets is subject to approval of the City Engineer.

The master street plan is intended to be implemented as adjacent properties undergo significant redevelopment, such as through zone changes, subdivisions, or new construction. Design width and alignment of all new secondary streets shall be determined during the development review process and will take into account urban design considerations of adjacent development and respect, but not necessarily replicate, dimensions of the existing street network. Where secondary streets do not provide for vehicle access, the street should have adequate width to provide for comfortable pedestrian space. New street connections on Richmond street alignment should be grade separated to ensure public safety across the rail line, subject to ODOT railroad department approval.
**Intersection Capacity Improvements**

Analysis done as part of the plan development process indicates that most signalized intersections within the plan area will continue to meet City and regional standards for performance within the 20 year planning horizon. However, a few intersections were identified for improvement to ensure safe and efficient traffic flow. In order to preserve the desired scale of the street network, where possible, these improvements focus on optimizing the signal system in order to improve efficiency, instead of removing on-street parking and acquiring additional right-of-way.

**Freight System**

The St. Johns Bridge carries significant amount of regional and local truck traffic that is routed through the town center along Ivanhoe, west of Philadelphia. The street network and connections to the regional freight system also encourage cut-through traffic on Fessenden Street instead of the designated freight route on Columbia Boulevard. The conflicts this freight movement creates with the access and circulation needs of the town center has been a long-standing issue within the community. To address this issue in advance of the *St. Johns Lombard Plan*, the Portland Office of Transportation completed the *St Johns Truck Strategy* in 2000, which provides a package of near term improvements to reduce these conflicts. These improvements are specifically intended to discourage use of Fessenden as a truck route and reduce the barrier effect to other modes that trucks create moving along Ivanhoe and St. Louis. Improvements to the section of the freight route through the town center, between the St Johns Bridge and Lombard west, should be designed to ensure truck speeds are kept within the posted speed limit. The long-term strategy is to support existing policy in the *Regional Transportation Plan* to study the location of a new bridge crossing west of the St. Johns Bridge.

**Pedestrian Crossing Improvements**

Creating a stronger pedestrian environment along Lombard Street and within the St. Johns town center is central to achieving several plan objectives, from revitalizing commercial areas and supporting transit use, to helping preserve the area’s small town character and scale. While both areas are currently well served with an inner-connected sidewalk system with widths that meet City standards for main streets, the major issue for good pedestrian access and circulation is safe and convenient crossing locations. On the Lombard main street this is particularly true in the area east of Ida Street where the roadway width of Lombard increases from 36 to 50 feet. Within the St. Johns town center the main issue is along Ivanhoe, where trucks and large traffic volumes generated by the St. Johns Bridge create a major barrier to good pedestrian access and circulation.

The plan recommends several locations to be improved with curb extensions and/or medians to improve pedestrian crossing safety and convenience. The locations chosen are spaced between signalized intersections to reduce the distance between enhanced crossings along the entire Lombard corridor, and are also intended to improve access to transit service. The priority locations are those in which crossing improvements are strongly recommended. The nonpriority locations (see action items) are those in which further evaluation and community consensus is required prior to design and implementation.
Pedestrian Crossing Improvements: Design Guidelines

Specific design details at the location level need to be developed through a follow-up design engineering and public involvement process, where issues related to turn movements, on-street parking supply, traffic flow and transit operations will be addressed and the final design will be determined. This process shall use the following guidelines in developing final design plans for all pedestrian crossings constructed.

- Involve the local neighborhood associations, business associations, adjacent property owners and the surrounding community in design process.
- Design improvements that improve pedestrian safety and enhance access to commercial destinations and transit service.
- Design improvements that directly support the urban development concept’s land use vision and objectives.
- Design improvements that minimize impacts to traffic flow, turn movements and on-street parking.
- Design improvements to support efficient transit service.
- If curb extensions are proposed at transit stops, bus zones (no curb extensions) should be placed at the following stop to reduce impacts to traffic flow.
**Town Center Gateway Intersection Improvements**

There are two “front doors” or gateways to St. Johns for visitors arriving by car from outside the area: the Philadelphia/Ivanhoe and Lombard/Richmond intersections. Both are major traffic portals as well. While previous planning efforts have improved the appearance and function of these intersections as gateways through landscaping, the current designs have also tended to obscure sight lines into the commercial core that lies behind the gateways. To help support revitalization of the business district through improving the visual as well physical connection into the commercial core, consistent with the plan objectives, the recommendations include new alignment concepts at both intersection locations.

**Lombard/Richmond Gateway**

Sight lines into the town center core from Lombard at Richmond are complicated by the bend in Lombard as it passes by the Lombard/Richmond gateway. Furthermore, the right-turn lane from Lombard westbound into the commercial core curves around a large radius corner that obscures sight distances with pedestrians crossing Lombard further to the west, near James John Elementary School and encourages speeding.

The new design concept shifts the island to the north and merges it with the sidewalk area, creating a more traditional right angle intersection alignment. Eastbound traffic on Lombard entering the town center core would still have a free right turn, but the turn movement would be around a tighter radius corner that will slow traffic speeds and improve sight distances down Lombard. The space occupied by the former island could be designed to allow for more active pedestrian use and improve sight lines into the commercial core for traffic approaching the intersection from the east. There are no capacity impacts anticipated with this realignment. Specific design details still need to be developed through a design engineering process with public involvement.
Philadelphia/ Ivanhoe Gateway

Heavy traffic and truck volumes and offset intersection angles complicate the intersection of Philadelphia and Ivanhoe. Access from the bridge to the town center core is via the one-way eastbound leg of Burlington that curves before its signalized intersection with Lombard. This curve, along with landscaping associated with the plaza as it extends out to Ivanhoe, tends to obscure sight lines into the business district core. Traffic circulation from the core to the bridge westbound is also difficult due to Burlington being one-way eastbound between Philadelphia and Lombard.

The design concept for this intersection in the near term is to visually open up the view into the business district along the Burlington leg of the intersection through new landscaping and redesign of the plaza. In the long term the plan recommends consideration of creating a new continuous straight alignment of Burlington between Lombard and Ivanhoe that would allow two-way traffic flow for better traffic circulation. However, this concept would place additional strain on the intersection’s capacity and would likely require a new river crossing to reduce traffic volumes on the St Johns Bridge. Specific design details still need to be developed through a design engineering process with public involvement.
Transit System

Transit is envisioned to play a significant role in supporting redevelopment opportunities within the plan area by improving access and the overall people moving capacity of the transportation system serving St. Johns. An efficient, effective transit system will also help maintain the desired scale of the existing street network by reducing the need to expand traffic capacity. In the long run, it is the intent of the land use and transportation system recommendations working in conjunction to lay the foundation for reintroducing a streetcar system to St. Johns.

The plan recommends several ways of enhancing the existing transit system to improve the overall convenience and attractiveness of using transit. The recommendations focus on improving the speed of travel times to regional destinations, safe access to service, and comfort at stops. Frequent service, transit priority signal system upgrades, stop consolidation, curb extensions at transit stops, and express service recommendations will all help to improve travel times within the plan area and the convenience of using transit. Pedestrian crossing improvements coordinated with stops will enhance safe access to transit service, while improvements to transit stops with shelters, schedule information, lighting and supporting amenities will enhance the comfort of using transit.
Bicycle System

Lombard is designated as a city bikeway in the Transportation System Plan, intended to serve as the central access route for bikes through North Portland to the St. Johns town center. Given the volume of traffic on Lombard, the preferred improvement is to provide a safe environment for cyclists and direct access to the business district with bike lanes. However, due to the existing narrow right-of-way on Lombard west of Alma and competing transportation needs east of Portsmouth, a combination of bike lanes and parallel “bicycle boulevard” routes is recommended to create a safe, convenient connection for bicycles between the regional bikeway system and the town center and main street.

Between Van Houton and Ida Streets there is sufficient right-of-way currently to provide bike lanes on Lombard without impacts to on-street parking or the number of travel lanes. This will provide a new connection between existing bike lanes on both Portsmouth and Ida. Providing bike lanes east of Portsmouth is not recommended because it would entail either removing the existing center turn lane or on-street parking within the full main street portion of the urban development concept. Within this segment a parallel route, using Oberlin Street, is recommended. Similarly, Lombard west of Ida is not recommended for bike lanes due to on-street parking loss. Therefore, parallel routes of Jersey and Central are recommended to complete the connection into the town center. Further study is required for the parallel routes to identify specific improvements needed to ensure safe bicycle passage and connections to existing and proposed bike lanes.
5C. Community Design Guidelines

Commentary

The St. Johns/Lombard Plan extends the design overlay (“d”) zone to properties zoned R1, R2, CS, CN, CG, and EX in the St. Johns plan district. A map of the affected area is on page 91.

The Community Design Guidelines serve as approval criteria for discretionary design review in the plan district. Eligible projects in the plan district have the option of meeting the nondiscretionary, regulations-based community design standards (Chapter 33.218 of the Zoning Code). Refer to the code section of this document for proposed amendments to the standards.

For the purposes of this section, the St. Johns town center is separated into four “urban character areas,” each distinguished by a unique mix of architecture and urban patterns. These unique patterns are described for each area. “Desired Characteristics and Traditions” statements highlight the architectural and urban patterns valued by the community and worthy of integration into new development. The “Desired Characteristics and Traditions” statements of this section provide guidance on how Guideline P1 of the community design standards should be considered in the St. Johns town center.

Guideline P1, “Plan Area Character,” reads:

*Enhance the sense of place and identity by incorporating site and building design features that respond to the area’s desired characteristics and traditions.*

The “Desired Characteristics and Traditions” statements will be used by design review staff and review bodies to determine if a proposal meets the intent of Guideline P1. They may also be used to inform references to “desired character” in the Zoning Code (included in criteria for adjustment requests, for example).

Previously adopted area and neighborhood plans lack clear and explicit references to desired characteristics and traditions, making interpretation of Guideline P1 difficult (often, nearby existing development is used to identify community character, but existing development does not always correspond to the community’s vision). This section is intended to resolve this issue. Note that the “Desired Characteristics and Traditions” statements are in narrative form, as opposed to succinct statements, to distinguish them from the actual Community Design Guidelines. The statements will be included in an appendix to the Community Design Guidelines document.
The diagram below illustrates the role of the “Desired Characteristics and Traditions” statements in relation to the Community Design Guidelines, emphasizing their role in providing area-specific guidance, and clarifying the nonbinding role the accompanying “may be accomplished by” statements described later in this section.

The “Desired Characteristics and Traditions” statements must be interpreted in the context of the “Urban Pattern” and “Architectural Pattern” statements that precede them.

As the descriptions in this chapter are not exhaustive, developers should refer to the background document, St. Johns/Lombard Plan Existing Conditions Report (April 2003, History and Urban Form and Land Use chapters), and consult with community members for more information. Community organization contacts include the St. Johns and Friends of Cathedral Park Neighborhood Associations, St. Johns Boosters, and the St. Johns Heritage Association.
St. Johns Town Center
Desired Characteristics and Traditions

Background

The built environment of the St. Johns town center is the result of development over decades, each of which brought a variety of building types and architectural styles. As a result, the St. Johns town center is an architecturally diverse area. The downtown area was developed prior to and during the streetcar era, before automobile use became widespread, resulting in a built environment very much oriented to the pedestrian. The riverfront area has a heritage of marine and industrial activity, but is also the site of the original settlement of St. Johns, and contains residential uses. The hillside area has developed over time as a neighborhood of mixed dwelling types and densities, conveniently located near the services of downtown St. Johns and employment areas on the peninsula.

The urban character area boundaries shown on the map below are for the purposes of this section only. The boundaries are flexible, as there is a transition between each area. For sites located at area edges, “Desired Characteristics and Traditions” statements from adjoining areas should be consulted, taking into account specific aspects of the site and its context.

Urban Character Areas Map
Urban Character Area 1: Residential St. Johns

The residential St. Johns area comprises three residential enclaves, adjacent to both downtown St. Johns and single dwelling neighborhoods. Within the plan area, the commercial district adjacent to Lombard and Ivanhoe Streets separates this residential area from the Hillside residential neighborhood. The area is not exclusively residential, and contains religious and other institutional uses, including the community center, all situated on large lots with prominent open areas. The housing stock is characterized by a mix of older houses from the early twentieth century, and postwar housing built to accommodate workers at nearby mills and industrial plants. It includes a scattering of duplexes and triplexes. Multidwelling housing consists of a mix of early and mid-to late twentieth century developments dispersed throughout the area, but primarily concentrated adjacent to Lombard Street and commercial nodes. Newer development over the past decade consists primarily of detached and attached single dwellings and duplexes on infill lots. The vision for the area builds on its eclectic mix of housing types and styles, and encourages continued infill development of detached and attached houses, duplexes, townhouses, and medium-density multifamily buildings, built to reflect the strong pedestrian quality that characterizes the area.

Urban Patterns

The well-established grid system of the residential St. Johns area is a prominent and important feature. Most streets are fully improved and provide direct pedestrian connections to the open spaces.
institutional uses and commercial areas within St. Johns. In this area, blocks are typically longer than those in the hillside area, measuring 200 x 400 feet. A number of blocks are developed with well-utilized, but often unimproved, alleys. Front yards are often generous, particularly for single-family residences, and emphasize the abundant open space provided around institutional and civic uses.

Architectural Patterns
The residential St. Johns area contains a wide variety of building types and architectural styles from different eras. The earliest houses in this area date back to the late nineteenth century. Smaller single-story early twentieth century and postwar era homes on typical (5,000 square-foot) lots characterize much of the development north of Lombard Street, interspersed with institutional and community-oriented uses that include the St. Johns Community Center, the Bachelor Club, the branch library, James John School, and churches. Included in the housing mix are low-rise, multidwelling developments generally from the mid- to late-twentieth century.

The east portion of this area comprises somewhat larger houses of varying eras and styles, including early twentieth century one-and-a-half and two-story bungalows and American basic houses, and one-story ranch-style dwellings set back with large front yards. Low-rise, multidwelling developments from the mid-twentieth century are found throughout the area, and vary in size from triplexes to larger 25-unit structures. They are generally set back from the street with parking areas typically predominating the street frontage.
Desired Characteristics and Traditions

The early housing styles and small-town scale of the residential St. Johns area provide the context for new projects. As such, new development should reflect and acknowledge this context by ensuring that main entrances are prominent, pedestrian connections are strong, landscaping is prominent and integrated appropriately, and parking areas do not dominate the streetscape.

Building and site design elements that contribute to the residential St. Johns character should be carried out in new projects. New development should:

- incorporate architectural and site development features of early twentieth century era houses, including eave length, siding materials and appearance, window and door trim, and roof pitch;
- continue existing front setback patterns;
- use landscaping to buffer and soften edges;
- provide strong visual connections between the public sidewalk and main entrances; and
- locate parking and vehicle areas toward the rear of residential dwellings.

When available, alleys should be used for vehicle access, to strengthen the pedestrian environment.

The area north of Lombard Street includes several civic and institutional buildings (such as James John Elementary School, St. Johns branch library, St. Johns Community Center, and Pioneer Methodist Church). These buildings provide essential services to local residents and define the characteristics of the adjacent residential area. New development must recognize and preserve the central roles of these buildings in the small-town character of St. Johns. New development should:

- include landscaping that complements existing landscaping of these buildings;
- maintain adequate setbacks and spacing from these buildings;
- be of a scale, proportion, and mass that ensures these buildings continue as the clear focus of the adjacent residential area; and
- incorporate architectural and site development features that reflect the quality of these buildings.

In the area near the water tower south of Lombard Street, new development should reflect the character and site design of the older housing stock, including front setbacks, exterior finish materials, and pedestrian orientation. The well-established pedestrian pattern throughout the neighborhood should be strengthened through design features that reinforce this prominent characteristic of the residential St. Johns area.
Urban Character Area 2: Downtown St. Johns

The small-town atmosphere of downtown St. Johns resonates with many people. Lombard Street is the center of this area, a remnant of the area’s origins as an independent city, characterized predominantly by streetcar-era commercial storefronts, some with residential floors above. Single dwelling residences, apartment buildings, and prominent civic and religious buildings contribute to the downtown character. Modern auto-oriented development is present here as well, but generally does not reflect the traditional orientation and scale of the streetcar-era development.

Urban Pattern
Traditional development in the downtown St. Johns area is fine grained. Blocks are generally 200 x 200 feet, unless altered for superblock development that occurred during the 1950s to 1970s. A unique block and street pattern has roots in the boundaries of land claims of the mid-1800s. The prominent streets of Philadelphia and Burlington intersect near the St. Johns Plaza, creating irregular block shapes and a strong linear connection between downtown and the river. The plaza is a focal point and prominent public space in the community. The footprints of many streetcar-era buildings cover most of their lot, generally 50 x 100 feet in area. Most development is built to the property line.
North of Lombard, centered on Charleston Street is a civic area that includes community-serving uses mixed with residential development. Lot sizes here tend to be larger than along Lombard, compatible with medium-density multidwelling development and existing community service uses.

Auto-accommodating development is centered around Ivanhoe Street, and generally has low building coverage and surface parking. Development tends to be set back from the property line, on larger lots. Two large blocks exist in the downtown: between Leavitt and Richmond, combining six small blocks; and at Burlington and Kellogg, combining two small blocks.

Architectural Pattern
Traditional streetcar-era storefront and mixed-use buildings are the predominant form along Lombard Street. Buildings range from one to three stories, typically with large storefront windows at the ground level. In some cases, upper floors accommodate residential units or office space. Exterior finish materials include brick, stucco and other masonry, as well as horizontal wood siding.

Prominent civic buildings, such as the old City Hall (North Precinct), post office (Baha’i Center), St. Johns Branch Library, and the National Cash Register Building (St. Johns Pub) follow Twentieth Century Classical and Georgian styles.
Desired Characteristics and Traditions

New development should support downtown St. Johns’ role as the heart of the town center, and should have a strong pedestrian-oriented presence. Throughout downtown St. Johns, new development should recognize the history of St. Johns as a city by utilizing design elements that strengthen the traditional small town character, pedestrian-scale orientation, and rhythm of building facades. Strategies to achieve this include development of small-scale buildings, 50 feet in width or less, one to three stories in height. Mass of taller or wider buildings can be moderated by incorporating architectural details that individualize storefronts or stepping back from the street.

Development of a diverse range of building types should be continued. Active uses should be included in development adjacent to or across the street from the St. Johns Plaza.

New development along Baltimore, Burlington, and Richmond should aspire to create a sense of enclosure and interesting architecture in ways that strengthen visual and physical connections to the downtown and riverfront. New development along Philadelphia, Pittsburg, and John, should add elements that improve the sidewalk environment and recognize these important pedestrian routes that link the hillside to downtown and the riverfront.

For the civic area north of Lombard, new development should support the community-oriented nature of this area through a strong pedestrian environment. New development should incorporate architectural features and exterior materials that complement the quality of respective nearby civic and institutional buildings, including James John School, the St. Johns branch library, and community center.

Alterations to existing large-scale commercial developments (those on superblocks, comprising more than one 200-foot block) should be integrated into the fine-grain urban pattern and mix of uses of downtown St. Johns. This can be accomplished by locating spaces suitable for small-scale active uses (such as bank services, restaurants, cafes, florists) at the street frontage, adding residential development in upper floors, and respecting the street plan in building location and surface parking circulation. New development of superblocks should follow the master street plan.

The transition between commercial and residential zones is important. New commercial development along streets serving as boundaries between residential and commercial zones (such as segments of Princeton, Syracuse, Burlington, and Richmond) should reflect the scale and character of the residential zone. Where possible residential components of mixed-use developments should be located adjacent to existing residential zones to improve compatibility.
Urban Character Area 3: Hillside Neighborhood

Development of the hillside neighborhood area is rich in history, dating back to the late nineteenth century when James John set out to create an active harbor settlement with rail shipping facilities. The area is almost exclusively residential, with the exception of a metal-clad industrial building near Cathedral Park, and a water tower on Willamette Boulevard. The area’s oldest housing is located here; many good examples remain of large houses belonging to prominent St. Johns citizens, and worker housing for nearby mills and other industries. Multifamily housing is recent construction (over the past 50 years) and is dispersed throughout the area, although most concentrated between Alta and Mohawk. Development over the last 10 years consists mainly of detached and attached infill houses and rowhouses. The vision for the area builds on the area’s eclectic mix of housing types and styles, and encourages infill of attached houses, rowhouses, and medium-density multifamily buildings.

Urban Patterns
Views of the St. Johns Bridge, Forest Park and the Willamette River permeate the area and heighten the area’s image. Most of the blocks in this area measure 200 x 200 feet; however, many links in the street network are not improved, or not up to standards (either unpaved or lack sidewalks). This gives the sense of additional green space in the area, a feature neighbors value, but diminishes the area’s image due to the low level of public improvements. Additionally, physical connections to the riverfront are limited. Due to the slope, many lots include retaining walls at the street lot lines, and garages at the property line, built into the slope.
Streets are organized in a grid pattern, broken by the axes of Burlington and Philadelphia, which create triangular blocks. This pattern is a positive attribute, since it helps direct and preserve public views. However, due to this axis, the intersections of Burlington at Edison and Willamette have expansive paved areas.

**Architectural Patterns**

The Hillside area contains a wide variety of building types and architectural styles from different eras of development. The earliest houses in this area date back to the late nineteenth century. Larger homes on large lots are concentrated around Syracuse between Philadelphia and Baltimore, and feature Colonial Revival, American Basic, and Queen Anne Vernacular styles.

The west portion of the area has a significant amount of one-story bungalows, and small Victorian worker cottages in the Queen Anne style. Setbacks range from about 10 feet to 20 feet. However, the area also accommodates the tallest building, Schrunk Riverview Tower, a 12-story residential apartment building. Mid-twentieth century multifamily developments can be found throughout the area: typically two stories in height, set back from the street to accommodate parking areas, and sometimes have street-facing facades limited to garage doors or blank walls. Many examples, however, dedicate significant area to landscaping. Recent examples of rowhouses are typical of the development found in many city neighborhoods: most are three stories in height, with ground floor garages. The easternmost portion of the area is almost suburban in nature, characterized by one-story, ranch-style homes with large front setbacks (20 to 25 feet) and lawns.
Desired Characteristics and Traditions

New development should contribute to the hillside neighborhood’s identity as a vibrant hillside village composed of 1900s-era houses as its foundation, supported by an eclectic mix of housing styles, types and densities that, when viewed as a whole neighborhood, complement each other and contribute positively to the town center.

Assets of the hillside should be celebrated in new development – its south-facing slope, location at the Willamette River’s bend providing expansive views, along with views of Cathedral Park, St. Johns Bridge, and the west hills. New development must be neighborly – it must reduce the prominence of parking areas as viewed from the street, strengthen main entrance connections, and be compatible with the height and massing of existing residential buildings.

To successfully contribute to the existing context and to be neighborly, new development in the Hillside area should strive to achieve the following: incorporate architectural and site development features found in existing historic houses, reduce impacts to adjacent houses if taller (stepping back, greater setbacks), dedicate generous amounts of site area to landscaping, provide strong connections between the sidewalk and the entrance, limit vehicle areas to the absolute minimum necessary, utilize durable building materials, and consider privacy when designing side and rear facades, without reducing window area. These features are particularly important along Princeton, Syracuse, Willamette, and Edison Streets.

New development along Baltimore, Burlington, and Richmond should aspire to create a sense of enclosure and interesting architecture in ways that strengthen visual and physical connections to the downtown and riverfront. New development along Philadelphia, Pittsburg, and John should add elements that improve the sidewalk environment and strengthen the identity of these important pedestrian routes that link the hillside to downtown and the riverfront.
Urban Character Area 4: Willamette Riverfront

The most prominent features of the riverfront are the St. Johns Bridge and the expansive Cathedral Park. Combined with the river and the backdrop of Forest Park, these public assets are breathtaking and can be seen from most locations in the area.

The original city of St. Johns was sited here in the 1880s; in fact, James John set up a store at the base of Burlington Street and operated a ferry nearby. Only two structures, the Miner House and a church, remain from that era. Riverfront industry that defined this area, including shipping and lumber, plywood, woollen, and flour mills (early 1900s), and shipbuilding (1940s), have disappeared. A few active foundries remain, but much of the industrial land is used for storage of machinery and steel.

Urban Pattern

Large sites along the river are in public ownership with the exception of the Lampros Steel site, positioned between Willamette Cove and the Water Pollution Control Lab and Cathedral Park. Access to the river is via Cathedral Park and the water lab.

Similar to the Hillside area, streets are organized in a grid pattern, broken by the axis of Burlington, which creates triangular blocks. This pattern is a positive attribute, since it helps direct and preserve public views. The main north-south streets of Richmond, Burlington, and Baltimore have wide roadways and are designated as important community streets serving all transportation modes. These streets end at the Bradford Street right-of-way, creating large block patterns near the river. The Philadelphia Street...
right-of-way is an important pedestrian route since it is aligned with the bridge and directly connects with Cathedral Park.

An active rail line in the Bradford Street right-of-way parallels the river. Much of the industrial buildings are located near Bradford and Crawford Streets.

As with the Hillside area, the easternmost portion is suburban in nature, developed with one-story single-dwelling homes with generous setbacks and front lawns on sloping lots. Views of Willamette Cove, the river, and Forest Park are pronounced, especially at Tyler Street. Most industrial sites are in the center of this area, with Lampros Steel as the focus. Cathedral Park dominates the western portion, along with the old Columbia Sportswear building. Here, industrial uses mix with 1900s-era small bungalows and recently constructed rowhouses.

Architectural Pattern
Industrial buildings do not follow a strong pattern. In part this is due to the fact that much of the industrial area is dedicated to outdoor storage; buildings on the site occupy a small part of the site and are secondary in use. Some buildings, however, occupy the entire site, such as the old Columbia Sportswear and Peninsula Iron Works buildings. These buildings have varied roof lines. Industrial buildings adjacent to Bradford Street are built to the property line, to benefit from rail access. Materials used in the industrial buildings include corrugated metal and concrete block.
Desired Characteristics and Traditions

Three central traditions comprise the riverfront’s heritage: industrial and working riverfront, origin as the first St. Johns city site, and prominent public assets of the St. Johns Bridge and Cathedral Park. The desired characteristics of the riverfront area acknowledge these traditions while allowing for architectural expression to create richness and diversity.

The riverfront area is envisioned to accommodate a range of uses, including light industrial, commercial and office, live/work space, and residential. Where possible, residential components of employment zone developments should be located adjacent to existing residential zones to improve compatibility.

Development along Baltimore, Burlington, and Richmond Avenues should add to the creation of distinguishable corridors that provide main connecting routes to downtown St. Johns. Buildings should be located close to the sidewalk, and orient toward these avenues with interesting and inviting facades. Curb cuts, driveways, garages, and surface parking should be avoided along these avenues. Active uses and outdoor space for public use should be incorporated along these avenues, except where industrial development makes these uses not practicable.

New development should recognize and address the riverfront heritage by incorporating elements or using exterior materials that reflect these characteristics, or by reuse of significant hard elements or prominent architectural features present on the site prior to redevelopment. An example is the Water Pollution Control Lab, which incorporates exterior finishes that reflect the area’s industrial heritage, and a remnant concrete wall in the Pittsburg right-of-way. Background information can be found in the St. Johns/Lombard Plan Existing Conditions Report and from local history groups such as the St. Johns Heritage Association.
Work space building in an industrial area. Building features include colorful metal exterior, awnings, and ground floor entrances into artists' work spaces.

Industrial building that uses concrete exterior at the street level and metal above.

Renovated industrial building featuring large windows and awnings over entrance points.
Commentary

The following section includes amendments to the Community Design Guidelines that highlight urban and architectural features or characteristics that are of value to the community and should be taken into consideration when new development is proposed. The amendments do not change the existing guidelines, but add examples of how to satisfy Guideline P1 (Plan Area Character) for properties in the St. Johns plan district. These additional statements are suggestions and do not constitute binding criteria, as do the guidelines.

Amendments to the “Portland Personality Guidelines” section of the Community Design Guidelines are shown as underlined text, except where noted. A reference is added to the background statements and desired characteristics and tradition statements outlined in the previous section.

Amendments to the Portland Personality Guidelines

These guidelines establish the urban design framework.

The Portland Personality Guidelines recognize the unique characteristics and urban design goals of different parts of the city, and encourage new development that enhances these characteristics and supports these goals. There are special guidelines for the three areas with adopted community plans. Other guidelines address historic and conservation districts, district and town center plans, and gateways.

Plan Area Character

Background

Plan Areas outside of the Central City which have areas within the design overlay include the Albina, Outer Southeast, and Southwest Community Plan areas, the Hollywood and Sandy Plan Area, and the Northwest District Plan Area, and the St. Johns/Lombard Plan Area. Each of these areas has distinct historic, cultural, and geographic characteristics that should be taken into consideration when developing in the area. New development blends into established areas by reflecting the architectural features and site design of the surrounding buildings and responding to views, topography, and nearby amenities such as parks, schools, and community centers.
Guideline P1:

Enhance the sense of place and identity by incorporating site and building design features that respond to the area’s desired characteristics and traditions.

See the St. Johns Plan District Desired Characteristics and Traditions for application of Guideline P1.

This guideline may be accomplished in the St. Johns plan district by:

A. In residential areas. Incorporating desired architectural and site development features to complement, rather than imitate, existing historic buildings.

[Images of houses and architectural details]

The houses pictured above illustrate desired architectural features. Desired site features include landscaped setbacks, concrete or stone retaining walls, and detached garages built into the slope at the property line.
B. **Along commercial streets:** Incorporating desired architectural and site development features to complement, rather than imitate, existing historic buildings.

The existing storefronts illustrate some of the desired characteristics. Other desired site features include outdoor space for dining and other activities, and building frontage and setbacks integrated with the public realm.

C. **In residential areas:** Dedicating a generous amount of site area to landscaping, and using species native to the area.

Landscaping around this apartment building softens the impact of the blank façade. A Pacific madrone tree within unimproved right-of-way, once a common tree along bluffs on the peninsula, adds visual interest and is an asset to the Hillside neighborhood.
D. Considering privacy when designing side and rear facades for residential buildings through use of textured glass, proper window location, and consideration of interface between adjacent development and proposed interior uses. Window area should not be reduced to gain privacy.

E. Incorporating into or adjacent to the right-of-way historical or artistic elements that add richness and meaning to the area.

- Historical plaques embedded in a stone wall in Cathedral Park
- Concrete remnants in Pittsburg Street right-of-way at the Water Pollution Control Lab
- Impressions of livery tools and horseshoes in the sidewalk adjacent to the new Safeway site along N. Ivanhoe Street (near Charleston). These impressions are not dated but may be in remembrance of a livery stable located near the site in the late 1800s.
F. Maintaining and reestablishing the area’s historic street grid. Where superblocks exist, locate public and/or private rights-of-way, connections, and open space in a manner that reflects the historic block pattern.

Map of the St. Johns town center. The prominent block pattern is fine grained, with most blocks measuring 200 by 200 feet.
G. Respecting the historic industrial character and public assets of the Willamette riverfront. The area’s prime industrial buildings incorporate durable exterior finishing materials such as metal and concrete. The boxy massing of these structures may be relieved by generous fenestration in new construction and adaptive reuse situations.

Silco Construction Co. Building at 8614 N. Crawford, features prominent entryway with overhang, pitched roof, well-maintained landscaping, and large windows.

Peninsula Iron Works, 6618 N. Alta, features generous window area and pitched roof.
5D: Zoning Map and Code Amendments

This Section contains the updates to the official Zoning Map for the St. Johns/Lombard plan area. The zoning map is followed by amendments to the *Zoning Code*. Code commentary is included along with code language to describe legislative intent.

Plan District and Main Street Overlay Zone Areas

Zoning Maps

Amendments to the Zoning Code
33.218, Community Design Standards
33.420, Design Overlay Zone
33.455, Main Street Node Overlay Zone
33.460, Main Street Corridor Overlay Zone
33.583, St. Johns Plan District
33.825, Design Review
Zoning Code Amendments

How to read this section

This section shows changes to portions of the Portland Zoning Code. Odd numbered pages show language that has been changed. Generally, language added to the Portland Zoning Code is underlined (example) and language deleted is shown in strikethrough (example). With regard to the St. Johns Plan District, all the language is new. To make the text easier to read, strikethrough and underline is omitted.

Even-numbered pages contain commentary on the changes to the zoning code.
Design Review Chapters

In addition to the other amendments to the Zoning Code to implement the St. Johns/Lombard Plan, the following amendments to the chapters addressing design review are also amended.

33.218.110(K) Windows

This standard applies to all development on sites zoned R1 in the plan district. Much of the recent multidwelling residential development in the Cathedral Park neighborhood has not been a good fit with the historic houses or the desired character of the area, as described by residents at community workshops that were part of the St. Johns/Lombard Plan. Application of the design overlay zone in this area is intended to address these concerns and to improve future infill so that it better relates to the streetscape.

Many elements affect a building’s relationship to the streetscape. While no one element can ensure good design, windows are essential to adding visual interest, contributing to safety, and improving the public realm.

Existing community design standards do not include a minimum window requirement for multidwelling structures. This standard fills that gap by boosting the minimum window requirement of the R1 zone, currently a minimum of eight percent of the street-facing façade for multidwelling structures, to 15 percent. This standard, working in concert with other community design standards, will improve the level of design for residential infill in the plan district.
33.218.110 Standards for Primary and Attached Accessory Structures in R3, R2, and R1 Zones

The standards of this section apply to development of new primary and attached accessory structures in the R3, R2, and R1 zones. The addition of an attached accessory structure to a primary structure, where all the uses on the site are residential, is subject to Section 33.218.130, Standards for Exterior Alteration of Residential Structures in Residential Zones.

A. through J. [no change.]

K. Windows. Street-facing windows must meet the following. Windows in rooms with a finished floor height 4 feet or more below grade are exempt from this standard:

1. [no change.]

2. A horizontal window opening may be created when:
   a. Two or more vertical windows are grouped together to provide a horizontal opening, and they are either all the same size, or no more than two sizes are used. Where two sizes of windows are used in a group, the smaller window size must be on the outer edges of the grouping. The windows on the outer edges of the grouping must be vertical; the center window or windows may be vertical, square, or horizontal; or
   b. There is a band of individual lites across the top of the horizontal window. These small lites must be vertical and cover at least 20 percent of the total height of the window.

3. St. Johns plan district. In the St. Johns plan district, at least 15 percent of the street facing facade must be windows. Windows used to meet this standard must allow views from the building to the street. Glass block does not meet this standard. Windows in garage doors do not count toward meeting this standard, but windows in garage walls do count toward meeting this standard. Development on flag lots or on lots which slope up or down from the street with an average slope of 20 percent or more is exempt from this standard.

L. through P. [no change.]
33.218.140 Standards for All Structures in the RH, RX, C and E Zones

Public testimony at the Design Commission and Planning Commission public hearings (held September 4 and 9, 2003, respectively) addressed the proposed design overlay on EG sites in the St. Johns Plan District. The testimony asserted that design review and the existing Community Design Standards (CDS) present problems when applied to industrial users because they are tailored to residential, commercial, and office uses. Therefore, the design overlay is not applied to the EG zone.

Within the city, the design overlay zone is applied to all EX sites. EX zoning is applied to sites within the riverfront area. While a range of industrial uses is allowed in the EX zone, recent development almost entirely consists of residential, commercial and office uses. To provide flexibility for these uses in the EX zone, the exterior finish materials standard is amended to allow metal and concrete.

33.218.140 (I) Exterior Finish Materials

The range of exterior finishes is limited under the community design standards. This is in part due to the fact that the standards originally were created for use in another part of the city, responding to a distinct neighborhood character.

To provide for new buildings that reflect the industrial/eclectic character of the St. Johns riverfront, this exception for sites in the EX zone allows for a wide range of exterior finishes— including those commonly associated with industrial buildings. This provision does not add significantly to code complexity, since it is an exception that liberates an existing standard. Its benefit is that it provides the opportunity for new development to respond to the local building tradition.
33.218.140 Standards for All Structures in the RH, RX, C and E Zones

The standards of this section apply to development of all structures in RH, RX, C, and E zones. These standards also apply to exterior alterations in these zones.

For proposals where all uses on the site are residential, the standards for the R3, R2, and R1 zones may be met instead of the standards of this section. Where new structures are proposed, the standards of Section 33.218.110, Standards for R3, R2, and R1 Zones, may be met instead of the standards of this section. Where exterior alterations are proposed, the standards of Section 33.218.130, Standards for Exterior Alteration of Residential Structures in Residential Zones, may be met instead of the standards of this section.

A. through H. [no change.]

I. Exterior finish materials. The standards of this subsection must be met on all building facades:

a. Exterior finish materials not allowed. Plain concrete block, plain concrete, corrugated metal, plywood and sheet pressboard may not be used as exterior finish materials except as secondary finishes if they cover no more than 10 percent of the surface area. Sheet pressboard is pressboard that is more than 6 inches wide. Foundation material may be plain concrete or plain concrete block when the foundation material is not revealed for more than 3 feet.

b. Exception for sites in the EX zone within the St. Johns plan district. Plain concrete block, plain concrete, and corrugated metal are permitted as exterior finish materials in the EX zone in the St. Johns plan district.

2. [no change.]

J. through O. [no change.]
33.420.045 Exempt From Design Review

The addition of design review requirements is intended to target infill development and renovation of attached and multidwelling structures.

Exempting from design review alterations to single-dwelling detached housing allows the current trend of renovation to continue without additional regulation.

33.420.060 When Community Design Standards May Not Be Used

The plan district limits height to 45 feet in the EX zone. However, an additional 10 feet may be requested through discretionary design review. In exchange for extra height, the discretionary track design review process allows consideration of a wider range of issues than the standards track. The standards fall short of adequately addressing issues associated with high intensity development. The discretionary design review process allows consideration of issues unique to the site, such as air, light and shading, proportion, context, relationship to adjacent buildings, and desired neighborhood character.

Note regarding state law governing design review for residential development: Oregon State Statute (ORS) 197.307 provides that approval standards for housing be "clear and objective . . . and shall not have the effect . . . of discouraging needed housing through unreasonable cost or delay." It authorizes a two-track system under which the applicant may choose to use a "clear and objective" track or a discretionary review track. The statute also allows a government to place conditions on residential development.

The requirement for the discretionary track for buildings (including buildings with residential use) above 45 feet in height is consistent with this statute since it allows the standards track option for reasonably-scaled residential development -- up to 45 feet in height. This height allows development up to four stories, and is the maximum height for common mixed-use and residential zones, such as mixed commercial (CM), storefront commercial (CS), and medium density multidwelling (R1). A condition of discretionary review is reserved for the most intensive development, over 45 feet in height.
33.420.045 Exempt From Design Review
The following items are exempt from design review:

A. through Q. [no change.]

R. Within the St. Johns plan district, alterations to single-dwelling detached structures.

33.420.060 When Community Design Standards May Not Be Used
The Community Design Standards may not be used as an alternative to design review as follows:

A. through F. [no change.]

G. In the EX zone within the St. Johns plan district, structures more than 45 feet in height.
33.825.025 Review Procedures
This amendment requires a Type II review procedure for design review applications in the St. Johns plan district. This level of review is typical for most areas of the city outside the Central City plan district. A Type II review is administered by the Bureau of Development Services; appeals are to the Design Commission.
33.825.025 Review Procedures

A. Procedures for design review. Procedures for design review vary with the type of proposal being reviewed and the design district in which the site is located. Design review in some design districts requires an additional procedural step, the "Neighborhood Contact Requirement," as set out in Section 33.730.045, Neighborhood Contact Requirement. Some proposals in the Central City plan district must provide a model of the approved proposal, as set out in Paragraph A.5, below.

1. Type III [no change.]

2. Type II. The following proposals are processed through a Type II procedure:
   a. through q. [no change.]
   r. Proposals within the St. Johns plan district.

3. through 5. [no change.]
Chapter 33.583 St. Johns Plan District

This is a new chapter of Title 33. The following Zoning Code text proposed is new and, for ease of reading, it is not shown in underlined text.

General

33.583.010 Purpose

St. Johns is a designated town center in the Metro 2040 Plan. The purpose statement explains that the intent of the St. Johns plan district is to establish a set of regulations that foster the development of a successful, mixed-use town center in St. Johns, the commercial and civic center of the peninsula. The purpose statement conveys that the regulations should establish a center that includes a compact urban form and a sense of vitality. The purpose statement further is intended to clearly describe the intended outcome of the regulations for two reasons. First, in order for a project to receive an adjustment to a standard, an applicant must demonstrate that the project will equally or better meet the purpose of the standard to be modified. Second, the purpose statement provides the basis for future evaluation of the regulation.

33.583.020 Where These Regulations Apply

These regulations apply within the boundaries of the St. Johns plan district shown on Map 583-1.
CHAPTER 33.583
ST. JOHNS PLAN DISTRICT
(Added by: Ord. No. 178452, effective 7/10/04.)
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Use Regulations
33.583.100 Purpose
33.583.110 Prohibited Uses
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33.583.200 Purpose
33.583.210 Drive-Through Facilities
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Map 583-1 St. Johns Plan District
Map 583-2 Maximum Heights

General

33.583.010 Purpose
The St. Johns plan district provides for an urban level of mixed-use development including commercial, employment, office, housing, institutional, and recreation uses. Specific objectives of the plan district include strengthening St. Johns’ role as the commercial and civic center of the North Portland peninsula. These regulations:

- Stimulate business and economic vitality;
- Promote housing and mixed-use development;
- Discourage auto-oriented uses and development;
- Enhance the pedestrian environment;
- Enhance the character of buildings in the plan district; and
- Support the Willamette greenway and opportunities to celebrate the Willamette River as a unique element of the urban environment.

33.583.020 Where These Regulations Apply
The regulations of this chapter apply in the St. Johns plan district. The boundaries of the plan district are shown on Map 583-1 and on the Official Zoning Maps.
Use Regulations

33.583.100 Purpose

The intent of the use regulations in the plan district is to guide the redevelopment of St. Johns into a dynamic town center containing a strong mixed-use commercial and civic core supported by an enhanced pedestrian environment. These standards are also intended to encourage opportunities for the establishment of additional residential and mixed-use development that supports the commercial and civic core of the town center and supports the long-term revitalization of the Willamette riverfront.

33.583.110 Prohibited Uses

Quick vehicle servicing uses (examples include full-serve and mini-serve gas stations, car washes, etc.) are prohibited throughout the plan district. Vehicle repair and commercial parking uses are prohibited in the portions of the plan district near the riverfront. The reason for these prohibitions is to exclude uses that have adverse impacts on the pedestrian environment and transit-oriented, mixed-use development due to the presence of large parking areas, multiple curb cuts, vehicle stacking lanes, vehicle maneuvering areas, and the exhaust attributed to stationary running automobiles. Additionally, self-servicing storage, agriculture, and detention facilities are prohibited in the EX and EG zones near the riverfront as these uses are out of character and would adversely impact the intended urban development concept and plan vision for this area.

33.583.120 Retail Sales And Service Uses in the EG and EX Zones

This regulation places limitations on the amount of square footage of uses within the retail sales and service use category allowed on sites in the plan district. This regulation is intended to ensure that such uses do not dominate the EG and EX zoned portions of the district. This regulation is also intended to ensure that the downtown St. Johns commercial core is preserved and protected by limiting the amount and scale of retail development that is allowed within the remainder of the town center. It should be noted that the 60,000 sq. ft. limit per site was included to ensure the plan district is in compliance with “Title 4, Industrial and Other Employment Areas,” of the Metro Functional Plan.
Use Regulations

33.583.100 Purpose
These regulations support St. Johns as the commercial and civic core of the North Portland peninsula by guiding the types and intensity of uses allowed in the plan district. These use regulations also ensure that land uses fostered within the plan district support an enhanced pedestrian environment and residential mixed-use development. Retail uses outside of the central commercial and civic core are limited to neighborhood-serving retail uses that will complement the riverfront area but do not compete with the uses located in the commercial core of the plan district.

33.583.110 Prohibited Uses

A. Plan district. Quick Vehicle Servicing is prohibited in the plan district.

B. EG and EX zones. The following uses are prohibited in the EG and EX zones:
   1. Vehicle Repair;
   2. Commercial Parking;
   3. Self-Service Storage;
   4. Agriculture; and
   5. Detention Facilities.

33.583.120 Retail Sales And Service Uses in the EG and EX Zones

A. Purpose. Limiting the floor area of Retail Sales And Service uses in the EG and EX zones ensures that they do not dominate the riverfront areas or overwhelm the transportation system and are generally limited to community-serving establishments.

B. Maximum per use. In the EG and EX zones, Retail Sales And Service uses are allowed. The square footage of the floor area plus exterior display and storage area of each use may be up to 10,000 square feet.

C. Maximum per site. In the EG and EX zones, the total floor area plus exterior display and storage area of all Retail Sales And Service uses on a site is limited to 60,000 square feet and a maximum FAR of 1:1. Retail Sales And Service uses where the floor area plus the exterior display and storage area is more than 60,000 square feet per site, or the FAR is more than 1:1 per site, are a Conditional Use. The approval criteria are in Section 33.815.128. Adjustments to this subsection are prohibited.
Development Standards

33.583.200 Purpose

The intent of the development standards is to guide the redevelopment of the St. Johns town center such that a strong commercial and civic mixed-use core, supported by an enhanced pedestrian environment, is created. These standards are also intended to encourage the development of residential and mixed-use development in the town center to support transit, and commercial and civic revitalization. These regulations also support the long-term evolution of the southern riverfront portion of the town center from an industrial/employment area to a mixed-use area. This riverfront area will include employment, residential, and neighborhood serving retail uses that support and enhance pedestrian environment and take advantage of their proximity to the river.

33.583.210 Drive-Through Facilities

Drive-through facilities are currently prohibited in the CS zone, allowed in the CG zone, and allowed in the CN2 zone if they are located on major city traffic streets or district collectors as designated by the Transportation System Plan. This regulation prohibits drive-through facilities in the CN2 and CG zones within the plan district to ensure that impacts on the pedestrian environment and pedestrian-oriented development, such as vehicle stacking lanes, maneuvering areas, and vehicle exhaust, do not occur.

Testimony to Planning Commission requested removal of the prohibition on drive-through developments. Planning Commission decided to allow redevelopment of existing drive throughs under certain circumstances, similar to the way they are allowed in the Hollywood town center. Drive-through developments currently exist on five CS-zoned sites in the plan district:

1. 7410 N. Chicago Avenue (tax account number R323668)
2. 8671 N. Ivanhoe Street (tax account number R191979)
3. 7340 N. Philadelphia Avenue (tax account number R232273)
4. 8221 N. Lombard Street (tax account number R192890)
5. 8040 N. Lombard Street (tax account number R156044)

A provision is made to allow the drive-throughs on these sites to continue as part of redevelopment when certain conditions that support development of the St. Johns town center are met.
Development Standards

33.583.200 Purpose
These development standards foster a vibrant mixed-use area with well-designed buildings that are of a scale and orientation that support a safe and attractive pedestrian environment. These standards help minimize conflicts between commercial and residential uses, and ensure transit-supportive levels of residential development in the plan district. The standards also support existing sites with drive-through facilities by creating limited opportunity for these facilities to redevelop as part of development that fosters an urban intensity of uses.

33.583.210 Drive-Through Facilities. Drive-through facilities are prohibited, except when they meet the following:

1. There was a legal drive-through facility on the site on January 1, 2004;

2. The new drive-through facility is on the same site and the existing drive-through will be removed;

3. The new drive-through facility will be part of a development on the site that meets the lot coverage and setback requirements of the zone, and after the new development is built, the FAR on the site will be at least 1:1; and

4. The drive-through facility must either:
   a. Meet the standards of Chapter 33.224, Drive-Through Facilities; or
   b. Meet the following:
      (1) The service area must be within the primary structure on the site;
      (2) The service area must have useable floor area above it on the second story; and
      (3) The stacking lanes must meet the standards of Section 33.224.050, Stacking Lane Standards, and must be enclosed within the primary structure on the site.
Development Standards Commentary (cont’d)

33.583.220 Exterior Activities in the EG and EX Zones
Exterior display, storage, and work activities are prohibited in the EX base zone, and exterior work activities are prohibited in the EG base zone. However, because these two zones and the provisions of this plan district are being used to create a mixed-use riverfront district, some exterior activities supportive of an enhanced pedestrian environment and mixed-use development are desirable. Thus, these provisions have been included in the plan district to ensure that pedestrian-oriented exterior activities are allowed and encouraged along the riverfront, in addition to exterior activities allowed by the base zones.

33.583.230 Housing Types Prohibited in the EG and EX Zones
To ensure efficient use of land and compact urban development when residential development is established in the EG and EX zoned portions of the plan district, detached single dwelling units are prohibited.
33.583.220 Exterior Activities in the EG and EX Zones. The following exterior activities are allowed in the EG and EX zones in addition to those permitted by the base zones:

A. Purpose. Exterior activities, such as outdoor cafes and exterior display of pedestrian-oriented services enhance the pedestrian environment of the plan district.

B. Standard. The following exterior activities are allowed in the EG and EX zones.

1. Outdoor seating for restaurants; and

2. Pedestrian-oriented uses, including flower, food, and drink stands, and other similar pedestrian-oriented uses.

33.583.230 Detached Houses Prohibited in the EG and EX Zones. Detached houses are prohibited in the EG and EX zones.
33.583.240 Minimum Density in the R1 Zone

This regulation modifies the minimum density requirement for lots less than 10,000 sq. ft. in the R1 zone. The minimum density recommendation changes the current minimum of 1 unit per 2,000 sq. ft. to a minimum of 1 unit per 2,250 sq. ft. This regulation does not apply to corner lots.

A majority of lots in the R1 zone in the plan district are 5,000 sq. ft. in area and a number of lots are between 5,000 and 10,000 sq. ft. in area. On lots 5,000 sq. ft. in area the Zoning Code requires a minimum of three units. Bureau of Development Services staff and members of the development community state that it is difficult to redevelop these small sites with three or more units while providing the required off-street parking, landscaping and open space areas. Lots between 5,000 sq. ft. and 9,999-sq. ft. face similar constraints, which increase on sloping sites. In addition, community members desire to promote owner-occupied housing in the R1 areas. Reducing the minimum density in the R1 aims to satisfy these objectives by providing the option to develop two rowhouses on a mid-block 5,000 -sq. ft. lot, a typical development that often results in owner-occupancy. This development type is currently supported by the market and fits with the community’s desired character for this area.

To ensure that development expectations and potential are retained on these lots, the maximum density allowance of one unit per 1,000 square feet is retained. Note that the reduction in minimum density is not recommended for corner lots because it is generally easier to accommodate the minimum number of units and satisfy the development standards on lots with two street frontages. To address the community’s aesthetic concerns, the design overlay is applied to all R1 areas in the plan district.

This situation is not unique to St. Johns and a case could be made to modify the minimum density requirement of the R1 zone on small lots elsewhere in the city. However, a number of factors present in St. Johns, including the sloped terrain, a desire to provide flexibility in housing design and encourage neighborhood reinvestment, result in this regulation. If the City Council determines that this issue needs to be considered on a citywide basis, the Bureau of Planning should be directed to include this issue as part of a citywide legislative project.
33.583.240 Minimum Density in the R1 Zone.

A. **Purpose.** Reducing the minimum density on small lots in the R1 zone provides flexibility for development of a broad range of dwelling types.

B. **Standard.** On lots less than 10,000 square feet in the R1 zone, the minimum density is 1 unit per 2,250 square feet of site area. This standard does not apply on corner lots.
33.583.250 Maximum Building Height

These regulations establish maximum allowable heights within the plan district. The maximum heights allowed correspond to those shown on Map 583-2. In most situations the height of the base zone applies; however, in the CN2 zone a bonus provision is applied to increase the maximum height from 30 to 45 feet (see Section 33.583.250, Bonus Option in the CN2 Zone). In the EX zone, these regulations allow an increased height to those shown on Map 583-2 when approved through a modification as part of Design Review.

An additional feature of Map 583-2 is a building height limitation of 30 feet, applied to specific riverfront areas. These areas are aligned with and the same width as the public rights-of-way located on the hillside to the north. The purpose of the height limitation ensures that development within these areas does not block views to the river and west hills from the public rights-of-way located up-slope of these areas.
33.583.250 Maximum Building Height

A. Purpose. The height regulations in the plan district protect public views and the character of St. Johns, the waterfront, and the residential area along the hillside. The height regulations work together with the Community Design Standards and Guidelines to ensure that the character and scale of new development is appropriate for this mixed-use area, and for the zone.

B. Standards.

1. Generally. The maximum building height for all sites is shown on Map 583-2 at the end of this chapter. Adjustments to these maximums are prohibited.

2. CN2 zone. In the CN2 zone, heights greater than those shown on Map 583-2 are prohibited unless allowed by Section 33.583.260.

3. EX zone. In the EX zone, increased height may be requested as a modification through Design Review, up to the maximums shown in parenthesis on Map 583-2. Heights greater than shown in parenthesis on Map 583-2 are prohibited.
33.583.260 Bonus Option for Housing in the CN2 Zone

In the CN2 zone, a bonus provision to increase the maximum height from 30 feet to 45 feet or 55 feet exists if residential development is incorporated into a site at a ratio of 25 percent or more of the net floor area of development on site. Additional bonuses to the development standards affecting the CN2 zone also apply if residential development is incorporated in a site. The following table illustrates the standards that are in effect with and without application of the development standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>CN2 Zone</th>
<th>With Bonus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Height</td>
<td>30 feet</td>
<td>45 to 55 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum FAR</td>
<td>.75 to 1</td>
<td>1 to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Building Coverage</td>
<td>65% of the site area</td>
<td>85% of the site area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, if at least 25 percent of the floor area of the site is in residential use, this provision would allow buildings up to the bonus height (45 or 55 feet), rather than 30 feet, and an FAR of 1 to 1, rather than .75 to 1, for the non-residential uses on site. It should be noted that residential square footage is not counted toward the FAR maximums.

These standards are intended to encourage redevelopment of CN2 property within the plan district for residential or residential mixed-use development. This provision is applied rather than rezoning these areas from a commercial to residential zone because it will have less impact on existing commercial uses. Commercial uses are allowed in the CN2 zone. This approach is favored over the use of the Mixed Commercial/Residential (CM) zone as it provides an incentive to create residential use through development bonuses, rather than requiring residential development as a condition to any new development. This later approach (the use of CM) could have the unintended effect of discouraging redevelopment of large opportunity sites and result in a stagnation of development on these and adjacent sites in downtown St. Johns.
33.583.260 Bonus Option for Housing in the CN2 Zone

A. Purpose. The bonus option encourages the development of residential and mixed-use buildings within the St. Johns plan district.

B. Where these regulations apply. The regulations of this section apply to areas on Map 583-2 where bonus building heights are shown in parenthesis and where the zoning is CN2.

C. Bonus. Proposals providing housing receive bonus floor area. Where floor area is being added to a site, and at least 25 percent of the new floor area will be in residential use, a bonus of 0.25 FAR is earned for the non-residential uses on the site. Proposals using this bonus are also subject to the following development standards. Adjustments to this subsection are prohibited:

1. Maximum building coverage. The maximum building coverage is 85 percent of the site area; and

2. Maximum height. The maximum height shown in parentheses on Map 583-2 is allowed. However, on the portion of the site within 15 feet of the lot line adjacent to or across the street from a site zoned residential, the maximum allowed building height is 45 feet. See Figure 583-1.

Figure 583-1
33.583.270 Building Coverage and Landscaping in the EX Zone

These regulations are intended to ensure that sites within the EX zone are not entirely developed with structures and that landscaped areas are incorporated into development sites. Landscaped areas provide potential benefits to development sites including:

- Improved aesthetic quality;
- Ability to provide on site stormwater management;
- Reduction of visual, noise and lighting impacts;
- Enhancement of the urban forest; and,
- Ability to provide a retreat for building occupants from the built environment.

This provision limits the total allowable building coverage of EX zoned sites in the plan district to 85 percent coverage and requires that a minimum of 15 percent of the site area be landscaped. The 85 percent building coverage is enough to allow the creation of a compact urban setting along the riverfront, enhanced by landscaped areas.

33.583.280 Residential Uses in the EG1 Zone

This regulation is intended to allow flexibility in the use of existing and new buildings in the EG1 zone. The provision allows a small amount of residential use in the General Employment 1 (EG1) zone for live/work and other alternative housing arrangements that may serve artists or others requiring residential and work spaces in proximity. The provision limits the residential density and floor area to minimize land use conflicts and the proliferation of housing in an overall employment setting. Residential use at greater intensity in new development is subject to the existing conditional use process.
33.583.270 Building Coverage and Landscaping in the EX Zone

A. **Purpose.** The building coverage and minimum landscape standards work with the FAR and height standards to control the overall scale and bulk of development and promote development consistent with the desired character of the plan district. These standards ensure that sites are landscaped, and that buildings do not completely cover a site.

B. **Maximum building coverage.** The maximum building coverage in the EX zone is 85 percent.

C. **Minimum landscaped area.** The minimum landscaped area in the EX zone is 15 percent. Landscape areas must be landscaped to at least the L1 standard.

33.583.280 Residential Uses in the EG1 zone

A. **Purpose.** This regulation provides flexibility in the use of structures in the EG1 zone to facilitate live/work development in an overall employment setting. The standards ensure that allowed residential uses will not dominate a site or area.

B. **Where these regulations apply.** These regulations apply in the EG1 zone outside the Riverfront Subdistrict.

C. **Residential uses.** Applicants for residential uses may choose to request a conditional use, or to meet the standards of this Section. Residential uses that meet the standards of this Section are allowed. Adjustments to this Section are prohibited. The standards are:

1. **Amount allowed.** Up to 50 percent of the floor area on the site may be in residential use, up to maximum FAR of 0.5:1, and a maximum density of 1 dwelling unit for each 10,000 square feet of site area; and

2. **Measurement.** The measurement standards of Subsection 33.130.253.C apply.
33.583.285 Additional Regulations in the Riverfront Subdistrict

This riverfront area of the St. Johns town center is a key community and city asset. The St. Johns riverfront accommodates industrial uses, but offers a unique opportunity to create a future mixed-use area that is well integrated into the greater St. Johns town center. The St. Johns riverfront may evolve over time from an employment area dominated by industrial uses and exterior storage to an urban mixed-use place that featuring a mix of housing, employment, community service, and limited commercial uses. These uses relate well to one another and to the greater plan district area through well-designed buildings and public spaces. The development standards of the Central Employment (EX) zone will ensure that the Riverfront Subdistrict is developed in a manner consistent with adjacent areas.

These regulations help support existing industry by limiting uses that may be less compatible with industry. The limitations also encourage development of housing and commercial office uses only in zones that allow these uses. They also encourage efficient use of land resources by setting a minimum density when all the floor area of a structure is residential.
33.583.285 Additional Regulations in the Riverfront Subdistrict

A. **Purpose.** These regulations allow the Riverfront Subdistrict to continue to accommodate industrial uses, but foster the transition to an urban mixed-use area that is well integrated into St. Johns. Limiting some uses in the EG zones protects industry, and encourages development of housing and office uses only where appropriate.

B. **Where these regulations apply.** The regulations of this section apply to sites in the Riverfront Subdistrict, shown on Map 583-1.

C. **Prohibited uses in EG zones.** Residential and Office uses are prohibited in the EG zones.

D. **Minimum residential density in the EX zone.** Where all of the floor area on a site in the EX zone is in residential use, the minimum residential density is 1 unit per 1,000 square feet of site area.
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Chapter 33.455 Main Street Node Overlay Zone

This chapter was originally created to apply to Sandy Boulevard. However, this chapter is being restructured for use on other main streets in the city, such as North Lombard. Thus, the sections of this chapter are being reorganized to include sections applicable to all main streets, as well as North Lombard and Sandy Boulevard. Over time this chapter may be further modified to address conditions specific to other main streets in the city or new regulations may be added applicable to all main streets, if appropriate.

General

33.455.010 Purpose

The purpose statement has been revised so that it addresses main streets in the City of Portland in general, rather than Sandy Boulevard exclusively.

33.455.030 Where These Regulations Apply

This section has been revised to direct the reader to the general sections of the chapter that apply to all areas within the Main Street Node Overlay Zone, and to those sections that apply exclusively to North Lombard and those that apply to Sandy Boulevard.
CHAPTER 33.455
MAIN STREET NODE OVERLAY ZONE
(Added by Ord. No. 174325, effective 5/5/00)
(Previously, Interim Resource Protection Zone, added by Ord. No. 163697, effective 1/1/91,
deleted by Ord. No. 171219, effective 7/1/97.)

Sections:
General
  33.455.010 Purpose
  33.455.020 Short Name and Map Symbol
  33.455.030 Where These Regulations Apply
North Lombard Regulations
  33.455.100 Standards for Community Corners
Sandy Boulevard Regulations
  33.455.200 Maximum Building Height
  33.455.210 Maximum Floor Area Ratio
  33.455.220 Transition Between Residential and Commercial Zones
  33.455.230 On-Site Location of Vehicle Areas Along Sandy Boulevard in the CS Zone
  33.455.240 Building Facades Facing Sandy Boulevard
  33.455.250 Required Design Review

General

33.455.010 Purpose.
These regulations encourage a mix of residential, commercial, and employment opportunities within identified centers of activity along Sandy Boulevard, identified main streets. The zone allows for efficient use of land at increased densities for the mutual reinforcement of public investments and private development. Allowing additional height and floor area for all uses encourages transit-supportive densities and a mix of uses and activities.

33.455.020 Short Name and Map Symbol.
The Main Street Node Overlay Zone is also referred to as the j zone, and is shown on the Official Zoning Maps with a ‘j’ map symbol.

33.455.030 Where These Regulations Apply.
The regulations of this chapter apply to sites zoned CS or EX that are in the Main Street Node Overlay Zone. Sections 33.455.010 through 33.455.030 apply to all sites in the overlay zone. Section 33.455.100 applies to corner sites with frontage on North Lombard. Sections 33.455.200 through 33.455.250 apply to sites with frontage on Sandy Boulevard.
North Lombard Regulations

33.455.100 Standards for Community Corners

The urban design concept developed for the St. Johns/Lombard Plan shows five areas along N. Lombard identified as “community corners.” These corners are located at key intersections along Lombard where the community has stated a preference for development that reinforces an active and pleasant pedestrian environment.

Community corners are to be zoned CS, CG or a combination of these zones plus R1. The Main Street Node Overlay Zone is being applied to these corners to ensure that development of the corner enhances the pedestrian environment both on Lombard and along a section of the intersecting street that forms the corner.

The overlay seeks to accomplish this by:

- requiring that the intersecting street have the same ground floor window treatment as that required along Lombard Street;
- orienting ground level development within 10 feet of the street lot line on both intersecting streets; and
- Siting parking at least 40 feet from the corner of the intersecting streets.
North Lombard Regulations

33.455.100 Standards for Community Corners

A. **Purpose.** These standards create active use areas and community gathering places along major streets intersecting with North Lombard. These standards ensure that development at key intersections along North Lombard is oriented to enhance the pedestrian environment.

B. **Standards.**

1. **Ground floor windows.** The standard of 33.130.230.B.3 must be met along both street frontages.

2. **The ground level street facing facades of primary structures** must be within 10 feet of both street lot lines.

3. **Surface parking areas are not allowed within 40 feet of the corner.**
Sandy Boulevard Regulations

33.455.200 through 33.455.250

Sections 33.455.200 through .250 contain the same set of regulations applicable to Sandy Boulevard before the restructuring of this chapter. The following table notes the original section number and the new section number following restructuring:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Old Section Number</th>
<th>New Section Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Building Height</td>
<td>33.455.040</td>
<td>33.455.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Floor Area Ratio</td>
<td>33.455.050</td>
<td>33.455.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition Between Residential and Commercial Zones</td>
<td>33.455.060</td>
<td>33.455.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Site Location of Vehicle Areas Along Sandy Boulevard in the CS Zone</td>
<td>33.455.070</td>
<td>33.455.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Facades Facing Sandy Boulevard</td>
<td>33.455.080</td>
<td>33.455.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Design Review</td>
<td>33.455.090</td>
<td>33.455.250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sandy Boulevard Regulations

33.455.200  Maximum Building Height.
33.455.210  Maximum Floor Area Ratio
33.455.220  Transition Between Residential and Commercial Zones
33.455.230  On-Site Location of Vehicle Areas Along Sandy Boulevard in the CS Zone
33.455.240  Building Facades Facing Sandy Boulevard
33.455.250  Required Design Review
Main Street Corridor Overlay Zone: Chapter 33.460

This chapter was originally created to apply to Sandy Boulevard. However, this chapter is restructured for use on other main streets in the city, such as North Lombard. Thus, the sections of this chapter are reorganized to include sections applicable to all main streets, as well as North Lombard and Sandy Boulevard. Over time this chapter may be further modified to address conditions specific to other main streets in the city or new regulations may be added applicable to all main streets, if appropriate.

General

33.460.010 Purpose

The purpose statement has been revised so that it addresses main streets in the City of Portland in general, rather than Sandy Boulevard exclusively.

33.460.030 Where These Regulations Apply

This section has been revised to direct the reader to the general sections of the chapter that apply to all areas within the Main Street Corridor Overlay Zone, and to those sections that apply exclusively to North Lombard and those that apply to Sandy Boulevard.
CHAPTER 33.460
MAIN STREET CORRIDOR OVERLAY ZONE
(Added by Ord. No. 174325, effective 5/5/00.)
(Previously, Natural Resource Zone, repealed by Ord. No. 163770, effective 2/8/91, and replaced by Chapter 33.435, Future Urban Zone.)

Sections:
General
33.460.010 Purpose
33.460.020 Short Name and Map Symbol
33.460.030 Where These Regulations Apply
33.460.0540 Building Coverage
North Lombard Regulations
33.460.100 Additional Regulations in the CN1 Zone
33.460.110 Additional Standards in the R1 Zone
33.460.120 Minimum Density in the R1 Zone
Sandy Boulevard Regulations
33.460.200 Bonus Building Height
33.460.210 Transition Between Residential and Commercial Zones
33.460.220 On-Site Location of Vehicle Areas Along Sandy Boulevard in the CS Zone
33.460.230 Building Facades Facing Sandy Boulevard
33.460.240 Required Design Review

General

33.460.010 Purpose
These regulations encourage higher density residential uses by allowing greater building heights, reducing required building coverage for residential development; and allowing more flexibility in site design. The intent of the zone is to provide transit-supportive levels of residential uses, in addition to and mixed-use development uses along the Sandy Boulevard identified main streets, between centers of commercial and mixed-use activity.

33.460.020 Short Name and Map Symbol
The Main Street Corridor Overlay Zone is also referred to as the m zone, and is shown on the Official Zoning Maps with an “m” map symbol.

33.460.030 Where These Regulations Apply
The regulations of this chapter apply to sites zoned CS or CG that are in the Main Street Corridor Overlay Zone. Sections 33.460.010 through 33.460.040 apply to all sites in this overlay zone. Sections 33.460.100 through 33.460.120 apply to sites with frontage on North Lombard. Sections 33.460.200 through 33.460.240 apply to sites with frontage on Sandy Boulevard.

33.460.0540 Building Coverage
On sites in the CS zone, where 100 percent of the floor area of a building is in residential uses, the minimum building coverage is reduced to 40 percent.
North Lombard Regulations

33.460.100 Additional Regulations in the CN1 Zone

The urban development concept for the St. Johns/Lombard Plan shows two areas along N. Lombard identified as “residential focus areas.” These areas are currently zoned General Commercial (CG), but contain a mix of commercial and residential uses.

The “residential focus area” concept calls for development of residential mixed-use buildings and housing along with compatible commercial uses. To accomplish this, the recommendation is to rezone these areas from CG to CN1 (Neighborhood Commercial 1) and to apply the Main Street Corridor Overlay to foster transit-supportive and pedestrian oriented development, and offer bonus development standards as an incentive if residential development is incorporated into a site.

To encourage mixed-use development and housing, a height and floor area bonus is offered. The maximum height and floor area ratio (FAR) are modified to provide an incentive for development of residential floor area. To use the bonus option, 25 percent or more of the floor area being added to the site must be in a residential use.

The table below illustrates the development standards of the CG and CN1 zones, as well as the standards that apply if the bonus provision were used. Note that residential square footage is not counted toward the FAR maximums.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison of Development Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Height</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonus Option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Area Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.75 to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since Commercial uses are allowed in the CN1 zone, this approach to encouraging residential and mixed-use development will create fewer non-conforming uses than if the areas were rezoned to a residential zone. This approach is favored over the use of the Mixed Commercial/Residential (CM) zone as it provides an incentive to develop, rather than requiring residential development.

To accommodate mixed use, residential, and neighborhood oriented commercial development, the base zone limitations on size of Retail Sales and Service and Office uses are increased from 5,000 square foot per use to 10,000 square feet. Larger uses may seek an adjustment to this standard. In addition, parking ratios of the CN1 zone are increased to the maximum standard allowed for other commercial zones.
North Lombard Regulations

33.460.100 Additional Regulations in the CN1 Zone

A. **Purpose.** These regulations encourage residential mixed use development and housing, in addition to small scale commercial development along sections of North Lombard Street to foster a transit-oriented main street environment. Size of uses are specified to promote commercial uses along the main street that serve a local market area, while limiting their potential impacts on residential uses. Parking standards for the CN1 zone are revised to provide adequate parking opportunity for development along a main street.

B. **Where these regulations apply.** These regulations apply to sites in the CN1 zone.

C. **Floor area for Retail Sales and Service and Office uses.** Each individual use is limited to 10,000 square feet of total floor area exclusive of parking area.

D. **Maximum allowed parking.** The maximum allowed parking in the CN1 zone is Standard B in Table 266-2.

E. **Bonus option for housing.** Proposals providing housing receive bonus floor area. Where floor area is being added to a site, and at least 25 percent of the new floor area will be in residential use, a bonus of 0.25 FAR is earned for non-residential uses on the site. Proposals using this bonus are subject to the following development standards:

1. Height. The maximum building height is 45 feet.

2. The maximum FAR for non-residential uses is 1:1. Adjustments to this maximum are prohibited.
33.460.110  Additional Standards in the R1 Zone

The standards for R1 sites respond to Planning Commission testimony requesting a higher level of design for multidwelling residential development along or near N. Lombard Street. Concerns were raised about compatibility of medium density residential structures with nearby single dwelling neighborhoods and the quality of construction materials.

In response to these concerns, the design overlay zone ("d") was considered for the R1 areas. These areas are essentially transition sites between the commercial sites along Lombard and established single dwelling neighborhoods. However, discretionary design review is not applied because it is difficult to effectively apply design review to narrow segments. Discretionary design review works best when applied to an identifiable district or area.

Although discretionary design review is not applied, the objective standards of design review - the Community Design Standards (CDS, Chapter 33.218) - have applicability for the R1 areas. In selecting standards, the objective is to focus on improving the front façade of the building (how the building relates to the public realm, as opposed to how it relates to existing development), and to minimize the amount and complexity of regulation. The standards are a subset of the existing CDS for structures in the R1 Zone. They accomplish the following: limit the area of front-facing garages, require a front-facing main entrance, require variation for large buildings, and limit options for exterior finishes. Other CDS were considered, including roof pitch, window trim, foundation landscaping, pairing of driveways, and eaves. However, these standards are not applied because they lean toward a particular style of housing rather than how the building addresses the public realm, or because they are addressed in other regulations.

Design of multidwelling structures is an issue throughout the City. A Bureau of Planning project currently underway, the Infill Design Project, is exploring this issue in detail, and will result in recommendations for design improvements citywide. In the interim, the plan includes essential standards that improve the street-level presence of new residential development within the Lombard corridor.
33.460.110 Additional Standards in the R1 Zone

A. **Purpose.** These standards ensure that development of sites with the potential for medium density development along or adjacent to the main street:

- contributes positively to established neighborhoods and the area’s character;
- creates a strong physical and visual connection between the living area and the street, and the main entrance and the street; and
- improves the transition between development in the commercial and single-dwelling zone areas.

B. **Where these standards apply.** The standards of this section apply to duplexes, attached houses, and multidwelling structures in the R1 zone.

C. **Adjustments.** Adjustments may be requested to these standards; they may not be modified through design review.
33.460.110 Additional Standards in the R1 Zone, continued

Following are the Community Design Standards referenced in the code:

110 E. Large building elevations divided into smaller areas. The front elevation of large structures must be divided into smaller areas or planes. When the front elevation of a structure is more than 750 square feet in area, the elevation must be divided into distinct planes of 500 square feet or less. For the purpose of this standard, areas of wall that are entirely separated from other wall areas by a projection, such as the porch or a roof over a porch, are also individual building wall planes. This division can be done by:

1. A porch, a dormer that is at least 4 feet wide, or a balcony that is at least 2 feet deep and is accessible from an interior room;
2. A bay window that extends at least 2 feet; or
3. Recessing a section of the façade by at least 2 feet; the recessed section must be at least 6 feet long.

110 G.1. Location of main entrance. The main entrance of each primary structure must face the street lot line. The following are exceptions to this standard:

a. On corner lots the main entrance may face either of the streets or be oriented to the corner.
b. For buildings that have more than one main entrance, only one entrance must meet this requirement.
c. Entrances that face a shared landscaped courtyard, landscaped to at least the L1 General Landscaping standard, are exempt from this requirement.

110 H. 4. Attached garages. When parking is provided in a garage attached to the primary structure and garage doors face a street the following standards must be met:

a. The garage must not be more than 40 percent of the length of the building frontage or 12 feet long, whichever is greater. Proposals in the Irvington Conservation District are exempt from this standard;
b. The front of the garage can be no closer to front lot line than the front façade of the house;
c. Garage doors that are part of the street-facing elevations of a primary structure may be no more than 75 square feet in area; and
d. There may be no more than one garage door per 16 feet of building frontage.

110 J. Exterior finish materials. The standards of this subsection must be met on all building facades:

1. Plain concrete block, plain concrete, corrugated metal, plywood and sheet pressboard are not allowed as exterior finish material, except as secondary finishes if they cover no more than 10 percent of the surface area of each façade. Composite boards manufactured from wood or other products, such as hardboard or hardplank, may be used when the board product is less than 6 inches wide.
33.460.120  Additional Standards in the R1 Zone, continued

D.  Standards.

1.  Community design standards. The following standards of Section 33.218.110, Community Design Standards for Primary and Attached Accessory Structures in the R3, R2, and R1 Zones, must be met:

   a.  110.E; Large building elevations divided into smaller areas;

   b.  110.G.1; Location of main entrance;

   c.  110.H.4; Attached garages; and

   d.  110.J.1; Exterior finish materials.
33.460.110 Additional Standards in the R1 Zone, continued

D (2) This regulation applies an existing 15 percent minimum window or door area requirement in the R1 zone to multidwelling structures. Currently, this regulation only applies to houses, attached houses, duplexes and manufactures homes in the R1 zone. Multidwelling structures are required to have a minimum of 8 percent windows.

For consistency, this same standard is applied both here in the main street overlay zone and in the St. Johns plan district for R1 sites:

D (3) This standard requires that only corner lots have alley access, amending an existing Community Design Standard. For sites served by alleys, the Community Design Standards require motor vehicle access from the alley to limit driveways along the street frontage. This standard is relevant since platted alleys exist within the Lombard corridor. However, most of the alleys are not paved or improved to city standards. This standard therefore may create a hardship for mid-block sites, where the cost of improvements to the alley may deter development. Amending the standard so that it applies only to corner sites will minimize the amount of alley improvements required of any one site.
33.460.110 Additional Standards in the R1 Zone, continued

2. At least 15 percent of the street facing facade must be windows. Windows used to meet this standard must allow views from the building to the street. Glass block does not meet this standard. Windows in garage doors do not count toward meeting this standard, but windows in garage walls do count toward meeting this standard. Development on flag lots or on lots which slope up or down from the street with an average slope of 20 percent or more is exempt from this standard.

3. Corner lots with alley access. If the site is a corner lot that is adjacent to an alley, access for motor vehicles must be from the alley.
33.460.120 Minimum Density in the R1 Zone

This standard reduces the minimum density on small sites in the R1 zone, and is identical to the minimum density standard for the St. Johns plan district (Section 33.583.240 of this document). The regulation modifies the minimum density requirement for lots less than 10,000 sq. ft. in the R1 zone. The minimum density is amended from a minimum of 1 unit per 2,000 sq. ft. to a minimum of 1 unit per 2,250 sq. ft. This regulation does not apply to corner lots.

The regulation is recommended because a majority of lots in the R1 zone in the plan district are 5,000 sq. ft. in area and a number of lots are between 5,000 and 10,000 sq. ft. in area. On lots 5,000 sq. ft. in area the Zoning Code requires a minimum of three units. Bureau of Development Services staff and members of the development community state that it is difficult to redevelop these small sites with three or more units while providing the required off-street parking, landscaping and open space areas. Lots between 5,000 sq. ft. and 9,999-sq. ft. face similar constraints, which increase on sloping sites. In addition, community members desire to promote owner-occupied housing in the R1 areas. Reducing the minimum density in the R1 aims to satisfy these objectives by providing the option to develop two rowhouses on a mid-block 5,000 -sq. ft. lot, a typical development that often results in owner-occupancy. This development type is currently supported by the market and fits with the community's desired character for this area.

To ensure that development expectations and potential are retained on these lots, the maximum density allowance of one unit per 1,000 square feet is retained. Note that the reduction in minimum density does not apply to corner lots because it is generally easier to accommodate the minimum number of units and satisfy the development standards on lots with two street frontages. To address the community's aesthetic concerns, the design overlay is applied to all R1 areas in the plan district.

This situation is not unique to St. Johns and a case could be made to modify the minimum density requirement of the R1 zone on small lots elsewhere in the city. However, a number of factors present in St. Johns, including the sloped terrain, a desire to provide flexibility in housing design and encourage neighborhood reinvestment, result in this regulation. If the City Council determines that this issue needs to be considered on a citywide basis, the Bureau of Planning should be directed to include this issue as part of a citywide legislative project.
33.460.120 Minimum Density in the R1 Zone

A. **Purpose.** Reducing the minimum density on small lots in the R1 zone provides flexibility for development of a broad range of dwelling types.

B. **Standard.** On lots less than 10,000 square feet in the R1 zone, the minimum density is 1 unit per 2,250 square feet of site area. This standard does not apply on corner lots.
Sandy Boulevard Regulations

33.460.200 through 33.460.240

Sections 33.460.200 through .240 contain the same set of regulations applicable to Sandy Boulevard before the restructuring of this chapter. The following table notes the original section number and the new section number following restructuring.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reorganization of Chapter 33.460 Section Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonus Building Height</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition Between Residential and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Site Location of Vehicle Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Along Sandy Boulevard in the CS Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Facades Facing Sandy Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Design Review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that prior Section 33.460.050 (Building Coverage), has been renumbered as 33.460.040 and has been placed in the "General" section of this chapter as this provision is proposed to apply to both North Lombard and Sandy Boulevard.
Sandy Boulevard Regulations

33.460.200 Bonus Building Height

33.460.210 Transition Between Residential and Commercial Zones

33.460.220 On-Site Location of Vehicle Areas Along Sandy Boulevard in the CS Zone

33.460.230 Building Facades Facing Sandy Boulevard

33.460.240 Required Design Review
ORDINANCE No. 178452
As Amended

Adopt and implement the St. Johns/Lombard Plan (Ordinance; amend Title 33)

The City of Portland Ordains:

Section 1. The Council finds:


2. Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) 197.628 requires cities and counties to review their comprehensive plans and land use regulations periodically and make changes necessary to keep plans and regulations up-to-date and in compliance with Statewide Planning Goals and State laws. Portland is also required to coordinate its review and update of the Comprehensive Plan and land use regulations with State plans and programs.

3. Portland Comprehensive Plan Goal 10, Plan Review and Administration, states that the Comprehensive Plan will undergo periodic review to ensure that it remains an up-to-date and workable framework for land use development.


5. Portland Comprehensive Plan Goal 3, Neighborhoods, calls for preserving and reinforcing the stability, diversity, residential quality, and economic vitality of the City’s neighborhoods, while allowing for increased density.

6. Neighborhood and area plans serve as components of the Comprehensive Plan and are intended to promote patterns of land use, urban design, infrastructure facilities and services that encourage and contribute to the economic, social, and physical health, welfare, and safety of the neighborhood and the city.

7. The area plan is an advisory document for directing and managing change over time. The adopted vision statement, policies, objectives, and zoning implementation measures of the St. Johns/Lombard Plan will serve as an official guide to decision-making, public deliberation, and investments.

8. Information used for the formulation of the policies and objectives of the St. Johns/Lombard Plan was based on Portland land use, natural resource, and public
infrastructure inventories, economic and transportation analyses, public comments from workshop and open house events, and other meetings, presentations and events.

9. The Bureau of Planning developed the St. Johns/Lombard Plan with participation from interested neighborhood and business associations, property owners, business persons and citizens and with cooperation from other bureaus and agencies.

10. Public involvement and outreach activities included regular consultation with citizen and technical advisory groups, neighborhood walks, visioning and urban design workshops, and open houses. Staff also attended numerous neighborhood and business association meetings and convened special-purpose advisory groups to assist in crafting and evaluating plan proposals.

11. The four neighborhood and two business associations in the plan study area each named a representative to the project’s citizen working group (CWG). In addition, six “at-large” members were selected through an open application process to form a twelve-person working group. The group began meeting in March 2002 and has met over twenty times over the course of the project. Citizen working group members are listed at the beginning of the St. Johns/Lombard Plan. These representatives informed staff on neighborhood and business issues and other matters related to the project and reviewed components and drafts of the St. Johns/Lombard Plan throughout its formulation.

12. A technical advisory group (TAG) composed of representatives from public service providers, city agencies, and other governments and organizations participated in the review of components and drafts of the St. Johns/Lombard Plan throughout its formulation. Members of the TAG are listed at the beginning of the St. Johns/Lombard Plan.

13. The St. Johns/Lombard Plan provisions reinforce community development efforts by encouraging the involvement of residents, businesses, and organizations into activities that benefit the St. Johns and Lombard Street commercial areas and their surrounding neighborhoods.

14. St. Johns/Lombard Plan provisions implement or are consistent with the Statewide Planning Goals, the Oregon Transportation Planning Rule, the Region 2040 Plan, the Metro Urban Growth Management Functional Plan, and the Portland Comprehensive Plan, as explained in the Recommended St. Johns/Lombard Plan: Findings Report attached as Exhibit B and incorporated as part of this ordinance. These rules, policies, plans, provide a basis for integrating new residential, commercial and employment activities into the study area.

15. The St. Johns/Lombard Plan includes an urban development concept and implementation action charts, which are adopted by resolution. The action charts represent a commitment from public and private groups to help implement the St. Johns/Lombard Plan.
16. The Notice of Proposed Action and copies of the St. Johns/Lombard Plan were mailed to the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development as required by ORS 197.610 on July 1, 2003.


20. Written notice of the March 17, 2004 City Council public hearing on the Recommended St. Johns/Lombard Plan was mailed to individuals who testified at the Planning Commission and Design Commission hearings and other interested individuals on February 25, 2004. A Measure 56 notification of the March 17, 2004 City Council public hearing on the Recommended St. Johns/Lombard Plan was mailed to all property owners potentially affected by Planning Commission recommended amendments to the base zoning or allowed use of property (where such recommended amendments differed from the Proposed St. Johns/Lombard Plan) on February 20, 2004.

21. The Vision Statement, Policies, Goals and Objectives, Master Street Plan, design review provisions and zoning measures of the St. Johns/Lombard Plan will serve as an official guide to public and private decision-making and investment in the plan area.

22. It is in the public interest that the recommendations contained in the St. Johns/Lombard Plan be adopted to direct change in the study area. These recommendations are consistent with Statewide Planning Goals, Metro’s Functional Plan and the City’s Comprehensive Plan for the reasons stated in the findings in Exhibit B.
NOW, THEREFORE, the Council directs:


b. Amend Ordinance No. 150580, Portland’s Comprehensive Plan, to augment the Comprehensive Plan Vision with the Vision included in the St. Johns/Lombard Plan, and incorporate by reference in Policy 3.6, Neighborhood Plans, the Planning Goals, Objectives, and Policies of the St. Johns/Lombard Plan, as shown in Exhibit A.

c. The Portland Comprehensive Plan Map and the Zoning Map of the City of Portland are amended, as shown in Exhibit A.

d. The Community Design Guidelines are amended as shown in Exhibit A. The Desired Characteristics and Traditions statements included in Exhibit A will be used by design review bodies as extensions of Community Design Guideline P1, Plan Area Character, in the St. Johns Plan District.

e. Title 33, Planning and Zoning of the Code of the City of Portland, Oregon, is amended as shown in Exhibit A.

f. The commentary in Exhibit A is adopted as legislative intent and as further findings.

g. Exhibit B, Recommended St. Johns/Lombard Plan: Findings Report, which contains findings on applicable statewide planning goals, the Metro functional plan, and Portland Comprehensive Plan, is adopted as findings of fact.

h. Adopt the Master Street Plan of the St. Johns/Lombard Plan as a supporting document of the Comprehensive Plan and direct the Office of Transportation to incorporate the St. Johns/Lombard Master Street Plan and an implementing objective into Comprehensive Plan Policy 11B during the next update to the Transportation System Plan.

Section 2. This Ordinance shall be in full force and effect 45 days after Council adoption.

Passed by the Council, MAY 26, 2004

Mayor Vera Katz
Barry Manning
March 17, 2004

GARY BLACKMER
Auditor of the City of Portland

By, Deputy
RESOLUTION No. 36219

As Amended

Adopt the St. Johns/Lombard Plan Urban Development Concept and Action Charts (Resolution)

WHEREAS, neighborhood and area plans are intended to promote patterns of land use, urban design, infrastructure facilities, and services which encourage and contribute to the economic, social, and physical health, welfare, and safety of the area and the city; and

WHEREAS, the St. Johns/Lombard Plan was developed with the cooperation of City bureaus and other public agencies and with the participation of neighborhood organizations, property owners, business persons, area residents, and other interested persons; and

WHEREAS, the attainment of the vision, urban development concept, goals, policies, and master street plan of the St. Johns/Lombard Plan is dependent upon the coordination of independent actions carried out by private interests, public service providers, and community-based associations; and

WHEREAS, action charts describe the proposed implementation projects, programs, and regulations of the St. Johns/Lombard Plan, identify appropriate timeframes for their implementation, and identify agents to oversee or participate in the implementation of an action; and

WHEREAS, the St. Johns/Lombard Plan urban development concept represents a refinement of the community’s vision for the St. Johns town center and North Lombard main street, and serves as a general blueprint for realizing that vision by identifying elements of urban form that are to be preserved, changed, and enhanced; and

WHEREAS, the St. Johns/Lombard Plan vision, goals, policies, and master street plan are adopted as part of the Comprehensive Plan, and actions taken to implement the St. Johns/Lombard Plan also uphold the Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, public notice was mailed on August 4, 2003 to interested persons, and on August 12, 2003 and August 15, 2003 to all property owners directly affected by plan proposals regarding the Portland Planning Commission and the Portland Design Commission public hearings held on September 9, 2003 and September 4, 2003 respectively; and

WHEREAS, the Portland Planning Commission held a public hearing and accepted public testimony on September 9, 2003, and continued deliberation on the plan at public meetings on October 14, 2003, November 25, 2003, December 9, 2003 and January 13, 2004, and voted to recommend that the City Council adopt the urban development concept and action charts of the St. Johns/Lombard Plan; and
WHEREAS, the Portland Design Commission held a public hearing and accepted public testimony on September 4, 2003, and continued deliberations at public meetings on December 4, 2003, and January 15, 2004, and voted to recommend that the City Council adopt the related design amendments of the St. Johns/Lombard Plan, and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission’s and Design Commission’s recommendations on the St. Johns/Lombard Plan are contained in Exhibit A; and

WHEREAS, it is in the public interest that the recommendations contained in the St. Johns/Lombard Plan be adopted to direct and manage change in the St. Johns town center and North Lombard main street areas of Portland.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Portland, a municipal corporation of the State of Oregon, that the City Council adopt the urban development concept and action charts of the St. Johns/Lombard Plan as shown in Exhibit A, and that:

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the implementation actions associated with the action charts of the St. Johns/Lombard Plan are approved by City Council as a starting place for projects, programs and regulations that will help implement the policies of the plan; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that all actions are adopted with the understanding that they may need to be adjusted or replaced with more feasible alternatives. Identification of an implementor for an action is an expression of interest and support with the understanding that circumstances will affect the implementor’s ability to take action; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Council authorizes the City agencies identified on the action charts as implementors to engage in activities aimed at implementing the projects, programs and regulations called for in the action charts of the St. Johns/Lombard Plan; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Council authorizes and directs the Bureau of Planning staff to make minor changes to the action charts of the St. Johns/Lombard Plan that correct typographical errors and to ensure parallel construction.

Adopted by the Council, MAY 26 2004

Mayor Vera Katz
Barry Manning
March 17, 2004

GARY BLACKMER
Auditor of the City of Portland

By

Deputy
# Appendix B: Outreach Log

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>MEETING/EVENT</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>SPONSOR</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
<th>STAFF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03/05/01</td>
<td>Meeting w/Mike Fitz, pres. No. Ptld Bus. Assn</td>
<td>Jubitz Truck Stop</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Introduce Plan</td>
<td>Ellen, Julia Gisler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/18/01</td>
<td>Mtg. w/Coordinator of Portsmouth Vision 20/20 steering committee</td>
<td>Peninsula CDC office</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Introduce Plan to coordinator</td>
<td>Ellen, Julia Gisler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portsmouth Vision 20/20 steering committee</td>
<td>Peninsula CDC office</td>
<td>Portsmouth Vision 20/20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Introduce plan to committee</td>
<td>Ellen, Julia Gisler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/11/01 – 10/26/01</td>
<td>Outreach Committee meetings (total of 12)</td>
<td>United House of Prayer for all Peoples</td>
<td>BOP</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>Meets 2nd and 4th Wednesday of month with standing Outreach Committee</td>
<td>Plan team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/21/01</td>
<td>Clean up North Portland</td>
<td>Lombard Street</td>
<td>BOP, Metro, Peninsula Clean Team</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>Charlotte Larson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/02/01</td>
<td>Portsmouth Neighborhood Plan kick-off event</td>
<td>Columbia Cottage</td>
<td>BOP/TCAP/PCDC/HAP</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/13/01</td>
<td>Smart Development Workshop</td>
<td>Water Pollution Control Lab</td>
<td>ODOT/BOP</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>TGM grant funding for workshop</td>
<td>Ellen, Charlotte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/19/01</td>
<td>St. Johns Business Boosters</td>
<td>Dad's restaurant</td>
<td>Boosters</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Introduce plan to general membership</td>
<td>Ellen, Charlotte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/23/01</td>
<td>El dia de San Juan</td>
<td>Street Fair on N. Charleston Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Introduce plan, staffed table with info</td>
<td>Ellen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/09/01</td>
<td>St. Johns NA monthly mtg</td>
<td>Water Pollution Control Lab</td>
<td>Neigh. Assoc.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Introduce plan to general membership</td>
<td>Ellen Wax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/01/01</td>
<td>Portsmouth Neighborhood Plan meeting – to discuss com. development</td>
<td>Columbia Cottage</td>
<td>BoP/TCAP/PCDC/HAP</td>
<td>10?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan team, Julia Gisler S. Gerber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/18/01</td>
<td>St. Johns in 21st Century target area committee mtg</td>
<td>SJ Community Center</td>
<td>SJ21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Introduce plan</td>
<td>Ellen, Marguerite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/25/01</td>
<td>Back-to-School Readiness Fair</td>
<td>St Johns Community Center.</td>
<td>Caring Community</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Provided info on the SJ/L planning process; Wish List activity; Find-Your-Home activity.</td>
<td>Riis, Charlotte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/08/01</td>
<td>Latino Festival</td>
<td>Cathedral Park</td>
<td>SJ21</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Provided SJ/L Plan info.</td>
<td>Plan team, Frederiksson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/27/01</td>
<td>Meeting with plan area businesses invited by N. Ptld Bus. Assoc.</td>
<td>Water Pollution Control Lab</td>
<td>BOP and N PDX BA</td>
<td>40?</td>
<td>Facilitated discussion with business owners; provided SJ/L Plan info.</td>
<td>Plan team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13/01</td>
<td>Walking Together – Banner Celebration</td>
<td>United Methodist Church</td>
<td>Portsmouth Vision 20/20</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Provided SJ/L Plan info.</td>
<td>Riis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13/01</td>
<td>Native American Festival</td>
<td>University Park Comm. Center</td>
<td>Univ Park Comm. Ctr.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Provided SJ/L Plan info.</td>
<td>Plan Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/18/01</td>
<td>Open House/Kick-Off</td>
<td>Roosevelt HS</td>
<td>BOP</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>Available to answer questions about planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## St. Johns/Lombard Plan Public Outreach Log

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/12/01</td>
<td>Cathedral Park Neighborhood Mtg</td>
<td>Water lab Cathedral Park</td>
<td>20? Barry</td>
<td>Intro Barry; presented info about plan; solicit CWG members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/26/01</td>
<td>St Johns NA Board Mtg</td>
<td>Comm Ctr St Johns NA</td>
<td>10 Barry</td>
<td>Intro Barry; presented info about plan; solicit CWG members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/26/01</td>
<td>University Park NA Board Mtg</td>
<td>Univ. Park NA</td>
<td>10 Barry</td>
<td>Intro Barry; presented info about plan; solicit CWG members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/27/01</td>
<td>Portsmouth NA Board Mtg</td>
<td>Columbia Cottage</td>
<td>Portsmouth NA 10 Barry</td>
<td>Intro Barry; presented info about plan; solicit CWG members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/17/01</td>
<td>Peninsula optimists</td>
<td>Tom’s Pizza Optimists</td>
<td>15 Barry</td>
<td>Info about plan, business involvement and CWG; w/ Cornelius Swart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4/02</td>
<td>St Johns Boosters Board Mtg</td>
<td>Boosters’ office</td>
<td>Boosters 5</td>
<td>Info about plan, business involvement and CWG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/10/02</td>
<td>Pedestrian Awareness project Mtg</td>
<td>Water lab Ped Awareness Group</td>
<td>15 Barry, Rich Newlands</td>
<td>Info about plan, transportation issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/12/02</td>
<td>Latino Resource Center Planning</td>
<td>Kenton Firehouse</td>
<td>SJ 21 10 Barry</td>
<td>Info about plan and Latino outreach and Latino CWG member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/16/02</td>
<td>SJ 21 Mtg</td>
<td>Community Center</td>
<td>SJ 21 14 Barry</td>
<td>Info about plan and Latino and business outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/17/02</td>
<td>Library Siting Mtg</td>
<td>Portsmouth Middle School</td>
<td>Multnomah County 40 Marguerite</td>
<td>Discussion about 2 sites for new library – one on Lombard/Huron and Columbia Villa. Serena Cruz and Ginnie Cooper led meeting; Cruz will recommend Columbia Villa site to Mult. Co. Commissioners in Feb 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/18/02</td>
<td>Business Canvassing</td>
<td>St Johns BOP</td>
<td>n/a Barry, Riis</td>
<td>Door to door canvassing of businesses providing plan information and seeking CWG participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/18/02</td>
<td>Business Canvassing</td>
<td>Lombard BOP/PDOT</td>
<td>n/a Rich, Mauricio</td>
<td>Door to door canvassing of businesses providing plan information and seeking CWG participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/23/02</td>
<td>Business Canvassing</td>
<td>St Johns BOP</td>
<td>n/a Barry, Marguerite</td>
<td>Door to door canvassing of businesses providing plan information and seeking CWG participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/23/02</td>
<td>Business Canvassing</td>
<td>Lombard BOP/PDOT</td>
<td>n/a Mauricio</td>
<td>Door to door canvassing of businesses providing plan information and seeking CWG participants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix B: Outreach Log

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/23/02</td>
<td>St Johns Boosters/Joe Beeler</td>
<td>Boosters' office</td>
<td>Boosters 4</td>
<td>Meeting to discuss plaza plans and public input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9/02</td>
<td>Latino Outreach Meeting</td>
<td>North Ptd. Firehouse</td>
<td>North Ptd. Firehouse NPNO</td>
<td>Discussed SJLP and Latino input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/23/02</td>
<td>African American Celebration</td>
<td>University Park Community Center</td>
<td>Metro, Portsmouth Vision</td>
<td>We provided info on the plan and encouraged people to fill out the Community Comment Survey (15 completed forms)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/28/02</td>
<td>Project Interwoven Tapestry Workshop #3, Receiving Comm.</td>
<td>Asian Family Center, NE Glisan</td>
<td>ONI, Interwoven Tapestry</td>
<td>Panel discussion with leaders of immigrant communities; obtained information on effective outreach strategies to immigrants/refugee groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/13/02</td>
<td>Citizen Working Group (CWG) Initial Meeting</td>
<td>Columbia Cottage</td>
<td>BOP</td>
<td>Presented project background, solicited TGM review, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/03/02</td>
<td>Vision Workshop</td>
<td>St. Johns Com Ctr 8427 N Central</td>
<td>BOP</td>
<td>Project update presentations, followed by group exercise to develop a vision for the plan area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/20/02</td>
<td>N. Ptd Neighborhood Clean-up</td>
<td>St. Johns and Portsmouth</td>
<td>NPNO n/a</td>
<td>Passed out literature on SJLP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/25/02</td>
<td>Project Interwoven Tapestry Workshop #4, Dynamic Differences</td>
<td>Asian Family Center, NE Glisan</td>
<td>ONI, Interwoven Tapestry</td>
<td>Panel discussion and group exercises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/01/02</td>
<td>CWG Meeting</td>
<td>Water Lab</td>
<td>BOP</td>
<td>~12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/04/02</td>
<td>Neighborhood Walk #1: Lombard East</td>
<td>Columbia Cottage 4339 N Lombard</td>
<td>BOP</td>
<td>Opportunity to explore plan area with community members and get their input on ideas for future change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/08/02</td>
<td>Neighborhood Walk #2: Lombard Central</td>
<td>St. Johns Fam. Ctr. 6443 N Lombard</td>
<td>BOP</td>
<td>Opportunity to explore plan area with community members and get their input on ideas for future change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/18/02</td>
<td>Neighborhood Walk #3: Downtown St. Johns</td>
<td>Pioneer Uni. Methodist Ch. 7528 N Charleston</td>
<td>BOP</td>
<td>Opportunity to explore plan area with community members and get their input on ideas for future change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/04/02</td>
<td>Neighborhood Walk #4: Cathedral Park/Riverfront</td>
<td>Water Poll Ctrl Lab 6543 N Burlington</td>
<td>BOP</td>
<td>Opportunity to explore plan area with community members and get their input on ideas for future change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/05/02</td>
<td>CWG Meeting</td>
<td>Water Lab</td>
<td>BOP</td>
<td>~12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### St. Johns/Lombard Plan Public Outreach Log

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/19/02</td>
<td>SJ 21 Meeting</td>
<td>Comm Ctr. SJ21</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Provided information on SJLP</td>
<td>Barry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/20/02</td>
<td>Neighborhood Walks/Vision Workshop Follow-up Meeting</td>
<td>St. Johns Com Ctr 8427 N Central</td>
<td>BOP 51</td>
<td>Presentation of results from neighborhood walks and vision workshop, followed by informal staff/citizen interaction session. Plan team; ZGF staff; LCA staff</td>
<td>Barry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/22/02</td>
<td>Lombard Street Fair</td>
<td>Between N Fiske and N Portsmouth</td>
<td>Local businesses n/a</td>
<td>Made project information available and explained planning process. Riis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/24/02</td>
<td>Peninsula Optimists</td>
<td>Tom's Pizza Optimists</td>
<td>~10</td>
<td>Provided information on SJLP</td>
<td>Barry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/26/02</td>
<td>Peninsula Kiwanis</td>
<td>SJ Pub</td>
<td>Kiwanis ~10</td>
<td>Provided information on SJLP</td>
<td>Barry, Rich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/10/02</td>
<td>CWG Meeting</td>
<td>Water Lab BOP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/23/02</td>
<td>Cath Park NA Land Use Committee</td>
<td>Water Lab Cath Pk 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provided info on zoning/comp plan; discussed R5 to RH zone change issues</td>
<td>Barry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/14/02</td>
<td>CWG Meeting</td>
<td>Water Lab BOP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/26 &amp; 08/28/02</td>
<td>Hmong Community Outreach Forums</td>
<td>Baha'i Center 8720 N Ivanhoe Planning and St. Johns 21st Century 21 and 13</td>
<td>Provided info on plan and process; initiated dialogue w. participants on transportation, housing, community life, recreation, commercial issues.</td>
<td>Marguerite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/02</td>
<td>Latino Outreach Forums (3)</td>
<td>Planning, Latino Network, St. Johns 21st Century 23</td>
<td>Provided info on plan and process; initiated dialogue w. participants on transportation, housing, community life, recreation, commercial issues.</td>
<td>Mauricio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/04/02</td>
<td>CWG Meeting</td>
<td>Water Lab BOP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/25/02</td>
<td>St. Johns Heritage Association</td>
<td>North Precinct</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Provided info on plan; asked about their goals for historic preservation – education, national register listings, public art/plaques.</td>
<td>Marguerite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/26/02</td>
<td>North Portland Business Association General Meeting</td>
<td>Lung Fung NPBA</td>
<td>~20</td>
<td>Provided information on SJLP</td>
<td>Barry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/26/20</td>
<td>Metro Council</td>
<td>Interstate Firehouse Metro</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Plan update for Metro Council at request of Rex Burkholder</td>
<td>Barry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/02/02</td>
<td>National Walk to School Day</td>
<td>Ivanhoe @ John Ave. to James John Elementary Pedestrian Awareness Project 150 150</td>
<td>A walk to show support for safety awareness in St. Johns. 7:15am to 7:45am</td>
<td>Rich, Marguerite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/02/02</td>
<td>CWG Meeting</td>
<td>Water Lab BOP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/15/02</td>
<td>CWG Meeting</td>
<td>Water Lab BOP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/23/02</td>
<td>Urban Design WS 1</td>
<td>Roosevelt BOP</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Discussed design concepts for sub areas with public</td>
<td>Plan team + consultant s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/6/02</td>
<td>CWG Meeting</td>
<td>Water Lab BOP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# St. Johns/Lombard Plan Public Outreach Log

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/19/02</td>
<td>SJ Boosters General Meeting</td>
<td>St. Johns Pub</td>
<td>Boosters</td>
<td>Project update/briefing; discussed future business meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/21/02</td>
<td>Urb Design WS 2</td>
<td>Roosevelt BOP</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Discussed refined design concepts for sub areas with public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/3/02</td>
<td>Columbia Corridor Assn. Trans Subcommittee</td>
<td>port CCA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Informed CCA trans subcommittee on plan concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/4/02</td>
<td>CWG Meeting</td>
<td>Water Lab BOP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/8/03</td>
<td>CWG Meeting</td>
<td>Water Lab BOP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/14 &amp; 1/15/03</td>
<td>3rd/4th grade class, Jane Rockwell teacher</td>
<td>James John Elementary School</td>
<td>BOP</td>
<td>Presentation on St. Johns history; brainstorm on future uses for the old Safeway site and Cathedral Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/22/02</td>
<td>African American Club</td>
<td>Roosevelt High School</td>
<td>BOP</td>
<td>Explored ideas to involve students in plan process; talked with students about how they use the area; possibility for future project-based work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/30/03</td>
<td>Shrunck Tower resident meeting</td>
<td>Shrunck tower</td>
<td>BOP</td>
<td>Presentation on plan and process; work to date. Discussed resident’s concerns regarding transportation, livability issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/5/03</td>
<td>CWG Meeting</td>
<td>Water Lab BOP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/7/03</td>
<td>St Johns Boosters Board: MTIP</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q&amp;A regarding MTIP application endorsement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/11/03</td>
<td>Cathedral Park Neighborhood Assoc. Board: MTIP</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q&amp;A regarding MTIP application endorsement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/20 &amp; 2/21/03</td>
<td>Business Open Houses</td>
<td>Frente Comun (2/20); Peninsula Senior Ctr (2/21)</td>
<td>BOP</td>
<td>Provided information about plan process to date; urban design concepts. Comparison data (population, income, households) for other main street areas shared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/5/03</td>
<td>CWG Meeting</td>
<td>Water Lab BOP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/10/03</td>
<td>St Johns Neighborhood Assoc. General membership: MTIP</td>
<td>Community Center SJNA</td>
<td>~20</td>
<td>Q&amp;A regarding MTIP application endorsement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/24/03</td>
<td>North Portland Business Association Daily Bread restaurant</td>
<td>NPBA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>MTIP application endorsement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/26/03</td>
<td>Kiwanis Club</td>
<td>St. Johns Pub Kiwanis</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Update on plan process; urban design concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/31/03</td>
<td>St Johns Neighborhood Assoc. Board Community Center SJNA</td>
<td>~10</td>
<td>MTIP application endorsement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/2/03</td>
<td>CWG Meeting</td>
<td>Water Lab BOP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/7/03</td>
<td>CWG Meeting</td>
<td>Water Lab BOP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Attendees</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/29/03</td>
<td>North Portland Rotary</td>
<td>Double tree Rotary</td>
<td>~20 Presented draft plan ideas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/7/03</td>
<td>CWG Meeting</td>
<td>Water Lab BOP</td>
<td>Plan staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/13/03</td>
<td>Portland Bicycle Advisory Committee</td>
<td>City Hall 12</td>
<td>Proposed bike lanes on Lombard proposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/17/03</td>
<td>Discussion Draft Open House</td>
<td>Community Center BOP</td>
<td>104 Shared Draft Plan concepts and implementation ideas: Urban Development Concept; transportation improvements; proposed Comp Plan and Zoning maps and draft code; proposed design areas; economic analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/20/03</td>
<td>Portland Pedestrian Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Portland Bldg. 12</td>
<td>Proposed pedestrian improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/04/03</td>
<td>CWG Meeting</td>
<td>Water Lab BOP</td>
<td>Plan team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/9/03</td>
<td>St. Johns Neighborhood Assoc</td>
<td>St Johns Community Center SJNA 30</td>
<td>Plan update MTIP grant status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/26/03</td>
<td>CWG Sub-group</td>
<td>St Johns Pub CWG</td>
<td>2 Discuss transport details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/02/03</td>
<td>CWG Meeting</td>
<td>Water Lab BOP</td>
<td>Plan team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/11/03</td>
<td>North Portland Bus Tour</td>
<td>Mobile HAP + NPBA ~20</td>
<td>Presented draft plan ideas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/28/03</td>
<td>Peninsula Optimists</td>
<td>Tom’s Pizza Optimists 10</td>
<td>Discuss transportation and plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/23/03</td>
<td>CWG Meeting</td>
<td>Water Lab BOP</td>
<td>Plan team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/06/03</td>
<td>CWG Meeting</td>
<td>Water Lab BOP</td>
<td>Plan team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/11/03</td>
<td>St. Johns Neighborhood Assn. Meeting</td>
<td>Community Center S J N A ~ 20</td>
<td>Presentation and discussion on proposed plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/12/03</td>
<td>Friends of Cathedral Park</td>
<td>Water Lab FOCP</td>
<td>Presentation and discussion on proposed plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/21/03</td>
<td>North Portland Business Association</td>
<td>Lung Fung NPBA ~20</td>
<td>Presentation and discussion on proposed plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/25/03</td>
<td>University Park Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>Methodist Church UPNA ~30</td>
<td>Presentation and discussion on proposed plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/2/03</td>
<td>Portsmouth Neighborhood Assn.</td>
<td>Columbia Cottage TCAP</td>
<td>Presentation and discussion on proposed plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/3/03</td>
<td>CWG Meeting</td>
<td>Water Lab BOP</td>
<td>Plan team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/25/03</td>
<td>Industrial property owners north of bridge</td>
<td>Water Lab BOP 6</td>
<td>Discussed industrial and zoning issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/1/03</td>
<td>CWG Meeting</td>
<td>Water Lab BOP</td>
<td>Plan team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/21/03</td>
<td>SJ Boosters General Meeting</td>
<td>Café Nola SJB ~12</td>
<td>Presentation and discussion on proposed plan; Q&amp;A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/5/03</td>
<td>CWG Meeting</td>
<td>Water Lab BOP</td>
<td>Plan team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/03</td>
<td>Stop the SJLP</td>
<td>St. Johns Concerned ~130</td>
<td>Listened to citizen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Location Details</td>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>Presentation Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/18/03</td>
<td>SJ Boosters General Meeting</td>
<td>Café Nola</td>
<td>SJB</td>
<td>Presentation and discussion on proposed plan; Q&amp;A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/24/03</td>
<td>University Park NA Methodist Church</td>
<td>UPNA</td>
<td>~20</td>
<td>Presentation and discussion on proposed plan; Q&amp;A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/10/03</td>
<td>CWG Meeting</td>
<td>Water Lab</td>
<td>BOP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/12/04</td>
<td>St. Johns NA Meeting</td>
<td>Community Center</td>
<td>SJNA</td>
<td>Presentation and discussion on proposed plan; Q&amp;A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/14/04</td>
<td>CWG Meeting</td>
<td>Water Lab</td>
<td>BOP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/26/04</td>
<td>Informational Open House for Business Community</td>
<td>Water Lab</td>
<td>NPBA, SJ Boosters; BOP</td>
<td>Presented information on recommended plan; answered questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/29/04</td>
<td>Stop the SJLP</td>
<td>St. Johns Community Center</td>
<td>Concerned Neighbors Group</td>
<td>~90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/04/04</td>
<td>CWG Meeting</td>
<td>Senior Ctr.</td>
<td>BOP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/28/04</td>
<td>Recommended Plan Open House</td>
<td>St. Johns Community Center</td>
<td>CWG</td>
<td>~150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Project Overview/Summary

The St. Johns/Lombard Plan will be a guide to implement the community’s vision over the next twenty years. Essentially a framework for community growth and development, the plan will address many facets of livability such as land use, transportation, housing and recreation. The plan is guided by the city’s and the region’s plans and policies, which promote the efficient use of land through compact urban development. Both areas are envisioned as pedestrian-friendly places that provide a mix of shopping, entertainment, housing, service, and employment opportunities.

A goal of the St. Johns/Lombard Plan is to enhance the livability of the area by identifying community needs and desires, public and private strategies, and actions that will improve existing and future conditions. Public meetings will be held at milestones throughout the process to inform and obtain feedback from members of the community. The plan will culminate in City Council adoption of planning strategies that will provide a vision for the future, a framework for evaluating and implementing public investments, and direction for private projects.

For more information, contact the City of Portland Bureau of Planning, St. Johns/Lombard Plan, 1900 SW Fourth Avenue, Suite 4100, Portland, OR 97201.
Telephone 503-823-7700 Fax 503-823-7800 TDD 503-823-6868
E-mail stjohnslombard@ci.portland.or.us
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This document is a compilation of information collected from the St. Johns/Lombard Open House and the Community Comment Survey. Citizen responses have been summarized. Following the summaries are actual responses – the responses have not been edited for content.
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How will this information be used?

The citizen responses recorded in this document will be used by staff and citizen volunteers during the plan process to help develop and refine policies, objectives, and implementation strategies for the plan area.
A. Open House Citizen Responses

Contained in this section is a summary followed by a complete list of written comments by participants of the St. Johns/Lombard Plan open house, October 18, 2001, at Roosevelt High School. During the open house event, participants were asked to provide written responses to a series of questions related to transportation, the built environment, and natural and recreational areas. Additionally, a station was set up for participants to discuss issues and to describe a future vision or wish for the community. Questions and responses were displayed to allow participants to share ideas and learn about other perspectives.
### Open House Response Summaries

The following are summaries of the responses to the topic-area questions asked at the open house. Issues or themes are identified where multiple responses were similar in content. Where possible, the summary lists are presented in order of frequency of responses, with the most frequently mentioned responses listed first. See page 10 for a complete list of responses.

1. **What do you consider to be the three most important transportation issues for St. Johns?**
   
2. **For Lombard Street?**

   This chart shows the top three issues or themes that surfaced. **Under each issue is a sampling of responses** (a total of 75 were received). The first issue listed in each column was most frequently mentioned. Other topics mentioned include issues related to trucks, the bridge, parking, and the sidewalk environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>St. Johns Transportation Issues</th>
<th>Lombard Street Transportation Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Traffic control</strong></td>
<td><strong>1. Traffic movement and circulation</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ... “Unsafe as you head into downtown St. Johns area.” ...  | ... “Relieve auto traffic on Lombard...” ...
| ... “Traffic is too fast on Lombard, Ivanhoe, and Princeton.” ... | ... “Current [signal] timing on Lombard is too short.” ...
| ... “Trucks must route away from town center and main street.” ... | ... “[We need] a one way couplet of Lombard and Central from the railroad cut into St. Johns.” ...
| **2. Transit**                 | **2. Traffic control**              |
| ... “Express bus service [is needed] to downtown and Sunday service by either the 17 or 40.” ... | ... “Cars are travelling too fast on Lombard – they need to be slowed down!” ...
| ... “[We need] bus service to Pier Park Apartments...” ... | ... “Need speed bumps, trees, and boulevards so people don’t assume all of St. Johns is part of the Portland Raceway.” ...
| ... “Extend service hours on bus line #16.” ... | ... “We need more traffic lights and curb extensions to slow down traffic.” ...
| **3. Pedestrian Safety**       | **3. Transit and pedestrian safety** |
| ... “The intersection of Richmond and Ivanhoe is dangerous and impassable by pedestrians.” ... | ... “[I] would like to see a smoother mass transit system, easier access to bus/Max.” ...
| ... “Less traffic, more pedestrian-friendly.” ... | ... “Street car service down Lombard.” ...
| ... “There needs to be a safe passage through the pedestrian district from the south and southwest to James John Elementary School.” ... | ... “Better pedestrian access to Willamette, along with a pedestrian-friendly downtown St. Johns. Bring back the street lamps and slow down the traffic.” ... |
3. **Question 3:** Citizens were asked to provide general transportation issues and is not summarized here. See page 13 for a list of responses.

4. **Question 4:** Citizens were asked to identify transportation issues on a map of the area. See pages 13-14 for a list of responses to the map exercise.

5. **What are your three most frequent destinations in St. Johns?**

The following two lists are organized in order of frequency of responses; the first destination of each list was mentioned most often (a total of 38 responses were received).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>St. Johns</th>
<th>Lombard Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. St. Johns Cafe</td>
<td>1. Fred Meyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Safeway</td>
<td>3. Gas station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Post Office</td>
<td>5. Ying Ying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Fred Meyer</td>
<td>7. Snooty Cats Café</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Starbucks</td>
<td>8. Fishwife Restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Cathedral Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **Along Lombard Street?**

The following two lists are organized in order of frequency of responses; the first destination of each list was mentioned most often (a total of 38 responses were received).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>St. Johns</th>
<th>Lombard Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. St. Johns Cafe</td>
<td>1. Fred Meyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Safeway</td>
<td>3. Gas station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Post Office</td>
<td>5. Ying Ying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Fred Meyer</td>
<td>7. Snooty Cats Café</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Starbucks</td>
<td>8. Fishwife Restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Cathedral Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Open House Summaries Continued

7. **Share your ideas on how to enhance the commercial areas of St. Johns and Lombard Street.**

   This list is organized in order of frequency of responses; the first idea was mentioned most often (a total of 105 responses were received).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likes</th>
<th>Desired Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Better grocery store</td>
<td>9. Add mixed used developments (mixture of residential and commercial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Improve the sidewalk environment</td>
<td>10. Rezone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Improve existing storefronts</td>
<td>12. Add decorative lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Fewer bars and adult businesses</td>
<td>13. Fewer auto-related businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Fill vacant storefronts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. **What do you like about the housing in this area?**   9. **What would you like to see changed?**

   This chart shows the major issues or themes that surfaced in the responses. The two lists are organized in order of frequency of responses; the first issue of each list was most frequently mentioned (a total of 89 responses were received).
Open House Summaries Continued

10. What do you see as the benefits of nearby industrial uses along the river?

The following list is a sampling of responses (a total of 18 were received). For this question, no clear theme surfaced since each response was unique:
- “Keeps trucks off the roads if you can export from industries to ships on the river.”
- “[Provides] family wage jobs.”
- “[Supplements the] tax base.”
- “Makes for a ‘working town’ identity.”
- “[Allows residents to] live close to work.”

11. Do you think existing vacant industrial sites should remain industrial? If not, what use(s) do you envision?

This list is organized in order of frequency of responses; the first comment was the most frequently mentioned (a total of 30 responses were received).
1. Combination of recreation, open space, trails
2. Combination of housing and commercial
3. Community facilities
4. Agriculture
5. Remain industrial

12. What do you consider to be the most important Willamette River or riverfront issues?

This list is a sampling of responses. For this question, no clear theme surfaced since each response was unique (a total of 11 responses were received).
- “New trail from Willamette Blvd. at north bridgehead on railroad cut to Willamette Cove (40 mile loop).”
- “Make the Willamette clean enough for swimming (at Cathedral Park).”
- “Clean North Portland Road—bike path.”
- “Open [bike path] connection through wastewater treatment plant.”
- “Continue bike path at North Portland Road across Columbia Slough Bridge.”
- “Bike trail along former Marine Drive needs to be repaved and maintained.”
13. **What natural and recreational areas do you use?**

   The list is organized in order of frequency of responses; the first comment was the most frequently mentioned (a total of 18 responses were received).

   1. Cathedral Park
   2. Kelley Point Park
   3. Columbia Park
   4. Smith and Bybee Lakes
   5. Pier Park
   6. Forest Park
   7. St. Johns Park
   8. George Park

14. **What natural or recreational areas need improvement? What’s missing?**

   This chart shows the top three issues or themes that surfaced. **Under each issue is a sampling of actual responses.** The first issue listed was most frequently mentioned (a total of 20 responses were received). Other issues raised with less frequency include river access and improvement to bridges over the railroad cut.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Trail connections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...“Connect the Eastbank Esplanade all the way to Cathedral Park.” ...“Directly connect the Peninsula Crossing Trail to Smith and Bybee Lakes.” ...“Create a trail from railroad lines from Cathedral Park to University of Portland.” ...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Recreational improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...“[We need] more playgrounds.” ...“Cathedral Park needs a permanent stage.” ...“[We need] parks where kids can play—sandboxes, fountains, building blocks.”...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Parks and open space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...“North Beach and Willamette Cove [should be] future parks.” ...“[We] need more pocket parks integrated into commercial areas.” ...“Open space plaza along Main Street (in Portsmouth neighborhood at Fiske and Lombard).” ...“Historic park with interpretive signage and plaques, respecting the [area’s] history.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. If you had one wish for your community, what would it be?

This chart shows the top six issues or themes that surfaced. **Under each issue is a sampling of actual responses.** The first issue listed was mentioned most frequently (a total of 60 responses were received).

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Safety</strong></td>
<td>. . . “[We need] safer and more pedestrian crossings on Lombard.” . . . “Get rid of crime, broken windows, and give the police jobs on every five blocks.” . . .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. River-related</strong></td>
<td>. . . “I wish I could go swimming in the Willamette River at Cathedral Park.” . . . “Develop the McCormick &amp; Baxter property into a publicly-owned park and recreation area with river access, hike and bike trails, and facilities similar to the Delta Park area.” . . .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Complete List of Responses to Open House Questions

Question# 1: What do you consider to be the three most important transportation issues for St. Johns?

- Better traffic flow.
- Get trucks out of St. Johns going to I-5.
- Four way stop needed on the corner of Lombard & Charleston. Unsafe as you head into downtown St. Johns area.
- Trying to cross Lombard and Ivanhoe on Leavitt (in a car). It's dangerous.
- Travelling north-south between Fessenden and Willamette (west of Fred Meyer). Almost all routes have one or more uncontrolled intersections prone to accidents. (We got hit at Princton and Tyler). Please add stop signs for east-west traffic.
- The intersection of Richmond and Ivanhoe is dangerous and impassable by pedestrians.
- Traffic too fast on Lombard, Ivanhoe, and Princeton (one businessman told me he's had three accidents in front of his store in the last year from people travelling too fast).
- Ivanhoe Street is very difficult to cross either by car or by foot.
- In the downtown St. Johns area it would be good to work on businesses allowing shared parking to better use space during both day and evening.
- The owner of Adam's 99 cents store at Lombard and Leavitt wants to relate to the city planners that speeding traffic in front of his store has resulted in three accidents at the intersection within the last year. One of the out of control cars actually ran into his storefront. He would like planners to consider traffic calming solutions for Lombard Street.
- Signal timing on Greely (Portland to Adidas). Greely green time at Adidas is too short in am commute.
- I would like to have a direct bus to downtown. When you have to transfer it adds a lot of time just riding the bus.
- Traffic signals on Leavitt at Lombard and Ivanhoe, or at least on some kind of traffic controls at these intersections during afternoon rush hours, such as temporary stop signs or a traffic control person, who could be a trained volunteer.
- More crosswalks for schools.
- Bridge maintenance.
- Four way traffic signals at Ivanhoe-Richmond and Willamette-Portland.
- Express bus to downtown and Sunday service by either the 17 or 40. Longer hours for the 16.
- There needs to be a safe passage through the pedestrian district from the south and southwest to James John Elementary School--at least one safe passage is essential. That means Ivanhoe Street should have a light, crosswalk of pedestrian crossing (flashing) sign lined up with the crosswalk on John Street.
- Express bus lines that go to Wilsonville/Salem areas.
- Less traffic, more pedestrian friendly.

Question# 1 Continued: What do you consider to be the three most important transportation issues for St. Johns?
• Traffic calming on N Amherst.
• Lighted bus stops. Direct or indirect lighting.
• Visibility at each intersection. Many large trucks park near intersections causing poor visibility for traffic entering Lombard/Polk & Lombard/Buchanan.
• Trucks must reroute away from town center and main street.
• Because of traffic volume, streets are not pedestrian friendly. Need to slow traffic.
• Work with local businesses to make sidewalks more interesting.
• What is Tri-Met doing to support businesses affected by I-MAX construction?
• More direct [bus] service from St. Johns to downtown Portland.
• Extend service hours on bus line #16.
• Promote bus line #16. Many folks don't know about it.
• What arrangements will be made for people to go to Vancouver when I-MAX opens and line #5 goes away?
• St. Johns Bridge. Absolutely must make this bridge safe for bikes and pedestrians! This thing is crazy! Why spend $30 million and leave it unsafe? This bridge is on the scenic route and is considered the major bike route through the area. We deserve a lawsuit for considering [rehab enough for this bridge].
• Need bus service to Pier Park Apartments (and the three others in area) via Fessenden and Columbia Boulevard.
• Also need [bus] service length of Columbia Boulevard to assist employees.
• Another St. Johns Bridge for truck traffic.
• No big trucks on Fessenden!
• No through trucks sign at St. Louis and Lombard.
• Simple speed limit signs on some of our neighborhood streets--Iris, Oswego, etc. Would be a big help hopefully! It seems that quite a few drivers in our neighborhood have forgotten that 25 mph is the law on residential streets. Thanks!
• Less, less! truck traffic on Ivanhoe and through St. Johns.

Question #2: What do you consider to be the three most important transportation issues for Lombard Street?

• Is there a way to get better pedestrian crossings--either add some, repaint them, etc.
• Also important is the fact that cars are traveling too fast on Lombard--they need to be slowed down!
• MAX or streetcar to St. Johns.
• Would like to see a smoother mass transit system, easier access to bus/MAX.
• Route heavy truck traffic away from Lombard.
• Buses running red lights.
• Center turn lanes from Portsmouth to Macrum on Lombard.

Question #2: What do you consider to be the three most important transportation issues for Lombard Street?
• One way couplet of Lombard and Central from railroad cut into central St. Johns.
• Columbia Blvd--Columbia way on-ramp. Make it one lane west from light past on ramp.
• Lombard is too narrow for the amount of traffic.
• Change Highway 30 bypass designate to Columbia Blvd. for easy through traffic.
• Make corner to corner walkways more visible. Walking friendly.
• Currently, too congested. I avoid driving down Lombard and use Willamette instead.
• Install traffic-activated sensors for left turn signals for existing left turn signals for Lombard traffic at Portsmouth Ave. At present there are long backups during rush hours especially for eastbound traffic.
• Also at this intersection [Lombard and Portsmouth Ave] the green cycle for Portsmouth is too long and should be added to the Lombard cycle.
• Traffic--no other neighborhood in the city would put up with heavy truck traffic running through their neighborhoods or next to their schools. Need another bridge across Willamette for trucks.
• Need speed bumps, trees, and boulevards so people don't assume all of St. Johns is a part of the Portland Raceway!
• Better pedestrian access to Willamette, along with a pedestrian-friendly downtown St. Johns. Bring back the street lamps and slow down the traffic.
• Signal timing on Lombard at Portsmouth. Lombard is too narrow for the amount of traffic it carries, especially with on street parking.
• Can we keep trailer trucks off Lombard Street? Columbia Blvd. is easily accessible.
• Light at Lombard and Portsmouth needs better timing/sensors. Traffic backs up approximately two blocks during afternoon rush.
• Street car service down Lombard.
• Connect downtown St. Johns with the new MAX line.
• Left turn refuge lanes for Lombard traffic at Wall Ave.
• Four lanes w/parking in turn lanes inside; outside lanes at intersections.
• Relieve auto traffic on Lombard by widening a parallel street or two lanes each way on Lombard.
• Current timing on Lombard is too short during 2-6pm, M-F.
• Can Tri-Met buses slow down on east end of Fessenden by elementary school? They come through at a pretty high speed for a residential area with many children.
• Streetscape needs to be enhanced to bring people in to local businesses: trees to provide shade, street lights closer to ground.
• Pedestrian crossings! We need more traffic lights and curb extensions to slow down traffic.
• Reduce amount of space given to car parking areas. Require bioswales and trees.
• Realize the open parking areas of downtown St. Johns as a shared parking area 24 hours--no specific tenant use, etc.
• City planning and PDOT are not encouraging parking for individual uses--shared parking would be more efficient and in some ways a new type--ped auto district. St. Johns downtown is an auto destination for many--West Hills, Sauvie Island, Linnton, etc.
Question #3: General Transportation Issues

- Additional stop signs needed on Houghton St. from Portsmouth to Wall, either in favor of Houghton or one or two cross streets.
- Tri-Met should have a direct line from St. Johns to downtown on all hours, not just peak. Need to get the cars off the street. I don't ride the bus any more because not convenient. Shouldn't have to go through NE and SE to get downtown. There are a lot of retired/elderly people who don't want to keep transferring--should just go directly. Currently only runs directly on commuter hours.
- How about making planning maps with local landmarks to help people spot and recall local issues?
- Build industrial/trucks only bridge to keep dangerous and destructive trucks off the St. Johns Bridge.
- Long term: new Fremont Bridge needed.
- Trucks aren't allowed on Ivanhoe but they come anyway. Need better enforcement.
- Median down Smith Street is stupid and a total waste of money.
- Streets are paved that don't need it and others need it but they don't pave those.
- Need bus service for St. Johns & Portsmouth neighborhoods along Columbia Blvd.
- Some form of traffic control at Lombard & St. Johns. Cars speed through the "S" curve on Lombard and are hard to see and dodge coming off St. Johns. My solution is to take Smith/Central/Leonard to St. Louis but this causes more traffic on these residential streets.
- Drop St. Johns Bridge to two lanes--add bikeway and wider sidewalks.

Question #4: Map Exercise  Consider the places where the transportation issues surface most often and identify the locations of concern.

General Comments on the Map Exercise

- Establish a maximum 20 mph speed limit in St. Johns town center
- Rework the St. Johns [bridge]
- Bike trail needed along greenway--trail should extend to cove--N. Edgewater.
- Two way traffic on N Philadelphia and N. Ivanhoe
- Repair/rework the intersection of N. Philadelphia and Ivanhoe
- Remove the ugly fencing on N. Willamette over railroad.
- Dangerous intersection at N. St. Johns/Lombard/Jersey due to industrial traffic from St. Johns turn onto N. Lombard.
- N Baltimore/Syracuse (concern about seniors at this intersection)
- N Houghton/Wall

Traffic controls or calming needed at following areas:

- N Richmond/Ivanhoe (4 responses)
- N Charleston/Jersey
- N Willamette Blvd.
- N Richmond/Ivanhoe
- N Charleston/Jersey
- N Willamette Blvd.
Crosswalks needed or concern about crossing noted at the following:

- N St. Louis/Ivanhoe
- N Charleston/Fessenden
- N Leavitt/Leonard
- N Leavitt/Ivanhoe
- N Leavitt/Kellogg

Traffic light needed at the following locations:

- University of Portland entrance (Portsmouth/Willamette?)
- Peninsula Crossing trail at Lombard (3 responses)

Better street lighting needed:

- Lombard and Wall

Sight distance problems:

- N Columbia Way/N Columbia Blvd (travelling east on Columbia Way ramp, merging to N Columbia Blvd (2 responses)

St. Johns Bridge comments:

- Improve pedestrian crossing (3 responses).
- Improve bicycle crossing (3 responses).
- Local access only.
Question# 5: What are your three most frequent destinations in St. Johns? What are the qualities that attract you to these places?

- Fred Meyer, St. Johns Pub, Riteaid
- Library, St. Johns Hardware, Vinyl Resting Place
- Businesses available to the community.
- Looking forward to seeing a day care center on Lombard.
- Safeway (across the street from my house), Peninsula Fred Meyer (nice deli food), Salvation Army Store (cheap items), post office on Ivanhoe (to mail letters), Dairy Queen (one dollar chocolate cones).
- John St. Cafe, St. Johns Pub, post office (good service, convenient location, great food, stamps)
- Public library, Tulip Bakery, barber shop
- Fred Meyer (variety/convenience), Safeway (on my way home, open all hours), Our Daily Bread (excellent food/prices/staff, best place in town!)
- Fred Meyer on Interstate, Mexican Place on Lombard, St. Johns Hardware (True Value Hardware)
- Library (books and internet), John St. Cafe (good food), post office (mail packages), Cathedral Park (music festivals)
- True Value Hardware [St. Johns Hardware], St. Johns Library, Blockbuster, St. Johns Pub, John St. Cafe. I want a Thai restaurant!
- Safeway, St. Johns post office, St. Johns Hardware
- St. Johns boat ramp, Peninsula Fred Meyer, West Coast Health Club
- John St. Cafe, Towers, bank

- Safeway (close by, can walk there), Cathedral Park/St. Johns Bridge (most beautiful bridge and park in Portland), St. Johns Pub (close by, ok food & prices, unpretentious atmosphere, great live music)
- James John School, Safeway
- My office, John St. Cafe, dry cleaner
- Post office (convenient, local), Dad's (inexpensive, relaxing), several local shops, i.e. hardware, library, Safeway
- John St. Cafe (great food and atmosphere, friendly staff, great location), St. Johns Pub (same as cafe), public library, also Starbucks, post office, Super Burrito Express
- Social services available to the St. Johns community (Loaves and Fishes, YWCA programs for seniors & families, heating help, churches in St. Johns, library, schools).
- Cathedral Park, Kelly Pt. Park, Roosevelt High track
- John St. Cafe, Starbucks, Books, etc (bookstore)
- Starbucks, John St. Cafe, St. Johns Pub, Safeway (need another grocery store such as Nature's, Trader Joe's, etc), post office, Riteaid
- Library, Blockbuster Video, Starbucks
- St. Johns Village (just like to go to the local village and support local business), Fred Meyer (proximity), Cathedral Park (beauty)
- St. Johns Cafe (Jamie's), Fred Meyer, record store next to the St. Johns Cafe (can't remember name)
**Question# 6: What are your three most frequent destinations on Lombard Street? What are the qualities that attract you to these places?**

- Les Schwab Auto Center, gas station on se corner Lombard & Portsmouth, Chapman's Auto Repair
- Gas station/carwash, Nicola's Restaurant, Fred Meyer
- Snooty Cats (coffee), US Bank on Emerald (withdrawals), Fred Meyer (food)
- Nicola's, Fishwife, Czaba's (independent restaurants with good food and prices).
  I do not like chain, junk food businesses, too many "auto" related businesses, too many taverns.
- Getting to the St. Johns Bridge, getting to US Bank, getting to and from my office at Lombard and Wall, Fred Meyer
- Gas, dentist, Weir's Bike Shop
- Fred Meyer, The Fishwife, Ying Ying
- Onion Patch (good food), El Gordito Pandaria (good food), Les Schwab & St. Johns Auto (car care close to home)
- Ying Ying, Snooty Cats, Papa Johns (they have food)
- Very, very sad Kienows is gone!!! We didn't need another Walgreens!
- Away--I avoid it when I can, dry cleaner (on the way to work), Fred Meyer (only when I have to).
- Sterling Savings, US Bank

**Question# 7: Share your ideas on how to enhance the commercial areas of St. Johns and Lombard Street.**

- No more junk stores.
- More upscale restaurants.
- Bookstore (Powell's annex?)
- Upscale grocery store (Trader Joe's, Nature's)
- Fewer bars/strip clubs.
- More restaurants (maybe a Thai restaurant or a vegetarian restaurant).
- Women's clothing store.
- Upscale grocery store like Trader Joe's.
- A nice clean Safeway.
- An upscale grocery store, e.g. Trader Joe's, Nature's
- Thai restaurant
- Bookstore.
- "Spruce up" the storefronts.
- Add more trendy places like Starbucks to attract citizens to town area.
- Johns St. Cafe is a nice addition.
- We need a Jiffy Lube in St. Johns!
- How about adding a Bi-mart?
- No more car dealers!
Rezoning.

Question #7 Continued: Share your ideas on how to enhance the commercial areas of St. Johns and Lombard Street.

- Better manage the 24 hour drive-thru businesses: zoning, restricted hours, sound barriers. Thank you!
- Well-managed and maintained grocery store in central St. Johns.
- More restaurants.
- Beautification project in central St. Johns.
- Better restaurants and stores--not just fast food.
- Clothing stores that are more affordable.
- Fewer thrift stores--we have enough.
- Business people in St. Johns don't have competition so they can charge whatever they want.
- Need Bible book store in St. Johns.
- We need mixed use development. Housing above storefronts, rezone CG to mixed use and commercial storefront.
- No more drive throughs.
- Emulate block on Lombard between Fiske and Jordan--the RIGHT idea.
- Need more 3-4 story housing in the commercial district and along Lombard. Not enough residents to support existing businesses!
- More family restaurants, good food.
- Less fast food restaurants.
- Less auto stores/lots.
- Blockbuster needs competition.
- Utilize all vacant buildings in the downtown core area.
- More mixed use with storefront improvements up along street, parking in rear.
- More pocket parks and patios to invite people to stay and shop, eat, enjoy.
- More decoration along sidewalks--bricks, fountains.
- Lower lighting for pedestrians. More lighting (old fashioned street lamps).
- Another grocery store.
- Restaurants.
- Have a branch post office on Lombard--maybe in or near Walgreens. It would be handy for elderly people especially.
- Need a new grocery store.
- Improve the storefronts--they look junky.
- Sidewalks should be swept--they're messy especially 8703 N Lombard.
- Music store.
- Hip pubs/cafes.
- Grocery store.
- Clothing stores!
- Make it a requirement to have ALL broken windows FIXED.
- Have curb cuts on every corner for mobility impaired people.
- Other grocery stores than Fred Meyer and Safeway.
- Need to have some nice family dining facilities.
- Clean up old town storefronts!
• Light the Peninsula loop.

Question# 7 Continued: Share your ideas on how to enhance the commercial areas of St. Johns and Lombard Street.

• Provide incentives for possible store owners who may lease/rent those vacant buildings--such as low interest construction loans.
• Provide businesses in these buildings that would employ local residents.
• Twinkle lights in the trees in front of stores.
• I'd like it to be easier to cross Lombard and Ivanhoe when you're going along Leavitt and John (driving). It's dangerous. You can't see around cars to pass through the interesection.
• Rent the vacant buildings with desirable businesses.
• Get rid of the strip club--Shagnasty's.
• Make the downtown area more pedestrian friendly.
• Get upscale grocery store.
• Upscale restaurants (like John St. Cafe which is excellent).
• Trees, plants, clean streets, etc. in entire downtown area.
• Refurbish St. Johns Theater.
• Make it a desired place to come.
• Bring back street lamps!
• Bring back pedestrians! People like to walk in St. Johns, why not make it pleasant?
• Think "NW 23rd Ave."
• Make it festive--Xmas lights, Halloween lights, themed flags, banners, lights, etc.
• Redo storefronts.

• Angled parking in downtown/congested areas.
• Require a minimum standard of commercial storefront that owners would have to meet, in terms of signage, repair, etc.
• Home Depot or similar in the area: it is awkward to have to go to Jantzen Beach for materials for upkeep/improvement on an older house.
• New grocery store.
• Improved storefronts (provide incentives to bring in new businesses)
• Better grocery store.
• Good neighborhood restaurants.
• More viable businesses in downtown St. Johns.
• Eliminate some of the bars, discount stores, etc. Fix up /restore storefronts. Attract more upscale business. Stand firm against any more parole board, prisons and low-cost health clinics. Gives St. Johns a "wrong side of the tracks" feel.
• Would like to see St. Johns attract the type of retail/restaurant businesses that will complement the small town character. Would like to see franchised and large corporate businesses discouraged from downtown St. Johns.
• We need a natural foods market.
• We need a breakfast restaurant on Lombard.
• Independent book stores (i.e. Looking Glass, Annie Bloom's).
• More good restaurants (i.e. East Indian, Greek, Japanese, or Russian cuisine).
Question #7 Continued: Share your ideas on how to enhance the commercial areas of St. Johns and Lombard Street.

- A Goodwill outlet would be great.
- An organic produce store.
- Trader Joe’s.
- Nightlife! Need places to eat, listen to music that are not topless! Rezone so topless joints cannot move into our neighborhood. It’s legal--other cities have done it, been taken to court, and won!
- Prohibit barbed wire on top of fences.
- Rezone to allow neighborhood commercial uses and less auto-oriented uses.
- Subsidize artistic endeavors. Artists bring renewal.
- Restrict franchise business growth.
- Flower baskets on allowable electric poles.
- Have resting area at Fiske and Lombard on church corner by Benson bubbler.
- Restrict franchise growth.
- Keep area clean--it’s ugly.
- "Hearts" has to go--let’s keep this kind of place out of our area. NO NUDE DANCING.
- Better and more good places to dine out.
- Better grocery store.
- I’d like to see more restaurants.
- Economic activity; more grocery stores, a Nature’s or at least one upscale grocer; more small businesses providing greater variety of services.
- More diverse business.
- Change zoning for all future commercial development along Lombard from Fiske to Portsmouth to storefront commercial ONLY!
- Need bigger, better garden and hardware store.
- Work some short-term "doable" items into a plan or plan process.
- Get rid of Blockbuster and create a more "historic" town feel.
- Need good grocery stores.

Question #8: What do you like about the housing in this area? (design, size, condition, availability, price, density, etc.)

- Diversity of houses.
- Mix of sizes, shapes, age and income.
- Price!
- The last affordable housing in Portland.
- Larger lots.
- Value for what you get in a house.
- Transportation needs are convenient.
- Accessibility to downtown, NW, Forest Park.
- Don’t divide! Big lots!!!
- Great to have owner-occupied, affordable housing.

Question #8 Continued: What do you like about the housing in this area? (design, size, condition, availability, price, density, etc.)
• More land/larger lot.
• Old houses.
• Diversity of community.
• Larger lots.
• Older houses.
• Has a neighborhood atmosphere--parks, trails, river.
• Funky buildings.
• The big lots and affordability.
• Still affordable.
• Lots of "fix-its."
• Some big houses.

All contribute to housing and where people want to live (reasonable prices, diversity in the community, Safeway, post office, gas stations, sub sandwiches, eating establishment, parks, fitness centers).
• Small, sturdy houses that are good for singles, older couples.
• Some double lots.
• Few "snout" style houses.
• Most homes face the street.
• Older homes.
• Courtyard apartments on Lombard.
• Affordable housing.
• Price.

Question# 9: What would you like to see changed about the housing in this area?

• Better quality control over design of new construction.
• Less multi-dwelling housing.
• Stringent design standards for new development.
• I'm not strictly opposed to rowhouses, but the designs that are getting built in St. Johns are causing the streets to be clogged with excess parked cars.
• No more rowhouses.
• Too many garages built with attached houses (snout houses).
• Building inspectors need to make sure buildings are built well--too many poorly built apartments.
• More mixed use, rowhouses.
• More variety in sizes, 3-4 bedroom.
• Fewer snout houses.
• Less apartments.
• More parks.
• More mixed use along Lombard and in St. Johns town center.
• Change zoning near Cathedral Park to encourage more residential.
• Transform the industrial land near river into residential and a riverfront trail to Willamette Cove.
• Promote infill and granny flats.
• Quality design residential.
• Change zoning of some industrial along river to residential.
Question# 9 Continued: What would you like to see changed about the housing in this area?

- Clean up storefronts.
- Apartment complexes are okay but some have problems—residents knocking down the fence and throwing garbage.
- Add street lights/trees.
- Better quality shops.
- Strive for improving the historic aspect of St. Johns.
- Get riff-raff off the streets.
- No more rowhouses.
- Too many tract houses; will always keep values low and number of renters high.
- Too many houses not kept up, trashed.
- Too many boats, dead cars, mobile homes allowed in front of homes for long periods of time.
- Too much ugly aluminum or vinyl siding sold to unsuspecting deep-pocketed folks in St. Johns.
- Not enough homes with garages.
- Too many ugly additions that get allowed. Zoning laws should prevent this.
- Need stricter design criteria for new homes—slapdash developments are destroying the character of our old St. Johns neighborhoods.
- We would like design controls for new construction and standards of decor to blend with existing neighborhoods.
- Need design standards to retain historic character.
- Change from heavy industrial to more neighborhood friendly zoning.
- Less vacant lots or for rent signs.
- Yards need to be kept up.
- Need more 2-3 story row housing and nice apartments on Lombard.
- Buildings painted.
- Condos that cut off view of the river—to too many of them.
- Should have fewer apartments.
- I would like to see the "loop" cleaned up. Too much broken glass. Very poor lighting.
- Not enough good housing.
- Opportunities for the elderly citizens who lived here their entire lives and want to stay near family.
- Better street lighting on Stockton.
- Good quality, multiuse housing and restaurants
- Need more control of upkeep private properties.
- Rental properties need to maintain better landscaping and housing appearance.
- More multidwelling residential on Lombard.
- Aim for 75% home ownership with demographic mix of income, heritage/race and age.
- Make multifamily housing in same design as single family homes (hidden density).
- Doesn't like small lots with too many housing units.
- Doesn't like narrow, three story rowhouses. Not compatible with single dwelling.
- Rezone existing general commercial and storefront commercial to include high density multidwelling structures—this would encourage more people moving into the area because of the established transportation (bus) nodes within this corridor.
- Renovation of some existing rundown housing—including single family houses as well as the apartments.
Question# 10: What do you see as the benefits of nearby industrial uses along the river?

- Keeps trucks off the roads if you can export from industries to ships on the river.
- Family wage jobs.
- Tax base.
- None! Area from UP bluff to Cathedral Park is ready to be part of neighborhood again. Industry has long since moved from most of this area.
- Makes for a "working town" identity.
- Can live close to work (but unfortunately this isn't really the case).
- Keeps expensive overpriced condos from taking over and bringing in jerks with BMWs.
- Shipping—by having a major shipping port, the fresh water keeps barnacles off the bottom of ships.
- Truck traffic.
- Commuters that speed through our neighborhood.
- Industrial sites often don't bother to beautify their sites. What's wrong with a few trees and picking up debris?
- Constant diesel pollution.
- Constant gasoline pollution.
- Jobs for people in the community.
- Industrial businesses could/should be partners with community and city to build a pedestrian bike trail along river to connect with east side esplanade.
- Marina with nice restaurant and sloops for small boats.
- Really wide Willamette greenway with trail.
- School taxes.

Question# 11: Do you think existing vacant industrial sites should remain industrial? Why? If not, what uses do you envision?

- Vacant industrial sites should be kept up. Any environmental issues, i.e. underground tanks, need to be cleaned up. Costs to be recovered in final sale or lease.
- Having enhanced sites available will attract potential occupants and add to the aesthetic value to each neighborhood.
- Recreational uses would be better—hiking, picnicking, biking.
- Doesn't matter to me.
- No! Change zoning to residential.
- There are of course plenty of industrial sites along Lombard already. Although they are necessary, so is livability and especially, education. Would like to see a local library on one of these sites.
- Should combine with park, residential and small commercial, i.e. restaurants, curio shops, doctors offices, etc.
- North Beach of Willamette should be park space.
- Vacant land should be used for affordable, green sustainable projects.
Question# 11 Continued: Do you think existing vacant industrial sites should remain industrial? Why? If not, what uses do you envision?

- No, should be converted to greenbelt/park land or to low or medium density commercial.
- Make it agricultural for folks to use to grow their own food.
- Hotel?!
- Should be rezoned to allow for recreational/natural resource enhancement.
- Clean up sites and put to other uses, some single story housing and commercial.
- Create recreational facilities and more spaces for outdoor theater (not amphitheater) that is neighborhood compatible.
- Better access to Willamette River with shops, eating, movie theater.
- No. I see bike path park.
- No! Industrial blocks above water lab should be housing with park along river.
- I am concerned about increases in traffic due to development of vacant industrial land.
- Industrial sites along river should become park/open space areas with connecting trails.
- Should not remain industrial. Pedestrian/bike walkways.
- Should not remain industrial. Parks.
- Should not remain industrial. Youth center.
- Should not remain industrial. Meeting center.
- Should not remain industrial. Houseboats.
- Should not remain industrial. Housing--land purchased by neighborhood to keep housing multi-income.
- Should not remain industrial. Farms.
- Should not remain industrial. Public market. (2 responses)
- Should not remain industrial. Elders center.

Question# 12: What do you consider to be the most important Willamette River or riverfront issues?

- New trail from Willamette Blvd. at N. Bridgehead on RR cut to Willamette Cove (40 mile loop)
- Improve safety at Pier Park.
- Keep the Willamette River clean.
- Make Willamette clean enough for swimming (at Cathedral Park)
- Restore Pier Park to what it used to be (about the 80s)--needs to be maintained, lighting improved; irrigation systems updated.
- Need garbage cans at George Park (lots of trash!)
- New play structures at George Park.
- Clean North Portland Road--bike path.
- Open connection through wastewater treatment plant (bike path)
- Continue bike path at North Portland Road across Columbia Slough Bridge.
- Bike trail along former Marine Dr. needs to be repaved/maintained.
Question 13: What natural and recreational areas do you use?
- Cathedral Park (bike/relax/enjoy the river)
- Columbia Park (walk dog, walk, tennis, pool)
- Pier Park (bike, walk dogs). Too dark/dangerous.
- Cathedral Park (boat dock, fishing, water ski)
- Small park in University Park
- Peninsula Crossing Trail
- Cathedral Park (concerts)
- Smith and Bybee
- Kelley Point (2 responses)
- Columbia Park (grandparents raising grandchildren picnic)
- Jazz Festival
- Take lunch break at Cathedral Park.
- Forest Park
- St. Johns Park
- George Park
- Peninsula Crossing Trail
- University of Portland “trail” to base of bluff, then north on railroad tracks to Willamette Cove

Question 14: What natural and recreational areas do you think need improvement? What’s missing?
- Access to the river from St. Johns
- Connect eastbank esplanade all the way to Cathedral Park
- Access to Willamette Cove
- Directly connect Penn Crossing Trail to Smith and Bybee
- Complete bike/ped trail around lake
- Connect Penn Crossing Trail to Willamette River
- Opportunities for community art (human scale, community organized)
- "Inviting" access to the Columbia River (across from Hayden Island)
- More playgrounds
- Open space/plaza along Main Street (in Portsmouth neighborhood at Fiske and Lombard)
- Connect Pier Park to Smith and Bybee--when?
- Create trail from railroad lines from Cathedral Park to University of Portland
- Major league baseball stadium in North Portland
- Cathedral Park needs a permanent stage
- Improving the Willamette Blvd and Lombard bridges that cross the railroad cut
- North Beach and Willamette Cove--future parks
- Need more pocket parks integrated into commercial areas
- "Historic" park with interpretive signage/plaques, respecting history of area
- Parks where kids can play--sand boxes/fountains/building blocks
- Ditto above!
- Complete unfinished portions of 40-mile loop

Question 15: If you had one wish for your community, what would it be?
• Post office substation at Walgreen's--Peninsula and Lombard.
• Keep the small service businesses here, like St. Johns Hardware and E & M Appliances. Good quality customer service.
• No more low cost housing!
• Post office hours are great! Good people, too!
• New hotel or motel near town center or B & Bs
• Love to see an all-you-can-eat place like Old Country Buffet. Nearest one is a whole half hour away.
• Wish it was easier to cross Lombard and Ivanhoe.
• I wish I could go swimming in the Willamette River at Cathedral Park.
• A community center that would be accessible for all ages from birth to older adults. Intergenerational.
• Get rid of crime, broken windows and give the police jobs on every five blocks.
• Require county, city or state buildings to pay their share of property tax.
• St. Johns has a great atmosphere--friendly people and good for shopping--good prices.
• Get trendy shops
• More updated shops, shoe shops.
• More restaurants--variety, good seafood/salad.
• Another grocery store.
• Apt upstairs/retail/mix use.
• Zoning at Cathedral Park change from commercial to residential.
• Senior housing--transition!!!!
• Strengthen retail strip.
• Have childcare/child input at events like this.
• Mixed residential and neighborhood serving businesses.
• Zoning to eliminate car-dependent businesses.
• Develop design standards to create "human scale" streetscapes, i.e. 1) street lights that are lower and welcome pedestrian foot traffic in evening 2) awnings that extend the width of sidewalks.
• Allow for creative business signage to attract residents to local small businesses (ordinance change? linking signage requirements to size of business?)
• Good department store.
• Olive Garden.
• More attractive places for young adults to hang out.
• Clean up (dirty)--improve store fronts.
• Want an all-you-can-eat place in St. Johns like Old Country Buffet.
• Make it easier to cross Lombard and Ivanhoe Streets when you're on a side street like Leavitt or John.
• Safeway is moving. Need a grocery store north of Lombard (because Lombard and Ivanhoe are so hard to cross).
• Cathedral and Columbia Parks are gorgeous.
• Need quality restaurants, stores, movie theater.
• Give incentives for existing businesses to invest in improvements.

Question# 15 Continued: If you had one wish for your community, what would it be?
• ADA requirements need to be met.
• More green spaces.
• Bike trails.
• We need a natural foods grocery (i.e. Nature's, Whole Foods).
• We need easy to obtain business loans.
• No more auto-oriented businesses on Lombard!!!!!!
• Change zoning requirements for future commercial development between Fiske and Portsmouth to storefront commercial.
• Fewer auto oriented businesses on Lombard.
• More neighborhood-serving businesses on Lombard.
• More multi-unit residential on Lombard.
• Safer/more pedestrian crossings on Lombard.
• A Thai restaurant.
• Expand plan area to include Pier Park and Smith & Bybee Lakes.
• Concerned about increased density of low-income residents in new Columbia Villa.
• Grocery store! At least improve Peninsula Fred Meyer.
• Need to finish trail on Columbia Blvd. between Portsmouth and Chautauqua Avenues.
• Need to move fir trees along Columbia Blvd.

• City of Portland hasn't spent any money on St. Johns--other places have gotten funding.
• Develop the McCormick & Baxter property into a publically owned park and recreation area with river access, hike and bike trails, and facilities similar to the Delta Park area.
• I would also like to see a natural foods grocery and/or a Trader Joe's.
• No jail!
• I would like to see a natural foods grocery here. I now drive to NW (Food Front) or NE Nature's but would shop here if there was one (natural food store) here. Please.
• This is lower priority than others' wishes but I wish the St. Johns Bridge had lights on it like SF's Bay Bridge. Oh I'd be so thrilled with that! I live three blocks from it. Plus I wish it was more pleasant to walk across. The noise is loud and you feel like you're going to get it by a truck.
• Does this community have an inordinately high number of low cost housing projects? Caution with any increases.
• Police policies need to be reviewed regarding high speed pursuits and sirens down Lombard. It sends a message of fear and insecurity, especially when there is little or no feedback about the level of crime or urgency to the response.
B. Community Comment Survey Summary

As of November 20, 2001, ninety Comment Forms have been returned; the majority were completed by open house attendees on October 18, 2001. Survey results are provided below, with the most common responses highlighted. The percentages listed are approximate. For some of the questions, the totals are greater than 100 percent because respondents could select multiple answers.

Do you live, work, or own property in the plan area?
- Live = 70%
- Own Property = 66%
- Live and Own Property = 58%
- Work = 7%

Does the plan area meet your needs for shopping, dining, and other services?
- No = 79%
- Yes = 18%

What percentage of your shopping, dining, appointments, and other errands take place outside the plan area?
- Over 75% = 38%
- 25% - 50% = 27%
- 50% - 75% = 22%
- Less than 25% = 11%

Mark all that apply: The housing in and around the plan area meets my needs in terms of …
- Affordability = 59%
- Size/type = 24%
- Availability = 23%
- Quality = 18%
- None of the above (or no response) = 16%
- All of the above = 14%

Community Comment Survey Continued
Do the parks and other recreational activities in or near the plan area meet your needs?
Yes = 72%
No = 26%

Are there convenient ways to access the Willamette River from the plan area?
Yes = 42%
No = 34%

How often do you travel to a destination within the plan area?
Daily = 57%
Weekly = 26%
2 – 3 Times per Week = 10%
Monthly = 4%

How do you usually get to destinations within the plan area?
Drive = 83%
Walk = 47%
Bike = 12%
Bus = 6%

What are your three most significant transportation concerns within the plan area?
Street Environment (trees, benches, sidewalks, signs, lighting, etc.) = 18%
Traffic Congestion = 17%
Pedestrian Access and Safety = 15%
Traffic Speeding = 14%
Bicycle Access and Safety = 10%
Parking Availability = 10%
Bus Service = 8%
Community Comment Survey Continued

**What are your top three priorities for transportation improvements in the plan area?**

- Improved Lighting = 16%
- Additional Street Trees/Landscaping = 15%
- Decreased Traffic = 15%
- Increased Pedestrian Safety = 15%
- More Crosswalks = 9%
- Additional Parking Spaces = 7%
- Increased Bus Service = 7%
- More/Improved Bus Shelters = 5%
- More Bike Racks = 2%
- (Other = 10%)

**Are there places in the plan area where you feel that safety is an issue?**

- Yes = 57%
- No = 24%

*If so, where?*

- **58% of responses related to transportation issues:** Lombard was mentioned most often, along with a number of intersections. All travel modes were referenced; areas of concerns for bicycle, pedestrian and vehicular safety were mentioned.
- **42% of responses related to personal safety issues:** The most commonly mentioned location was downtown St. Johns. Some of the other locations included Columbia Villa, Pier Park, and the Peninsula Loop.

**What three things do you most enjoy about the plan area?**

- Neighborhood Character = 28%
- Geographic Location = 21%
- Natural Beauty = 21%
- Auto Accessibility = 8%
- Housing Options = 7%
- Recreational Facilities = 4%
- Shops/Services/Restaurants = 4%
- Cultural Events = 2%
- (Other = 3%)
What are your top three priorities for improvements in the plan area?

Shopping/Services Options = 19%
Historic Preservation = 10%
Crime Prevention = 10%
Litter/Graffiti Removal = 8%
Auto Access/Mobility/Safety = 6%
Pedestrian Access/Mobility/Safety = 6%
Crosswalks = 5%
Landscaping = 5%
Lighting = 5%
River Access = 5%
Environmental Protection = 4%
Bicycle Access/Mobility/Safety = 3%
Housing Options = 3%
Recreational Opportunities = 3%
Schools = 2%
Social Services = 2%
(Other = 2%)

Is there anything else you would like to tell us?

58% provided additional comments. By far the most commonly mentioned concern was the need to “maintain and attract clean, updated businesses.” A number of respondents said that they love the area and believe it has great potential. Other comments related to concerns about low income and dense housing, congestion, the desire for a new grocery store, and the need for pedestrian and bicycle improvements. Some respondents noted their excitement and appreciation for the fact that work on the St. Johns/Lombard Plan has begun.
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Existing Conditions
1. Introduction

What Is the St. Johns/Lombard Plan?

The St. Johns/Lombard planning process is designed to explore the features that make St. Johns and Lombard Street great places. The process will also look at issues affecting the area now, and develop strategies to increase the long-term vitality of the area so that they become better places in the future. The process entails a comprehensive study that will examine and analyze land use, transportation, economic conditions, infrastructure and community facilities and services in the study area. Ultimately, strategies will be adopted to implement the community’s vision for the area as well as the Region 2040-based town center and main street concepts.

Part of the planning process includes an evaluation of the existing Portland Zoning Code and Comprehensive Plan map designations, and a recommendation for amendments to promote compact, efficient, mixed-use, transit-supportive, and pedestrian friendly development. Transportation planning activities will include circulation and congestion management analyses. Strategies for improving transportation access and circulation for all travel modes—pedestrian, bike, transit and auto—will be developed, as will strategies for balancing parking needs. A broad-based public participation process and program of coordinated technical/interested agency involvement is in progress.

Final plan products include an implementation strategies report and a proposed St. Johns/Lombard Plan that includes proposed map and text amendments to the Zoning Code and Comprehensive Plan. The Portland City Council will review the proposals for adoption.

Why Plan for St. Johns and Lombard Street Now?

St. Johns and Lombard Street are important places in Portland’s urban fabric with great historic value and many community amenities. Both places are valued by the community and have the potential to become even more vibrant places in the coming years.

St. Johns and Lombard Street are highlighted in the Region 2040 Growth Concept for their importance within the city and the region, based on location, accessibility, and existing development patterns. The Region 2040 Growth Concept designates Lombard as a ‘main street’ and St. Johns as a ‘town center.’ The designations mean that the areas are appropriate for mixed-use development and greater transportation facility and service options.

(See Chapter 2, Policy Parameters, for more information.)
Project Boundary

The St. Johns/Lombard plan area includes the St. Johns town center (downtown St. Johns, the hillside of Cathedral Park, and the Willamette riverfront), and North Lombard Street from Columbia Park to downtown St. Johns. [See Figure 1 below]

The area encompasses parts of the Friends of Cathedral Park, the Community of Portsmouth, St. Johns, and University Park neighborhoods. Together, these four neighborhoods are often referred to as the ‘peninsula.’

Map 1: St. Johns/Lombard Plan Boundary
Purpose of this Report

The information compiled in this report will guide the development and implementation strategies of the *St. Johns/Lombard Plan*.

This report includes information on existing land use, demographics, transportation system, and community facilities and services in the St. Johns/Lombard plan area. It also includes information on policies that will influence the planning process, economic and market conditions, relevant planning issues, and community organizations serving the area.

Planning Process

The Bureau of Planning initiated the *St. Johns/Lombard Plan* in the fall of 2001. The process includes a citizen and technical agency participation program that will be ongoing throughout the entire project and will parallel specific project phases, tasks and products. The project process is represented graphically in Figure 2 on the next page.

The first phase of the project focuses on collecting information about existing conditions in the study area. A vision and design phase overlaps the existing conditions work, and brings together members of the community and technical experts to discuss ideas about how the area should develop in the future. This phase of the project will culminate in development of an urban design concept at community workshops that will draw participation from a broad spectrum of interested parties.

After this, the proposed urban design concept will be analyzed to determine what types of opportunities and constraints to development the proposal raises. Then, a further round of analysis and input from citizen and technical advisors will take place and strategies will be developed to implement the preferred concepts. These strategies will be included in the proposed *St. Johns/Lombard Plan* that will be reviewed by the Portland Planning Commission in the summer of 2003. The Planning Commission’s recommended *St. Johns/Lombard Plan* will be presented to City Council for adoption in the fall of 2003.
Figure 1: Planning Process Flow Chart

Public Outreach
Kickoff Open House
Visioning Workshop
Neighborhood Walks
Urban Design Workshops
Community Meetings
Fall 2001 - Winter 2003

Review Concept Plan
Community Workshops
Spring 2003

Develop Concept Plan

Develop and Publish Draft Plan

Planning Commission
Public Hearing
Spring/Summer 2003

Develop and Publish Planning Commission Recommendations

City Council
Public Hearing
Summer/Fall 2003


**Report Structure**

The following chapters are included in this report:

- **Chapter 1, Introduction**, provides an overview of the *St. Johns/Lombard Plan* and outlines the structure of this report;

- **Chapter 2, Policy Parameters**, describes the planning and policy framework that guides the development of the *St. Johns/Lombard Plan*;

- **Chapter 3, History and Urban Form**, contains a brief summary of the historical highlights of the St. Johns/Lombard plan area and lists the historic resources in the area;

- **Chapter 4, Demographics**, contains demographic information on the characteristics of the people that live within the four neighborhoods included in the St. Johns/Lombard plan area;

- **Chapter 5, Land Use**, provides a narrative description of the current existing land uses and a discussion of the current *Comprehensive Plan* map designations for the plan area;

- **Chapter 6, Housing**, contains demographic information on housing characteristics within the four neighborhoods included in the St. Johns/Lombard plan area;

- **Chapter 7, Transportation**, discusses transportation facilities in the study area and includes information on traffic volumes, roadway geometry and classifications, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, parking, accident data, and transit routes and ridership [under separate cover];

- **Chapter 8, Economic Conditions**, reviews and analyzes the prevailing demographic and economic conditions in the St. Johns/Lombard plan area and the extended neighborhood trade area [under separate cover];

- **Chapter 9, Environment**, describes the Willamette River waterfront and upland environmental resources in and around the St. Johns/Lombard plan area;

- **Chapter 10, Public Facilities and Services**, provides information on the types of community facilities and community services provided within the study area. It includes a narrative description of parks, water systems, wastewater and stormwater systems, public schools, and public services such as libraries and community health services;
Chapter 11, **Community Organizations**, describes many of the community organizations available to individuals, families, seniors, youth, and business owners who live and/or work in the study area. Many of this organizations will help implement the *St. Johns/Lombard Plan*;

Chapter 12, **Previous Plans and Studies**, describes the planning efforts that were previously undertaken in the study area and provides a historical context for the current plan process; and
2. Policy Parameters

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the policy framework that guides the St. Johns/Lombard Plan. This framework can be thought of as a hierarchy in which plans for smaller jurisdictions or geographic areas must comply with those for larger jurisdictions. Planning for the St. Johns/Lombard area must be consistent with the City of Portland’s adopted plans and policies, which must be consistent with regional plans and policies, which in turn must be consistent with state goals and related regulations. A summary of the major rules, plans and policies that guide the St. Johns/Lombard Plan are described in Figure 2.
**State Goals and Rules**

Through Senate Bill 100, the 1973 Oregon Legislative Assembly established the system currently in place for regulating land use in the state of Oregon. The Senate Bill enacted Chapter 197 of the *Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS)*, which requires each city and county in Oregon to adopt and maintain comprehensive plans and land use regulations that meet state standards. (The ORS has been amended by several subsequent legislatures.) The legislature delegated the authority to establish the state standards to the Oregon Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC). This commission adopted standards called the ‘statewide planning goals.’

**Oregon’s Statewide Planning Goals**

Oregon’s ‘statewide planning goals’ constitute the framework for a statewide land use planning program. There are nineteen of these goals, incorporating state policies on land use, resource management, economic development, and citizen involvement.

There are four broad categories of goals, within which specific topics are addressed. The first group deals with the planning process, and contains Goal 1, Citizen Involvement, and Goal 2, Land Use Planning. A second group, the conservation goals (3 – 8, 13,15), covers topics such as farmlands, forestlands, and natural resources. The third group is made up of goals that relate to development (e.g., housing, transportation, and public facilities and services); this includes goals 9 – 12 and 14. The fourth group, containing goals 16 – 19, relates to coastal resources.

Goals 1 and 2, and 5 through 15, apply to the City of Portland; the others apply to other geographic areas. Some of these goals are further explained by the administrative rules found in Division 14 of *Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR)*, which is published by the Secretary of State.

Oregon’s ‘statewide planning goals’ are achieved through local planning. State law requires each city and county to have a comprehensive plan and the zoning and land division ordinances needed to put that plan into effect.

Locally adopted comprehensive plans must be consistent with the statewide planning goals. The state’s Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) reviews plans for such consistency. When LCDC officially approves or ‘acknowledges’ a local government’s plan, it becomes the controlling document for land use in that area.

State law specifies that special districts and state agencies must conform to the same statewide planning laws that cities and counties must comply with. Further, special districts and state agencies are required to carry out their programs in accordance with acknowledged local plans. Oregon’s planning laws strongly emphasize coordination of planning. A city's plan, for example, must be
consistent with the related county plan, and vice versa. The programs of special districts and state agencies must be coordinated with local plans.

Comprehensive plans provide overall guidance for an area’s land use, economic development, and resource management. Each plan contains two main components:

- A body of data and information called the inventory or background report, describing a community’s resources and features. This must address all of the topics specified in the applicable statewide goals.
- The policy element that describes the community’s long range objectives and the intended means to achieve them. The policy element of each community’s plan is adopted by ordinance and has legal authority.

Local plans evolve as a result of two processes: plan amendment and periodic review. Plan amendments are map or text changes that occur as needed; they usually deal only with portions of a plan, specific geographic areas, or are based on special topics such as transportation studies. Periodic reviews are broad evaluations of an entire plan that occur every five to seven years. A plan may be modified extensively after such a review; Portland received final plan acknowledgement in 2000.

Local planning efforts, such as the *St. Johns/Lombard Plan*, are generally accompanied by a set of implementing measures—the two most common being zoning and land division ordinances. These are land use controls that every city and county in Oregon has adopted and periodically revises to help carry out plans and policies. The *St. Johns/Lombard Plan* will update Portland’s *Comprehensive Plan*, and may result in changes to the *Zoning Code* text and map for the plan area.

### State Transportation Planning Rule

The *Transportation Planning Rule* (TPR) expands on ‘Statewide Planning Goal 12, Transportation,’ by providing a framework for local actions to implement a more balanced approach in determining the need, financing, and use of transportation facilities. It is intended to foster the development of land use and transportation patterns that:

- reduce the number of vehicle miles traveled per capita,
- reduce overall reliance on the automobile,
- support types of development that are less auto-dependent, and
- encourage alternative modes of travel.

The *Transportation Planning Rule* mandates several steps by which local jurisdictions can reduce reliance on automobiles. The TPR sets a high standard for success, targeting vehicle miles traveled, an indicator of urban congestion and air pollution, for a per capita reduction of ten percent over twenty years, and a five percent additional reduction over thirty years.
To make this possible, the rule seeks a more formal connection between land use and transportation planning. Local jurisdictions are required to produce a Transportation System Plan (TSP) that provides a balanced, multimodal transportation system and determines the long range allocation of transportation resources in ways that benefit the desired transportation and land use outcomes. The TSP was completed in December 2002.

Areas addressed within the framework of the TSP include:

- expanding the city’s multimodal transportation by providing transportation choices,
- implementing the Region 2040 Growth Concept, and
- maintaining and improving the transportation system in an environmentally sustainable way.

The regional outgrowth of TPR implementation is likely to be seen in the form and style of future development. It will affect the current suburban development pattern most dramatically, by fostering a more efficient pattern of land use that offers more choices for accessibility, increased connections within and between neighborhoods, and a better mixing of uses closer to residences and workplaces.

**Metropolitan Housing Rule**

The purpose of this rule is to ensure the provision of adequate numbers of housing units and the efficient use of land within the metropolitan Portland urban growth boundary (UGB). It is also designed to provide greater certainty in the development process, which can lead to reduced housing costs.

The Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) created this administrative rule to further specify the requirements of ‘Statewide Planning Goal 10, Housing.’ The rule sets housing density and affordability targets as well as the ways local jurisdictions are required to implement them through the comprehensive planning process. The St. Johns/Lombard Plan must meet the following citywide requirements:

- designate sufficient buildable land to provide the opportunity for at least fifty percent of new residential units to be attached single family housing or multiple family housing, or justify an alternative percentage based on changing circumstances,
- consider the needs for manufactured housing and government assisted housing within the UGB in arriving at an allocation of housing types; and
- provide for an overall density of ten or more dwelling units per net buildable acre.
Regional Policies and Regulations

Metro is the directly elected regional government for the urbanized portions of Clackamas, Multnomah, and Washington Counties. In addition to maintaining numerous regional facilities, including the Oregon Zoo and solid waste facilities, Metro is responsible for managing regional growth through land use and transportation planning. Metro determines the location of the urban growth boundary surrounding the Portland metropolitan area, as well as when and by how much this boundary will expand.

In 1994, following two years of discussion with local jurisdictions and citizens, Metro adopted the Region 2040 Growth Concept (Growth Concept). The Growth Concept designates particular areas in the region where additional population and development will be focused in order to accommodate future growth. Metro’s Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) works in conjunction with the Growth Concept, to plan for the multimodal transportation needs of the designated areas for additional development.

The 2040 Functional Plan and 2040 Framework Plan were adopted in 1996 and 1997, respectively. These plans provide local governments with a comprehensive policy basis for growth management issues, and direct local governments to implement specific standards for achieving growth management objectives.

Region 2040 Growth Concept

The Region 2040 Growth Concept, adopted by the Metro Council in December 1994, establishes a general policy direction for managing growth in the region through the year 2040. It served as a guide for developing Metro’s regional 2040 Framework Plan. The Growth Concept indicates the preferred form of regional growth and development, what densities should characterize different areas, how to protect open spaces and natural resources, and how to maintain air and water quality. Its basic philosophy is: preserve access to nature, conserve valuable resource lands by minimizing expansion of the UGB, and build better communities in already urbanized areas for current and future residents. Fundamental to the Growth Concept is a multimodal transportation system that provides a range of travel mode options and ensures mobility of people and goods throughout the region.

To accommodate future growth, Metro, along with the cities and counties in the region, jointly designated a number of mixed-use development areas that correspond to mapped region-wide ‘design types.’ The St. Johns/Lombard Plan has the following ‘design types’ within its boundaries.

- Town centers are envisioned as areas with concentrations of employment and housing that provide access to a variety of goods and services. They are walkable areas, with mixed residential and commercial land uses and frequent transit service. They are intended to provide shopping and employment opportunities within a local market area, serving several thousand people.
• **Main streets** are envisioned as mixed-use corridors that provide neighborhood shopping with residential and some commercial and office uses along a street or at intersections. Main streets are walkable areas with frequent transit service.

**Region 2040 Framework Plan**

The *Region 2040 Framework Plan* was adopted in December 1997; it implements the *Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives*, including the adopted *Region 2040 Growth Concept*. The *Regional Framework Plan* gives local jurisdictions the land use planning tools they need to manage growth. This plan, mandated by the voter-approved 1992 Metro Charter, carries legal authority. It contains region-wide policies on land use, transportation, housing, parks and green spaces, water, and natural hazards. Provisions of the *Regional Framework Plan* require changes in local comprehensive plans to meet these policies.

**Urban Growth Management Functional Plan**

The *Urban Growth Management Functional Plan* (UGMFP) was created to allow early implementation of the *Region 2040 Growth Concept*. It establishes specific actions local governments must take to adhere to regional growth management policies; it contains twelve functional planning areas that must be addressed. Among other things, the UGMFP requires local governments to change, if necessary, their policies and ordinances to:

- apply minimum density standards for residential zones, allow accessory dwelling units, and establish 2040 ‘design type’ boundaries;
- meet or exceed standards for parking minimums and maximums;
- demonstrate compliance with water quality standards and stream protection; and
- prohibit large-scale retail uses in most employment and industrial areas.

The UGMFP requirements also include:

- increasing interconnections in the local transportation system to reduce congestion and make walking or biking for short trips more feasible,
- establishing transportation mode use targets,
- identifying where level of service traffic congestion measures may be used,
- specifying congestion management actions which must be considered and implemented prior to increasing roadway capacity, and
- promoting boulevard design standards.
Regional Transportation Plan

The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is a twenty-year blueprint to ensure the ability to travel throughout the region as it grows. The RTP establishes transportation policies for all forms of travel: motor vehicle, transit, pedestrian, bicycle and freight. It also includes specific objectives, strategies and projects to guide local and regional implementation of each policy. The RTP also comes with cost estimates and funding strategies to meet these costs. Federal and state transportation dollars are allocated according to priorities set in the RTP. The plan was first adopted by the Metro Council in 1983, and is updated periodically to reflect changing conditions. The most recent update of the RTP was completed in 2000.

Local Goals and Policies

The City of Portland has adopted regulations to support and implement state and regional planning objectives.

Portland’s Comprehensive Plan

In 1980, the Portland City Council adopted its Comprehensive Plan for the city, including goals, policies, objectives and a plan map, to guide the city’s future development and redevelopment over a twenty-year period. The Comprehensive Plan is intended to be dynamic: able to inspire, guide, and direct growth in the city, while also responding to change through amendment and refinement. Since adoption, the goals, policies, and objectives of the plan have been amended in response to new circumstances, special studies, new technology, and changes in state, regional and local plans and mandates. The St. Johns/Lombard Plan will ultimately result in updates to the Comprehensive Plan text and Comprehensive Plan map.

The Portland Zoning Code (Title 33) is not a part of the Comprehensive Plan. Rather, it is the major implementation tool of the Comprehensive Plan map. The Zoning Code contains regulations that control the use and development of the land. Since the map is the application of the goals and policies to specific locations within the city, the Zoning Code must be consistent with the land use designations and provide the definitions and standards for implementing the Comprehensive Plan.

Portland, Gresham, Multnomah County Housing Affordability Consolidated Plan

The Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS), and its successor the Portland, Gresham, Multnomah County Consolidated Plan, 2000 -2005, include strategies for increasing affordable housing opportunities within Multnomah County. These reports assess the housing needs of the participant jurisdictions and present strategies for meeting these housing needs through targeting
federal, local, nonprofit, and private sector programs and resources. Portland’s Bureau of Housing and Community Development was the lead agency in the interjurisdictional partnership that created this plan.

The Bureau of Planning is implementing the goals of the consolidated plan. While the plan assumes that some public subsidy will be needed, it emphasizes the role of regulation in creating opportunities for the market to help meet the need for affordable housing in the region. The consolidated plan calls for increasing housing densities and providing for alternative forms of housing that could be affordable to people earning a range of incomes.

**River Renaissance**

River Renaissance is a citywide partnership to revitalize the Willamette River in Portland. This comprehensive new approach to river health and vitality combines a shared vision and strategy to integrate the natural, recreational, urban and economic roles that make the Willamette River vital to Portland and the region. River Renaissance was created to optimize city efforts, forge public-private partnerships, leverage resources, and mobilize the community to revitalize the river. It is intended to link many independent city programs, plans and services and inspire community action. An integrated River Renaissance Plan will include key actions, investments and policies for watershed health, a robust harbor economy, enhanced access and recreation and new urban development.

**Portsmouth Neighborhood Plan**

The *Portsmouth Neighborhood Plan* was adopted on June 26, 2002. The goals, policies, and objectives of the *Portsmouth Neighborhood Plan* are in conformance with the goals, policies, and map designations of the Portland *Comprehensive Plan*. The north side of Lombard Street from the railroad cut to Columbia Park is included in the Portsmouth neighborhood boundary and the *St. Johns/Lombard Plan*. The policies of the *Portsmouth Neighborhood Plan* regarding Lombard Street are being considered in the St. Johns/Lombard planning process.
Key Issues and Planning Implications

Oregon’s statewide planning system provides the framework for coordinated planning from the state level down to the most detailed area planning projects conducted locally. Some of the key policy issues that will need to be addressed through the St. Johns/Lombard planning effort are described below.

- State law requires opportunities for extensive citizen involvement in the planning process. It is essential to design and sustain a public involvement process that includes parties affected by the decisions in the St. Johns/Lombard Plan.

- State planning goals direct urban growth away from rural resource lands and into urbanized areas. Strategies to encourage compact urban areas need to be adopted as part of the planning efforts for the St. Johns town center and Lombard main street.

- State and regional rules and policies require coordination of land use and transportation planning for more efficient resource allocation. A plan for implementing policies that link land use with transportation is essential for successful town center and main street areas.

- Regional planning initiatives largely direct new growth and development into existing urban areas to limit development of resource lands. Strategies that encourage new development at opportunity sites within the study area are essential to meet this directive.

- City policies address the need to accommodate a fair share of regional population and employment growth within existing urbanized areas, while maintaining and enhancing livability. The St. Johns/Lombard Plan should develop tools to encourage housing and employment in the study area, while maintaining livability.

- State, regional and local policies recognize the need to accommodate a diversity of housing types for peoples of all socioeconomic levels. A study of existing housing needs and future potential to accommodate additional housing should be considered.

- State, regional and local policies recognize the need to provide a variety of transportation options, with a focus on reducing automobile reliance and associated congestion and air pollution. Strategies to accomplish this should be included in the St. Johns/Lombard planning effort.
3. History and Urban Form

This chapter is divided into two sections. The first section, ‘History and Urban Form,’ presents a brief history of the area, focusing on settlement, industrial development, and transportation. The second section, ‘Historic Resources,’ summarizes the types of federal, state, and local historic resources and lists the current historic resources in the St. Johns/Lombard area. Information about heritage trees is also included.

Readers who wish additional information on the area’s history are referred to the following documents.

- *Oral Histories*, Volumes 1 through 5 (St. Johns Heritage Association)

History and Urban Form

‘There is considerable evidence that the people of St. Johns have an exceptionally strong local community loyalty. This community cohesiveness has many desirable aspects and is probably partly a result of the previous existence of the area as an independent town.’

~ *St. Johns Plan*, 1959, City of Portland Bureau of Planning

Pre-European Settlement

Settlement by indigenous peoples in the Northwest has occurred over a very long period of time, likely over 10,000 years. A great deal is unknown about the early inhabitants of the Oregon Territory, due to the difficulty of archaeological research. Many of the settlements or campsites have been eroded, washed away, buried under development or industrial fill, or excavated by relic hunters.

For most riverine tribes in Oregon, the focus of life was the Columbia River, which functioned as an indigenous ‘highway.’ Both Washington and Oregon, as the present boundary connotes, share in the history of this river and its tributaries. From accounts as early as 1800, the area was endowed with the necessities for a good living: the climate was mild, species of birds, game, fish, and plants were abundant. People fished for salmon and supplemented their diet with berries and roots (camas, wokas, bitterroot, etc.) They were unique
traders and middlemen in a commercial activity that may have been the largest north of Mexico. Known tools and usable articles of the riverine tribes are mountain sheep horn spoons, bowls and ladles, tubs used as mortars, root digger sticks, an assortment of basketry types, sally bags woven for gathering, salmon-packing pestles, fishnets, dipnets, beadwork, and tanned hide garments.

Many tribal groups, including those along the Oregon Coast and particularly along the Willamette and Columbia Rivers, were wiped out by disease early in the recorded history of this region, between the 1820s and the 1840s. During this period, anthropologists were not present to record the ways of life. Early settlers, who came from the east, had little interest in the culture of native peoples — they were instead attracted to the land and its wealth in timber, furs, salmon, and other resources. Interest in Native American culture developed later on in the 1880s when their numbers dramatically declined.

Evidence of settlements exist around the peninsula: a winter campground was uncovered at the northern portion of the peninsula, likely used by the Chinook; accounts from Lewis and Clark cited up to two hundred Native Americans living near the present Port of Portland’s Terminal #4 area; and a lodge was located at the foot of Alta Street, now part of Cathedral Park. Oral histories, documented by the St. Johns Heritage Association, refer to interaction and relationships with Native Americans:

‘Kasana was the last powerful Chief of the Multnomahs (a tribe of the Chinook Nation) on Sauvies [sic] Island. He was one of the noblest of Indians, spent his entire life on the Willamette and Columbia Rivers, and was on very friendly terms with both Fred Ramsey and James John and all the whites. He was said to remember the Lt. Broughton’s English expedition that came up the Columbia River, passing Sauvies [sic] Island, slightly beyond Troutdale, where Kesano’s lodge stood. This was in 1792.’

~ Maxine Hurt, St. Johns Heritage Association

Profile of Settlement from 1850s

James John filed the plat for the town of St. Johns, located on the east bank of the Willamette, in 1852. Although the area was almost inaccessible overland, John envisioned a major harbor with rail shipping facilities and bridges spanning the Willamette, and worked to attract residents and businesses. St. Johns was officially incorporated in 1865.

Around the same time, the Portsmouth neighborhood area consisted of a few farms, but was predominantly forest, with some clearings. In the 1880s, a group of realtors sought to create a city, to be called the City of Portsmouth. They platted a 290-acre tract, known as the old John Waud Donation Land Claim (see map below). Their vision of a city did not materialize, however, and the area ended up in the hands of the Electric Land Company (Portsmouth Neighborhood Plan, p. 78).
The map above shows early land claims in the plan area. The boundaries of these claims laid the ground for the present day system of streets and blocks. Note the diagonal northern and southern boundaries of the James John claim, which coincide with St. Louis Avenue (originally Vancouver Street) and Richmond Avenue (originally Main Street), respectively.

‘St. Johns was served adequately by river-borne transportation, and a few river-related industries settled there, but real growth did not occur until reliable overland transportation was available. This did not occur until 1889 when a steam powered train initiated service to the town of Albina. In order to continue on to Portland, passengers had to transfer to an electric line from Albina.’

~ Potential Historic Conservation Districts,
City of Portland Bureau of Planning.

The University Park subdivision was platted by Methodists during the 1880s, who named streets in the plat after eastern colleges and well-known Methodist teachers, philosophers, and prominent bishops, ministers, and laymen. Most of the streets in present-day Portsmouth are named after Methodist teachers, philosophers, and clergy (Portsmouth Neighborhood Plan, p. 79).
Profile of James John

Some called him ‘Old Jimmy John’ and described him as a hermit and a recluse. Others called him ‘Saint’ John. These nicknames fit well with his generous nature. James John bequeathed his extensive real estate holdings for the establishment of public schools in St. Johns, the community that grew up on his donation land claim.

James John was born in Ohio in 1809. He crossed the plains to the Sacramento Valley in California in 1841, and in 1843 came to Oregon with a party of Hudson’s Bay Company employees. After settling in Linnton, he bought a town lot and helped build a warehouse that was expected to make Linnton a great seaport. The venture failed, and in 1847 he took a claim on the bluff across the river, the present site of St. Johns.

In 1850, he laid out some lots and operated a country store. Two years later, he began a ferry service using a rowboat across the Willamette between his claim and Linnton, from which a trail took off for the Tualatin Valley.

The plat for the town of St. Johns was filed in 1865. James John died in 1886. He never married, but in his will, he instructed executors to lease all his real estate for fifteen years, after which the real estate was to be sold. A trust fund was to be created, and the money was to be used to build public schools and to pay teachers’ salaries.

Is it John or Johns?

In accounts written after Mr. John’s lifetime, his name is sometimes spelled with the ‘s,’ and sometimes without the “s.” Theories for the inconsistency abound – Indiana relatives spelled his name John, but several unsuccessful attempts were made to change St. Johns to St. John. Johns appears on the deed to his donation land claim and in his newspaper obituary. An announcement in The Oregonian, which he placed himself, was signed James Johns, yet an editorial appearing in The Oregonian argued for John:

‘The town which most persons call St. Johns, and which calls itself St. Johns, should be called St. John: for James John was the original settler there, and he was known as ‘Old Jimmy John.’ . . . There are Saints John but no Saint Johns. The latter term is impossible. After awhile the public schools will take hold of it and bring history and literature to support of the idea, and everybody will be ashamed to say ‘Saint Johns.’”

~ February 9, 1936
Annexation History

In early 1891, the City of Albina annexed most of the north peninsula, including St. Johns and the Portsmouth and University Park areas. Later that year the entire area was consolidated into the City of Portland. Toward the end of the decade, St. Johns residents became dissatisfied with the lack of services provided and the higher taxes levied by Portland. They pushed for separation, which finally occurred on October 17, 1898. An excerpt taken from an article in The Oregonian describes the public sentiment:

‘The residents of that portion of the city known as St. Johns are jubilant over their success in securing a divorce from Portland, and a speedy return to rural simplicity.’


Soon after on February 19, 1903, St. Johns was once again an independent city and flourished with over 2,000 residents.

Four years later, rumors of corruption surrounded St. Johns officials, and helped to change public opinion on annexation. Adding to the dissatisfaction, St. Johns residents were paying more in taxes than Portland residents. In 1911 a vote to annex St. Johns into Portland passed, but St. Johns officials claimed an unconstitutional election on the grounds that:

‘... a city, in committing suicide, is violating the terms of its charter.’

~ The Oregonian, April 4, 1915

Although the Oregon State Supreme Court ruled in favor of the St. Johns officials, the pursuit of annexation continued. Voters approved a constitutional amendment that established rules about annexation. Soon after, D. C. Lewis pushed for annexation and was elected state senator. He passed legislation that further defined annexation procedures. St. Johns residents on April 5, 1915, voted 799 to 499 in favor of annexation to Portland.

On July 8, 1915, St. Johns and the town of Linnton merged with the City of Portland, bringing the last of the original six cities into a single jurisdiction (Portland, East Portland, Albina, Sellwood, Linnton, St. Johns). The establishment of these six cities and their unique combination of residential, commercial, and industrial development serve as a legacy for the City of Portland today. These cities and the ‘streetcar suburbs’ established along the major transportation lines laid the framework for the character that we know today.
Early Water and Rail Transportation

Steamboat service connected Portland with Vancouver, St. Johns, Milwaukie, and Oregon City. These steamboats were fast passenger sternwheelers, handsomely furnished, some with dining rooms and salon decks. Many companies operated both work and passenger boats; a prominent one in St. Johns was the Shaver Transportation Company, started by George Shaver in 1880. Travel from St. Johns to the town of Linnton (across the river to the north) was by ferry, which carried vehicles and passengers until completion of the St. Johns Bridge in 1931.

Prior to the establishment of rails, a trip to Portland from St. Johns took a full day by horse and buggy or wagon. By 1886, several traction companies covered Portland’s west side but by the late 1890s, the Steele Brothers constructed an electric line that ran from Fulton Park to Stanton Street on lower Albina (now North Mississippi) and upper Albina (North Williams). At this location, St. Johns passengers transferred to a steam line operated by the Willamette Bridge Company. Steam motor cars pulled two and sometimes three coaches, traveling a route through the town and around Fessenden Street. In 1904, electric streetcar lines were laid in St. Johns:

'We lived on what was called ‘the loop.’ Streetcars came into St. Johns on Lombard Street, but some of the cars left Lombard at Wall Avenue and northwest to Fessenden Street and on into St. Johns via Jersey Street, which was at that time the name of the main street.’


The advent of the streetcar system encouraged rapid growth and produced several lasting effects. By allowing relatively quick access to employment centers, the streetcar opened new land for subdivision. The streetcar system also provided easy access to existing towns and neighborhoods such as St. Johns, Lents, Sellwood, and Montavilla. In these outlying communities, the streetcar helped spur an increase in residential and commercial development, but contributed to their decline as independent economic centers. Linked by bridges, rail lines, and roads, downtown Portland became the area’s major center.

Another impact of the streetcar lines was the development of retail establishments and apartments along the major streetcar corridors. At transfer points, neighborhood commercial centers were born. The businesses that operated along the streetcar lines were small scale, pedestrian-oriented, and close to the residential neighborhoods they served.
Widespread interest in establishing railroad service flourished, in part due to the peninsula’s relatively flat grade. The 1904 U.S. Congress authorized construction of a railroad bridge across the Columbia River from Vancouver. The Northern Pacific provided service from Seattle to Vancouver, and would surely expand its service with the new bridge. Thus, the peninsula opened its doors to industrial growth.

“The SP&S Railroad . . . formed in 1905 gained approval to cut an open gap through the Peninsula. But in September 1906, the mayor (of St. Johns) vetoed the ordinance stating that the cut would be a defacement of property and a visual blight that would destroy the unity of the district’s neighborhoods. Local residents opposed the cut, but the council overrode his veto.’

~ Elsie NaSmythe Norris, St. Johns Heritage Association.

Automobiles were present in the early 1900s, but their numbers didn’t grow significantly until the early 1920s:

‘In 1907, there were about 500 automobiles in Portland and the speed limit was only 15 mph; the police had trouble enforcing it as their only mode of transportation was by foot.’

~ Thomas Lind, St. Johns Heritage Association.

**St. Johns Bridge**

‘St. Johns (seventy years ago) was to most voters from other city districts, a place way out at the end of nowhere! Why would we need a bridge?’

~ Celia Burley for the *St. Johns Review*, May 7, 1992

Six months before the 1927 election, a few St. Johns folks had an idea to get the people of Portland out to vote for a new bridge. They formed a caravan of entertainers that traveled to every grange, school, and meeting place in Multnomah County. The St. Johns group put on a show with a vaudeville act, singers, musicians, and dancers. And the centerpiece was the following song, put to the tune of “Sidewalks of New York.”
Portland is a lovely place, and that you will agree,
We have some wonderful bridges, they’re as fine as they can be.

But the town is all lopsided, here’s the way the bridges run,
There’s seven south of Broadway, while in the north we haven’t one!

They go from east side to west side, all in the south of town,
While St. Johns, her one best suburb, in a ferry boat goes round.

We’ve been patient and that you will allow,
But we’re fed up with that ferry, and we want a bridge right now.

Our side is the best side in dear old Portland town,
We produce the payroll, in your book just mark that down.
All we want is a fair deal, and when the voting is done,
We’ll walk across the St. Johns bridge in nineteen thirty-one!

~ William Burley, 1927

A bond issue of $4,250,000 was authorized by voters at the 1928 primary election, for the construction of the St. Johns Bridge. Robinson & Steinman, engineers from New York, were appointed to design and construct the bridge.

The bridge opened June 13, 1931, replacing the city’s last ferry. It is located about seven miles northwest of downtown Portland, and aligned with North Philadelphia Street, connecting the two principal industrial districts of St. Johns and Linnton. Its main span is 1,200 feet — the longest suspension bridge west of the Mississippi River at the time of construction.

A distinct architectural feature is the Gothic arch, used in the steel batterleg towers and the reinforced concrete piers to carry the approach spans. The towers are 408 feet and the piers vary in height from 22 to 150 feet above ground.
Profile of Industry and Commerce

Pre-1900
The Oregon Barrel Company, established in 1867, was one of the largest businesses in St. Johns. Its main customers were in Honolulu, where “half barrels” were in great demand for American shipment of sugar. Later, when the company switched to production of bags, its business declined.

1900s
The St. Johns retail community consisted of six groceries, one drug store, two hardware stores, one tailor shop, two confectioners, one millinery, two meat markets, one feed store, one jewelry store, and a barber shop. The community around Portsmouth and Lombard Street consisted of a pharmacy, meat market, millinery story, plumber, and a feed and fuel establishment. A business of note was Glass Brothers and Company, which provided groceries, boots and shoes, hardware, and other household items.

St. Johns didn’t require as many retail establishments as would be found in the average country town of its population, due to the short distance and easy access by electric line or boat to Portland’s large department stores.

Below is a description of St. Johns during the period of 1903 to 1905, from an article that appeared in The Oregonian:

‘There is a most remarkable growth in the town of St. Johns. Two years ago there were a few shacks to mark the place on higher ground where many fine buildings now stand. There has been an increase from an assessment of $310,000 to $1,250,000 inside a year. More than $1,000,000 has been expended in founding manufacturing establishments and more are coming.’

~ November 13, 1905

The Port of Portland was created in 1891 to oversee river traffic. The Port’s dry dock was created soon after and was the largest industry in St. Johns. With a construction cost of $400,000, it was originally 500 feet long, and capable of accommodating the largest vessels in use on the Pacific Ocean at that time. Shipping activities centered on the dry dock. At the turn of the twentieth century, Portland was fifth among US cities in exports of flour and grain, and the world leader in lumber manufacturing. In addition, shipbuilding plants were attracted to the dry dock. One company engaged in the construction and repair of wooden vessels, and one for steel vessels.

Portland Manufacturing Company was the first mill built in St. Johns and the first plywood plant in America. It manufactured veneers made of native woods; the veneers were used for cabinet drawers, wooden baskets, fruit boxes, clothes hampers, and similar household items. The company’s investment was $50,000, and sixty people were employed. An excelsior mill also was in operation, using the waste from the veneer factory.
Portland Woolen Mills was the second largest industry. After a fire destroyed the Sellwood plant, the mill opened operations in St. Johns because of its railroad and water shipment access and the availability of inexpensive fuel from the sawmills.

‘The selection of St. Johns by this company for its home is another irrefutable argument in favor of the great future of the place.’
~ St. Johns on the Willamette: A Suburb of Portland, Oregon, at the Gateway to Portland Harbor.

Advertisement in The Peninsula, 1909

The Peninsular Lumber Company was located 1,500 feet upstream from the Port’s dry dock; it processed 300,000 feet of lumber per day and employed two hundred men. Owners were C.C. Barker, H.C. Stewart, C.F. Latimer, and F.C. Knapp, well-known capitalists from Wisconsin and Michigan and owners of extensive tracts of Oregon timber. Another significant industry was W.V. Jobes & Sons Flour Mill. It was equipped with the most modern machinery of the day, capable of processing four hundred barrels per day.

St. Johns waterfront, circa 1918  (June Wymore Sundeen)

With the annexation of St. Johns in 1915, Portland acquired its riverfront area, which became Terminal 3, and eventually the site of the St. Johns Bridge (1931). And in 1932, the waste disposal industry located in St. Johns, a result of industrial expansion and population growth.

The Oregon Shipyards (just north of Terminal #4) built Liberty Ships during World War II. It recruited workers from all over the country and was known for its production capacity and helped create boom years for St. Johns. In 1943, the community of Vanport was constructed in North Portland. Roughly 1,600 defense housing units were created for 34,000 shipyard workers.
The Port of Portland in 1941 began to acquire land for the Rivergate Industrial District. The area is about 3,000 acres and contains the Smith and Bybee Lakes, a significant wildlife habitat and the nation’s largest freshwater wetland within a city.

**Historic Resources**

Many buildings and sites in the St. Johns/Lombard plan area are identified for their historic significance. This section describes the federal, state, and local programs that regulate historic resources. The city’s current inventory of historic properties follows. Also included is information about the City’s Heritage Tree program.

**National Register of Historic Places**

The National Register of Historic Places is the nation’s official list of cultural resources worthy of preservation. Authorized under the *National Historic Preservation Act of 1966*, the National Register is part of a national program to coordinate and support public and private efforts to identify, evaluate, and protect our historic and archeological resources. Properties listed in the register include districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that are significant in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering, and culture. The National Register is administered by the National Park Service, which is part of the U.S. Department of the Interior.

The old U.S. Post Office (currently the Baha’i Center) on Ivanhoe Street is listed on the register. Refer to the description that follows in this section for specific information about this building and its interior murals.

**City of Portland Historic Resource Designations**

The following categories of designated historic resources are regulated by Chapter 33.445, Resources Protection Overlay Zone, of the City of Portland Zoning Code.

**Historic Landmarks**

Historic landmarks may be an individual structure, site, tree, landscape, or other object that is of historic or cultural significance. A historic landmark generally derives its significance from at least two of the following:

- the importance of its designer, previous owners, or builder in local, state, or national history,
- the quality of its architecture or landscaping,
- the fact that it is one of a few remaining examples of a building type that is of significance in local, state, or national history,
- association with a significant cultural or ethnic group, or
- the role it has played in shaping local, state, or national history.
Information supporting a specific resource’s designation is found in the city’s Historic Resource Inventory, its National Register nomination, or the local evaluation done in support of the resource’s designation.

The following five properties within the St. Johns/Lombard plan area are designated as Portland Historic Landmarks. Information on these sites is contained in the next section, “Portland Historic Resources Inventory.” Additional information supporting their designation is found in the staff report that approved their designation, and if applicable, the National Register nomination.

- Miner House (oldest house in St. Johns)
- St. Johns City Hall (North Precinct)
- St. Johns Bridge
- National Cash Register Building (St. Johns Pub)
- U.S. Post Office (Baha’i Center), also on National Register of Historic Places

Historic District

A historic district is a collection of individual resources that is of historical or cultural significance at the local, state, or national level. Information supporting a specific district’s designation is found in the city’s Historic Resource Inventory, its National Register nomination, or the local evaluation done in support of the district’s designation.

There are currently no designated historic districts in the St. Johns/Lombard area.

Conservation Landmark

A conservation landmark may be an individual structure, site, tree, landscape, or other object that is of historical or cultural interest at the local or neighborhood level. Conservation landmarks are examples of developments that have helped create the character of the region’s districts and neighborhoods. A conservation landmark generally derives its significance from at least two of the following:

- the importance of its designer, previous owners, or builder in local, state, or national history,
- the quality of its architecture or landscaping,
- the fact that it is one of a few remaining examples of a building type that is of significance in the neighborhood’s history,
- association with a significant cultural or ethnic group, or
- the role it has played in creating the historic character of the area where it is located.

Information supporting a specific resource’s designation is found in the city’s Historic Resource Inventory or the local evaluation done in support of the resource’s designation.
There are currently no designated conservation landmarks in the St. Johns/Lombard area.

**Conservation District**

A conservation district is a collection of individual resources that is of historical or cultural significance at the local or neighborhood level. Information supporting a specific district’s designation is found in the city’s Historic Resource Inventory or the local evaluation done in support of the district’s designation.

There are currently no designated conservation districts in the St. Johns/Lombard area.

**Portland Historic Resources Inventory**

The Historic Resources Inventory was completed by the City in 1985 and includes about 5,000 properties. It is a catalogue of historic resources that may be eligible for landmark or district designation. Although intended primarily as a planning tool, the inventory also serves as a valuable resource for historical research.

Most resources listed in the inventory are given a ranking of I, II, or III; some are unranked. Rank I and II resources may be eligible for listing in the National Register; Rank I resources have the highest priority for listing. Rank III resources may be eligible for listing in the National Register as part of a Historic District. Although some properties are without a rank, that does not preclude the designation of that property as a landmark.

**Properties within the Plan Area**

This section lists the properties in the St. Johns/Lombard area that are in the Portland Historic Resource Inventory. The inventory is organized chronologically in the following four categories.

- Community, Religious, and Public Buildings
- Residences
- Commercial and Storefront Buildings
- Sites and Structures
Community, Religious, and Public Buildings

- **Seventh Day Adventist Church, 1887**  
  6837 N. Salem Avenue  
  **Significance:** Religion and Development. Oldest standing church in St. Johns, although it hasn’t been a church for some time. When the focal point of the town was moved upland from Crawford Street to its present location along Lombard, this church remained at its original location. The current use is residential.  
  **Rank:** III

- **University Park Methodist Episcopal Church, 1892**  
  4775 N. Lombard Street  
  20th Century Gothic  
  **Significance:** Religion and Architecture  
  **Rank:** II

- **St. Andrews Episcopal Church, 1895**  
  7704 N. Hereford Avenue  
  Arts and Crafts  
  **Significance:** Religion. St. Andrews Episcopal Church was established as a mission church of the Good Shepherd Church, which was a mission church of Trinity Episcopal. Built in 1895, it stood in a grove of trees. In 1905 the church was moved from the corner of N. Willis and N. Chautauqua to its present site. The building was used as a church until 1956 when a new one was built at 7600 N. Hereford. Recently renovated, the former church is home to the William Temple House.  
  **Rank:** None

- **University Park Congregational Church, 1905**  
  7459 N. Haven Avenue  
  20th Century gothic  
  **Significance:** Religion  
  **Rank:** III

- **National Cash Register Building/St. Johns Pub, 1906**  
  8203 N. Ivanhoe Street  
  20th Century Georgian, Colonial Revival  
  **Significance:** Architecture and Recreation. Originally built as an exhibition hall on the site of Lewis and Clark Exposition Fairgrounds, 1906.  
  **Rank:** Portland Historical Landmark, Rank I
• **St. Johns City Hall/North Precinct, 1907**  
  North Portland Community Policing Center  
  7214 N. Philadelphia Avenue  
  20th Century Classical  
  **Significance:** Government. Served as the city hall until 1915 when St. Johns was annexed to Portland.  
  **Rank:** Portland Historical Landmark

![City Hall and Burlington Street](Laura Norene Minkler)

• **Multnomah Theater, circa 1908**  
  8637-8641 N. Lombard Street  
  Streetcar Era Commercial  
  **Significance:** Architecture and Humanities. The theater was the first moving picture theater house in St. Johns and one of the earliest in Portland. It featured a Wurlitzer pipe organ, shipped from Cincinnati. Auditorium seated 850. The theater was turned into a bowling alley in 1925. The movie theater moved across the street to become the Venetian Theater.  
  **Rank:** III

![Multnomah Theater](Laura Norene Minkler)

• **St. Johns Library, circa 1913**  
  7510 N. Charleston Avenue  
  20th Century Georgian  
  **Significance:** Architecture. The St. Johns Library building was a gift from Andrew Carnegie and is of Southern Colonial design. It was renovated in 2000. The branch houses the peninsula area resource collection, which includes documents detailing the history of the St. Johns neighborhood.  
  **Rank:** II

![St. Johns Branch Library](Laura Norene Minkler)

• **Seventh Church of Christian Science, 1919**  
  9008 N. Smith Street  
  20th Century Georgian  
  **Significance:** Religion. Originally a church and school.  
  **Rank:** III

• **7528 N. Charleston Avenue, 1921**  
  Tudor  
  **Significance:** Architecture and Religion. Original function was St. Johns Methodist Community Center and Church. Current owner is Pioneer Methodist Church.  
  **Rank:** III
• University Park Library, 1922  
7508 N. Hereford Avenue  
Bungalow  
**Significance:** Architecture, Humanities, and Social. Neighborhood fundraising efforts established this library. It was owned by the University Park Library Association until 1927, when it was taken over by the Multnomah Library Association. This site was selected because of its proximity to Portsmouth School. In 1975, the county abandoned the building and the neighborhood established a senior center. Currently, the building houses the Peninsula Senior Center.  
**Rank:** II

• Laurel Lodge International Order of Odd Fellows, 1925  
8401-07 N. Ivanhoe Street.  
**Streetcar Era Commercial**  
**Significance:** Social and Architecture  
**Rank:** III

• Venetian Theater/St. Johns Theater, circa 1925  
8704-06 N. Lombard Street  
**California Mission Style**  
**Significance:** Architecture and Recreation. The Venetian Theater was established in 1925. It was previously the Multnomah Theater (1908), located across the street. After the move, the Multnomah Theater was turned into a bowling alley.  
**Rank:** III

• James John Elementary School, 1929  
7439 N. Charleston Avenue  
**20th Century Georgian**  
**Potential Historic Conservation Districts (1978)**  
**Significance:** Architecture  
**Rank:** III
• **U.S. Post Office / Baha‘i Center, 1932**
  8720 N. Ivanhoe Street
  20th Century Georgian
  **Significance:** Visual Arts and Architecture. *Works Progress Act* (WPA) mural on the interior walls depicts and symbolizes the history of St. Johns district from pioneer times to the 1930s. The WPA was a federal program that, among other things, sought to increase public recognition of art as a legitimate and worthy profession. The artist is John Bailator, graduate of University of Oregon and Yale School of Fine Arts.

  The mural has two themes: pioneer development and modern times. Depicted in the pioneer scene are James Mock, P. T. Smith, William Killingsworth, Jason Lee, John McLoughlin, an American Indian, and a pioneer woman. Depicted in the modern times scene are civic leader Thomas J. Monaham, an engineer, letter carrier on pony, a mechanic, a lumber worker, the town hall and Engine No. 5.

  Scenes depict the cornerstone ceremony for the new post office, with officials J. M. Jones, postmaster of Portland, Edward J. Ball, Dan S. Duff, and Mr. Curran, president of the St. Johns Businessmen’s Club. Another scene depicts the bridge surveying group with Dr. Steinman, and A. W. Davis. Industrial development is symbolized through a scene at the Portland Woolen Mills.

  **Rank:** National Register of Historic Places, Portland Historical Landmark, Rank II

• **Young Women’s Christian Association (YWCA), 1936**
  8010 N. Charleston Avenue
  English Cottage
  **Significance:** Architecture and Social. Original function was a community center.
  **Rank:** None
Residences

- **Miner House, 1886**  
  7821 N. Crawford Street  
  Classic Revival  
  **Significance:** Architecture, Development, and Social. The Miner house was once surrounded by farmland. Near the house stood chicken sheds, barns, a windmill, and a tower. Amos Miner was one of St. John’s earliest settlers, and had a donation land claim. This house is the oldest residence in St. Johns.  
  **Rank:** Portland Historic Landmark, Rank 1

- **7472 N. Stockton Avenue, 1890**  
  Queen Anne Vernacular  
  **Significance:** Architecture  
  **Rank:** None

- **8716 N. Syracuse Street, circa 1890**  
  Queen Anne Vernacular, American Basic  
  **Significance:** Social and Education. In association with Edna M. Hollenbeck, a piano and public school teacher in St. Johns.  
  **Rank:** None

- **7466 N. Stockton Avenue, 1894**  
  Rural Vernacular  
  **Significance:** Architecture  
  **Rank:** None

- **7463 N. Olin Avenue, 1894**  
  Rural Vernacular  
  **Significance:** Architecture  
  **Rank:** None

- **7475 N. Olin Avenue, 1894**  
  Rural Vernacular  
  **Significance:** Architecture  
  **Rank:** III

- **7457 N. Olin Avenue, 1895**  
  Rural Vernacular  
  **Significance:** Architecture  
  **Rank:** III

- **7459 N. Newell Avenue, 1895**  
  Queen Anne Vernacular  
  **Significance:** Architecture  
  **Rank:** III
6929 N. Alta Street, 1900
Rural Vernacular
Significance: Architecture
Rank: None

7416 N. Portsmouth Avenue, 1900
Queen Anne Vernacular
Significance: Architecture
Rank: None

7467 N. Jordan Avenue, 1900
Queen Anne Vernacular
Significance: Architecture
Rank: III

4744 N. Lombard Street, circa 1900
Rural Vernacular
Significance: Architecture. Originally designed as a residence, it was previously used as apartments. Currently used as office space.
Rank: III

Brice House, circa 1900
7207 N. Chicago Avenue
Queen Anne Vernacular
Rank: II

7458 N. Jordan Avenue, 1903
Queen Anne Vernacular
Significance: Architecture
Rank: None

7451 N. Jordan Avenue, 1904
Bungalow
Significance: Architecture
Rank: None

7469 N. Westanna Avenue, 1906
Queen Anne Vernacular
Significance: Architecture
Rank: None

7300 N. Mohawk Avenue, 1906
Bungalow, Queen Anne Vernacular
Significance: Architecture
Rank: None
• **8734 N. Syracuse Street, circa 1906**  
  Colonial Revival  
  Significance: Government and Medicine. In association with C.S. Cook, who was mayor of St. Johns from 1903 to 1905. Also in association with Dr. Mary Maclachlan, a doctor in St. Johns. She was practicing in 1904 and may have been the first female doctor in St. Johns.  
  Rank: III

• **8060 N. Ivanhoe Street, 1907**  
  Bungalow  
  Rank: None

• **6636 N. Richmond Avenue, circa 1907**  
  Rural Vernacular  
  Significance: Social and Development. In association with Mr. Moxon, an early settler of St. Johns and an assistant postmaster.  
  Rank: III

• **Christmas Residence, 1908**  
  5214 N. Lombard Street  
  American Basic  
  Significance: Architecture. Originally designed as a residence for G.E. Christmas.  
  Rank: None

• **7523 N. Gloucester Avenue, 1908**  
  Colonial Revival  
  Significance: Architecture  
  Rank: None

• **8910 N. Syracuse Street, 1908**  
  Colonial Revival  
  Rank: III

• **7011 N. Chicago Avenue, 1908**  
  American Basic  
  Significance: Social and Architecture. Original owner Dr. Joseph McChesney, a resident of St. Johns from 1920 to 1932. Originally designed as a residence, converted to a duplex.  
  Rank: III

• **7425 N. New York Avenue, circa 1908**  
  Queen Anne Vernacular  
  Significance: Social and Architecture. Originally located at 208 E Burlington Street, this house was the second to last house built by P.T. Smith. After his death, his wife Mary Jane Smith sold it to William King, who in turn sold it to Olaf Lind. After a parking lot was proposed for the site, Lind saved the house by moving it to the present location. Later, he converted it to apartments.  
  Rank: None
• 4762 N. Lombard Street, circa 1908
  Rural Vernacular
  Significance: Architecture. Originally designed as a residence. Currently houses apartments above ground floor retail.
  Rank: None

• 8691 N. Edison Street, 1910
  American Basic
  Significance: Architecture. Originally built as residence, converted to apartment house
  Rank: None

• 7447 N. New York Avenue, circa 1910
  Bungalow
  Significance: Architecture
  Rank: None

• 7034 N. John Avenue, circa 1910
  Queen Anne Vernacular, Colonial Revival
  Significance: Architecture.
  Rank: None

Storefronts and Commercial Buildings

• Bickner Brothers General Merchandise/St. Johns Hardware, 1904
  8621 N. Lombard Street
  Streetcar Era Commercial
  Significance: Social and Development.
  The Bickner Department Store is the oldest retail building in St. Johns. General merchandise was sold on the first floor, while the second story was used as a community hall. Most organizations in St. Johns held their first meetings in Bickner’s Hall. The St. Johns Hardware Store occupied the first floor in 1908, and was in business at this location up until July 2002.
  Rank: III

• 8928 N. Lombard Street, circa 1906
  Streetcar Era Commercial
  Significance: Architecture and Commerce. Previously used as apartments.
  Rank: III
• **8326 N. Lombard Street, 1907**
  Italianate
  **Significance:** Architecture and Commerce. Previously retail; storefront altered in 1922.
  **Rank:** None

Tulip Bakery at 8326 North Lombard Street storefront, 2002

• **St. Johns Undertaking Company/Crouchley Plumbing, 1910**
  8717 N. Lombard Street
  Streetcar Era Commercial
  **Significance:** Architecture. Original purpose was a funeral parlor; now a plumbing business.
  **Rank:** None

• **Reed Grocery and Meats, 1910**
  6343 N. Lombard Street
  Western Falsefront Vernacular
  **Significance:** Architecture. Originally a storefront with residence above.
  **Rank:** None

• **Conrad M. Sexton Blacksmith Shop, circa 1910**
  7512 N. Berkeley Avenue
  Oregon Rustic, round log construction
  **Significance:** Architecture and Curiosity. Part of Conrad M. Sexton’s Blacksmith Shop’s complex. Original function was residential.
  **Rank:** III

• **McChesney Block, 1917**
  8947 N. Lombard Street
  Streetcar Era Commercial
  **Significance:** Architecture and Commerce. Brick walls, decorative cornice with modillions and two large consoles. Retailers included a bookstore owned by L.B. Chipman, a cigar store owned by A. Unger, and a candy and confectionery store owned by G. Ward. A post office was on the south corner. The upper rooms were suites, some of which were medical offices of Dr. Joseph McChesney. Others were apartments, without kitchen facilities.
  **Rank:** III

• **Peninsula Title Abstract and Realty Company, circa 1920**
  8907 N. Lombard Street
  Streetcar Era Commercial
  **Significance:** Architecture. One-story brick with decorative brick panels.
  **Rank:** None
• **8915 N. Lombard Street, circa 1920**  
Streetcar Era Commercial  
**Significance:** Architecture. Brick walls with decorative cornice, panel and frieze. Previously owned by Ray and Irish Publishers, and the *St. Johns Review.*  
**Rank:** None

• **Independent Order of Odd Fellows Peninsula Lodge, 1925**  
4834 N. Lombard Street  
Streetcar Era Commercial  
**Significance:** Architecture and Social. Originally a retail and clubhouse building.  
**Rank:** None

• **8638 N. Lombard Street, 1925**  
Streetcar Era Commercial  
**Significance:** Architecture. Current use is a café with a small theater in the rear.  
**Rank:** None

• **Wall Street Auto Service/Master Muffler, 1925**  
6027 N. Lombard Street  
California Mission style  
**Significance:** Transportation and Architecture. Original and present uses - automobile service.  
**Rank:** III

• **4730 N. Lombard Street**  
Mediterranean  
**Significance:** Architecture. Originally designed as a duplex. Merck Realty has occupied the building since 1972.  
**Rank:** III

• **8302 N. Lombard Street, 1940**  
Streamline Moderne  
**Significance:** Architecture. Originally a filling station, most recently a florist. An application was filed for National Register listing; the building is undergoing restoration.  
**Rank:** II

• **5003 N. Lombard, 1950**  
Fifties Modern  
**Significance:** Architecture  
**Rank:** None
Sites and Structures

- **6700 N. Alta Avenue, circa 1805**
  Camp site of Lewis and Clark Expedition.
  **Significance:** Exploration. William Clark reportedly slept here during the Lewis and Clark expedition. Other historical accounts refer to a Native American lodge that was located near this site. Present use: southerly part of block is developed with houses and row houses, Cathedral Commons; northerly portion is vacant of structures.
  **Rank:** Site

- **6700 N. Burlington Avenue, circa 1850**
  Site of store operated by James John.
  **Significance:** Agriculture and Development, in association with James John. James John was born in the Midwest, migrated to California in 1841 and moved to Oregon in 1843. He took a claim in 1846 on the peninsula where St. Johns is now located. John farmed and operated a store at the foot of N. Burlington Street. In his will, he left his estate to endow schools in the community.
  **Rank:** Site

- **6900 N. Pittsburgh Avenue, 1888**
  Ferry Landing Site
  **Significance:** Transportation. St. Johns Ferry began operation in 1888. It served areas in Portland and Linnton. Service ended when the St. Johns Bridge was built in 1931. Original features were a concrete landing. Currently part of Cathedral Park, owned by the City of Portland.
  **Rank:** Site

- **Northern Substation, 1906**
  6616 N. Lombard Street
  Brick Utilitarian
  **Significance:** Architecture and Development
  **Rank:** III
• **Portsmouth Cut, circa 1907**
  Railroad Cut
  6929 N. Carey Boulevard
  The Portsmouth Cut is an approximately 6,600 foot long cut in the bluffs at St. Johns through which run two mainline and auxiliary railroad track.
  **Significance:** Transportation. The railroad bridges, cuts, and tunnels of North Portland, all built circa 1907, were the result of competition between the principals of two major railroads: James J. Hill (Great Northern,Northern Pacific, and Spokane, Portland, and Seattle (SPSRR)) and E. H. Harriman (Union Pacific and Southern Pacific). The Great Northern did not have direct access to Portland, leading Hill to build the SPSRR to provide independent access to Portland. He built the bridge over the Willamette River, the cut through the North Portland Peninsula, and the steel bridges over the Oregon Slough and the Columbia River. On the other hand, Harriman wanted direct access to Seattle for his Union Pacific line, which passed through Portland. Around 1910, the railroads settled their differences and the Union Pacific built a tunnel through the peninsula to connect with the SPSRR at what is now called North Portland Junction.
  **Rank:** III

• **North Lombard Street Viaduct, 1910**
  6700 N. Lombard Street
  **Significance:** Engineering. Reinforced concrete slab on steel frame. Lattice steel railing.
  **Present Owners:** City of Portland and the Spokane, Portland, Seattle Railroad
  **Rank:** I

• **St. Johns Bridge, 1931**
  6900 N. Philadelphia Avenue
  Suspension Bridge, Gothic Revival
  **Significance:** Development, Engineering, and Transportation: The ferry operating between two towns was inadequate for the growing population. A bond issue was approved in 1928 and the New York firm of Robinson and Steinman designed the bridge. The resulting cable-suspension scheme with Gothic influence produced an aesthetically pleasing structure. At the time it was built, the suspension span was the longest of any kind west of Detroit (1,207 feet). It was the world’s largest steel strand suspension bridge.
  **Rank:** Portland Historical Landmark
Heritage Trees

The City of Portland’s Heritage Tree ordinance requires the City Forester to annually prepare a list of trees that are of special importance to the city because of their age, size, type, historical association, or horticultural value. The ordinance also requires the consent of the Urban Forestry Commission and the Portland City Council before pruning or removing a heritage tree. Approximately 234 trees in Portland are designated as heritage trees. None of the heritage trees are located within the plan boundary. Map 2 identifies eleven heritage trees located in proximity to the plan area.

Map 2: Portland Heritage Trees

Key Issues and Planning Implications

The following key issues and planning implications pertaining to the history and urban design section of this report will help direct the St. Johns/Lombard planning efforts.

• Numerous historic buildings and sites are located throughout the study area and contribute to the character of the area.

• The Historic Resources Inventory, the city’s most recent study of historic resources in the St. Johns/Lombard area, is not complete. The plan area contains historic resources that are not identified.

• The plan area contains trees that may be worthy of heritage tree designation.

• St. Johns’ history as an independent city is evident throughout the area today. Planning efforts should recognize and respond to this character. Efforts should involve local community groups, such as the St. Johns Heritage Association.

• Potential projects that address the above issues include: (1) development of heritage education programs for schools and the greater community; (2) establish markers or plaques that commemorate historical events or prominent citizens; and (3) prepare nominations for individual properties to the National Register of Historic Places and nominations for trees for heritage tree designation.

Sources

(1) St. Johns History, Bicentennial First Issue, St. Johns Heritage Association.
(2) St. Johns Heritage Association, Vols. 2 through 5.
(3) Oregon Historical Society. Background information for the Indians of the Oregon Country Exhibit at the Oregon Historical Center, written by Edward Malin, 1968.
(4) St. Johns Review.
4. Demographics

The *St. Johns/Lombard Plan* encompasses parts of the Portsmouth, University Park, St. Johns and Cathedral Park neighborhoods. This chapter contains information on the characteristics of the people that live within these four neighborhoods. In this chapter, these four neighborhoods are sometimes referred to as the ‘study area.’ Together, they cover the North Portland peninsula west of Chautauqua Boulevard between the Columbia and Willamette Rivers.

The demographic information in this chapter is presented in two parts. The first part, Neighborhood Profiles, contains information on individual neighborhoods. The second part, Neighborhood Trends, contains information in a tabular and graphic format that illustrates the demographic trends in the area.


**Data prior to 1990.** The information presented prior to 1990 is only an approximation of neighborhood characteristics. The data used to 1990 followed census track boundaries. Because census tract boundaries do not align exactly with neighborhood boundaries the area for each neighborhood was slightly larger or smaller area than what was included within the official neighborhood boundaries.

**1990 and 2000 Data.** The data from 1990 and 2000 was derived from the *Portland Neighborhood Information Profiles*. This information was compiled by Portland State University’s Center for Urban Studies and the City of Portland’s Office of Neighborhood Involvement using 1990 and 2000 U.S. Census information and official neighborhood boundaries.
Neighborhood Profiles

St. Johns

Of the four neighborhoods in the study area, St. Johns has the largest population. The 2000 census reported a population of 11,346. The neighborhood has seen significant changes in its racial/ethnic diversity and family composition over the last twenty years.

The most significant demographic trend has been the increase of Hispanic residents in St. Johns. Since 1990, the Hispanic community has increased from three percent of the neighborhood in 1980 to roughly fifteen percent in 2000. According to the US Census, in the year 2000, the St. Johns population was sixty-two percent white, fifteen percent Hispanic, nine percent black, two percent American Indian/Alaska Native, six percent Asian/Pacific Islander, and five percent multiracial. Like Portsmouth, St. Johns is significantly more diverse than the city of Portland.

In 2000, nineteen percent of the 4,148 households in St. Johns were families with children under 18. In 1996 eighteen percent of the households with children were single parent families. The average household size in 2000 was 2.7.

St. Johns is the only neighborhood in the study area whose senior population diminished in size from 1990 to 2000. The age group of 18 to 64 year olds increased, however, in the same time period. This trend is similar to the city of Portland; the population 65 and older decreased from 1990 to 1996 while the 35 to 64 year old population increased. Citywide, there were more children under the age 20 in 1996 and fewer people between the ages 20 to 34. An increase occurred in the age group 0 to 17, from twenty-seven percent in 1990 to twenty-nine percent in 2000.

In 2000, St. Johns’ median household income was $38,577. The median value of owner occupied units was $128,150. Median gross rent was $638.

The educational attainment of St. Johns’ residents is most similar to the Portsmouth neighborhood. In 2000, twenty-five percent of residents over age 25 had not completed high school, while seventeen percent had degrees varying from vocational, associate, bachelor, and graduate.

In 2000, the occupations of St. Johns residents were concentrated in technical/sales/administrative (twenty-seven percent) and operators/fabricators/laborers (twenty-three percent). St. Johns had the highest percentage of persons commuting to work by car. The vast majority of St. Johns residents, 83.9 percent, reported driving to work in 2000; 4.2 percent commuted via public transportation.
Cathedral Park

Cathedral Park is the smallest neighborhood in the study area. In 2000, the U.S. Census reported that 3,033 people lived in Cathedral Park. The population was seventy-six percent white; the largest minority groups were black (six percent) and Hispanic (nine percent).

The 2000 Census reported 1,361 households in Cathedral Park. Of those households, twenty-two percent were married couples without children and thirteen percent were families with children under 18 years of age. Eighteen percent of all households were single parent families with children under 18. Average household size in 2000 was 2.2, the smallest in the study area.

The senior community in the neighborhood increased in population, while citywide the age group 65 years and older decreased from fourteen percent of total population in 1990 to twelve percent in 2000. The age group 18 to 64 increased from sixty percent in 1990 to sixty-seven percent in 2000. The age group 0-17 decreased from twenty-six percent in 1990 to twenty percent in 2000.

Cathedral Park is second to University Park for educational attainment of residents twenty-five years and older. In 2000, twenty-eight percent had attained some type of degree and fifty percent had at least completed high school, while only sixteen percent of residents over 25 had not completed high school.

In 2000, a high concentration or workers sixteen years and older, (twenty-eight percent), held jobs in technical/sales or administrative. Managers/professionals had the second highest concentration, with twenty-six percent of neighborhood workers.

In 2000, Cathedral Park had a median income of $36,484. The median value of owner occupied units was $119,275. Median gross rent was $644.

The Cathedral Park neighborhood has the second highest percent of residents driving to work (83.7 percent) of all the neighborhoods in the study area; 4.6 percent of workers commute by public transportation.

Portsmouth

Portsmouth is the most racially and ethnically diverse neighborhood in the study area. In 2000, the U.S. Census reported that fifty-one percent of the population was white, fourteen percent black, two percent American Indian/Alaska Native, seven percent Asian/Pacific Islander; nine percent multiracial. These figures have changed significantly in the last twenty years. The city of Portland overall is notably less diverse than Portsmouth; in 2000, Portland’s population was seventy-eight percent white. There is significant ethnic diversity in the Portsmouth neighborhood as well. In 2000, the Hispanic community represented seventeen percent of the population, an increase from four percent in 1980.
Portsmouth’s total population has slowly increased over the last twenty years, with 8,304 people reported in the 2000 Census. In 2000, there were 2,866 households in the neighborhood.

In 2000, nineteen percent of households were made of families with children under the age of 18. Seventeen percent of households had families with no children. Twenty-five percent were composed of female single parent with children. The average persons per household in 2000 was 2.9, an increase from 2.8 in 1990.

In 2000, the Portsmouth neighborhood had the highest percentage of residents in the study area that had not completed high school. For those over the age of 25, eighteen percent had not completed high school, while sixteen percent had a vocational, associate, bachelor, graduate or professional degree.

The median household income in 2000 was $34,511. Median value of owner occupied units was $118,000. Median gross rent was $548.

In 1990, the age group 65 years and older was ten percent of the population in the neighborhood. In 2000, the percentage decreased to seven percent. On the other hand, the age group 0 to 17 years increased from thirty-two percent in 1990 to thirty-three percent in 2000.

Twenty-eight percent of Portsmouth workers 16 years and older held jobs in the Operators/fabricators/laborers sector. Twenty-four percent held jobs in office/sales/technical.

The vast majority of Portsmouth’s residents, over eighty percent, reported driving to work in 2000. Over five percent of commuters used public transportation.

**University Park**

Between 1980 and 2000, the population increased from 5,072 to 5,250, about four percent. During the same period, the number of households increased from 1618 to 1,692, slightly over four percent.

In 2000, the average persons per household was 3.10, the largest in the study area. Of all households, twenty-nine percent were families without children. Sixteen percent were families with children under 18. Around thirteen percent were single parent households.

University Park is the least racially diverse of the four neighborhoods in the study area. In the year 2000, the U.S. Census estimated that eighty-four percent of the population was white, compared to fifty-one percent in the Portsmouth neighborhood. Hispanics represented the largest minority group at five percent.

Both the age groups 65 years and over and 0 to 17 years have decreased in the last ten years. In 2000, seniors made twelve percent of the population, compared
to seventeen percent in 1990. The number of children decreased to fourteen percent, from sixteen percent in 1990. The age group 18 to 64 increased from sixty-seven percent in 1990 to seventy-four percent in 2000.

The residents of University Park have the highest level of education in the study area, comparable to the city of Portland. In 2000, only seven percent of those 25 years and older had not completed high school; thirty-four percent had at least a college degree. Around sixty percent had some college education.

In 2000, sixty-five percent of workers over the age of 16 held jobs in the managerial/professional and office/sales/technical categories. The neighborhood had the lowest percentage of workers in operators/fabricators/laborers category.

In 2000, the median income in University Park was $46,224, the highest of the four neighborhoods. Median housing value (owner occupied units) was $143,917. Median gross rent was $650.

University Park residents had the lowest percentage of auto commuters of the four neighborhoods. Sixty-two percent drove to work. Fourteen percent walked to work, a much higher percentage than the other neighborhoods in the peninsula. University Park also had the lowest percentage of transit commuters. Close to four percent used public transportation to work.

**Neighborhood Trends**

**Total Population**

The total population in the four neighborhoods in the study area has increased from 12,719 in 1940 to 27,933 in 2000. Most of this growth occurred during the 1940s when the study area’s population increased 110 percent, from 12,719 people to 26,667. This population boom can be attributed to the thousands of new jobs created in the area during World War II. However, over the last fifty years, the study area has experienced only a modest ten percent growth. The table on the next page compares the population growth of the study area to the city of Portland from 1940 to 2000.
Figure 3: Total Population, 1940 to 2000

Table 1 shows the total number of persons living in each of the four neighborhoods in the study area in the twenty-year period from 1980 to 2000. The study area’s population was stable during the 1980s with an increase of 2,379 people during the 1990s.

Table 1: Population by Neighborhood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>7,807</td>
<td>7,806</td>
<td>8,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>5,072</td>
<td>4,964</td>
<td>5,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns</td>
<td>12,914*</td>
<td>9,803</td>
<td>11,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral Park</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2,981</td>
<td>3,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Area</td>
<td>25,793</td>
<td>25,554</td>
<td>27,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>367,917</td>
<td>467,401</td>
<td>507,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Census data for 1980 combines the St. Johns and Cathedral Park neighborhoods.
Racial/Ethnic Diversity

The dramatic increase in the ethnic and racial diversity of the study area is one of the most striking demographic trends of the last sixty years. In 1940 the population was ninety-nine percent white. By the year 2000, the white population had decreased to sixty-eight percent of the total.

The study area is significantly more racially diverse than the city of Portland as a whole. The first table below provides a comparison of the racial and ethnic distribution of the study area and Portland for the years 1980, 1990, and 2000. The second table shows the racial breakdown of the four neighborhoods in the study area. The third table shows the significant increase of the Hispanic community in the study area’s neighborhoods over the past twenty years.

Table 2: Race and Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Study Area</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Study Area</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Study Area</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Study Area</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Race</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*New ethnicity category in the 2000 Census.

Table 3: Race and Ethnicity by Neighborhood, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>Native Islander</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral Park</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding and respondents may also identify themselves as Hispanic in multiple race categories. Figures are for 2000.

Table 4: Hispanic Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns</td>
<td>3%*</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral Park</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Area</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Census data for 1980 combines the St. Johns and Cathedral Park neighborhoods.
Age Breakdown

The graph below illustrates the age breakdown in the study area from 1940 to 2000. The percentage of people in the 0-19 year old category in 1940 is almost identical to the percentage in 2000 (roughly twenty-nine percent), with a dramatic increase from the mid-1940s through the 1970s that represents the ‘baby boomers’ born after World War II. The senior population as a percentage of the total population in the study area has gradually increased since the 1950s with a slight decline during the 1990s.

Figure 4: Study Area Age Breakdown, 1940 to 2000

The table below illustrates the age breakdown of the study area neighborhoods during the ten-year period from 1990 to 2000 and how they compare with the city of Portland as a whole.

Table 5: Age of Population, 1990 to 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-17 Years</td>
<td>18-64 Years</td>
<td>65 Years and Older</td>
<td>0-17 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral Park</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Households

During the 1990s, roughly 526 households were added to the study area for a total of 10,067 households in 2000. Most of these new households (382) were in the St. Johns neighborhood.

Table 6: Total Number of Households, 1980 to 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>2,890</td>
<td>2,811</td>
<td>2,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>1,766</td>
<td>1,679</td>
<td>1,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns</td>
<td>5,163*</td>
<td>3,766</td>
<td>4,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral Park</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,285</td>
<td>1,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Area</td>
<td>9,819</td>
<td>9,541</td>
<td>10,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>159,504</td>
<td>187,262</td>
<td>197,087</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Census data for 1980 combines the St. Johns and Cathedral Park neighborhoods.

The average persons per household in the four study area neighborhoods has generally increased since 1980. University Park neighborhood had the highest average in 2000 with 3.1 persons per household. Cathedral Park has the lowest at 2.23, and is the only neighborhood in the study area below the citywide average.

Table 7: Average Number of Persons per Household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns</td>
<td>2.50*</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral Park</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Census data for 1980 combines the St. Johns and Cathedral Park neighborhoods.

The study area has a significantly higher percentage of single parent family households than the city of Portland as a whole. In 1996, sixteen percent of the households in the study area were single parent families with children under age 18 compared to only nine percent in the city of Portland.

Table 8: Single Parent Families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>1996</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral Park</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Area</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Families with children under age 18.
**Median Household Income**

In the study area, the median household income increased by only thirty-two percent from 1950 to 1996. In Portland, the median income increased by fifty-eight percent. The graph below has been adjusted for inflation.

**Figure 5: Adjusted Median Income, 1950 to 1996**

The numbers in Table 9 for median household income have not been adjusted for inflation.

**Table 9: Median Household Income, 1990 to 2000**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>$17,860</td>
<td>$28,064</td>
<td>$34,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>$28,211</td>
<td>$35,937</td>
<td>$46,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns</td>
<td>$21,097</td>
<td>$25,687</td>
<td>$38,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral Park</td>
<td>$18,958</td>
<td>$25,455</td>
<td>$36,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>$25,592</td>
<td>$31,524</td>
<td>$44,470</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 10: Household Income by Neighborhood, 2000**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than $14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral Park</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Educational Attainment

Education levels have risen in the study area over the last twenty years. In 1980, seventeen percent of residents over 25 years of age had less than a ninth grade education, compared to only nine percent in 2000; eight percent had completed four or more years of college, compared to twenty-two percent in 2000. In 1980, sixty-four percent of the population had attained at least a high school degree, compared to seventy-eight percent in 2000.

Table 11: Educational Attainment, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Attainment</th>
<th>Portsmouth</th>
<th>University Park</th>
<th>St. Johns</th>
<th>Cathedral Park</th>
<th>Study Area</th>
<th>Portland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 9th Grade</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th to 12th Grade, No Diploma</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School or Equivalent</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College, No Degree</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 or More Years of College</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Persons over 25 years of age.

Figure 6: Study Area Educational Attainment, 1980 to 2000
Table 12 below illustrates the percent change in people employed in specific occupation categories tracked by the census from 1980 to 2000. Overall, there has been a general increase in people employed in managerial/professional and service occupations. The numbers of people employed in the office/sales/technical and operators/fabricators/laborers occupation categories have remained fairly stable and the numbers of people employed in the precision/craft/repair category have declined.

### Table 12: Occupations, 1980 to 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Managerial/ Professional</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns</td>
<td>12%*</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral Park</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office/Sales/Technical</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns</td>
<td>31%*</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral Park</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Occupations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns</td>
<td>15%*</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral Park</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Precision, Craft, Repair</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns</td>
<td>16%*</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral Park</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operators, Fabricators, Laborers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns</td>
<td>26%*</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral Park</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Census data for 1980 combines the St. Johns and Cathedral Park neighborhoods.*
Travel to Work

In 2000, the majority of the study area’s residents used a private automobile to get to work. Public transportation was the second most common form of transportation to work in the study area neighborhoods. With the exception of the University Park neighborhood, where over fourteen percent of the residents walk to work (or an education facility), all other forms of transportation to work were very small.

Table 13: Transportation to Work by Neighborhood, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode of Transportation</th>
<th>Portsmouth</th>
<th>University Park</th>
<th>St. Johns</th>
<th>Cathedral Park</th>
<th>Portland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Automobile</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transportation</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Means</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work at Home</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Issues and Planning Implications

The neighborhood profiles and demographic data demonstrate some changes in demographics in the study area over the last twenty years. Some of the planning issues and implications associated with these changes are noted below.

- The St. Johns/Lombard area is an ethnically and racially diverse place. Over the last twenty years, the study area has experienced little population growth; however, the characteristics of its residents have changed significantly. In 1980, the study area’s population included mostly white residents (eighty-seven percent). Today, the percentage of white residents has dropped, while all other racial and ethnic categories have increased.

- The Hispanic community experienced a significant increase in population—eleven percent in the study area since 1980. The Asian community increased by four percent in the same period. Opportunities should be provided for these growing communities to participate in planning for their neighborhoods.

- The age breakdown of the study area population has changed in the last twenty years. The trend is toward an older population. The age range of 65 and older has remained consistent since 1980, representing thirteen percent of the total population. The age range of 35 to 64 has increased by eight percent, representing thirty-five percent of the total population. This is in contrast to the age range of 20 to 34, which decreased by seven percent since 1980, and the age range of 0 to 19, which decreased by three percent.

- There is a higher percentage of single parent families with children under age 18 in the study area than in the city as a whole. In 1996, sixteen percent of the population of the study area was in a single parent household compared with only nine percent citywide.

- The area has a relatively high average household size, indicating larger family household sizes overall. However, Cathedral Park has a very low number of persons per household and was the only area neighborhood to experience a decrease in household size between 1990 and 2000. This indicates a different type of household characteristic in Cathedral Park: fewer children and potentially higher per-capita income.

- In 2000, the median yearly household income in the study area was $4,650 less than the medium yearly household income of the city as a whole. The percentage of households in the middle income categories, between $15,000 and $49,000 in the study area is very similar to the city as a whole. However, the study area has a significantly higher percentage of households making less than $15,000 than the city as a whole (thirty-two percent vs. twenty-two percent) and less households making over $50,000 (seventeen percent vs. twenty-eight percent).
• Education levels increased over the last twenty years. Overall, residents have more school diplomas and college degrees. Even though the medium yearly household income increased, the breakdown of the different job categories of residents who live in the study area remained fairly constant (slightly more service workers but less precision, craft, and repair workers). Individual neighborhoods have experienced greater shifts in the percentages of residents working in the different job categories than the area as a whole.

• In the last twenty years the percent of people driving to work alone increased eleven percent. In 1980 fifty-nine percent of workers in the study area drove alone compared to seventy percent in 1996. Fewer workers are using public transit, thirteen percent in 1980 compared with ten percent in 1996. Residents who report working at home has increased by two percent since 1980.

Sources
Demographic information in this chapter was derived from the following sources.

1980 US Census, Neighborhood Statistics Program
• 1980 U.S. Census compiled data at the block level.
• 1980 Neighborhood Statistics Program data for neighborhoods in the study area, and for the city of Portland.
• Limitation: Friends of Cathedral Park and St. Johns neighborhoods were combined in the 1980 data.

U.S. Census Bureau Web Site
• Block group and census tract data for neighborhoods in the study area includes block groups 39.014, 39.015, and 39.024; census tracts 40.02, 40.04, 41.02, 41.01, 42.
• Limitation: Data includes a small portion of the Kenton and Arbor Lodge neighborhoods, east of Portsmouth and University Park.
• Limitation: At the time of this research only two variables from the 2000 U.S. Census were released: total population and racial and ethnic breakdown.

American Community Survey CD ROM
• The American Community Survey is a monthly sample household survey similar to the long form census questionnaire. It was first tested in 1996 and is expected to replace the long form for the 2010 Census. The 1996 American Community Survey provides the most current demographic data for all
variables other than total population and racial/ethnic breakdown, the only two variables that have been released from the 2000 U.S. Census.

- Block group and census tract data for the neighborhoods in the study area and for the city of Portland was obtained from the U.S. Census web site. This includes block groups 39.014, 39.015, and 39.024; census tracts 40.02, 40.04, 41.02, 41.01, 42.
- **Limitation:** Data include a small portion of the Kenton and Arbor Lodge neighborhoods, to the east of Portsmouth and University Park.
5. Land Use

This chapter provides information on the types and locations of land uses and activities in the St. Johns/Lombard plan area. It includes a description of the current land uses and the current Comprehensive Plan map designations and zoning for the plan area. Maps of Comprehensive Plan designations and land uses can be found on pages 67 and 77, respectively. Also included in this chapter are maps that depict the age of existing structures (page 79) and value of improvements compared to total assessed value (page 80).

Introduction

The land use patterns within older neighborhoods of the city have been shaped largely by history and past planning efforts. Streetcar lines, shipyards, and mills, circa 1900, helped shape the city’s form and left their mark on the city’s neighborhoods.

Previous planning efforts have resulted in policy documents such as the City’s Comprehensive Plan. These combined efforts have contributed in shaping land use patterns and created a strategy for refining and maintaining the city’s land use patterns through preservation, enhancement, and redevelopment.

(See Chapter 4, History and Urban Form, and Chapter 12, Previous Plans and Studies for more information.)

Comprehensive Plan Map Designations

The Comprehensive Plan map guides land use and development patterns within the City of Portland. All land in the city is assigned a Comprehensive Plan map designation that determines what type of land uses can be located there in the future. The Comprehensive Plan map designations protect community livability and provide certainty for those wishing to develop or redevelop their land. The designations are tied to policy statements in the Comprehensive Plan.

Zoning Map Designations

Each Comprehensive Plan map designation corresponds with one or more zones, which are defined in the Zoning Code. Zoning is a tool that helps implement the Comprehensive Plan map. The Zoning Code contains regulations that specify the
allowed development type, scale, and density on a given site. Zones include provisions that regulate the use of land and some aspects of building and site design. Like the Comprehensive Plan map, the official zoning maps specify which zone is applied to every site within the city.

Most land in the city has a zone that is consistent with its Comprehensive Plan map designation. However, there are some situations where the zoning differs from the Comprehensive Plan map designation. Usually this occurs when the existing land use pattern, or the services, are not in place to support the long range vision of the Comprehensive Plan. Within the St. Johns/Lombard plan area the two maps closely resemble each other. There are only seven places in the plan area where the zoning map designations differ from the Comprehensive Plan map designations.

In most cases the difference between the Comprehensive Plan map and the zoning map is that the Comprehensive Plan map calls for slightly higher residential densities than does the zoning map. However, in the hillside area of Cathedral Park the Comprehensive Plan map calls for high-density multi-dwelling development while the zoning map only allows medium density single-dwelling residential. In areas where these discrepancies occur, there is a quasi-judicial land use process by which the zoning map can be amended to match the Comprehensive Plan map as long as is can be demonstrated that there are adequate public services to accommodate the land uses.

Overlay Zones and Plan Districts

In addition to the Comprehensive Plan map and zoning map designations, sites may be affected by further regulations through the application of overlay zones or plan districts. These regulations supersede the base designations and may be more or less restrictive than the base designation. Overlay zones apply to specific circumstances rather than specific areas of the city and may deal with issues like design, scenic resources, greenway resources, or environmentally sensitive areas. In contrast, a plan district is created and applied to specific geographic areas to address unique characteristics and development issues.

Comprehensive Plan Map Designations

The Comprehensive Plan map designations are strategically applied throughout the city based on a number of factors. These factors include topography and other physical features, existing land uses and zoning, public review of legislative planning efforts, available and future infrastructure, and desired redevelopment activities. The pattern of Comprehensive Plan map designations within the St. Johns/Lombard plan area reflects these planning parameters. The following Comprehensive Plan map designations apply to the St. Johns/Lombard plan area.
Residential Designations

Although North Lombard Street is primarily designated for commercial uses, multidwelling residential designations are interspersed outside of the downtown area. There are also single dwelling designations directly adjacent to the commercial designations along much of Lombard outside of the downtown area.

The Cathedral Park hillside, southwest of downtown St. Johns, is designated for a mix of low, medium, and high density multidwelling development.

**High Density Single-Dwelling.** This designation continues Portland’s most common pattern of single-dwelling development. It is intended for areas with good public services and no development constraints. Single-dwelling residential is intended to be the primary use. The maximum density is generally 8.7 units per acre and the corresponding zone is R5.

**Attached Residential.** This designation is intended for areas with complete public services and without development constraints. It allows a mixture of housing types of a single-dwelling character, including attached houses. Allowed densities for attached houses are higher than for detached housing. The maximum density is generally 17.4 units per acre for attached housing. To allow the fulfillment of these densities, the allowed scale of these projects should be allowed to be greater than for other single-dwelling housing structure types. The corresponding zone is R2.5.

**Low Density Multidwelling.** This designation continues a common development pattern for low density multidwelling mixed with single-dwelling housing types. It is intended for areas with good public services and no development constraints. It may be used on larger development sites, or on smaller sites near arterials, transit service, or commercial areas. The maximum density is generally 21.8 units per acre, but may go up to 32 units per acre in some situations. The allowed scale of the development is greater than for single-dwelling housing. The corresponding zone is R2.

**Medium Density Multidwelling.** This designation continues a common development pattern for medium density apartments. It is intended for areas with good public services including transit, and no development constraints. It may be used for lands near arterials, transit streets, or commercial areas. The maximum density is generally 43 units per acre, but may go up to 65 units per acre in some situations. The scale of development is intended to reflect the allowed densities while being compatible with nearby single-dwelling areas. The corresponding zone is R1.

**High Density Multidwelling.** This designation allows high density multidwelling structures and structures of an intense scale. It is intended for areas with good public services including high quality transit, no development constraints, and proximity to commercial areas. Maximum density is based on a floor area ratio, not units per square foot. Densities range from 80 to 125 units per acre. The corresponding zone is RH.
Commercial Designations

Commercial land uses predominate along North Lombard Street, with multi-dwelling residential designations interspersed east of the railroad cut. Outside of downtown, North Lombard Street is predominately designated for General Commercial land uses. Within downtown St. Johns, North Lombard Street is designated Urban Commercial with the remainder of downtown bearing the Neighborhood Commercial designation.

**Neighborhood Commercial.** This designation is intended to allow neighborhood-oriented commercial uses in and adjacent to residential areas. In more densely developed neighborhoods, development should be oriented to pedestrians. In less densely developed neighborhoods, development may be more auto-oriented. In both cases, the allowed intensity of development is low to maintain compatibility with the residential areas, and development is oriented to pedestrians, bicycles, and transit where high quality transit service is available. The corresponding zones are Neighborhood Commercial 1 (CN1) and Neighborhood Commercial 2 (CN2).

**Urban Commercial.** This designation is intended for more developed parts of the city near relatively dense residential areas. A full range of retail, service, and business uses are allowed serving a local and a larger market area. It is intended primarily for areas that are served by transit. Development should have a strong orientation to pedestrians. It is also intended to allow commercial development in some areas while maintaining housing opportunities. The corresponding zones are Mixed Commercial/Residential (CM) and Storefront Commercial (CS).

**General Commercial.** This designation allows a full range of commercial uses having a local or regional market. Development will mostly have an auto-orientation, but along streets where high quality transit service is available, development will also be oriented to pedestrians, bicycles, and transit. It is intended for arterial streets and to be used for developing areas and for larger, older areas that already have an auto-oriented development style. The corresponding zone is General Commercial (CG).

Employment and Industrial Designations

Industrial and employment designations are located exclusively in areas adjacent to the Willamette River in a manner that reflects the historic pattern of riverfront development within the St. Johns area. Shipyards and port activities have been and remain a significant presence in the area.

**Mixed Employment.** This designation is intended for areas where a wide variety of employment opportunities are encouraged in an industrial-type setting. Industrial uses are allowed with few limitations. Commercial uses are allowed, but are limited in intensity as not to overburden public services and to maintain adequate industrial development opportunities.
Residential development is restricted to prevent conflicts with the other uses. The corresponding zones are General Employment 1 (EG1) and General Employment 2 (EG2).

**Industrial Sanctuary.** This designation is intended for areas where City policy is to reserve land for existing and future industrial development. A full range of industrial uses are permitted and encouraged. Nonindustrial uses are limited to prevent land use conflicts and to preserve land for industry. The corresponding zones are General Industrial 1 (IG1), General Industrial 2 (IG2), and Heavy Industrial (IH).

### Other Designations

The designated Open Space sites in the plan area are Cathedral Park and the St. Johns Community Center. Columbia Park, adjacent to the eastern border of the plan area, also has an Open Space designation.

**Open Space.** This designation is intended for lands that serve an open space function, primarily public lands, but also some private areas. Lands intended for open space designation include parks, natural areas, golf courses, and cemeteries. The corresponding zone is OS.
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Existing Land Use Pattern

The following narrative describes the existing land use pattern of the St. Johns/Lombard plan area. In some cases it will also identify the Comprehensive Plan map or zoning map designation. This narrative is based on field observations of plan staff and comments from participants of neighborhood walks held in the spring of 2002.

The existing land use pattern is described below in six separate segments. Each segment has distinct physical and land use characteristics.

North Lombard – East

This segment includes development along North Lombard Street between North Woolsey Avenue and North Portsmouth Avenue, extending approximately one block north and one block south .

A mix of commercial retail, institutional, single-dwelling and multidwelling residential development can be found fronting the street. A few sites have ground floor commercial uses with residential units located on the upper floors. Most structures are limited to two stories.

Approximately four vacant lots exist along this stretch of Lombard, although many properties in the easternmost area have low levels of development (parking or auto sales lots). Zoning is a combination of CG (General Commercial) and R1 (Medium Density Multidwelling).

Single-dwelling and multi-dwelling development, intermixed with limited institutional land uses, front the streets located one block north and south of Lombard in this area. This residential neighborhood also contains a number of vacant lots that could be redeveloped, based on current zoning (R1), with medium density multi-dwelling development.

Based on comments provided from the community during neighborhood walks conducted in May 2002, the retail and residential development in this area is considered to be some of the most pedestrian-oriented, particularly between North Fiske Avenue and North Portsmouth Avenue. This area was noted as having a successful pedestrian environment as it contains mature trees and neighborhood-oriented commercial development that is compatible with adjacent residential development. Columbia Park, located along the eastern edge of this area, is a noted amenity that adds to the positive aspects of this area.
North Lombard – Central

This segment includes North Lombard Street, and development located approximately one block north and south of Lombard along a stretch extending west from North Portsmouth Avenue to the railroad cut owned by Burlington Northern/Santa Fe.

A mix of commercial retail, institutional, and multidwelling residential development front Lombard in this area. Additionally, a few vacant lots and lots with vacant buildings front the street. The majority of businesses are vehicle serving (such as auto repair and servicing) or oriented towards auto access (such as fast food establishments). Generally, most retail development along this stretch of Lombard is limited to one story and typically has off-street parking areas. However, multi-dwelling development along the western section of this area is two stories. This stretch of Lombard is predominately zoned CG, but there are areas of R1, which correspond closely to the existing pattern of multidwelling development.

The development one block to the north and south of North Lombard Street is primarily single-dwelling houses, with approximately five multidwelling structures. Vacant lots were not identified in these areas. The current zoning designation is predominately R5 with a small amount of R1, matching the existing residential development.

Neighborhood walks participants noted that improvements are needed to the pedestrian environment. Participants also noted that there are many vehicle-servicing retail establishments and most development is oriented to the automobile rather than the pedestrian. However, there is general acknowledgment in the community that this area provides a variety of useful retail services.

The railroad cut defines the western border of this area. The railroad cut and associated bridge are identified as needing aesthetic improvements. Specifically, the bridge seems to lack regular maintenance and the chain link fencing applied is inconsistent with the original metal work along the railing. This site could be utilized as a significant ‘gateway’ to neighborhoods and business districts located east and west of the cut.
Participates of the neighborhood walks suggested that archways or banners could be added to the bridge to improve the aesthetics of this crossing. It was also noted that such improvements could better unite the east and west sections of North Lombard Street which are separated physically and visually by the railroad cut.

An additional aspect to the railroad cut is the Peninsula Crossing Trail, located along the eastern ridge of the cut. This trail extends from North Willamette Boulevard to North Columbia Boulevard. In 2002, a trail was completed around the Water Facilities Treatment plant north of Columbia Boulevard that connects the Peninsula Crossing Trail with the 40-mile loop along Columbia Slough. The trail provides north/south access across the peninsula for pedestrian and bicyclists, but its trailhead along North Lombard Street is not easily identified. Participants of the neighborhood walks noted that this trail system provides an excellent opportunity for access to other trails and neighborhoods along the peninsula. It was suggested that signage, green space maintenance, and incorporation of park amenities could improve identification of the trailhead and would enhance use and enjoyment of the trail.

**North Lombard – West**

This segment includes N. Lombard Street and development located approximately one block north and south of North Lombard Street along a stretch extending west from the railroad cut to North Buchanan Avenue.

A mix of commercial, single-dwelling residential, and institutional land uses can be found within this segment. Although commercial land uses are present, there are approximately sixteen single-dwelling structures. Commercial uses along this stretch are dominated by auto sales and servicing, along with some office buildings and a Fred Meyer retail center, one of two large grocery stores located within the plan area. The residential area located one block north and south of North Lombard Street is primarily single-
dwelling residential, with a few multidwelling buildings in addition to the Fred Meyer site.

Neighborhood walks participants pointed out that development backs onto the railroad cut rather than facing the cut. It was suggested that future development here and elsewhere along the cut be oriented to take advantage of the aesthetic amenity of the cut, a well-established woodland along the slopes. Walks participants also noted that many of the auto yards have chain-link fencing next to the sidewalk on North Lombard Street, creating a negative aesthetic experience for pedestrians.

**Downtown St. Johns**

For the purpose of this narrative, downtown St. Johns is defined as the area extending from North Buchanan Avenue west to North Trumbull Avenue along North Lombard Street, and extending from North Smith and Central Streets south to North Sycamore and Princeton Streets.

This area contains the greatest mix of uses including single and multidwelling residential, commercial, institutional, industrial, and mixed-use development. Commercial activities within this area are primarily located along North Lombard and Ivanhoe Streets, although some commercial development can be found one block north and south of these two streets.

The majority of commercial uses in this area is small-scale or specialty retail and dining facilities. Safeway operates a grocery store within this area but has plans to replace it with a larger facility at North Ivanhoe Street. Development located one block north or south of North Lombard Street is primarily small-scale retail establishments in older buildings. Approximately eleven mixed-use development buildings are located along this stretch. Development along North Ivanhoe Street and other nearby commercial sites is relatively recent and has a different character and architectural style than development along North Lombard Street.

Institutional uses in this area are primarily focused on public services such as schools, social and health services, libraries, community centers, and park and recreation facilities. Multi-dwelling land uses within this area are generally located along or close to major streets with transit service, such as North Lombard and Ivanhoe Streets. Single-dwelling development is located primarily in the northwest and southeast portions of this area, and is mixed with multidwelling development elsewhere.
The CN2 (Neighborhood Commercial 2) zone is applied along blocks just north and south of North Lombard Street, and there is a fairly inconsistent pattern of development within these areas. The CN2 zone allows for a mix of commercial as well as single and multidwelling land uses. The CN2 zone is intended to be primarily auto accommodating and requires on-site parking. This can result in a pattern of development out of context with adjacent residential sites and the type of development typically found in more urban zones, such as the CS (commercial storefront) zoned areas along North Lombard Street.

During the neighborhood walks, community members noted that downtown St. Johns has a scale and visual character appealing to many people. Participants noted that additional higher-density or mixed-use residential development could help revitalize and support existing commercial uses.

It was further noted that this area has a concentration of civic and institutional uses, such as a plaza, park, library, and school, that are well connected to downtown commercial development. Some of these uses have views of the west hills and the St. Johns Bridge. It was suggested that these areas provide a foundation for public use; investment in these facilities could strengthen the downtown area as the center or ‘heart’ of the peninsula community.

Walk participants also noted that the downtown is not well connected with surrounding neighborhoods or the waterfront area. They also identified truck traffic through the downtown area as a major impact on the pedestrian environment; they also noted traffic on North Ivanhoe and North Lombard Streets as a safety hazard for students attending James John Elementary School.

Cathedral Park Hillside

For the purpose of this narrative, this area is defined as south of North Syracuse and North Princeton Streets, extending to roughly North Decatur Street and extending from North Tyler Avenue west to North New York Avenue.

A mix of single-dwelling and multidwelling residential development dominates this area. The greatest concentration of single-dwelling houses are located along
the eastern edge of the area. Throughout the residential areas are pockets of intact traditional bungalow style houses as well as areas with newer townhouses or attached houses. Multidwelling development exists primarily within the central portion, but is also found mixed with older bungalows and newer townhouses throughout the Cathedral Park hillside.

Several blocks located in the northwest portion of this area are designated High Density Residential (RH) by the Comprehensive Plan map; a few blocks in this area are also zoned RH. Only one structure, the Schrunk Tower, has the scale and height allowed by the RH zone. The majority of this area is located within the scenic (s) overlay zone. This overlay zone requires that new development be limited to 75 feet in height and specifies that development meet all Zoning Code design standards applicable to development within a scenic corridor.

During the neighborhood walks it was noted that Cathedral Park and views of the Willamette River, St. Johns Bridge, and Forest Park are significant attributes of this area. It was also noted that the mix of housing types and employment areas is an additional advantage. The area has a number of steeply sloped streets, and many streets are unimproved or lack sidewalks. These features were seen as limiting factors in providing pedestrian access to the riverfront and establishing connections between the river, the hillside, and downtown St. Johns.

Willamette Riverfront

The Willamette Riverfront contains two areas: a northern portion which lies roughly between North Decatur and North Bradford Streets, and a southern portion from North Bradford to the Willamette River. An active rail line that serves industry lies within the North Bradford right-of-way.
The northern portion of this area contains industrial and employment land uses focused in manufacturing, salvage, and storage. This industrial area extends from roughly North Decatur to North Bradford Streets, from North New York Avenue to North Richmond Avenue. Cathedral Park, which is designated and zoned Open Space (OS) and bisects the area near its midpoint. The eastern portion of this area is zoned EG2 (General Employment 2), and contains a steel storage and shipment facility, truck repair use, and other industrial storage facilities. Some industrial lands appear to be underutilized; several lots are used primarily to house surplus marine parts and boats in various states of construction. Much of the land in this area is vacant of development and is used as outdoor storage.

West of Cathedral Park the area is mostly designated General Industrial (IG2). The area includes a number of industrial buildings with office, manufacturing and distribution uses. This area contains the former Columbia Sportswear site, a full block development that is currently vacant, and Moonstruck Chocolates. The area near Cathedral Park also includes a partially developed block of residential land uses bounded by North Decatur, North Crawford, North Baltimore and North Alta. This block is designated High Density Multi-dwelling Residential (RH). Several sites located west of North Baltimore are substantially developed industrial uses served by rail. Vehicle and pedestrian access is via North Bradford Street, a substandard right-of-way that also accommodates rail lines.

The south portion of the Willamette Riverfront extends between North Bradford Street and the river east from Port of Portland Terminal 4, to North Tyler Avenue. This area runs along the east bank of the river and contains five primary sites. The Mar-Com site, located on the western portion of this area, is an industrial site used for ship refurbishing. It is located in the Heavy Industrial zone (IH), adjacent to other heavy industrial sites to the west. Mar-Com is accessed via North Bradford Street, and is bordered on the west by Terminal 4 and on the east by Cathedral Park. Cathedral Park, which is designated and zoned Open Space (OS), borders the Bureau of Environmental Services (BES) Water Pollution Control Lab, an institutional/employment land use site zoned EG2. Next to the BES site is an industrial storage site used primarily to store steel, also zoned EG2. The last site in this area is a portion of Metro’s Willamette Cove property.
Willamette Cove is an area of open space, recently acquired by the Metro Green Space program, which extends west to the railroad cut.

This entire area is located within the Willamette Greenway. Development within this area is subject to the provisions of Chapter 33.440 (Greenway Overlay Zones) of the Zoning Code. This chapter contains criteria, standards, and procedures for the development of land, change of uses, and the intensification of uses within the greenway. It also contains regulations and standards focused on floodway protection, riverfront recreation and access, and riverbank environmental resources. There are five specific greenway overlay zones, four of which apply to portions of this area. Some of the use restrictions and development standards applicable to these overlay zones are similar; however, differences do exist and may affect the pattern of future development along the riverfront.

Walk participants noted that access to the river is a major attribute but that the riverfront is not well connected with the residential hillside or downtown St. Johns. Good pedestrian access exists along the riverfront from the BES Water Lab to and through Cathedral Park, but access to and through Willamette Cove is desired. Participants noted that pedestrian access along the greenway trail should extend from Cathedral Park to the Swan Island industrial area, located approximately 1.5 miles up river. Participants generally indicated that much of the area appears underutilized (vacant or used for storage), and may be ready to transition to other uses.
MAP 4: Existing Land Uses on this page.
Key Issues and Planning Implications

The existing land uses within the St. Johns/Lombard plan area are the result of the evolution of the area from an independent town. Today’s Comprehensive Plan map designations are largely the result of the citywide Comprehensive Plan adopted in 1980. The following list of issues and planning implications are from observation about the existing conditions and comments received through surveys and at various public workshops held to date.

- Modification of existing Comprehensive Plan map designations and base zoning may be necessary to realize the vision presented by the plan and create successful urban areas.

- The General Commercial designation along North Lombard Street east of downtown St. Johns has promoted an auto-accessible development pattern. However, it may be appropriate to promote a ‘main street’ pedestrian-oriented environment in select areas, particularly from Portsmouth to Fiske. These areas generally developed at a time that predates extensive use of automobiles, when pedestrian and public transportation played a more significant role in the shaping of the urban environment.

- Use of Neighborhood Commercial (CN2) in downtown St. Johns should be reviewed. Development standards of the CN2 base zone may not be appropriate for town center development.

- Use of the High Density Residential (RH) designation for the Cathedral Park hillside should be examined for compatibility with vision of future residential development.

- Examine areas along North Lombard Street for conflicts between the commercial zone interface with single-dwelling residential areas.

- Examine the industrial/employment zones along the riverfront. Many sites seem underutilized. A balance is needed between the need for industrial land and the desire to improve the riverfront as an activity area.

- For some sites, a change in the Comprehensive Plan or zoning designation may classify the existing use as nonconforming, or not permitted by the new designations. Although this situation is unavoidable, especially for areas where a change of use is desirable, measures can be taken to limit the creation of nonconforming uses.

- Many zones appropriate for town centers and main streets are for areas that have good pedestrian access and transit service. Improvements to the transportation system as a whole need to be identified to help create a successful town center and main street.
6. Housing

Although the plan area focuses around the commercial town center and main street areas, there is a notable amount of residential uses within its boundaries. For a broader picture and better understanding of the area’s housing, demographic information is presented for St. Johns, Cathedral Park, Portsmouth, and University Park neighborhoods. Within the context of this chapter, these neighborhoods are referred to as the ‘study area.’


Data prior to 1990. The information presented prior to 1990 is only an approximation of neighborhood characteristics. The data used prior to 1990 followed census track boundaries. Because census tract boundaries do not align exactly with neighborhood boundaries, the actual area for each neighborhood was slightly larger or smaller than what was included within the official neighborhood boundaries.

1990 and 2000 Data. The data from 1990 and 2000 was derived from the Portland Neighborhood Information Profiles. This information was complied by the City of Portland’s Office of Neighborhood Information and Portland State University’s Center for Urban Studies using 1990 and 2000 census information and official neighborhood boundaries.
Neighborhood Housing Demographics

Number of Housing Units

During the period of 1990 and 2000, 480 housing units were added to the study area. During the 1990s the majority of the new units built in the study area (395 units) were located in the St. Johns neighborhood. Portsmouth, University Park, and Cathedral Park neighborhoods each experienced an increase of less than fifty new units in the same ten year period.

Table 14: Number of Housing Units, 1990 to 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>2,993</td>
<td>3,016</td>
<td>3,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>1,847</td>
<td>1,751</td>
<td>1,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns</td>
<td>*5,508</td>
<td>4,066</td>
<td>4,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral Park</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,374</td>
<td>1,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Area</td>
<td>10,348</td>
<td>10,207</td>
<td>10,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>168,591</td>
<td>210,820</td>
<td>236,578</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Census data for 1980 combines the St. Johns and Cathedral Park neighborhoods.

Housing Units in Structure

Within the City of Portland, there has been a slight decrease in the percentage of single-dwelling housing units and a slight increase of housing units in apartment buildings. Neighborhoods in the study area generally reflect this trend. However, the number of single-dwelling units increased in Cathedral Park.

Table 15: Housing Units in Structure Type, 1990 to 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhoods</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single Dwelling</td>
<td>Duplex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral Park</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Occupied Status

Since 1980 the percentage of housing units occupied vs. the percentage of housing units vacant in the study area neighborhoods has closely mirrored the City of Portland as a whole. In all four neighborhoods the split has been fairly consistent throughout the twenty year time period.

Table 16: Housing Unit Occupancy Status, 1980 to 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns</td>
<td>94%*</td>
<td>6%*</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral Park</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Census data for 1980 combines the St. Johns and Cathedral Park neighborhoods.

Tenure

In the study area neighborhoods for the period 1980-1996, the percentage of owner occupied housing units has increased over the past twenty years. This is also the trend for the city of Portland as a whole.

Table 17: Housing Units by Tenure, 1980 to 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns</td>
<td>51%*</td>
<td>43%*</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral Park</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Census data for 1980 combines the St. Johns and Cathedral Park neighborhoods.

Date of Construction

As of 1996, fifty-two percent of the housing units in the study area were built before 1950, but only five percent were built after 1979. University Park neighborhood has the least amount of recently built housing in the study area with seventy-one percent built before 1950, and two percent built after 1979.

Table 18: Age of Housing Units, 1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Built 1949 or Earlier</th>
<th>Built 1950-1979</th>
<th>Built 1980 or Later</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>1,433</td>
<td>1,901</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>1,383</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns</td>
<td>1,980</td>
<td>1,764</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral Park</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Area</td>
<td>5,654</td>
<td>4,925</td>
<td>541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>10,849</td>
<td>78,784</td>
<td>18,806</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Median Value of Owner Occupied Units/Median Gross Rent

During the 1980s, the median value of owner occupied housing units in the study area remained fairly constant. However, the median value of owner occupied units rose sharply during the 1990s in the study area and Portland as a whole. The median values of owner occupied units listed in Table 19 below are not adjusted for inflation.

Table 19: Median Value of Housing Units, 1980 to 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>$41,700</td>
<td>$38,100</td>
<td>$118,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>$50,200</td>
<td>$51,600</td>
<td>$143,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns</td>
<td>$40,500*</td>
<td>$37,400</td>
<td>$128,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral Park</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>$38,700</td>
<td>$119,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>$54,900</td>
<td>$58,600</td>
<td>$173,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Census data for 1980 combines the St. Johns and Cathedral Park neighborhoods.

In 1980 the median gross monthly rent in the study area was the same as the city of Portland as a whole. However, by 2000 the gross monthly rent in the study area was 84 dollars less than Portland as a whole. The median gross monthly rates listed in Table 20 below are not adjusted for inflation.

Table 20: Median Gross Monthly Rents, 1980 to 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>$183</td>
<td>$351</td>
<td>$548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>$204</td>
<td>$457</td>
<td>$650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns</td>
<td>$212*</td>
<td>$380</td>
<td>$638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral Park</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>$343</td>
<td>$644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>$203</td>
<td>$397</td>
<td>$709</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Census data for 1980 combines the St. Johns and Cathedral Park neighborhoods.
**Median Income/Median Housing Value**

The cost of housing is rising faster than the median income for the study area as well as for Portland. The graphics below, adjusted for inflation to the 1996 dollar value, indicate a sharp rise in median housing value accompanied by a lack of growth in median income. In the study area, the median household income increased by 32 percent from 1950 to 1996; significantly less than the 287 percent growth in median value of owner-occupied units. In Portland, the median income increased by 58 percent while the median value of owner occupied units rose 225 percent.

**Figure 5: Adjusted Median Income, 1940 to 1996 (also shown on p. 54)**

![Median Income Graph](image)

**Figure 7: Median Gross Monthly Rents, 1980 to 2000**

![Rents Graph](image)
Key Issues and Planning Implications

The data collected in this chapter demonstrates some changes in the housing demographics in the study area over the past fifty years. Some of the planning issues and implications associated with these changes are noted below.

- Housing within the study area is composed primarily of multidwelling units while the surrounding areas are mostly single dwelling units. This mix is appropriate in town center and main street areas, which call for a greater concentration of housing, retail and employment uses.

- The St. Johns/Lombard plan area has many amenities that make it an attractive place to live. Additional housing and mixed-use development near public transit could help reduce auto usage and encourage more pedestrian activity. More people walking, working, and shopping in St. Johns downtown and along Lombard Street would help create a more pleasant, safer environment.

- The data reveal an increase in the percentage of owner-occupied housing. While this is a positive indicator, the planning effort should ensure the potential for a wide range of housing types that are suitable for residents of all ages, income levels, and abilities.

- Rents and sales prices in the study area are lagging behind Portland as a whole. Lower rents and prices may make the area less desirable for housing developers.
7. Transportation

Consultant’s Report Under Separate Cover
8. Economic Conditions

Consultant’s Report Under Separate Cover
9. Environment

This chapter is divided into three sections: Willamette River Waterfront, Upland Environmental Resources, and Hazard Areas. Environmental resources in these sections are in or near the St. Johns/Lombard plan area. A map of the environmental resources can be found on page 94. The hazard area section contains maps of flood, landslide, and earthquake hazards on pages 104 to 106.

**Willamette River Waterfront**

The Willamette River waterfront of the St. Johns/Lombard plan area includes Cathedral Park and a portion of the waterfront known as North Beach. The boundaries of North Beach extend along the northeast bank of the river from Cathedral Park to the University of Portland, and consists of three primary environmental resources: Willamette Cove, the McCormick and Baxter site, and the Triangle Park property.

North Beach and its individual component areas have been evaluated and studied by numerous planning efforts conducted over the last few years, a few of which are ongoing. Reports produced in support of these efforts document riverbank composition, habitat conditions, flood hazards, contamination issues, former land uses, and potential future land uses. Information compiled in these documents has been cited below to provide a more complete picture of the Willamette waterfront in the St. Johns area.

*(See the sources section at the end of this chapter for more information about these studies.)*

**Willamette Cove**

Willamette Cove is a twenty-seven-acre tract of open space acquired by Metro in 1996 that extends along the river from Richmond Avenue to the Burlington Northern Railroad bridge. This open space area is currently vacant but the site once contained a mill and dry-dock facility. Some structural remnants of these past uses, such as concrete foundations, can be found on site.

The intended future use of the property is an urban natural area with passive recreation opportunities. Previous industrial uses at this site have contaminated the soils in the area. The *North Beach Vision and Action Plan* (September 1999) proposed a long-term land use transition for the lowlands between Cathedral Park and the University of Portland from industrial sanctuary to mixed use. The plan also proposed relocation of the greenway trail from Willamette Boulevard closer to the river.
Map 7: Environmental Resources

Vegetation
Willamette Cove contains small areas of beach with driftwood and rubble. The forest is closer to the river where the bank is less steep. The forestlands of Willamette Cove are dominated by young black cottonwood trees and contain nonnative tree species, including Lombardy, poplar, catalpa, and holly. Cherry and birch also occur infrequently. Himalayan blackberry and clematis dominate the understory and are suppressing most other plant species other than sword fern. Exotic English ivy is also carpeting the understory and topping the crowns of many trees. The forest contains few large trees and snags (most were killed by ivy), and is bisected by well-worn and compacted dirt trails. Tree canopy cover within this forest varies from fifty to seventy percent, shrub cover from fifty to eighty percent, and herbaceous cover is only fifteen to twenty-five percent.

Wildlife Habitat
Willamette Cove contains a long stretch of riparian corridor that is linked to river and upland forest habitat. The banks and beach vary from natural to semi-natural in condition, but overall create an unbroken stretch of undeveloped riverfront from the north to the south end of the site. The site also contains a unique mixture of vegetative community types within a relatively small area, including natural and semi-natural beach, open parkland, open grassland,
scrub/shrub, bottomland forest adjacent to a foothill savanna/oak woodland community. This assemblage of plant communities in conjunction with the river creates a habitat mosaic that supports a diverse group of resident and migratory birds, insects, small mammals, and fish. The quality of food sources is also more likely to be sustained year-round with so many habitat types in proximity to each other, making this an important forage area for most species found here.

There are several factors which serve to limit the abundance or quality of habitat and species diversity within this reach, including soil and sediment contamination, various outfalls, widespread and uncontrolled exotic plant species invasion, excessive erosion on unprotected trails, and an abundance of debris on beach and banks. The soil quality may be limited in this area due to a history of commercial sawmill activity. The exotic invasion within the understory and canopy of the mixed forest area is having a severe detrimental effect on the majority of understory plant species, and is limiting the productivity of this forest. The extensive trail system within the southern half of this site has created large areas of compacted, unvegetated soil that is increasing erosion of the substrate within the forest and shrub areas of the site. The debris and rubble on the beach and banks of the river reduces the value of the areas as foraging habitats, and promotes a less aesthetic character than necessary for such a long stretch of otherwise natural beach.

**Flooding**

Portions of Willamette Cove are located within the 100-year flood plain and the first twenty to fifty feet of the entire waterfront of this area was inundated in the 1996 flood.

**Recreational Trails**

The *Willamette Greenway Plan* shows the primary greenway trail along the top of the riverbank through Willamette Cove. The *North Portland Willamette Greenway Trail Feasibility Study* proposes an additional trail alignment through Willamette Cove along the railroad tracks. There is a trail gap between Willamette Cove and the BES Water Lab, at an industrial site used by Lampros Steel.

**Zoning**

The River General (g), greenway overlay zone has been applied to Willamette Cove. This overlay zone is intended to extend protection to existing resources along riverbank and calls for the planting of additional greenway vegetation where vegetation does not exist or is dominated by nonnative species.

Since 1996, an additional greenway overlay zone has been established, the River Water Quality (q) overlay, to protect the functional values of water quality resources by prohibiting, limiting, or mitigating the impact of development along the riverbank. This overlay zone is applied along the length of Willamette Cove and extends from the water’s edge to North Bradford Street.
McCormick and Baxter Site

The McCormick and Baxter site is a fifty-acre parcel located along the south side of the Burlington Northern Railroad bridge, outside the St. Johns/Lombard plan area. The property has been owned by the McCormick and Baxter Creosote Company for over fifty years and was once operated as a wood treatment plant. However, the site has been closed since 1991 and was listed as a Superfund site in 1994 by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) due to extensive contamination of soils, groundwater, and river sediments, associated with past wood-treatment operations. The EPA and Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) are currently leading a multiyear clean-up project for the site. It is estimated that clean-up operations will cost $20 million and last a number of years with efforts designed to isolate contaminated soils and shoreline sediments to make the site safe for reuse. Ground water monitoring and treatment efforts are expected to continue for several years longer.

In 2002 the Bureau of Planning published the McCormick and Baxter Site Reuse Assessment: Final Report. This report analyzed the site’s redevelopment potential and presented an approach for the reuse of the site based on a recommendation of an advisory committee with members representing stakeholder and community interests. The recommendation of this committee is to redevelop the site as a permanent park to include a variety of active and passive recreation uses and to rehabilitate the waterfront as a riparian buffer 100 to 300 feet wide. Implementation of this recommendation includes the development of interpretative and recreational trails, such as a segment of the conceptual North Portland Trail, which bisects the site.

Vegetation and Wildlife Habitat

Despite the presence of vegetation this area has not been identified as having significant habitat value, nor has it been the focus of any recent resource assessments conducted along this stretch of the river.

Zoning

The River Industrial (i) greenway overlay, applied over the entire site, designates the site for river dependent or river-related industrial land uses. This zone also extends significant protection of bank resources as it requires that new development be set back seventy-five feet from the top of bank and restoration of the bank area with greenway vegetation. Thus, redevelopment of the site would include revegetation of the nonvegetated portions of the riverbank.

Flooding

The 1996 flood did not significantly affect this site and only small portions of the riverbank located within the 100-year flood plain were impacted. The riverbank composition along this site is a combination of river beach and unclassified fill materials. The bank has been heavily altered by previous development; yet, riparian vegetation is located along a beach area located on the northern half of the riverbank.
**Triangle Park Property**

The Triangle Park property is a vacant industrial site located between the McCormick and Baxter site and the University of Portland. This site is also outside the St. Johns/Lombard plan area. Although the site is vacant of buildings, BES maintains a stormwater detention facility as this site has barge-docking facilities located along the north segment of its riverbank. The riverbank of this site consists of riprap and unclassified fill. The riprap portion of the bank is located adjacent to the barge docking facilities.

The *North Beach Vision and Action Plan* notes that this property was purchased in 1997 for use as a water dependent industrial site. Specifically, the plan goes on to note that the property owners, Triangle Park, LLC, plan to use the site for marine industrial uses along the waterfront and that warehouse facilities or light industrial uses could be located north of the railroad tracks that bisect the site.

This site is unique to North Beach in that it has rail access as well as existing barge docking facilities. Despite these potential industrial amenities, the roads leading to the site do not serve the site well. Primary access to the site is provided via Van Houten Road which has a very steep lower section that is not well suited to handle either large volumes of traffic or large truck traffic. The only other route into the site is provided by a steep, curvy stretch of North Portsmouth Avenue that is only capable of providing secondary emergency access to the site. It has been estimated that making road improvements necessary to accommodate industrial truck traffic could cost several million dollars.

In addition to transportation constraints, this site is affected by other factors that may determine how it is used in the future. The *North Beach Vision and Action Plan* notes it is contaminated by past industrial uses. However, the plan notes that most of the contamination is found near shore river sediments and that Triangle Park, LLC, has agreed to commit up to $750,000 to investigate and conduct remediation activities pursuant to a prospective purchaser agreement made with DEQ. Additionally, portions of this site located between the river’s edge and railroad tracks are within the 100-year flood plain and were inundated by the 1996 flood.

Although various factors limit redevelopment of this site, the *North Beach Vision and Action Plan* recommended that the site be utilized for a mix of industrial and commercial uses, with the BES stormwater facility being retained and possibly enhanced to serve as an interpretative feature integrated with the greenway trail. The plan notes that access to the site via Van Houten Road should be enhanced and that secondary access via North Edgewater Street, located north of the site within Willamette Cove, should also be considered.

**Zoning**

The site is zoned for heavy industrial land uses and the River Industrial (i) greenway overlay zone is applied to this site.
Other Waterfront Areas

Three additional waterfront sites are located near or within the immediate St. Johns waterfront area. The Bureau of Environmental Services Water Pollution Control Lab is located adjacent to the southeast boundary of Cathedral Park. The Mar-Com shipyard and the Port of Portland Terminal 4 are both located just north of Cathedral Park, with the Mar-Com shipyard being centered between Terminal 4 and the park. These sites are briefly described below.

Bureau of Environmental Services Water Pollution Control Laboratory

At the base of the St. Johns Bridge, the Water Pollution Control Lab returned a 7.6-acre formerly polluted industrial site to public access. See page 120, Chapter 12, Public Facilities and Services, for more information.

Mar-Com Shipyard

The Mar-Com facility is a privately owned and operated shipyard that conducts repairs, overhauls, and design and construction of new vessels. The site has dry-dock and crane facilities along the waterfront, as well as berthing facilities and storage areas. In addition to its waterfront access, the site is located directly adjacent to an active railroad line, and truck and vehicle access via North Bradford Street. The riverbank composition of this site is largely unclassified fill materials. Much of the site is within the 100-year flood plain; these areas roughly correlate with the areas inundated by the 1996 flood.

The riverbank associated with the site has been heavily altered by industrial development. A review of surface and aerial photographs indicate that no significant clusters of riparian vegetation exist on site. Additionally, it appears that no recent assessments have been conducted to evaluate resources or habitat potential at this site. Despite the absence of riparian habitat on site, the River Industrial (i) greenway overlay has been applied to this site; thus, a planting of greenway vegetation is required along the riverbank if the site is redeveloped.

Port of Portland - Terminal 4

Terminal 4 is a large marine industrial facility that contains nine berths, a grain elevator, bulk freight facility, rail and truck access, and other support facilities. This facility borders the plan area. Some of these facilities are underutilized or considered obsolete by the Port of Portland who is considering various redevelopment options for this facility and the other terminals operated by the Port. Toyota Motor Corporation currently leases a significant portion of the terminal as an automobile off-loading and temporary storage site. Their operations are located just north of the Mar-Com shipyard. The Port is currently redeveloping the lease area to consolidate and modernize vehicle off-loading, storage and processing facilities for Toyota.

The riverbank composition in this area is largely a combination of riprap, sea walls, and structures. An area extending along the riverbank and landward no more than 100 feet is within the 100-year flood plain, and the 1996 flood inundation area extends up to 200 feet from the riverbank. Riparian vegetation does not currently exist along the riverbank; however, the ‘i’ greenway overlay
zone has been applied to this site. The application of this overlay zone implies that greenway vegetation is required to be re-established along the bank where it does not conflict with marine industrial land uses. Currently, the Port of Portland is proposing, as part of the Terminal 4 Toyota redevelopment, to restore the bank along the shoreline of the Toyota facility by removing riprap, fill and other bank treatments, “rolling back” the bank, and installing bioengineered bank treatments including native riparian vegetation.

**Upland Environmental Resources**

In addition to the natural areas identified along the east bank of the Willamette River, there are three primary upland natural areas located within or in close proximity to the St. Johns/Lombard Plan study area: Edison Street Forest, Waud Bluff, and the railroad cut. Although, these areas are not in a pristine state, they are important. They provide islands of habitat and migration corridors for a variety of wildlife, and help to reduce stormwater runoff, air pollution, and heat island effects. For residents, they offer an aesthetic and physical retreat from the built environment associated with the peninsula. The following sections describe these areas in greater detail.

**Edison Street Forest**

The Edison Street forest is located approximately 1500 feet east of Cathedral Park. The site is bordered on the east by North Edison Street. The forest area is completely surrounded by residential and commercial property, and is situated on a bluff overlooking the Toyota auto-receiving shipyard at Port Terminal 4.

**Vegetation**

The site contains approximately ten acres of open oak forest and disturbed understory, interspersed with small areas of planted lawn. The forest occurs in two sections that form an “L” shape. Large white oak trees, characteristic of the foothill savanna/oak woodland community type, dominate the bluff. The trees are approximately 95 to 120 years of age. A mixture of medium aged Douglas fir, bigleaf maple, black cottonwood, and Scouler willow also occur at the site. The forest canopy is fairly open, with canopy closure from thirty to forty-five percent. Bigleaf maple, black cottonwood, and Douglas fir dominate the northern section of the forest. The open canopy has allowed an invasive and disturbance-based shrub and herbaceous understory to develop on the moderately dry and exposed ridge. The shrub understory in both sections of the forest is largely composed of Himalayan blackberry, young holly, cultivated apple trees, Scot’s broom, and trailing blackberry. The herbaceous understory contains a non-native-dominated mixture of reed canarygrass, fowl mannagrass, western sword fern, tansy ragwort, clematis, English ivy, vetch, Canada thistle, and bedstraw.

The understory throughout the forest contains large areas of disturbance, including many intersecting areas of severely compacted and eroding dirt trails,
debris piles, and small excavated pits which contained surface water at the time of the surveys. A few snags are located within the forest, and the majority of large mature white oak trees are within 100 feet of the edge of the bluff. The edge of the bluff is densely carpeted with English ivy, which is suppressing most other vegetation on this west facing exposed shelf.

**Wildlife Habitat**

This site received a low habitat score on the City’s Wildlife Habitat Assessment Survey form when compared to other habitat sites in the area. Some of the trees contain holes on dead limbs that suggest woodpecker or other small cavity-nesting bird use. Although this forest is one of the only areas of local cover for bird or small mammal species, wildlife use within the site is limited due to the relatively small size of the forest and the disturbed nature of the understory. The Toyota shipyard consists of a very large paved area that does not allow habitat connections between this site and the Willamette River. This ‘sea’ of pavement forms an island of reflected heat, which can scorch vegetation and prevent many species from utilizing surrounding habitat areas. Bird species observed included dark-eyed junco, song and house sparrows, starlings, American robin, and golden-crowned kinglet. Several raccoon tracks and mole holes were also found on the site. It is likely that raptors such as red-tailed hawks may hunt this site while utilizing the updrafts of warm air that form along the bluff face.

**Zoning**

Much of this area is currently designated General Employment 2 (EG2). Residential uses may be allowed in this zone through the conditional use approval process. A new multi-unit housing development recently began development within a portion of this resource area. The development site is approximately 1.5 acres in size and is located at the intersection of North Reno Avenue and North Edison Street. This development has had a significant impact to the forest canopy as a number of mature oak trees were removed. These impacts are possible because the forest is not protected by city, state, or federal regulations.

**Railroad Corridor**

The railroad corridor resource is approximately forty-five acres and bisects the peninsula for a length of 6,600 feet, from Willamette Cove to an area near the southeast shore of Smith Lake. The corridor, also known as the Portsmouth Cut and railroad cut, was excavated in 1907 to create an at-grade railroad crossing across the peninsula to provide direct access from the north to Portland for the former Great Northern Railroad. The corridor bisects the St. Johns/Lombard plan area near the mid-point of North Lombard Street.

The combination of soil composition (the dominate type along the corridor is silt loam Goble soil) and slopes (averaging forty degrees in grade) results in hazards within the corridor related to soil erosion, slumping, and landslides.
Vegetation
The vegetation on the banks is comprised of a deciduous overstory and large shrub zone containing numerous native and exotic plant species. The dominant tree species is the bigleaf maple, approximately thirty to forty years in age. Other occasional trees include Douglas fir, apple, cherry and hawthorn. Shrubs include western hazel, snowberry, oceanspray, Oregon grape, poison oak, thimble berry, vine maple, Himalayan blackberry, laurel, and holly. The herbaceous layer contains sword fern, lady fern, clematis, and ivy. It is not certain to what extent invasive nonnative vegetation has been removed. Removal efforts typically need to ongoing, as it is difficult to prevent reintroduction of nonnative species.

Wildlife Habitat
The Burlington Northern rail corridor follows a ravine that links the wildlife habitat of the Willamette River greenway with the Columbia Slough habitat area. The habitat is limited to the forested banks of the corridor, because the ravine bottom is lined by railroad tracks, service roads, and other railway facilities.

Recreational Trails
The Peninsula Crossing Trail is along the top of the east side of the corridor. The trail connects to the 40-mile loop and natural areas along the Columbia Slough and Willamette Boulevard.

Zoning
The environmental conservation overlay zone, ‘c’ overlay zone, is applied to the slopes on both sides of the corridor.

Waud Bluff
Waud Bluff is located along the south and west facing slopes above Willamette Cove, starting near the intersection of North Bradford Street and Van Buren Avenue, and extending south to the University of Portland. The slopes gradually turn into terraced uplands with steep, abrupt bluffs that vary from 50 to 150 feet high. Waud Bluff is a continuation of the eastern Willamette River terrace. The bluff is set back to varying degrees from the Willamette River. At Willamette Cove, the slopes are behind the cove and approximately 500 feet from the river. Progressing southward, the slopes become steeper and are up to 1,000 feet east of the river in the vicinity of the McCormick/Baxter property. At the University of Portland, the bluffs meet the river before abruptly angling eastward again, around the Mock’s Bottom area.

Vegetation
The slopes are densely forested throughout the majority of Waud Bluff, although the forest is never wider than 500 feet, and averages approximately 200 feet in width. A foothill savanna/oak woodland forest community on the upper slopes and terrace characterizes the vegetation, with elements of the bottomland forest mixed in lower on the slopes. White oak, Pacific madrone, and occasional ponderosa pine dominate the upper slopes and terrace. The slopes, bluffs, and
terraced uplands throughout Waud Bluff contain the most substantial remnants of white oak/pacific madrone forest (historically widespread within the Willamette Valley) that exist within the city of Portland.

In the transition area between the upper slopes and terrace and the moister bottomland forest on the floodplain, bigleaf maple, Douglas fir, western red cedar, and red alder are found. On the lower slopes, especially where the bluffs are closer to the river, black cottonwood, bitter cherry, and Pacific dogwood are found. Tree canopy closure varies, but averages between twenty-five and thirty-five percent. Downed wood is common in the forest, and trees tend to be younger due in part to occasional wind-throw and landslides on these steep, exposed slopes.

The shrub understory is dominated by Himalayan blackberry and Scot's broom, but also contains several important native species such as red elderberry, western hazel, snowberry, serviceberry, and oceanspray. The herbaceous understory is largely composed of English ivy, clematis, and Oregon grape. The shrub cover is close to twenty-five percent, and ground cover exceeds ninety percent.

**Wildlife Habitat**

Wildlife observed during the City’s Wildlife Habitat Assessment Survey was relatively limited during the field observations that took place in the winter. However, it is likely that a greater diversity of birds and small mammals are present during the spring and summer months when foraging within this dry community type is more abundant. Bird species sited included northern flicker, pine siskin, American goldfinch, golden-crowned kinglet, dark-eyed junco, rufous-sided towhee, American kestrel, red-tailed hawk, and northern harrier. Small mammals sited included squirrel and pocket gopher. This is likely to be a well-traveled community type for various species of hawks, which can utilize the updrafts along the bluffs to hunt the floodplain as well as the terraced uplands.

**Wildfires**

Two wildfires, one in 2001 and another in 2002, have impacted this resource area. These fire events, especially the 2001 event, had a significant impact on understory vegetation. Specifically, most of the understory vegetation within the burn area was completely destroyed by these events. Additionally large trees and shrubs were also impacted, as the 2001 event extended into the canopy of this larger vegetation.

Despite these impacts, long term damage to these resources is not expected as the fire was not intense enough to destroy the seed bank, the natural reserve of seeds that collect in the soil overtime, or the majority of the larger trees along the slope. Fires such as these can be destructive to development that interfaces with natural areas; however, fires are a natural process that native vegetation generally responds to in a favorable manner. Specifically, fire returns nutrients to the soil, can trigger seed germination in various species, and may assist in the removal of nonnative invasive species not adapted to a fire ecology. Additionally, although trees and shrubs may lose much of their foliage during a fire, many species will survive such an event and begin to resprout along their trunks and branches or near their root crown within days following an event.
Some of these processes were observed to a limited extent along the bluff following the recent fires. Due to concerns about soil erosion, slope stability, and rehabilitation of native species within the burn zone, re-vegetation efforts were implemented following these events. These efforts focused on the reseeding of the slope with native plant species.

Zoning
Along some sections of the bluff the environmental conservation overlay zone has been applied. Along others, the greenway natural overlay zone has been applied. Both of these zones provide similar protection of the natural resource areas associated with the bluff.

Hazard Areas
Areas susceptible to flood, landslides, and earthquakes are shown on the maps on the following pages.

Flood Hazard Areas
Flood hazard areas are subject to a one percent or greater chance of flooding in any given year. These areas are commonly known as the 100-year flood plain. The Potential Flood Hazard Map (Map 8 on p. 104) identifies areas of the city that are subject to flooding. Proposals for land divisions sites within potential flood hazard areas must comply with regulations in Chapter 33.631, Potential Flood Hazard Areas, of the Zoning Code.

Potential Landslide Hazard Areas
Potential landslide hazard areas are identified on Map 9 on page 105. The map includes slopes greater than fifteen percent, and incorporates the results of a study by Portland State University in 1997 (commissioned by Metro). Proposals for land divisions sites within the potential landslide area must comply with regulations in Chapter 33.632, Potential Landslide Hazard Areas, of the Zoning Code. The regulations help minimize public and private losses as a result of landslides.

Relative Earthquake Hazard Areas
Relative earthquake hazard areas are identified on Map 10 on page 106. Earthquake hazard data was produced by the Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries, for Metro. The map shows areas having the greatest tendency to experience damage due to any combination of liquefaction, amplification of ground shaking or slope instability hazard. Zones A have the highest hazard and D the lowest hazard.
Key Issues and Planning Implications

The quantity and quality of natural resources within the plan area, both upland and along the water’s edge, is a significant factor influencing future land use decisions and the extent to which environmental conservation and enhancement activities will need to be conducted. The following list of issues and planning implications result from observations of the existing conditions in the area and a review of literature produced by past and ongoing planning efforts addressing river and environmental resources.

• Despite the quality of riparian habitat along the St. Johns waterfront, numerous opportunities exist to conserve and enhance these resources. Specifically, publicly owned open space areas such as Cathedral Park and Willamette Cove contain substantial river frontage that is currently used primarily for passive recreation. In the case of Willamette Cove, passive recreation is probably the most intensive land use allowed on this property due to terms of the bond measure that allowed Metro’s acquisition of the site.

• The Willamette Greenway Plan shows the primary greenway trail along the waterfront of the St. Johns/Lombard plan area from Cathedral Park to Willamette Cove. There is a trail gap between Willamette Cove and the BES Water Lab. This gap exists within the Lampros Steel industrial site. Potential redevelopment of this site could provide an opportunity to fill this gap at some point in the future.

• Recent riparian restoration activities conducted adjacent to the BES Water Lab, as well as those proposed at Terminal 4, demonstrate that additional enhancement activities can be pursued along the St. Johns waterfront in the context of the more intense land uses in these areas.

• Three significant primary upland areas have been identified within or adjacent to the plan area. Two of these areas, the railroad corridor and Waud Bluff, are located on steep slopes that are currently protected by environmental and greenway overlay zoning. These properties are largely outside the plan area. The third area, the Edison Street Forest, is also completely outside the plan area. This resource is not currently protected, but is being considered by other ongoing planning efforts.
Sources

Public review draft of the *Willamette River Inventory – Natural Resources*, prepared by the City of Portland Bureau of Planning in August 2000. This document catalogues natural resource areas along the Willamette River and was used to describe Willamette Cove, Edison Street Forest, and Waud Bluff.

*North Beach Vision and Action Plan*, prepared by Cogan, Owens, Cogen, and the Cathedral Park, University Park, and St. Johns Neighborhood Associations, September 1999.

*East Buttes, Terraces, and Wetland Conservation Plan*, City of Portland Bureau of Planning, adopted by City Council in 1993. This plan provided information on the railroad corridor.

10. Public Facilities and Services

This chapter provides information on the types of infrastructure, community facilities and services provided within the plan area. It includes a narrative description of parks, water systems, wastewater and stormwater systems, police, fire/emergency services, public schools, libraries, and social services.

Parks Planning

Parks 2020 Vision Master Plan

The Portland Bureau of Parks and Recreation released the Parks 2020 Vision Master Plan in 2001 as a long range planning tool for the development and maintenance of Portland’s parks system. To keep pace with forecasted population growth, the plan proposes acquiring an additional 1,870 acres to add to Portland’s 12,591 acres of public parkland and open space. The plan provides a vision for policy guidance, funding strategy and subarea recommendations for improvements.

Key findings in the Parks 2020 Vision Master Plan for the North Portland sub-area include:

- 1,232 acres of parkland, second highest of the six subareas.
- The eastern portion of the Cathedral Park neighborhood is identified as park deficient.
- Access to the Columbia Slough, due to traffic on Columbia Boulevard, is a problem.
- Neighborhood access to the 40-mile loop trail system is limited.

Recommendations relevant to the St. Johns/Lombard Plan include:

- Develop new parks along the Willamette River at the Willamette Cove and McCormick Baxter sites.
- Develop new sports fields (Northgate Park and McCormick Baxter potential sites).
Recommendations for existing individual parks are classified into three basic categories:

**Redevelopment.** Sites that have a minimal level of development. Master plans are needed before development.

(No parks in the St. Johns/Lombard plan area have been identified for redevelopment.)

**Basic Renovation.** Developed parks with one or two basic features in poor condition. Correcting these problems will not modify other park features. Some may be bond projects that were not fully improved due to lack of funds.

(Columbia Park, Pier Park, Portsmouth Park, Northgate Park)

**Repairs.** Developed parks with improvements that need only minor repairs or changes to a few features.

(St. Johns Park, McKeena Park, George Park)

**Interstate Corridor Urban Renewal Area Park Needs Assessment**

Currently, a needs assessment study of the twelve parks located in the Interstate Corridor Urban Renewal Area (ICURA) is being conducted by the Bureau of Parks and Recreation. The study includes Columbia Park, Columbia Annex, Northgate Park, and University Park (all within the ICURA boundaries) and is scheduled to be completed by July 2003. The study will result in a capital improvement list for parks projects in the ICURA.

**Open Space and Park Facilities**

**City Parks**

There are ten developed parks either in or within approximately one-quarter mile of the plan area. These parks provide a wide range of recreational opportunities. The total area of these parks is 215 acres, with a range between 4.5 and 86 acres. All of the parks listed below are maintained by the Portland Bureau of Parks and Recreation.

**Cathedral Park,** located in the study area underneath the St. Johns Bridge, is one of North Portland’s most prominent parks. The 17.5 acre multi-use park serves as important link to the Willamette River and home to many community events. Facilities include open grass fields, a hiking trail along the river, picnic
Existing Conditions Report

Columbia Park anchors the east end of the St. Johns/Lombard Plan study area, and serves as a forest gateway to the Lombard main street. Over thirty-three acres in size, it is the largest park within or adjacent to the plan area. Acquired in 1891 just before the City of Albina consolidated with the City of Portland, the park was meant to be Albina’s first park similar to Portland’s recent improvements to Washington Park.

Columbia Park's most prominent characteristic is its towering forest of Douglas fir trees, primarily on the north side of Lombard Street. The park also provides for a wide range of recreational activities, including sports fields for baseball, softball and soccer, two lighted tennis courts, a volleyball court, horseshoe pit, indoor swimming pool, wading pool, playground, picnic shelter and tables and walking trails. Restrooms are provided. The park is also home to Columbia Cottage, a community meeting space. The Parks 2020 Vision Master Plan recommends basic renovation improvements for Columbia Park.

St. Johns Park, located near the core of the St. Johns town center, is adjacent to the St. Johns Community Center. The park itself provides 5.6 acres of open space for picnics, walking and recreational activities, including softball and soccer fields, a playground and wading pool. The Parks 2020 Vision Master Plan recommends minor repairs for St. Johns Park.

Pier Park, just north of the St. Johns town center is the area's largest developed park. Acquired in 1959, the eighty-six-acre park is named for Stanhope S. Pier, a long time Portland city commissioner. A full range of recreational facilities are offered, including baseball, softball and soccer fields, basketball court, two tennis courts, outdoor swimming pool, playground, wading pool, skatepark, picnic tables and shelter. Restrooms and parking are also provided. The Parks 2020 Vision Master Plan recommends basic renovation for Pier Park.

McKenna Park, three blocks south of Lombard Street, is a neighborhood scale park serving the University Park neighborhood. The 4.5 acre park includes softball and soccer fields, basketball court, playground, picnic tables and wading
Existing Conditions Report

Parks 2020 Vision Master Plan recommends minor repairs for McKenna Park.

Portsmouth Park is another smaller neighborhood sized park serving the University Park neighborhood. The four-acre park has a softball and soccer field and playground. The Parks 2020 Vision Master Plan recommends basic renovation for Portsmouth Park.

Northgate Park, adjacent to Clarendon Elementary School, serves the western half of the Portsmouth neighborhood. Northgate Park is a large multi-use neighborhood park acquired in 1940. Facilities include baseball, softball and soccer fields, lighted tennis courts, playground, wading pool, picnic shelter and tables and walking paths. Restrooms and parking are also provided. Parks 2020 Vision Master Plan recommends basic renovation for Northgate Park.

George Park, a two-acre park that serves the eastern section of the St. Johns neighborhood. Established in 1971, the park is named after Melvin Clark George, a state senator from Multnomah County and later a United States Congressman. The park provides a playground, picnic tables and trails. The Parks 2020 Vision Master Plan recommends ‘repairs’ for George Park.

University Park, adjacent to the University Park Community Center, is located four blocks north of Columbia Park. The 16.4 acre park provides a softball field and playground. Restrooms and parking are also provided.

Chimney Park, located at the northern corner of the St. Johns neighborhood, was once the site of the city’s incinerator. Only the chimney now remains. The sixteen-acre park is also the home of the city’s archive building. Mostly undeveloped, the park offers hiking trails.

Table 21: Park Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Ball Field</th>
<th>Soccer Field</th>
<th>Basketball Court</th>
<th>Tennis Court</th>
<th>Swimming Wading</th>
<th>Playground</th>
<th>Picnic Tables</th>
<th>Restrooms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Johns</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pier Park</td>
<td>86.1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKenna</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northgate</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chimney</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>215.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recreational Facilities

**St. Johns Racquet Center**, 7519 North Burlington, is located near the heart of downtown St. Johns. It provides three indoor tennis courts, three indoor racquetball courts and fitness space.

**St. Johns Community Center**, 8427 North Central, was originally part of a recreation complex that served Kaiser shipyard workers during World War II. After the war the building was dismantled and moved to its present location at the edge of the St. Johns town center. The center serves the neighborhood with an auditorium and community meeting space, and a gymnasium for indoor sports.

**University Park Community Center**, 9009 North Foss, was built in the 1940s for shipyard workers in Columbia Villa. It now serves as community center that offers a recreation in the form of a gymnasium and training room, along with meeting room and classroom space.

Community Gardens

Portland Bureau of Parks and Recreation has been running a community gardening program since 1975. These gardens create additional open space within neighborhoods and provide residents with the opportunity to create and maintain their own gardens. There are approximately twenty-six gardens established throughout the city, with three in or near the plan area (with space for seventy-eight plots). Space is open through sign-up and registration with the Bureau of Parks and Recreation. Volunteer garden managers are elected to help with on-site coordination and work parties.

**Johns Garden**, North Edison & Johns
A 0.62 acre garden located in the Cathedral Park neighborhood. There are forty-seven garden plots in the Johns Garden. The garden also features fruit trees and native plants.

**Portsmouth Community Garden**, North Haven & Hunt
Established in 2000, this garden serves the Portsmouth neighborhood and is located on the site of the Portsmouth Middle School. The Bureau of Parks and Recreation is in the process of taking over management of the Portsmouth Community Garden. Staff is working with the local community to put the new garden program in place; it was formerly managed by the Portsmouth Middle School, which will continue to maintain several plots.

**Pier Garden**, North Iris & Burr
Pier Garden, along the eastern edge of Pier Park near Johnswood, is in the planning stage and is scheduled to be built this year.
Recreational Trails

**40-Mile Loop Trail**, conceived in 1904, is actually a 140-mile regional trails system that when completed, will nearly encircle all of Multnomah County. The trails will connect to more than thirty parks in the Portland metropolitan area and the Columbia, Willamette, and Sandy Rivers in a continuous loop.

Four segments of the trail system run through North Portland. The most northern segment runs along the Columbia River between Kelley Point Park and the Sandy River. Another planned segment runs along Marine Drive, adjacent to Smith and Bybee Lakes, linking Kelley Point Park to the Peninsula Crossing Trail. The third segment also runs east-west, but along the Columbia Slough and the southern edge of Smith and Bybee Lakes. The fourth links Kelley Point Park to the St. Johns Bridge, providing a north-south connection to the Willamette River and points south. The alignment winds south from the Columbia Slough to Pier Park. From the park the trail uses the local street network (North Weyerhaeuser, North Reno and North Edison) to finally connect to Cathedral Park and the St. Johns Bridge.

The bridge is a key link because it provides the only connection across the Willamette River for many miles to the segment of the 40 Mile Loop along the west bank of the Willamette River. The bridge also will link to trail connections into Forest Park and its trail system. The Friends of Forest Park has funding to construct a pedestrian path from the Wildwood Trail to the west end of the St. Johns Bridge. As part of the bridge rehabilitation work, the Oregon Department of Transportation has agreed to improve west access onto the bridge.

**Peninsula Crossing Trail**, provides a direct and continuous trail connection between the Columbia and Willamette Rivers for pedestrians and bicyclists. The trail’s alignment is divided into three segments. The first segment starts at the Willamette River and runs along the railroad cut (Carey Boulevard) to North Columbia Boulevard. The trail then runs south along and across Columbia Boulevard to the Columbia Boulevard Wastewater Treatment Plant ('Big Pipe Trail'). From there the trail runs along and across the Columbia Slough towards North Portland Road where it then follows North Portland Road north to its connection to the 40 Mile Loop trail adjacent to the Columbia River.

The trail is a collaborative effort between the residents of North Portland, Metro, the 40 Mile Loop Land Trust, the City of Portland, and the Oregon Department of Transportation. Funding has been provided by the 1995 Metro Open Spaces Parks and Streams Bond Measure. The trail will be managed by the Portland Bureau of Parks and Recreation.

**North Willamette Greenway Trail**, is a proposed trail that runs along the east bank of the Willamette River, connecting the St. Johns and Steel Bridges. In the shorter term a neighborhood trail connection will be created to the proposed Willamette Cove Park. A feasibility study from June 2002 identified alignment options through North Portland. Only the most northern segment, between the BES Water Quality Lab and Cathedral Park, is currently in place. The city is currently negotiating a trail alignment that bridges the gap between the Willamette Cove property and the existing Cathedral Park segment of trail.
Park and Recreation Capital Improvements

Cathedral Park Band Shell
The Bureau of Parks and Recreation has been working with the Cathedral Park Jazz Festival on the design for a new band shell for the park. A conceptual design has been prepared to support fundraising; the festival organization is embarking on an effort to raise the $480,000 required to implement the plan. The Cathedral Park Jazz Festival recently celebrated its twentieth season.

Skateboard Park at Pier Park
The Bureau of Parks and Recreation supervised the development of a skateboard facility sited in Pier Park. The National Guard installed the underground stormwater system, the concrete block substructure, and some of the final concrete slopes. The National Guard worked on this project for three years and completed it in 2001. The Bureau of Parks and Recreation subsequently performed final grade and seed work. The St. Johns community is currently raising funds to add lighting. Minor additional improvements are needed.

University Park Community Center
Upgrading of the University Park Community Center (UPCC) will be accomplished over the course of three primary phases. These three phases follow a facility master plan that was completed in 1998.

- Phase 1 is completed and has renovated the north wing of the existing community center primarily using Capital Improvement Program funds.
- Phase 2 will renovate the south wing of the existing community center primarily with funds from a federal grant (UPARR). Phase 2 will renovate about 6,000 square feet of additional building space of the south wing and will be completed during the spring of 2003. It will achieve seismic upgrading and improved structural integrity; new mechanical and plumbing systems; new electrical system and lighting; new doors and windows; new siding and painting; improved circulation; and better program space. In addition it will include a new kitchen and related food-handling facilities for Loaves and Fishes, which provides onsite meals and a meals-on-wheels program.
- Phase 3, scheduled for 2004-5, includes new recreational facilities behind the existing community center with funds from a bond measure or levy. Phase 3 will add about 20,000 square feet of new building behind the existing community center and renovate about 2,000 square feet of the existing lobby space. This phase includes a new gymnasium and locker rooms, a fitness and dance room, a teen lounge/game room, a lobby expansion to use for a ‘community living room’ and ‘trading post,’ a main entry, and an expansion of the existing computer classrooms. Funds from the levy will be used for a regulation-sized basketball gymnasium, locker/shower/toilet facilities for the new gymnasium and future swimming pool, four family change rooms, a multi-purpose dance/aerobics room, a teen lounge/game room, and an audio lab in the computer room. The lobby space between the new addition and the existing building will become the community ‘living room.’ A swimming pool is planned beyond Phase 3.
Levy funding will provide for Phase 3 expansion of UPCC. As a result, a piece of University Park will be used for parking. Hope VI development will require dedication of eight acres of open space, some of which may be used for active recreation. At this time a new neighborhood park is not planned. Improvements to University Park have been identified in that process, but are not funded. The Hope VI Master Plan is scheduled for completion in 2003.

**Columbia Park New Playground Equipment**
During planning for the bond project improvements in Columbia Park, new play equipment and pathway and restroom renovation were identified as community priorities for the park. However, available funding could not cover all the improvements. A local fundraising effort was conducted by The Community Association of Portsmouth, the Peninsula Community Development Corporation, the North Portland Business Association, Friends of Columbia Park, and Portsmouth Vision 20/20.

**Kelley Point and Marine Drive Trail Projects**
In partnership with the Port of Portland and the Portland Office of Transportation, the Bureau of Parks and Recreation worked on multiple trail projects, including:

- Marine Drive trail improvements were completed in 2002 from the Columbia Slough to the railroad overcrossing by the old Marine Drive (road improvements end at the entry to Terminal 6).
- Construction of a portion of the 40-Mile Loop Trail, under the Lombard-Marine Drive bridge at Columbia Slough was completed in 2002.
- The Port of Portland has submitted a land use application for the 40-mile Loop trail on the NE bank of the Columbia Slough from the Lombard-Marine Drive bridge to the end of Port property at the St. Johns landfill.
- Greenway permits have been obtained for trail improvements within Kelley Point Park. One portion will be built in the spring of 2006 with grants from Oregon State Parks. The remainder is scheduled to be constructed summer of 2003 with system development charges (SDCs) and Metro 26-26 funds. However, additional funding is needed to complete the project.
- Trail construction is planned southwest of the Port’s Terminal 6, between the Columbia Slough and driveway to Kelley Point Park. This improvement is part of the Port’s five-year capital plan and may include an informal canoe launch, to be initiated in the next couple years as funding allows.

**Smith Bybee Mini Master Plan**
This effort, jointly sponsored by the Bureau of Parks and Recreation and Metro, has not begun. The Bureau of Parks and Recreation and Metro are exploring methods to determine trail location and construction timing for trails in the landfill and resource areas managed by Metro.
Water

The City of Portland Bureau of Water Works provides drinking water within the study area. The water infrastructure in the study area is a well-developed portion of Portland’s system.

Sources, Storage and Distribution

The Bull Run reservoirs are the main sources of water. Selected for its excellent water purity, natural lake, and with enough elevation to allow gravity feed to the Portland area, the water system began service in the late 1800s. In the mid-1980s, the City developed a system of groundwater wells located in the Columbia South Shore area to serve as a secondary source of water. Well water is usually blended with Bull Run water before it is distributed to customers, minimizing variability in water quality.

The St. Johns/Lombard plan area lies within two pressure zones: Vernon 362 is supplied directly by Vernon Tanks, while pressure regulators from Vernon 362 supply Vernon 270. Water originates from Bull Run, then flows to Powell Butte Reservoir, Mt. Tabor Reservoir 5, and then to Vernon Tanks.

Water mains are located under almost every right-of-way in the study area and the Water Bureau monitors them for leaks and other deterioration. Mains are designed to simultaneously meet peak day flow requirements and fire flow requirements.

Capital Improvements

The Bureau of Water Works’ 1997 capital improvement program does not identify significant maintenance and expansion projects for the plan area through the year 2007.

The Bureau of Water Works foresees few obstacles to increased development due to water distribution infrastructure. As redevelopment occurs, some distribution mains (2-8 inch diameter) may need to be upsized to supply larger services for specific developments. However, the existing storage capacity and large transmission mains should be large enough to supply future development.

Stormwater and Wastewater

Portland’s Bureau of Environmental Services (BES) provides stormwater and wastewater collection and disposal services within the study area. For the most part, the study area is in the combined sewer system. Wastewater and stormwater runoff generated in the study area are fed into a combined sewer system and conveyed to the Columbia Wastewater Treatment Plant. Efforts to control combined sewer overflows (CSO) in the slough are largely complete.
Attention is now on controlling CSOs into the Willamette River. A large pump station will be constructed on Swan Island, south of the planning area.

In general, much of the plan area’s stormwater and sanitary infrastructure is old. Some pipes are identified in the Public Facilities Plan (PFP) in need of upgrading. Basement flooding is reported in the PFP as being moderate to low.

Small portions of the plan area, such as along the Willamette River, have no or very little sanitary or stormwater infrastructure. The southeastern portion (encompassing Mock’s Bottom) and the northwestern portion of the plan area (near the St. Johns Bridge) have separate storm and sanitary sewer systems.

**Capital Improvement Projects**

Two small projects are planned for the area:

- BES may construct a bioswale between the Cathedral Park parking lot and Willamette River to filter stormwater before it enters the river. The project is uncertain, and
- BES will repave four blocks of North Gay Avenue with porous pavement.

Significant completed projects include:

- The Big Pipe. Construction on the Columbia Slough Consolidation Conduit was finished in 2000. It took three years to build the 3.5 mile, twelve-foot and six foot diameter pipeline, at a cost of $70 million. The conduit was part of the effort to control CSOs into the slough by ninety-nine percent.
- Columbia Boulevard Treatment Plan Additions. Several improvements were made by BES to the plant to accommodate the added flow from the Big Pipe. They included an influent pump station, a new dry weather treatment facility, modified wet weather treatment facilities, and a second outfall pipe to the Columbia River. Finished in 2000.

**The Public Facilities Plan (1999)**

The Public Facilities Plan (PFP) identifies the major public infrastructure needed over the next twenty years to support the City of Portland’s Comprehensive Plan and Metro’s 2040 plan. It provides current and projected system deficiencies and recommended solutions and actions for each. The PFP addresses only the significant facilities that are part of the overall system.

The objective of the PFP is to identify improvements needed to the combined sewer system, both at present and for projected future conditions, to ensure a level of service (capacity) that is adequate to prevent basement flooding during a twenty-five-year design storm.
The PFP uses a watershed approach to assess needs. Using a watershed as a unit avoids solving a problem in one area while creating another problem elsewhere. It also demands close coordination of the various sewer systems (combined, sanitary, and stormwater) within a watershed. The plan area lies within two watersheds: the Columbia Slough watershed, and the Willamette River watershed.

**Water Pollution Control Laboratory**

Situated along the Willamette River at the base of the St. Johns Bridge, the Water Pollution Control Lab returned a 7.6 acre formerly polluted industrial site to public access. The site was developed to blend into Cathedral Park as well as continue the Willamette River greenway. The site also features a stormwater demonstration garden. The garden and landscape are visited regularly by school groups and others interested in learning about sustainability, stormwater management, riparian habitat, and plant identification. The pond provides data about traditional and innovative approaches to stormwater management.

The exposed steel frame skeleton, materials, and colors reflect the imagery of St. Johns and the industrial areas surrounding the lab. The community meeting room is a key design feature that links the neighborhood to the facility.

Water run-off from the area is treated onsite in the water demonstration retention pool, and bioswales surrounding the building and parking areas treat onsite stormwater. Four labs coexist in the site:

- the metal analysis lab, where technicians use sensitive instruments to detect metals in water samples;
- the organics analysis lab, where technicians study water samples for traces of organic materials such as pesticides;
- the general chemistry lab, where technicians use basic chemistry to test for alkalinity, oil and grease, suspended solids and oxygen demand in water samples; and
- the nutrient analysis lab, where technicians check for nutrients in water leaving Portland’s treatment plants and flowing into the river.

**Combined Sewer Overflow Control**

Controlling combined sewer overflow (CSO) is a response to the federal *Clean Water Act*. The combined sewer system is located along both sides of the Willamette River and includes approximately one-third of the area and two-thirds of the population of the City of Portland. It includes most of downtown Portland and many older residential areas, including much of the plan area. The city is actively engaged in controlling CSOs. CSOs in the Columbia Slough have been controlled to ninety-nine percent, and construction has started on projects that will control CSOs in the Willamette River to ninety-four percent.

The combined sewer service area is divided into forty-two basins, within five watersheds. It includes the network of pipelines and pump stations that collect
and convey combined sewage. Combined sewage is composed of stormwater from streets, parking lots, roofs and sanitary waste from homes, businesses, institutions such as schools and hospitals. During moderate to heavy precipitation, combined sewage flows overwhelm the sewer system, and excess (untreated) flows are released through outfalls to the Willamette River.

The main objective of the CSO program is ultimately to reduce sewer overflows to the Willamette River by ninety-four percent and to the Columbia Slough by ninety-nine percent. During the last ten years, annual CSO volume has decreased by fifty-three percent, from six billion gallons a year to less than three billion gallons a year. This has significantly reduced the amount of bacteria, metals, chemicals and other pollutants in the slough and river.

**Police**

The Portland Bureau of Police provides a number of basic services to the study area. These services include neighborhood policing, investigative services, and crime interdiction services (drugs, vice, and gang enforcement).

The North Precinct is the branch responsible for North Portland. Eighty-three employees (thirty-five in the day shift) work in the historic St. Johns City Hall building.

**Programs**

- North Precinct Neighborhood Response Team is a small team of officers who work on large-scale problem solving activities.

- Portland Police, the Multnomah County Neighborhood Deputy District Attorney, and Bureau of Buildings inspectors work together to enforce the chronic nuisance property ordinance to alleviate activities occurring repeatedly at the same address.

- North Precinct and the Neighborhood District Attorney are currently in the process of working with St. Johns businesses to establish an alcohol impact zone.

- North Precinct and several other government agencies are currently in the process of applying for a Federal Weed and Seed Grant for the St. Johns, Cathedral Park, and Portsmouth neighborhoods. This grant will allow the police and social service agencies to address drug abuse and intervention programs that affect family life and the livability of the area.

**Crime and Safety Issues**

Street drinking and transient camps continue to be ongoing problems in St. Johns. The alcohol impact zone, when established, is designed to reduce street drinking.
Gang graffiti is appearing more frequently and there was a recent gang-related homicide in Northgate Park. North Precinct has requested more assistance from the gang unit.

**Crime Statistics**

The following table and figures contain information on reported crimes in the St. John/Lombard plan area and surrounding neighborhoods. The table provides a comparison of reported crime activity over a period of several years. Note that crime statistics are based on reported crimes, which means a report was filed on a crime incident. Higher crime statistics do not necessarily indicate that more crime is occurring, only that more crimes are being reported.

**Table 22: Crime Statistics, 1991 to 2002**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple Assault</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Theft</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Prowls</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Larceny</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Abuse</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Residential Burglary</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Burglary</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 8a: Crime Statistics: Assault**
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Fire, Rescue, and Emergency Services

The Portland Bureau of Fire, Rescue and Emergency Services provides a wide variety of services to the St. Johns/Lombard plan study area. These services include, but are not limited to, responding to fires, medical emergencies, and hazardous material incidents.

Station Locations

Two fire stations are located within or near the St. Johns/Lombard plan area:

- 5247 North Lombard, in the Portsmouth neighborhood, and
- 7205 North Alta, in the Cathedral Park neighborhood.

Response Times

According to the bureau, the two stations provide for prompt response-time. The Bureau does not foresee any problems in the provision of services in a more developed, populated area, as long as major access routes remain expedient and streets remain accessible to emergency vehicles.

An area of potential concern is development near the river west of the railroad line near N. Bradford Street. Trains frequently use this railroad line which could slow down response times by blocking emergency vehicles.

Schools

Portland Public Schools (PPS) provides public education for the study area. Elementary schools generally serve students in kindergarten through grade five and are located to serve neighborhood-size areas. Middle schools have students from larger, more geographically dispersed areas, serving grades six through eight. High schools serve grades nine through twelve and encompass the largest geographic area.

PPS has a ‘magnet schools’ program that allows students to transfer to a school with focused curriculum on a special interest such as art, science, or a foreign language. Students are also allowed to transfer out of their neighborhood school if space is available at another school they wish to attend.

SUN Schools: James John Elementary and George Middle School

SUN schools are full-service schools, providing after school and evening activities for parents, students and the local community. SUN Schools provide school-based and school-linked services, such as park and recreation programs, mental health services, senior activities and classes, library programs, youth clubs, SMART programs, art, music, and cultural programs.
Public High Schools

Two public high schools serve the St. Johns/Lombard plan area.

- **Roosevelt High School**, 6941 North Central Street, serves the entire study area. Roosevelt had in 2001 enrollment of 1,141 students, a decrease of 5.3 percent over the last five years. In 2001, 53.8 percent were minority students, up from 40.2 percent five years ago.

- **Jefferson High School**, 5210 North Kerby Avenue, is a ‘magnet’ performing arts school serving the entire district. Jefferson had a 2001 enrollment of 855, a decrease of 13.2 percent over the last five years. In 2001, 84.2 percent were minority students, up from 79.6 percent five years ago.

Public Middle Schools

Two public middle schools serve the St. Johns/Lombard plan area.

- **George Middle School**, 10000 North Burr Avenue, serves the west portion of the study area. George had a 2001 enrollment of 558 students, a decrease of 0.5 percent over the last five years. In 2001, fifty-nine percent were minority students, up from 38.5 percent five years ago.

- **Portsmouth Middle School**, 5103 North Willis Boulevard, serves the eastern portion of the study area. Portsmouth had a 2001 enrollment of 489 students, an increase of 19.6 percent over the last five years. In 2001, fifty-six percent were minority students, up from 42.3 five years ago.

Public Elementary Schools

Several public elementary schools serve the St. Johns/Lombard plan area.

- **Astor Elementary School**, 5601 North Yale Street, serves the southeast portion of the study area. Astor had a 2001 enrollment of 337 students, a 11.3 decrease over the last five years. In 2001, 32 percent were minority, up from 26 percent five years ago.

- **Ball Elementary School**, 4221 North Willis Boulevard, serves the northwestern portion of the area and offers a prekindergarten program. Ball had a 2001 enrollment of 309, an increase of 3.3 percent over the last five years. In 2001, 71.5 percent were minority students, up from 61.9 percent five years ago.

- **Clarendon Elementary School**, 9325 North Van Houten Avenue, serves the north central portion of the study area. Clarendon had a 2001 enrollment of 393 students, a decrease of 10.5 percent over the last five years. In 2001, 75.6 percent were minority students, up from 53.5 percent five years ago.
• **James John Elementary School**, 7439 North Charleston Avenue, serves the western portion of the area to the Willamette River. In 2001, James John had an enrollment of 564 students, a 12.3 percent decrease over the last five years. In 2001, 56.4 percent were minority students, up from 44 percent five years ago.

• **Peninsula Elementary School**, 8125 North Emerald Street, serves the easternmost portion of the study area. Peninsula had a 2001 enrollment of 328 students, a nine percent increase over the last five years. In 2001, 61 percent were minority students, up from 47.5 percent five years ago.

• **Sitton Elementary School**, 9930 North Smith Street, serves the westernmost portion of the study area. Sitton had a 2001 enrollment of 421 students, a one percent increase over the last five years. In 2001, 58.4 percent were minority students, up from 36.5 percent five years ago.

**Multnomah County Library**

Multnomah County operates the St. Johns branch library in the study area, located at 7510 North Charleston Avenue. The library, constructed in 1913, is one of the region’s oldest. Between March 2000 and February 2001 the library was closed for renovation, receiving mechanical, electrical and plumbing upgrades, new telecommunications equipment to allow better online access to information, as well as upgraded restrooms and service desks to meet disability access standards. Space was expanded from 5,068 square feet to 6,381 square feet, adding a new community meeting room while maintaining the historic nature of the building.

The library serves the west section of North Portland with books, videotapes, DVDs, CDs, audio cassettes and other library materials for uses of all ages. The branch’s collection provides materials for Spanish and Vietnamese speaking members.

As of June 1, 2002, the St. Johns branch had 18,203 users, or 3.1 percent of all Multnomah county library cardholders. Out of sixteen branches, St. Johns ranks ninth in terms of cardholders and eleventh in terms of circulation. The number of users at the St. Johns branch increased by 28 percent in the last five years. However, this rate is lower than the system-wide increase of 48 percent for the same period.

The St. Johns branch library is expected to meet user demands in the near future. The planned opening of the Interstate Corridor branch will be an asset to the area. Additionally, the Multnomah County Library’s ‘hold system’ and the coming integrated computer system will help medium size branches such as St. Johns, keep pace with community needs and growth.
Social Services

Multnomah County Aging and Disability Services

Multnomah County Aging and Disability Services serves persons with physical disabilities ages 18 and older, and all persons ages 60 and older. The District Senior Center, located in the St. Johns YWCA, is the only center located in or near the study area. Following is a list of Multnomah County Aging and Disability Services in the North/Northeast area. These facilities serve county residents living north of Burnside Street, east of the Willamette River, and west of 82nd Avenue.

- St. Johns YWCA, District Senior Center, 8010 North Charleston.
- Northeast Aging Services Office, 5325 NE Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard.
- Hollywood Senior Center, District Senior Center, 1820 NE 40th Avenue.
- Urban League and Northeast Loaves and Fishes, 5325 NE Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard.
- North Disability Services Office, 4925 N Albina Street.

Multnomah County Health Division

Multnomah County provides a number of health-related programs and services, including health centers, school-based health centers, field team offices, corrections health facilities, dental offices, and neighborhood access sites.

The new family North Portland Health Clinic in St. Johns opened in the fall of 2001. Some services provided by the North Portland Health Clinic include: Oregon Health Plan (OHP) and Adult and Family Services (AFS) eligibility screening, Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) services, nutrition counseling, family planning, field nursing office, pharmacy, immunizations, newborn and well child care, radiology, vision screening, specialty referral, nursing advice, general primary medical care for all ages, mental health treatment, lead screening, and HIV testing. Construction of retail space facing North Lombard Street is also a part of this mixed-use project. The following are other Multnomah County Health facilities located within or near the study area:

- North Portland Health Center, 8918 North Woolsey Avenue
- George Middle School, School-based Health Center, 10000 North Burr Street
- Roosevelt High School, School-based Health Center, 6941 North Central Street
- Portsmouth Middle School, School-based Health Center, 5103 N Willis Boulevard
- North Portland Field Team Office, 8981 North Dana Street
- Roosevelt Family Resource Center, 6941 North Central Street
- Vector Control, 5235 North Columbia Boulevard
Multnomah County Community Programs and Partnerships

The following agencies provide social services funded by the Multnomah County Division of Community Programs and Partnerships.

- **Caring Community of North Portland.** The Caring Community of North Portland is one of nine Caring Communities in Multnomah County. All of the Caring Communities are affiliated with the Leaders Roundtable, a coalition of county, state, city, school district, for-profit and nonprofit business leaders. All of the Caring Communities share the goal of achieving 100 percent high school completion and ensuring that adequate and appropriate services are developed and delivered to foster the growth of strong healthy individuals and families. The Caring Community of North Portland’s primary goal is to provide North Portland families with accessible social services and opportunities through partnerships with schools, agencies and community organizations.

- **Multnomah County Roosevelt Family Resource Center.** This service team provides opportunities for educators, community members, and providers to come together to educate one another. The staff is concerned and addresses community issues. The Family Resource Center provides services and support to youth and families and the community of North Portland.

- **James John School TouchStone Program.** A school-based social service program that reaches out to youth and families, delivering services to families, schools, and communities by highlighting strengths, creating opportunities and celebrating successes. Touchstone is a voluntary program for children and families enrolled in schools at various locations in Multnomah County. No income guidelines required.
Key Issues and Planning Implications

Several key issues and planning implications emerge from analyzing the existing infrastructure, facilities and services in the planning area.

• While there is generally an adequate number and distribution of parks and recreation sites in the area, there is a need for improvements to existing facilities to meet current and future demands. Some parks should be renovated and some of the area’s recreation facilities do not provide the full range of opportunities available in other city park and recreation facilities. However, the planning area has proximity to trails and natural resources such as Smith and Bybee Lakes, the 40-Mile Loop Trail, the Willamette River, and Kelley Point Park. Also, school sites comprise a significant part of the area’s public open space.

• The city’s supply of water is expected to be able to serve the projected increase in population in the area. The infrastructure for water distribution within the study area is currently adequate, though as the area redevelops, smaller sized water lines may have to be replaced with larger lines to meet additional needs.

• Excess surface runoff into the combined sewer basins within the area causes moderate street and basement flooding. Impervious surface areas in the plan area range from around forty percent to over fifty percent, contributing significantly to stormwater runoff that enters the system.

• The St. Johns branch of the Multnomah County Library system has recently been expanded and services and infrastructure updated. Improvements in information systems and the addition of a new branch on Interstate Avenue will help accommodate future users.

• The area has seen a four percent decline in student enrollment, with some schools gaining a significant number of students, others losing students, while others maintaining a steady student population. All schools, however, have seen increases in minority student population.

• There are two fire stations within the plan area. Response times are adequate and the bureau does not foresee problems in a more developed, populated area, as long as major routes remain expedient and streets remain accessible to emergency vehicles.

• In areas west of the railroad line at North Bradford Street, adequate response times might not reached, as trains frequently use the line, potentially blocking emergency vehicles.
11. Community Organizations

This chapter describes many of the community organizations and resources available to individuals, families, seniors, youth, and business owners who live and/or work in the St. Johns/Lombard study area. Many of the organizations are working collaboratively with each other and with government agencies to build a healthier and stronger community.

Neighborhood and Business Associations

Four neighborhood associations (Cathedral Park, Portsmouth, St. Johns, and University Park) and two business associations (North Portland Business Association and the St. Johns Business Booster) are represented within the St. Johns/Lombard study area. These organizations provide a forum for citizen input on community matters and sponsor activities that bring together residents, businesses and individuals to enhance the area’s livability, prosperity, and community pride. Below is a brief summary of these associations.

Friends of Cathedral Park Neighborhood Association. Prior to 1990, Cathedral Park was considered part of the St. Johns neighborhood. Past activities include Blue Heron Blues Festival, public outreach (EPA funded) for McCormack and Baxter, land-use and other policy outreach, Festival Latino, Festival Symphony, and crime prevention organization. There is a general meeting on the 2nd Tuesday of the month at 7 p.m. and a board meeting on the 4th Tuesday at 6:30 p.m. at the Water Pollution Control Laboratory 6543 North Burlington.

The Community Association of Portsmouth. (TCAP) received the Mayor's Spirit of Portland Award in 2001 in recognition of its commitment to promote safe streets and schools, neighborhood livability, and build a sense of community identity. Portsmouth is one of the most ethnically diverse neighborhoods in Portland. TCAP members continue to support a multiyear Friends of Tree’s street tree program and neighborhood trash removal activities as well as campaigns to address street drinking and littering. TCAP board members have demonstrated community leadership through participation in a wide range of projects, including the Interstate Max urban renewal area citizen advisory committee, the Hope VI Columbia Villa redevelopment, the Portsmouth Press (a multilingual bimonthly newspaper now published as the North Portland Press), the annual Lombard Business Fair, and a new Columbia Park children’s playground. Recently, the neighborhood was selected for a demonstration program called ‘e-volvement.’ The program’s mission is to ‘bring a low-income neighborhood into
the information age’ by providing residents low cost computers and high speed broadband communication. The neighborhood also completed a neighborhood plan that was adopted by the City Council in June 2002. Monthly general membership forums are held on the first Tuesday of each month at the Columbia Cottage in Columbia Park, 4339 North Lombard Street; TCAP board meetings are held the fourth Tuesday of the month at the same location.

**St. Johns Neighborhood Association** seeks to improve the livability of the neighborhood. General membership meetings are the second Monday of the month, usually with special presenter and community-based interest/concern issues. Members participate or have participated on the following committees or groups: the Smith & Bybee Lakes Committee, Portland Harbor Superfund Citizen Advisory Committee, Portland Utility Review Board, *St. Johns/Lombard Plan* Citizen Working Group, and the St. Johns Truck Study. Ongoing and special events include: annual participation in the St. Johns Parade, Back to School Readiness Fair, and Peninsula Clean Team activities. The association supports St. Johns in the 21st Century activities, brings the Oregon Symphony to Pier Park, raises funds for the Fire Bureau Sally Ann Fund, helped build the skate park at Pier Park, hosted the North Precinct Forum in conjunction with budget issues, conducts litter pick-ups on the weekends bi-annually, and participates in National Night and Friends of Trees tree plantings. General meetings are held the second Monday of the month, and board meetings are held the last Monday of the month, at the St. Johns Community Center, 8427 North Central Street.

**University Park Neighborhood Association** is a long-standing organization that works to improve the livability of the neighborhood. The association meets on the fourth Monday of the month at Portsmouth Trinity Lutheran Church, 7119 North Portsmouth Avenue.

The mission of the **North Portland Business Association (NPBA)** is “promotion of business interests for economic development of North Portland.” Formerly known as the Lombard North Business Association, the group was formed in 1988 and serves a broad range of business needs. The association holds an annual picnic and Christmas party, and is involved in community events including street tree plantings. The group meets the fourth Thursday of every-other month at the Lung Fung restaurant, 2025 North Lombard Street.

The **St. Johns Boosters** is a membership driven organization serving the St. Johns community for over seventy-five years. The Boosters were incorporated to promote growth and development of the St. Johns area; to provide for the welfare and solicit the good will of the public; and to promote the legitimate interests of the commercial, industrial, professional, social, charitable, and religious concerns in the St. Johns area. Any individual, organization, or group with an interest in those purposes of the St. Johns Boosters is eligible for membership.

The Boosters represents a full spectrum of civic involvement and advocacy, from ongoing preservation of community history to improving the quality of neighborhood life to economic development of the area. The Boosters membership is involved in many community activities: the St Johns Parade;
Holiday Events in the Business District; participation in the development and implementation of the St. Johns in the 21st Century; and the storefront enhancement program. General meetings are held the third Tuesday of every month, and board meetings are held the first Thursday of every month.

Community Organizations and Services

A wealth of resources and programs are provided to community members. Below is a list of the community organizations that serve different populations in the St. Johns/Lombard plan area.

North Portland Neighborhood Services is a nonprofit district coalition serving as an umbrella organization for the North Portland neighborhood and businesses associations. The office provides citizen outreach and services to address neighborhood livability, public safety, housing, transportation, business improvement, and cultural diversity issues. Primary financial support is from the City of Portland general fund.

St. Johns in the 21st Century mission statement: ‘as an organization of visionary citizens and business members we endeavor to bring together the community of St. Johns by building a progressive spirit of cooperation.’ St. Johns in the 21st Century is funded in part with a target area designation (TAD) grant from the Bureau of Housing and Community Development. The initial TAD grant nomination was submitted, and managed, by the St. Johns Business Boosters. Today, the North Portland Office of Neighborhood Involvement acts as manager of the grant.

Art on the Peninsula, led by a local committee, promotes public art in the area. Staff from the Office of Neighborhood Involvement facilitates this peninsula-wide program.

Peninsula Clean Team is a group of area residents and business people who promote a clean and beautiful North Portland, one in which residents take pride in their community. They sponsor and assist with community clean up events and have related equipment that can be utilized by any neighborhood/business association or other community organization interested in conducting beautification activities. Staff from the Office of Neighborhood Involvement facilitates this peninsula-wide program.

St. Johns Heritage Association is a non-profit organization dedicated to recording the history and stories of the St. Johns’ community. The association has produced the first bicentennial booklet and published five books that record the unique stories and history of the St. Johns’ community. Their goal is to continue publishing the history and stories, with a focus on the younger community. St. Johns Heritage Association meets the fourth Wednesday of each month except for August at 10:30 a.m. on the second floor of the North Precinct,
7214 North Philadelphia. A museum is housed in the precinct, and contains countless artifacts, photos, and displays.

**Friends of Trees** works to preserve, care for and plan urban trees throughout the Portland metropolitan. Each year, in partnership with residents and community groups, Friends of Trees conducts several events in the St. Johns/Lombard area.

**Frente Comun Latinos del Norte de Portland** (Common Front of Latinos of North Portland) or “Frente Comun” is a grass-roots nonprofit organization that strives to serve as a voice to the needs of the Latino community. It acts as a central location where the Latino community can have access to important information and a wide range of classes and programs. Frente Comun targets two areas: providing naturalization services, and enhancing the family life of Latinos through educational programs.

**Hmong-American Unity of Oregon, Inc.** serves the Hmong American community by:
- providing mediation services that address community and families' problems;
- assisting the Hmong American community find community resources;
- outreaching to the mainstream society and other organizations;
- maintaining Hmong cultural activities; and
- providing events such as the Graduation Award Ceremony, Summer Picnic, and New Year Celebration for the community.

**Community Activities/Events**

Each year numerous community events and activities take place in the different neighborhoods in the St. Johns/Lombard plan area. Community events help promote pride and provide opportunities for residents to meet each other. Below is a brief description of several popular community activities.

The **St. Johns Parade** reflects the vitality and community spirit of the peninsula neighborhoods. The parade has a unique old fashion small-town feeling with involvement ranging from major civic and service groups to individual members of the community. The parade also includes the first appearance of that year’s Rose Festival princesses.

The first St. Johns Parade, in 1963, culminated a ‘Clean-up/Fix-up/Paint-up’ week. The St. Johns Boosters, involved in this first parade, has supported the event ever since. Today, the parade is held in May on the Saturday before Mother’s Day.

The first **Cathedral Park Jazz Festival** was held in 1980 as a memorial to Howard Galbraith, a community advocate who was instrumental in creating Cathedral Park. The summer festival has continued throughout the years and features two days of jazz performances as well as a variety of food vendors.
The Cathedral Park Jazz Festival committee is currently leading the planning efforts for the Lewis and Clark bicentennial celebration in St. Johns in 2005. It is believed that a party of the Lewis and Clark Expedition camped by the river in Cathedral Park on their return trip home in April 1806.

**Holiday Traditions in St. Johns** go back many, many years. Most of these activities have been accomplished with the help of the St. Johns Boosters and local merchants. The *Christmas scroll street ornaments* first appeared in the business district in 1961.

In 1978, the St. Johns Boosters established the first *St. Johns Christmas Market* in order to fill the vacant storefronts of two department stores that closed that year. The Christmas market returned each year until 1995, then again from 1997 through 2001. Some years have proved a challenge to find vacant storefront space to hold this event.

With no Christmas market in 1995—due to lack of vacant storefront Space—the St. Johns Community Grange organized the opening of *Santa's Castle*. Since 1995 the St. Johns Boosters has sponsored and supported Santa's Castle.

**Columbia Slough Small Craft Regatta** is sponsored by the Columbia Slough Watershed Council and the Portland Bureau of Environmental Services. The Annual Columbia Slough Regatta is the largest paddling event in Oregon, hosted by the Columbia Slough Watershed Council for the past eight years. This free event attracts hundreds of canoeists and kayakers each year. Past regattas have hosted more than 340 participants and 160 boats. Held on the last Sunday in July, this annual paddle is a celebration of the Columbia Slough, a waterway with unique history, abundant wildlife and many recreation opportunities.
Key Issues and Planning Implications

The peninsula has a long history of residents, businesses, churches, and civic groups working to build community pride and to provide for the social, recreational and educational needs of their community. Below are issues and implications that pertain to the community and may be addressed in the St. Johns/Lombard planning process.

- Local businesses, churches, nonprofits, and residents have worked in partnership to carry out many of the community events, such as the St. Johns parade. Planning efforts should consider ways to create opportunities for building on these efforts to enhance community identity and for supporting community involvement.

- The St. Johns downtown area has many community services such as the library, community center, and public schools. These amenities provide a place for community members to meet and are important community assets. Public services and gathering places enhance the vitality of a town center. Planning efforts should consider ways to preserve and increase these types of community assets in the town center and also along Lombard Street.

- A rich cultural diversity exists in the plan area. This diversity brings new social customs and rituals that enrich community life. The different cultural norms of new residents should be considered in developing community services and programs.
12. Previous Plans and Studies

This chapter briefly describes plans and studies previously undertaken in the St. Johns/Lombard plan area. The list is in chronological order.

Comprehensive Development Plan for the St. Johns Area, 1959

St. Johns was the first subarea of Portland to complete a comprehensive development plan. Initiated in May 1957, its purpose was to identify actions to guide the future physical development and increase the potential of St. Johns. The study investigated past trends, land use patterns, zoning, housing, schools, parks, traffic circulation, population and utilities. The City of Portland adopted a new zoning code in 1959 that incorporated zone changes for St. Johns. The zoning changes allowed for optimum development of vacant lots, reduced the number of nonconforming uses, and provided a transition area and buffer between residential and commercial uses.

St. Johns Business District Improvement Program, 1976

The St. Johns Business District Improvement Program was initiated as part of a comprehensive neighborhood preservation program; it was the city’s first significant effort to upgrade a neighborhood commercial district. The purpose of the study was to identify actions, projects, and policies for improving the business district. Recommendations were reported in the Five Year Action Program. These included policies for transportation improvements, business promotion, public and institutional use, housing development, and environmental improvements. Approximately $1.5 million was directed into the business district and over $4.6 million into the residential area in 1978 and 1979 to complete some of the recommended projects.

In 1982, a Commercial District Policy Study was performed to evaluate the impacts of the St. Johns Business District Improvement Program’s Five Year Action Program. Project elements that were implemented include:

- Rerouting of truck and nonlocal traffic around the business district, with local traffic directed onto Lombard through the business core.
- Installation of parking signs for new one- and two-hour parking areas.
- Improved transit service: buses routed into the business district, and the addition of a bus shelter in the pedestrian plaza transfer area.
• Installation of a pedestrian mall, street furniture, and upgraded lighting.
• Improved signage and landscaping at the business district entrance.
• Secured funding to hire a business expeditor to conduct promotional activities in the district.
• Production and distribution of the St. Johns Building Improvement Handbook. Funded by a grant from the National Endowment for the Arts, the handbook was used to establish an overall business district design theme and guide building improvements and new development in the business district. Distributed to local businesses, it describes steps for implementing parking, street tree, and security programs for the district, and contains remodeling tips and financing information.

St. Johns Riverfront Development, 1977

The St. Johns Riverfront Development project was initiated in response to the federal government’s Urban Development Action Grant (UDAG) program, announced in 1977. Administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the UDAG program was designed to help alleviate physical and economic deterioration by providing financial support for local housing, neighborhood improvement and economic development projects. The waterfront area south of Cathedral Park was identified as an appropriate redevelopment site for the UDAG program. Unfortunately, HUD terminated the grant agreement in 1981, and without funding, PDC was unable to implement the original St. Johns Riverfront Development project. An amended development program that included an urban renewal plan was later developed.

St. Johns Waterfront Access Study, 1977

The purpose of this traffic study was to recommend a plan for truck and auto access to all waterfront development within the study area (roughly between North Portsmouth and North Bruce Avenues, and North Lombard Street and the Willamette River). Principal conclusions of the Waterfront Access Study are:

• Access should be provided separately to the industrial, residential and recreation areas to minimize the mixing of trucks with residential traffic. Therefore, it would not be desirable to provide a continuous road along the waterfront connecting the areas of different land use.
• Baltimore Avenue is too steep for heavy trucks or vehicles towing boat trailers.
• Catlin Avenue is the most appropriate location to provide auto access to the north end industrial area, but trucks should not be permitted since it is a residential street.
• Widening the right-of-way and constructing a truck route on the Weyerhauser Avenue alignment would likely not be an acceptable solution.
• It would not be necessary or desirable to route traffic from other waterfront areas through Terminal 4.

• A truck route extending north from the north end industrial area is required; an appropriate location is difficult to determine.

• The number of railroad grade crossings should be kept to a reasonable minimum, consistent with the number and speed of trains and the convenience, safety and emergency access requirements of the several pockets of industrial, residential and recreational development on the river side of the tracks.

• Joint use of North Edgewater Street by large pole trucks and residential and recreational traffic is hazardous and should be avoided by rerouting the trucks to Van Houten Place.

• While Van Houten Place is a potentially safer truck route than Edgewater Street, its hazardous condition at the top of the grade where it joins Van Houten Avenue should be remedied.

• There are additional truck problem locations that affect truck routing in the study area, and improvements should be planned at these locations not already scheduled for reconstruction.

Portland Comprehensive Plan, 1980

Portland’s Comprehensive Plan development process incorporated goals and policies for the city as a whole, and reevaluated the 1959 zoning map. Zone titles and their requirements were changed through this process, and the new policies and zoning map changes into effect in January 1981. Zoning map changes we

The Comprehensive Plan resulted in zone changes for portions of the St. Johns/Lombard plan area.

Columbia Corridor Transportation Study, 1998

This study was adopted by City Council following the 1992 update to the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan. The objective of this study was to provide a transportation plan to implement improvements to the existing transportation network that efficiently and safely serve all travel modes and trips within the region, as determined by land use designations and related transportation needs. The recommended transportation improvement program proposed projects categorized in four areas:

• corridor-wide expanded transit service;

• safety, traffic management and operational improvements;

• connectivity improvements; and

• system improvements.
The study also proposed an implementation schedule, with timeframes ranging from six years for safety and traffic management projects, to twenty years for system improvements.

**North Beach Vision and Action Plan, 1999**

Through a grant from Metro, the Friends of Cathedral Park Neighborhood Association, in cooperation with the University Park and St. Johns Neighborhood Associations, hired a consultant to develop a community-based vision and action plan to guide the future use of North Beach. This two-mile riverfront area was historically in industrial use and is now mostly vacant or in public use. The vision contains these key elements: river focus, mix of uses, employment opportunities, river access trails, environmental and cultural resources, adequate transportation facilities, and open space/recreational opportunities. The action plan recommendations include: a mix of uses, environmental enhancements, a recreational greenway trail, improved roadways and access, and interpretive features such as signs and other elements, to provide a sense for the area’s unique history and environmental values. The plan was reviewed and accepted by City Council, though not adopted.

**North Portland Greenway Trail Feasibility Study, 1999**

This feasibility study conducted by the Bureau of Parks and Recreation identified a conceptual alignment for a greenway trail between the Steel Bridge and the St. Johns Bridge on the east side of the Willamette River. Results of this study will be incorporated into the Bureau of Planning’s Willamette River planning effort. The study proposes relocation of the planned trail alignment from Willamette Boulevard to the riverfront between Willamette Cove and Swan Island.

**Portsmouth Vision 20/20 Target Area, 1999**

In the fall of 1997, the Portsmouth neighborhood received a Target Area Designation (TAD) grant from the Bureau of Housing and Community Development. This five-year community development grant allowed for outreach to Portsmouth residents and planning for future neighborhood improvements. The grant included funding for a full-time TAD coordinator, to work from the office of the Peninsula Community Development Corporation (PCDC).

The program was named ‘Portsmouth Vision 20/20’ (PV 20/20) and a steering committee of neighborhood interests was formed. In January 1999, the steering committee adopted the *Portsmouth Action Plan*, which includes overarching goals that reflect the major concerns of residents as identified through a community process. It also lists projects and potential partners needed to implement the goals.
City funding for the TAD ended in July 2002. It is the goal of the steering committee that the Portsmouth Neighborhood Plan, adopted June 2002, carry forward some of the uncompleted action items of the Portsmouth Action Plan.

**Willamette Cove Master Plan, 1999**

The Bureau of Parks and Recreation developed a master plan for Willamette Cove, a twenty-seven-acre parcel of land along the Willamette River, bordering the University Park and Cathedral Park neighborhoods. The site, purchased with funds from the Metro Greenspaces Bond Measure, is part of the Portland Harbor Superfund listing. Metro and the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) are investigating contamination from prior industrial uses and clean-up needs. After clean-up remedies are completed, the city plans to enter into an interagency agreement with Metro to maintain the park. Implementation of the master plan currently is not funded.

**A Study of the Pedestrian Realm and Multimodal Access in the St. Johns Town Center, 2000**

This report, authored by graduate students at Portland State university, details an extensive community outreach and data analysis effort designed to evaluate the pedestrian environment in St. Johns. The project team interviewed local residents, surveyed town center users, held group discussions with neighborhood associations, and conducted an existing conditions inventory and parking assessment to supplement the results from community outreach efforts. The findings include the following:

- The community is generally satisfied with the town center’s pedestrian realm. However, there are not enough crosswalks in the study area to allow for safe pedestrian crossing.
- Residents’ safety concerns include the significant truck traffic, children walking through the town center to James John Elementary, and the town center environment at night (the many local taverns).
- The needs of elderly and disabled residents of Schrunk Tower and the surrounding neighborhoods are not being met. Handicap ramps throughout the town center are not in compliance with the 1990 *Americans with Disabilities Act*.
- Many business owners identified a lack of quality infrastructure, such as benches, ornamental streetlights, and gateway signs, and feel that related improvements would increase the economic viability of the area.
- There is no on-street parking shortage in the town center.
- Transit users are generally satisfied with public transportation to and from the town center.
- Few cyclists use the town center because of narrow travel lanes and truck traffic.
St. Johns in the 21st Century Target Area, 2000

The St. Johns in the 21st Century citizen committee developed an action plan to guide future projects and activities aimed at improving the identified target area, the St. Johns Business District. The project’s lead agency, the Bureau of Housing and Community Development (BHCD), approved the action plan, and implementation began on July 1, 2000; it is expected to be continued until the end of 2003. Action items include improving the pedestrian environment, supporting local businesses, conducting market analyses, sponsoring cultural events, and promoting a main street identity and small town character.

Parks 2020 Vision Master Plan, 2000

The Parks 2020 Vision Master Plan was adopted by City Council in July 2001. It contains 20 years of park improvement projects that were determined through a two-year community input process. The report looks at all aspects of the current parks system and offers strategies to continue its successes, remedy its failures, and plan for future needs. The vision plan’s objectives are to:

- ensure Portland’s park and recreation legacy for future generations.
- Provide a wide variety of services and recreation opportunities for all residents;
- preserve, protect and restore Portland’s natural resources;
- create an interconnected regional and local system of trails and paths; and
- develop parks, recreation facilities and programs that promote community activities.

Meeting these objectives will require:

- acquisition of 1,870 acres of park land, including 620 acres of protected habitat land;
- provision of 100 new sports fields;
- construction of six new full-service community centers;
- development of 150 additional miles of trails, including completion of the 40-mile loop trail; and
- creation of public plazas in each regional and town center, and green connections along each designated main street in the city.

(See Chapter 10, Public Facilities and Services, for an analysis of parks in the area.)

Interstate Corridor Urban Renewal Area, 2000

In August 2000, City Council approved the Interstate Corridor Urban Renewal Area (ICURA) to help fund construction of the Interstate light rail and to promote community revitalization in North and Northeast Portland. The Portsmouth neighborhood is contained in the CURA. Over 85 percent of the urban renewal dollars generated are expected to be used for projects, other than the construction of light rail, that promote community revitalization. The funding
steering committee and various working groups, comprised of city staff and community members, have developed strategies for prioritizing projects within the urban renewal area.

**St. Johns Truck Strategy, 2001**

The St. Johns Truck Strategy is a study to reduce the amount of truck traffic on local neighborhood streets while investigating transportation improvements that improve truck travel to commercial or industrial sites, the freeway system and the St. Johns Bridge. Following are recommendations of the advisory committee’s multimodal strategy.

- Truck traffic to and from the St. Johns Bridge should be relieved or mitigated, but not eliminated.
- Designated truck streets should come as close as possible to achieving the policy (North District Policies, *Transportation Element*) of having the trucks skirt the edges of the neighborhood.
- Streets such as Lombard, St. Louis, and Ivanhoe, which up until 1992 were designated truck streets, may be appropriate for continued truck traffic. Improvements on the designated truck streets should be designed to keep trucks moving, not moving faster, and the improvements must include pedestrian/bicycle safety and convenience improvements, particularly from Reno to Philadelphia.
- The intersections of Portland/Columbia, T-4 Road/Burgard, Reno/Lombard, Johns/Lombard, Lombard/St. Louis/Ivanhoe, and Ivanhoe/Philadelphia are of particular interest or concern.
- Fessenden and local cross streets between Fessenden and Columbia should be improved to discourage truck traffic (i.e., design treatments, traffic calming, speed limit changes, turn movement restrictions on Columbia, and any pedestrian/bicycle safety improvements that fall outside of the other improvement categories).
- Truck signage must be reviewed and improved.
- Education and enforcement action needs to occur on an ongoing basis, and there should be additional public input to turn the concepts into actual improvements.

**St. Johns Truck Advisory Committee Minority Report, 2001**

This report was produced by a representative of the Friends of Cathedral Park Neighborhood Association, in response to the *St. Johns Truck Strategy*. It contains the following recommendations:

- Enforce the already-established truck route on U.S. Highway 30, Interstate 405, the Fremont Bridge, and Marine Drive. Set up obstacles at North Marine Drive and North Portland Highway to prevent trucks from accessing North
Fessenden. Provide signage at the U.S. Highway 30 west on-ramp instructing trucks to continue to the Fremont Bridge instead of the St. Johns Bridge.

- Build a road along the railroad cut that runs north-south under the viaduct between North Ida and North Carey Streets.
- Prohibit trucks over 18,000 pounds on the St. Johns Bridge.

**McCormick and Baxter Reuse Assessment, 2001**

The Bureau of Planning coordinated a reuse assessment for this vacant superfund site after completion of cleanup work. The assessment was one of ten pilot projects done around the country to launch EPA's Superfund Redevelopment Initiative. The fifty-acre site has industrial zoning and is part of the finite land supply available for harbor industrial growth, but it is constrained by marginal truck access, costly infrastructure needs, and clean-up cost liability. Other reuse challenges include the evolving character of the North Beach waterfront, relationship to the residential neighborhood at the top of the adjacent bluff, brownfield reuse issues, and riverfront opportunities for habitat and recreation. A stakeholder committee reached general agreement on reuse recommendations, including primary use of the site as a permanent park. City Council reviewed and endorsed the project's reuse recommendations.

**Portsmouth Neighborhood Plan, 2002**

The *Portsmouth Neighborhood Plan*, jointly staffed by the Bureau of Planning and Peninsula Community Development Corporation, addressed neighborhood needs and concerns by establishing a policy framework for future development. It prioritized neighborhood activities and identified partners in the government, nonprofit, and private sectors that could help the neighborhood improve the quality of life, focusing on issues such as neighborhood diversity, affordable housing, public safety, parks and open spaces, human development, transportation, and neighborhood commercial services. The plan also included a legislative zone change in the southeast corner of Columbia Villa, from residential (R2) to commercial (CS), in order to implement the goals of the neighborhood plan by allowing the retail and community services called for in the Hope VI Plan to revitalize Columbia Villa.

**St. Johns Business District Marketing Study and Plan, May 2002**

St. Johns in the 21st Century (SJC) hired Metropolitan Group to develop a marketing strategy to improve understanding of the St. Johns business district customer base as well as to identify tools to enhance and develop existing new businesses in the district. This report was and funded by a grant from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.
River Renaissance Plans and Studies

Willamette and Columbia Slough Watershed Plans

Watershed planning is an important component of Portland’s River Renaissance and fundamental to the city’s ongoing commitment to improve, protect, and restore urban waterways. In January 2001, five themes were developed by a broad range of stakeholders to articulate the River Renaissance vision – a clean and healthy river; prosperous working harbor; Portland’s front yard; vibrant waterfront districts and neighborhoods; and partnerships, leadership, and education.

In the fall of 2001, the city’s River Renaissance management team directed the Bureau of Environmental Services to develop management plans for all watersheds in Portland. The area studied as part of the St. Johns/Lombard Plan falls within the Willamette River and the Columbia Slough watershed plan areas. Comprehensive watershed recommendations will be submitted in the summer of 2004.

Portland Harbor Industrial Lands Study, February 2003

This study assesses the future land needs of industries in the harbor area, focusing on river-dependent, freight-related, and other concentrated industries. It also generally describes the structure, dynamics, and outlook of the urban industrial districts along the harbor. The harbor area consists of the industrial districts downstream of the Steel Bridge, including the industrial lands contained within the plan area. The study will be used as background research for area planning efforts, including the St. Johns/Lombard Plan.

The study was completed in two parts. Part One was prepared by the Bureau of Planning. It is an inventory of harbor area industries, a review of industrial trends, and an analysis of the harbor area’s economic role in the region. Part Two was prepared by E.D. Hovee and Company with Parsons Brinkerhoff and the J.D. White Company. It analyzes how harbor area industries are changing, their future land and location needs, and the industrial constraints of harbor area sites.
Key Issues and Planning Implications

• St. Johns and the peninsula community have a history of planning efforts with an uneven public involvement and implementation track record. Previous efforts have received mixed reaction in the community. Sound planning and follow through is crucial to the success of the St. Johns/Lombard planning effort.

• In the last few years the St. Johns/Lombard area has been the focus of several planning studies ranging from transportation, recreation, environmental, and waterfront studies. It is critical for the St. Johns/Lombard planning process to be mindful of previous and ongoing planning efforts, and where possible and appropriate, provide a framework that integrates the features of these plans and studies.
CHAPTER 1: EXISTING CONDITIONS

This section presents a background document of the existing transportation conditions in the St. Johns town center and Lombard Street corridor area. The information includes roadway network characteristics, intersection operating conditions, pedestrian, transit, bicycles, heavy vehicles, parking and other related transportation topics.

STUDY AREA

The project area focuses on the St. Johns town center generally located between Trumbull Avenue and Tyler Avenue, from the Willamette River to Smith Street and extends to the Lombard Street corridor between Tyler Avenue to Woolsey Avenue located on the North Portland peninsula. Figure 1-1 shows the project study area.

The following sections summarize current traffic and transportation conditions for various modes of travel in the study area, with supporting detail (traffic counts and level of service calculations) provided in the appendix.

ROADWAY NETWORK

The St. Johns neighborhood is located on the north Portland peninsula which is geographically separated from the Portland metro area by the Willamette River to the west, the Columbia Slough and the Columbia River to the north and the north Portland ridge along Willamette Boulevard to the south. The peninsula location of the St. Johns area results in a unique roadway network. Poor street connectivity is due to a lack of connections to adjacent areas. The St. Johns Bridge is the only outlet to the northwest. Portland Road is the only outlet to the north. Several major roads follow the geographical boundaries of the peninsula (i.e. Willamette Boulevard follows along the North Portland ridge) resulting in different street grid orientations and atypical roadway network configurations. The North Portland peninsula roadway network is divided by the north-south Burlington Northern Santa Fe railroad tracks. Railroad crossings are only provided at four locations; Willamette Boulevard, Lombard Street, Fessenden Street and Columbia Way.

The following section describes the general roadway characteristics for each key roadway in the vicinity of the study area.

Interstate 5 is the regional north/south freeway that provides access to and from the study area. Generally, I-5 in north Portland is six lanes wide (three northbound lanes and three southbound lanes) with a posted speed limit of 55 miles per hour. Interstate 5 access to the study area is provided at the Lombard Street interchange, Portland Boulevard interchange (connects to Willamette Boulevard) and Columbia Boulevard interchange (connects to Columbia Way and Fessenden Street/St. Louis Avenue).
Lombard Street is one of several major east-west roadway within the north Portland peninsula area. It serves as a direct connection between I-5 and the St. Johns town center. Within the study area, the roadway generally consists of one westbound and one eastbound through travel lane. Sidewalks are provided on both sides of the roadway throughout most of the study area. No bike lanes are provided on the roadway. The posted speed limit along Lombard Street within the study area ranges from 25 to 35 miles per hour. On-street parking is generally provided along both sides of the roadway throughout most of the study area. Separate left-turn lanes are provided on Lombard Street at the majority of signalized intersections.

Ivanhoe Street is a major east-west roadway in the St. Johns town center. The roadway is located one block south of Lombard Street and serves high volumes of heavy vehicle traffic north of Philadelphia Avenue. The roadway generally consists of one eastbound and one westbound through travel lane. Sidewalks are provided on both sides of the roadway throughout most of the study area. On-street parking is generally provided along both sides of the roadway. Over twenty years ago, the segment of Ivanhoe Street between Philadelphia Avenue and Richmond Avenue began to serve as a town center bypass route for bridge related traffic.

Philadelphia Avenue crosses the Willamette River via the St. Johns Bridge connecting US 30 in Northwest Portland to the St. Johns town center in North Portland. The roadway has a four-lane cross-section on the bridge and narrows to two-lanes at Lombard Street. Sidewalks are provided on both sides of the roadway throughout most of the study area. No bike lanes are provided on the roadway within the town center or on the St. Johns Bridge. Future bike lanes on Philadelphia Avenue are currently being studied as part of ODOT’s St. Johns Bridge Rehabilitation project. The posted speed limit is 35 miles per hour within the study area.

St. Louis Avenue/Fessenden Street serves as a major roadway in north Portland connecting the St. Johns town center to Columbia Boulevard (via Columbia Way) and residential neighborhoods to the east. Within the study area, the roadway consists of one northbound and one southbound through travel lane. Sidewalks are provided on both sides of St. Louis Avenue throughout most of the study area. Sidewalks and bike lanes are provided on both sides Fessenden Street near the study area. On-street parking is generally provided along both sides of the roadway.

Willamette Boulevard is located along the south ridge of north Portland. The roadway provides a connection between north Portland residential neighborhoods, the University of Portland and the St. Johns town center. Within the study area, the roadway generally consists of one westbound and one eastbound through travel lane. Sidewalks and bike lanes are provided on both sides of the roadway throughout most of the study area. On-street parking is generally provided along north side of the roadway throughout most of the study area.
Portsmouth Avenue is a major north-south roadway in north Portland connecting from Columbia Boulevard to Willamette Boulevard. Within the study area, the roadway generally consists of one northbound and one southbound through travel lane. Sidewalks and bike lanes are provided on both sides of the roadway throughout most of the study area. On-street parking is generally provided along both sides of the roadway.

Columbia Boulevard/Columbia Way serves as a major east-west roadway along the northern edge of the north Portland peninsula. The roadway connects the north Portland and northeast Portland industrial areas and serves high volumes of freight traffic. Columbia Way and Fessenden Street/St. Louis Avenue provide a major connection between Columbia Boulevard and the St. Johns town center. Columbia Way and Fessenden Street currently experience cut-through truck traffic. This issue being studied as part of the St. Johns Truck Strategy.1

The downtown area of St. Johns is designated a town center.2 Typically, a town center provides close access to local services and high quality public transportation with connections to regional centers (downtown Portland) and other major destinations (Portland airport). Lombard Street in north Portland is designated a main street.3 Main streets feature mixed-use developments that function similar to a town center but are located along a corridor. Main streets are designed to emphasize pedestrian, transit and bicycle travel.

Table 1-1 summarizes the functional classifications for each roadway (i.e. roadway, transit, bike, pedestrian, freight, emergency response and street design) based on Metro and the City of Portland designations.

---

3 2040 Growth Concept, Metro, 1995.
## Table 1-1
### Summary of Functional Classifications for Roadways Within the Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Bike</th>
<th>Pedestrian</th>
<th>Freight</th>
<th>Emergency Response</th>
<th>Street Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metro</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 5</td>
<td>Principal Arterial (Freeway)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Main Roadway Route</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Freeway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major Arterial (west of Philadelphia)</td>
<td>Frequent Bus</td>
<td>Regional Access (east to St. Louis)</td>
<td>Transit/mixed-use corridor</td>
<td>Road Connectors (west of Philadelphia)</td>
<td>Community Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lombard St</td>
<td>Major Arterial (east of Philadelphia)</td>
<td>Regional Connector (west of St. Louis)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia Ave</td>
<td>Major Arterial</td>
<td>Regional Bus</td>
<td>Regional Corridor Off-street</td>
<td>Transit/mixed-use Corridor</td>
<td>Road Connectors</td>
<td>Regional Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(St. Johns Bridge)</td>
<td>(St. Johns Bridge)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivanhoe St</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Regional Bus</td>
<td>Pedestrian District</td>
<td>Road Connectors</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Portland</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lombard St</td>
<td>Major City Traffic (west of Philadelphia)</td>
<td>Transit Access Street</td>
<td>City Bikeway (except St. Louis to Richmond)</td>
<td>City Walkway</td>
<td>Major Truck Street (west of St. Louis)</td>
<td>Major Emergency Response Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District Collector (east of Philadelphia)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia Ave</td>
<td>Major City Traffic Street</td>
<td>Transit Access Street</td>
<td>City Bikeway</td>
<td>City Walkway and Pedestrian District</td>
<td>Major Truck Street</td>
<td>Major Emergency Response Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(St. Johns Bridge)</td>
<td>(St. Johns Bridge)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis Ave/ Fessenden St</td>
<td>Neighborhood Collector Street</td>
<td>Transit Access Street</td>
<td>City Bikeway</td>
<td>Pedestrian District</td>
<td>Local Service Truck Street</td>
<td>Major Emergency Response Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivanhoe St</td>
<td>Major City Traffic Street (St. Louis to Philadelphia)</td>
<td>Transit Access Street</td>
<td>City Bikeway (St. Louis to Richmond)</td>
<td>Pedestrian District</td>
<td>Major Truck Street (Philadelphia to St. Louis)</td>
<td>Major Emergency Response Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willamette Blvd</td>
<td>Neighborhood Collector Street</td>
<td>Transit Access Street</td>
<td>City Bikeway</td>
<td>City Walkway</td>
<td>Local Service Truck Street</td>
<td>Major Emergency Response Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

4 2000 Regional Transportation Plan, Metro, August 10, 2000, Chapter 1.
5 Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan, City of Portland, adopted by City Council125 October 2002.
Several major roadways within the study area are designated ODOT facilities. The ODOT designation requires that ODOT standards are applied for roadway design. Table 1-2 summarizes the ODOT roadway classifications and access management spacing standards for ODOT facilities within the study area. The spacing standards are based on the speed limits for each facility. In the St. Johns Town Center if driveways are allowed and land use permits, the minimum spacing for driveways is 175-feet or mid-block if the current city block spacing is less than 350 feet.

**Table 1-2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Speed Limit (mph)</th>
<th>Spacing Standard (feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia Ave – St. Johns Bridge to Ivanhoe St</td>
<td>Statewide Highway</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivanhoe St – Philadelphia Ave to Richmond Ave</td>
<td>District Highway</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Ave – Ivanhoe St to Lombard St</td>
<td>District Highway</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lombard St – Richmond Ave to east study area limits</td>
<td>District Highway</td>
<td>25 to 35</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the 1999 Oregon Highway Plan.

**ACCESS AND CIRCULATION**

Regional access to the north Portland peninsula and the St. Johns study area is provided via the Interstate-5 freeway or US 30. These are the major connections to the Portland metro area. The I-5 interchange at Lombard Street is located approximately two miles to the east of the study area. US 30 (St. Helens Road) is located across the Willamette River approximately one-half mile to the west of the St. Johns town center via the St. Johns Bridge (Philadelphia Avenue).

The major streets that provide local access to the St. Johns study area are Lombard Street, Columbia Boulevard and Willamette Boulevard from the east and Portland Road from the north. The major roadways within the St. Johns town center are Philadelphia Avenue, Lombard Street, Ivanhoe Street, St. Louis Avenue and Richmond Avenue. These roadways comprise the major circulation routes in the area. Ivanhoe Street serves the majority of east-west traffic through the area and is the designated route for heavy vehicle traffic traveling to/from the St. Johns Bridge and the north Portland industrial area. Ivanhoe Street runs parallel to Lombard Street one block to the south. Over twenty years ago, the segment of Ivanhoe Street between Philadelphia Avenue and Richmond Avenue began to serve as a town center bypass route for bridge related traffic and heavy vehicle traffic.

---

6 1999 Oregon Highway Plan, Oregon Department of Transportation, Appendix C.
Lombard Street within the St. Johns town center serves local east-west traffic. Lombard Street does not allow for heavy vehicle traffic due to narrow lane widths and active on-street parking. St. Louis Avenue and Richmond Avenue are located at the west and east ends of the St. Johns town center and provide a major north-south connection between Ivanhoe Street and Lombard Street. At these two locations (St. Louis Avenue and Richmond Avenue) the major heavy vehicle and through traffic routes change from Ivanhoe Street to Lombard Street.

Lombard Street to the east of the St. Johns town center serves the majority of east-west traffic through the area. Willamette Boulevard runs parallel to Lombard Street several blocks to the south and serves mostly local traffic. Fessenden Street runs parallel to Lombard Street several blocks to the north and provides a connection between Columbia Boulevard and St. Louis Avenue in the St. Johns town center. The Fessenden Street-Columbia Boulevard roadway connection serves a high volume of truck traffic.

Traffic signals are located at most major intersections on Lombard Street. Additional traffic signals are provided at several locations in the St. Johns town center and at major intersections on Columbia Boulevard/Columbia Way and Fessenden Street. Three signalized pedestrian crossings are located on Lombard Street; one within the commercial area at Hodge Avenue, one within the town center at John Avenue and one within the west residential area at Reno Avenue. When warranted, traffic signals at intersections can improve both access and circulation for vehicles, bicycles and pedestrians. Figure 1-2 shows the existing locations of signalized intersections within the study area.
PEDESTRIAN

Pedestrian Classifications

The study area encompasses all but one block of the St. Johns Pedestrian District as designated by the City of Portland in the Comprehensive Plan.7 The Pedestrian District is bounded by St. Louis Avenue, Central Street, Richmond Avenue and Willamette Boulevard. According to the proposed Comprehensive Plan Goal 6, Pedestrian Districts are walkable areas where intense pedestrian use either exists or is expected. Zoning within Pedestrian Districts should encourage a mix of uses and density that supports transit, and development that is oriented to automobile uses is discouraged. All streets in Pedestrian Districts should be developed with sidewalks on both sides, and may include widened sidewalks, curb extensions, street lighting and street trees. Crossing improvements such as curb extensions, median pedestrian refuges, marked crosswalks or traffic signals are appropriate at main intersections. Figure 1-3 shows the locations of street lighting in the study area. Curb ramp locations within the study area are shown in Figure 1-4.

All of Lombard Street within the study area, except for the block between Trumbull Avenue and St. Louis Avenue, is classified as a City Walkway. In addition, within the study area Central Street between Trumbull Avenue and St. Louis Avenue, Willamette Boulevard between Richmond Avenue and Tyler Avenue, and Philadelphia Avenue from Willamette Boulevard south over the St. Johns Bridge are all classified as City Walkways. City Walkways are to provide “safe, convenient and attractive pedestrian access to activities along major streets, to provide connections between neighborhoods, and to provide access to transit and recreational and institutional destinations.”8 City Walkways should also provide safe and convenient crossing opportunities for pedestrians.9

The Pedestrian Environment

Within the study area, St. Johns is a relatively dense mix of uses with good transit connections and a well-connected network of streets. These are ideal conditions for a relatively high proportion of walking trips relative to other modes of transportation, and visual observation as well as pedestrian counts show that many in St. Johns choose this mode of transportation. Figures 1-5 and 1-6 show the existing pedestrian volumes in the a.m. and p.m. peak hours.

The pedestrian environment within the business core and Lombard Main Street portions of the study area differs from the environment in the more residential areas. These two broad divisions are examined below in terms of four measures of the pedestrian environment. Streetscape looks

---

8 Ibid., p. 2-14
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at the scale and uses in the area as they relate to pedestrians. Sidewalks are the necessary bones of the pedestrian system. Accessibility is a civil right, as described by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990; under the ADA, designing and constructing facilities for public use that are not usable by people who have disabilities constitutes discrimination. Pedestrian street crossings are the connective tissue essential for pedestrian mobility.

The St. Johns Town Center Business Core and Lombard Main Street

*Street scene in the Business Core and Main Street*

Within the central business district of the town center area, the streetscape is at an appropriate scale for pedestrian travel. Along the Lombard Main Street corridor, uses tend to be much more automobile oriented, although isolated pockets of pedestrian-scaled activity centers exist, such as in the vicinity of Fiske Avenue.

*Sidewalks in the Business Core and Main Street*

The public right-of-way is improved with sidewalks on both sides in the business core of the St. Johns town center, as well as along the Lombard Main Street. An exception is a sidewalk deficiency at the southwest corner of Ivanhoe Street at Philadelphia Avenue. Sidewalk widths and configurations in the area vary. The central business district of the town center has twelve-foot sidewalks with a six-foot through pedestrian zone and street trees and utility poles in the furnishing zone, adjacent to the curb. Along the Lombard Main Street section, sidewalks are separated in some places by a narrow unplanted strip, in other places the sidewalk is adjacent with the curb. Much of Lombard Street east of Ida Avenue has an unusually generous planting strip of six feet. In general, sidewalk widths within the town center and along the Lombard Main Street section are consistent with the Pedestrian Design Guide\textsuperscript{10} for local streets within a Pedestrian District and for City Walkways as applicable.

The condition of the existing sidewalk inventory varies from excellent to poor. Much of the inventory is many decades old, although periodic maintenance has been done. A study conducted by Portland State students in 2000 found sidewalks in the business core “generally in poor condition.”\textsuperscript{11}


\textsuperscript{11} A Study of the Pedestrian Realm and Multi-Modal Access in the St. Johns Town Center, Bowie, Miller, Ronchelli and Schang,
**Accessibility in the Business Core and Main Street**

The study area includes a number of accessibility deficiencies. Most corners on the arterial streets in the study area have at least one curb ramp. However, all along Lombard, there are few curb ramps for crossing Lombard. Most of the ramps are oriented for crossing the side streets only. Figure 1-5 shows the curb ramp locations within the study area.

The conditions of the ramps varies greatly. There are many ramps that were built in the 1970s and 1980s that do not meet the guidelines for the public right-of-way that were issued as an interim final rule by the Access Board in 1994. These older ramps tend to be too steep and lacking adequate landings at the top for maneuvering, in some cases rendering them unusable by many people with disabilities. In June 2002, the Access Board issued new draft of guidelines that call for ramps with a minimum four-foot width, and level top landings of at least four feet by four feet, a full foot wider than most existing ramps.

In the business core, garbage cans and dumpsters sometimes provide an additional impediment to travel for anyone using a mobility device.

**Pedestrian Street Crossings in the Business Core and Main Street**

Signalized pedestrian crossings within the study area are found on Lombard Street and Ivanhoe Street. Figure 1-2 shows the location of signalized pedestrian crossings.

Signalized crossings are located within the study area on Lombard Street at:

- St. Louis Avenue
- Burlington Avenue
- John Avenue
- Richmond Avenue
- Oswego Avenue
- Buchanan Avenue
- Ida Avenue
- Wall Avenue

---

Portland State University Master of Urban and Regional Planning Professional Planning Workshop, March 2000, p. 16.

12 The Access Board is an independent Federal agency responsible for developing accessibility guidelines under the ADA to ensure that new construction and alterations covered by titles II and III of the ADA are readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities.
- Portsmouth Avenue
- Hodge Avenue
- Fiske Avenue
- Woolsey Avenue

Signalized pedestrian crossings are located on Ivanhoe at:
- Baltimore Avenue
- Buchanan Avenue

There are a handful of marked crosswalks at unsignalized locations within the study area, including two school crossings for James John Elementary. There is a marked unsignalized crosswalk across Lombard Street at Leavitt Avenue. There is a marked, signed, unsignalized crosswalk across Lombard Street for the Peninsula Crossing Trail just east of the railroad cut. There are two pedestrian-only school crossing signals on Lombard Street, one at John Avenue and one at Hodge Avenue.

Crossing the street can be a challenge in various locations within the study area. Specific pedestrian crossing problem areas include:

- The “pedestrian hotspot” in the triangle of Richmond Avenue, Lombard Street and Jersey Street. Motorist confusion and consequent distractions appear to contribute to risk for crossing pedestrians.
- The corner of Ivanhoe Street and Richmond Avenue can be difficult to cross due to high traffic volumes, high speed turns with the free southbound right turn movement, poor sight distance and a potential for high pedestrian volumes from the adjacent retail land uses.
- Along Ivanhoe Street between Philadelphia Avenue and Richmond Avenue, the volume and speed of traffic make crossing difficult, and there are no signalized crossings. This section of roadway separates the Cathedral Park neighborhood from James John Elementary School. The intersection at Ivanhoe Street and Richmond Avenue, where traffic makes uncontrolled turning movements, presents particular hazards for pedestrians.
- Heavy volumes of truck traffic along Ivanhoe Street between Philadelphia Avenue and St. Louis Avenue discourage pedestrian crossings. The traffic signal at Baltimore Avenue is the only signalized crossing location on this roadway segment.
- Vehicles traveling westbound on Lombard Street experience poor sight distance as they approach New Jersey Street due to the right-turn bend in the roadway. This section of roadway separates the Cathedral Park neighborhood from James John Elementary School.

- St. Louis Avenue north of Lombard Street is excessively wide (45’ to 50’ wide curb to curb) requiring more crossing time for pedestrians.

- There are several stretches of Lombard Street with more than 1,500 feet between signalized crossings. These gaps are from Reno Avenue to St. Louis Avenue, Ida Avenue to Wall Avenue and Wall Avenue to Portsmouth Avenue. Refer to Figure 1-2.

- Lombard Street east of Ida Avenue is excessively wide (approximately 50’ wide curb to curb) requiring more crossing time for pedestrians.

**The Residential Areas**

**Streetscape in the Residential Areas**

Much of the town center area adjacent to the business core is residential in character. These areas are made up of both single-family and multi-family residential developments. The streetscape is at an appropriate scale for pedestrian travel.

**Sidewalks in the Residential Areas**

Although much of the residential area has fully improved streets with sidewalks on both sides, there are exceptions. In particular, sidewalks are incomplete or missing from many of the streets in the southern part of the town center near the river and in the vicinity of Cathedral Park. There are also sidewalks missing in a few places in the northern part of the town center, such as on John Avenue adjacent to St. Johns Park, on Hudson Street, and on New York Avenue. One block south of the Lombard Main Street area between Woolsey Avenue and Portsmouth Avenue is generally lacking in sidewalks.

On residential streets, six-foot sidewalks separated from the roadway with planting strips are common. In some cases the planting strips are quite wide, particularly where the roadway is narrow. The condition of the existing sidewalk inventory varies from excellent to poor.
**Accessibility in the Residential Areas**

In the residential areas, there are more intersection corners without ramps than intersection corners with ramps. Many residential intersection corners have original steel banding still in place. An additional impediment to travel for anyone using a mobility device is the prevalence of parked cars that block sidewalk access. This appears to be a common practice in some of the residential sections where on-street parking is extensive. Although the ADA allows sidewalks to follow the grade of the adjacent street, the steep grades of streets in the southern part of the town center present a challenge for many of those using mobility devices.

**Pedestrian Street Crossings in the Residential Areas**

While crossing the street is not difficult on quieter residential streets, it can be a challenge along the busier streets through the residential areas. Along St. Louis Avenue, the volume and speed of traffic and the excessive width of the roadway make crossing difficult, and there are no signalized crossings except at Lombard Street. Smith Street, while less busy than St. Louis Avenue, can also be difficult to cross due to the volume and speed of traffic.

**Access to Schools, Parks and Trails**

One school, James John Elementary, lies inside the study area. There are also five other elementary schools, three middle schools and Roosevelt High School within walking distance of the study area boundaries. Figure 1-7 shows the location of parks and schools within the study area.

The St. Johns Community Center and St. Johns Park, the St. Johns Community Garden, the St. Johns Racquet Center and Cathedral Park all lie within the study area. All are accessible by foot. Also within the study area is a portion of Willamette Cove, an undeveloped open space that may be developed by Portland Parks and Recreation in the future as a natural area with river access and passive recreation. The study area intersects the Peninsula Crossing Trail, which provides a facility for bicycle, pedestrian and skate access to the Forty Mile Loop, Smith and Bybee Lakes, the Columbia Slough and Marine Drive. The east end of the study area is bounded by Columbia Park, and there are also two parks (Swan Island Bluff and Pier Park) that are within easy walking distance of the study area boundaries. Refer to the Parks and Trails section of the document for additional information.
Figure 1-7
Parks and Schools
Pedestrian Safety Issues

The intersections of Ivanhoe Street at Baltimore Avenue and Lombard Street at St. Louis Avenue were identified in the Portland State University study as having recorded pedestrian crashes and being perceived by survey respondents as dangerous intersections for pedestrians. According to the study, “both have common attributes, such as crosswalk striping and push button signal operation, and both are within the commercial truck route that passes through the town center.”

St. Louis Avenue at Lombard Street

BICYCLE

Based on the City of Portland Transportation Element,\textsuperscript{14} City Bikeways are “intended to serve the Central City, regional and town centers, station communities and other employment, commercial, institutional and recreational destinations”. The following roadways are designated City Bikeways by the City of Portland\textsuperscript{15} within the study area:

- Lombard Street
- Philadelphia Avenue
- Willamette Boulevard
- Ivanhoe Street
- Smith Street
- Richmond Avenue
- Burlington Avenue
- St. Louis Avenue
- Smith Street

Designated on-street bicycle lanes are provided on St. Louis Avenue, Smith Street, Columbia Way, Portsmouth Avenue, Willamette Boulevard, Ida Avenue and Fessenden Street in the St. Johns area. Figure 1-8 shows the location of on-street bike lanes and multi-use paths within the study area. Existing bike facilities comprise approximately 55\% of the designated City Bikeways within North Portland west of Interstate Avenue. This leaves approximately 45\% of the designated City Bikeways in need of bike facility improvements. The major deficiency in the bike facility network is Lombard Street, which does not currently provide bike lanes.

Due to the low traffic volumes and speeds on local streets, it is assumed bicycles will share the roadway with vehicles on many of the roadways within the St. Johns town center. Bicycle parking is generally provided on Lombard Street within the town center and at several locations east of Portsmouth Avenue. Bicycle parking is also provided on Fessenden Street at Midway Avenue near George Middle School. Figure 1-9 shows the location of bicycle parking facilities.

\textsuperscript{14} Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan, City of Portland, adopted by City Council October 2002.
\textsuperscript{15} Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan, City of Portland, adopted by City Council October 2002.
City of Portland
St. Johns Town Center/Lombard Plan

LEGEND
- Blue: On-Street Bike Lanes
- Pink: Multi-use Trail

Figure 1-8
Bicycle Facilities
Figure 1-9
Bicycle Parking Facilities
TRANSIT

St. Johns has transit service comparable to many regional centers. Transit service within the Portland Metro area is provided by Tri-Met (Tri-County Metropolitan Transportation District of Oregon). The transit routes that serve the north Portland peninsula are shown in Figure 1-10 and described below.

Route 1 – Greeley connects the University of Portland in north Portland to downtown Portland. The route travels on Portsmouth Avenue and Willis Street within the study area. Buses run approximately 12 minutes apart in the AM and PM peak commute hours.

Route 4 – Fessenden connects North Portland to downtown Portland. The route travels from the St. Johns town center on St. Louis Avenue, Fessenden Street and Woolsey Avenue within the study area. Buses run approximately 12 minutes apart in the AM and PM peak commute hours.

Route 6 – MLK Blvd runs between St. Johns Town center, Rivergate industrial area, Expo Center and downtown Portland via Lombard Street, Marine Drive and MLK Boulevard. Buses run approximately 15 minutes apart in the AM and PM peak commute hours.

Route 16 – Front Ave/St. Johns runs between St. Johns Town center, Northwest Portland industrial area and downtown Portland. The route travels on Philadelphia Avenue, Ivanhoe Street and Lombard Street within the study area. Buses run approximately 30 minutes apart in the AM and PM peak commute hours.

Route 17 – NW 21st Ave/St. Helens Rd connects downtown Portland, the Northwest Portland industrial area, St. Johns Town center, Linnton and Sauvie Island. Buses run approximately 10 to 15 minutes apart in the AM and PM peak commute hours.

Route 40 – Mocks Crest connects downtown Portland, the Northwest Portland industrial area, St. Johns Town center and Sauvie Island. The route travels on Lombard Street, Ivanhoe Street and Willamette Boulevard within the study area. Buses run approximately 10 to 15 minutes apart in the AM and PM peak commute hours.

Route 75 – 39th Ave/Lombard provides service between St. Johns Town center, Rivergate, Hollywood town center (connections to MAX red and blue lines) and the Milwaukee Transit Center. Buses run approximately 12 minutes apart in the AM and PM peak commute hours.

Routes # 4, 6 and 75 will connect to the Interstate MAX light rail line planned to begin operation Fall 2004. Interstate MAX will travel between the Expo Center and the Rose Quarter Transit Center with connections to the MAX red and blue lines.
Transit coverage within the study area is shown in Figure 1-11. The transit coverage area is defined as all locations within 0.25 miles of a bus route. The transit coverage in St. Johns is fairly good with approximately 90% located within the transit coverage area. The northwest portion of Columbia Boulevard is the only area that does not have access to transit within 0.25 miles.

The transit boardings (ons) and departures (offs) for all of the transit stops along the bus routes within the study area were evaluated to determine the level of daily transit activity. The location of bus stops and bus shelters along with the daily passenger boardings for each are shown in Figure 1-12. The total daily transit ridership for each bus route within the study area is summarized in Table 1-3. Bus routes #75 and #4 are ranked in the top four in ridership based on system wide data.

Table 1-3 –Daily Weekday Passenger Boardings Per Route

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route Description</th>
<th>Daily Number of Passenger Boarding Within the Study Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#4 – Fessenden</td>
<td>1,899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6 – MLK Blvd</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#16 – Front Ave/St. Johns</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#17 – NW 21st Ave/St. Helens Rd</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#40 – Mocks Crest</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#75 – 39th Ave/Lombard</td>
<td>1,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,767</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are several bus stop locations within the study area that experience significant daily usage. The most popular bus stop locations and average daily boardings are listed below:

- The bus stop on Burlington Avenue at Kellogg Street serves an average of 800 boardings per day. This stop is a transfer for bus routes #4, 17, 40 and 75. A bus shelter is provided at this location.
- The bus stop on eastbound Lombard Street at Pier Park serves an average of 330 boardings per day. This stop is a transfer for bus routes #6, 40 and 75.
- The bus stop on eastbound Lombard Street between Alma Avenue and Ida Avenue serves an average of 190 boardings per day. A bus shelter is provided at this location.
- The bus stop on eastbound Fessenden Street near Richmond Avenue serves an average of 170 boardings per day. A bus shelter is provided at this location.
- The bus stop on eastbound Fessenden Street east of Columbia Way serves an average of 150 boardings per day. A bus shelter is provided at this location.
Figure 1-12
Bus Stops and Shelters with Daily Boardings
**MOTOR VEHICLES**

This section describes the vehicle traffic conditions within the study area along the key roadways. Items discussed in this section include traffic performance, safety, street cross sections, and parking information.

**Traffic Performance**

Traffic data for the study area was supplied by the City of Portland for traffic volumes, speed surveys, signal timing sheets, and existing AM and PM peak hour turn movement counts. The turn movement counts were conducted within the past three years. The remaining data was historic data from within the past ten years. The AM and PM peak hour turn movement counts for the analysis are included in the appendix.

While analysis of traffic flows is useful in attempting to reach an understanding of the general nature of traffic in an area, traffic volume alone indicates neither the ability of the street network to carry additional traffic nor the quality of service provided by the street facilities. For this reason, the concept of level of service (LOS) has been developed to correlate traffic volume data to subjective descriptions of traffic performance at intersections.

The level of service (LOS) at an intersection is similar to a “report card” rating, based on average vehicle delay. Level of service “A”, “B” and “C” indicate conditions where vehicles can move freely. Level of service “D” and “E” are progressively worse. LOS “D” is generally accepted as the minimum acceptable LOS during peak periods. For signalized intersections, level of service “F” represents conditions where the average delay for all vehicles through the intersection exceeds 60 seconds per vehicle generally indicated by long queues and delays. Under this operating condition, delay is highly variable, and it is difficult to estimate average delay accurately because congestion often extends into, and is affected by adjacent intersections. Descriptions of levels of service for signalized intersections are contained in the appendix.

The available traffic count data was used to determine existing operating conditions at the study intersections based on the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual methodology for signalized intersections.\(^\text{16}\) Table 1-4 provides a summary of the results for the a.m. and p.m. peak hour. The City of Portland’s preferred minimum performance level is LOS E for signalized intersections.

and LOS D overall for unsignalized intersections. ODOT facilities would require a volume to capacity ratio of less than 0.99 for both the first and second hours of the p.m. peak period for signalized intersections within town centers and on main streets. All study intersections currently operate at LOS D or better with a volume to capacity ratio less than 0.99 during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. Traffic count data was not available during the a.m. peak hour at three signalized study intersections. However, operational problems are not expected during the a.m. peak hour at these locations due to the LOS A conditions experienced during the p.m. peak hour.

### Table 1-4

**Study Intersection Operating Conditions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Intersection</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour</th>
<th></th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delay</td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>V/C</td>
<td>Delay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Signalized Control</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis Ave/Lombard St</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore Ave/Ivanhoe St</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia Ave/Ivanhoe St</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia Ave/Lombard St</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Ave/New Jersey St</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oswego Ave/Lombard St</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan Ave/Lombard St</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ida Ave/Lombard St</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall Ave/Lombard St</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth Ave/Lombard St</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiske Ave/Lombard St</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolsey Ave/Lombard St</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| LOS  | Level of service                      |
| Delay| For signalized intersections, the average vehicle delay in seconds for all movements at an intersection. |
| V/C  | Volume to capacity ratio of the intersection. "A/A" refers to level of service of left turning traffic from major street and the level of service of traffic turning from the minor street onto the major street. |
Volume Survey

Vehicle volume survey data was provided by the City of Portland for several locations along roadways within the study area.\textsuperscript{17} The 24-hour volume profiles for two locations on Lombard Street within the study area are shown in Figure 1-13 and Figure 1-14 below. The surveys found a daily traffic volume on Lombard Street of 8,500 vehicles at Catlin Avenue and 16,400 vehicles at Carey Boulevard. The average daily traffic (ADT) volumes on other roadways within the study area are shown in Figure 1-15.

\textsuperscript{17} Historic volume data provided by the City of Portland was conducted during 2002.
The average daily traffic volumes on key roadways within the St. Johns area were compared to other major roadways in the Portland metro region. The average daily traffic volumes and cross-section are summarized below.

- Sandy Boulevard – 25,000 to 30,000 ADT with four lanes
- Hawthorne Boulevard – 20,000 to 25,000 ADT with four lanes
- NE 23rd Avenue – 12,000 to 15,000 ADT with two lanes
- Capitol Highway – 10,000 ADT with two lanes
- Denver Avenue – 7,000 ADT with two lanes

**Historical Volume Data**

Growth trends within the St. Johns area can be determined based on historic traffic volume data. By comparing the increment of growth between available data sets, an annual growth rate can be calculated for key roadways. Table 1-5 summarizes the historical count data and growth trends for Lombard Street on the east end of the study area (near Burlington Northern Santa Fe railroad tracks) and the St. Johns Bridge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>ADT*</th>
<th>Net Change</th>
<th>% Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lombard Street**</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>10,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>15,900</td>
<td>+5,200</td>
<td>+49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>13,900</td>
<td>-2,000</td>
<td>-13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>16,400</td>
<td>+2,500</td>
<td>+18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>16,400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>ADT</th>
<th>Net Change</th>
<th>% Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns Bridge</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>14,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>20,900</td>
<td>+6,100</td>
<td>+41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>17,400</td>
<td>-3,500</td>
<td>-17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>18,400</td>
<td>+1,000</td>
<td>+6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>23,800</td>
<td>+5,400</td>
<td>+29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* ADT = Average daily traffic based on two-way volumes.
** Lombard Street near Burlington Northern Santa Fe railroad tracks.

Data provided by City of Portland, Office of Transportation.

Based on the historical volume data for the St. Johns area, the majority of traffic growth occurred during the 1960’s. The average annual growth rate on Lombard Street and the St. Johns Bridge from 1970 to 2000 range from 0.1% to 0.4%. This implies that growth rates in the St. Johns area have been stable for the last 30 years with moderate growth.
Speed Survey

Historical speed survey data was provided by the City of Portland for several locations along major roadways within the study area. These speed surveys track the volume and speed of vehicles as they pass a point on the roadway. Table 1-6 summarizes the speed survey findings.

### Table 1-6 – Speed Survey Data Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Posted Speed Limit</th>
<th>85th Percentile Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lombard Street east of Hodge Avenue</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lombard Street east of Richmond Avenue</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore Avenue north of Willamette Blvd</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston Avenue north of Hudson Street</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson Street south of St. Louis Avenue</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivanhoe Street west of Richmond Avenue</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis Avenue south of Smith Street</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All speeds shown in miles per hour.

At several of the survey locations, the 85th percentile speed observed is greater than the posted speed limit. This 85th percentile speed is used as a measure of the upper limit of reasonable speeds for the prevailing conditions. Typically, facilities and controls are designed for the 85th percentile characteristics which include speeds, reaction times, visibility, and other characteristics within which 85 percent of the driver population exists.

Traffic Calming

Several traffic calming projects have been implemented within the St. Johns area. In general, traffic calming projects are provided to improve the pedestrian and bicycle environment within an area. Recent traffic calming projects include:

- Speed bumps on Macrum Avenue (Lombard Street to Willamette Boulevard)
- Curb extension and median islands on Columbia Way and Smith Street (Columbia Boulevard to St. Louis Avenue)
- Speed bumps on Ida Avenue (Lombard Street to Willamette Boulevard)
- Pedestrian refuge provided on Portsmouth Avenue (near Newark Street)
- Speed bumps on Van Houten Avenue (Fessenden Street to Hudson Street)
- Speed bumps on Wabash Avenue (Lombard Street to Willis Street)
- Speed bumps on Wall Avenue (Lombard Street to Fessenden Street)

18 Historic speed survey data provided by the City of Portland was conducted within the past ten years.
Citizens have identified several locations within St. Johns that are potential areas for future traffic calming improvements. These locations include:

- Buchanan Avenue (Columbia Boulevard to Fessenden Street)
- Charleston Avenue (Fessenden Street to Lombard Street)
- Foss Avenue (Willis Street to Houghton Street)
- Gilbert Avenue (Smith Street to Lombard Street)
- Ivanhoe Street (Reno Avenue to St. Louis Avenue)
- Oswego Avenue (Lombard Street to Columbia Way)
- St. Johns Avenue (Lombard Street to Seneca Street)
- Washburne Avenue (Lombard Street to Willis Street)
- Willamette Boulevard (St. Louis Avenue to Portland Boulevard)
- Woolsey Avenue and Wall Avenue (Willamette Boulevard to Lombard Street)

**Heavy Vehicle Traffic**

The study area encompasses Philadelphia Avenue, Ivanhoe Street, St. Louis Avenue, and Lombard Street (within the St. Johns town center) which are designated as a Major Truck Street by the City of Portland. Major Truck Streets attract high volumes of truck trips and distribute the traffic regional to minor truck streets. All other streets in the study area are classified for local truck access only.

The St. Johns Truck Strategy characterizes four key truck routes within the St. Johns area. These routes include:

- **Northern Perimeter Route** – Located on Columbia Boulevard, Burgard Street, Lombard Street, St. Louis Avenue and Ivanhoe Street. This route encourages non-local truck traffic to go around the residential and retail-commercial areas.

- **Middle Route** – Located on Marine Drive or Columbia Boulevard, Portland Road, Fessenden Street, St. Louis Avenue and Ivanhoe Street. This route is used mostly by non-local trucks because it is more direct than the Northern Perimeter Route. This route creates conflicts with residences and retail properties in the St. Johns town center.

- **Southern Route** – Located on Lombard Street from the St. Johns town center to Denver Avenue. This route is used less frequently by truck traffic because of several signalized intersections, narrow lanes and heavier traffic.

- **St. Johns Bridge** – All three key truck routes use the St. Johns Bridge to access the north Portland peninsula. Truck traffic conflicts with the St. Johns town center’s mix of residential and retail-commercial uses.

---

Vehicle classification survey data was provided by the City of Portland for several locations along roadways within the study area. These surveys indicate the volume of vehicles by classification type as they pass a point on the roadway. Three survey locations were chosen on truck routes at the boundaries of the study area. Catlin Avenue and Carey Boulevard are located on Lombard Street near the west and east boundaries of the study area, respectively. Table 1-7 summarizes the 24-hour volume for each vehicle classification and the corresponding percentage from the survey data.

### Table 1-7 Vehicle Classification Survey Data Summary (24-hour Volumes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Passenger Car Volume</th>
<th>Single-Unit Trucks Volume</th>
<th>Multi-Unit Trucks Volume</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lombard Street at Carey Boulevard</td>
<td>16,434 (94%)</td>
<td>770 (5%)</td>
<td>143 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lombard Street at Catlin Avenue</td>
<td>6,820 (80%)</td>
<td>1,108 (13%)</td>
<td>621 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns Bridge</td>
<td>17,794 (88%)</td>
<td>1,513 (8%)</td>
<td>832 (4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In general, heavy vehicle volumes within the study area have a peak period which endures throughout the day with volumes remaining fairly constant from 7:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. This heavy vehicle peak period occurs during the a.m. peak period (7:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m.) but begins to lower during the p.m. peak hour (4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.).

### Roadway Cross Sections

Four locations within the study area were selected to identify the characteristics of the roadway cross sections. These locations include Lombard Street, Ivanhoe Street and Philadelphia Avenue within the St. Johns town center and along the Lombard Street corridor. The details for each cross section location are summarized in Table 1-8. A sketch for each roadway cross section is shown in Figures 1-16 to 1-18.

---

21 Historic truck survey data provided by the City of Portland was conducted within 2002.
Table 1-8

Key Roadway Cross Section Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Right-of-Way</th>
<th># of Travel Lanes</th>
<th>Curb-to-Curb</th>
<th>Furnishing Zone</th>
<th>Through Zone</th>
<th>Sidewalk</th>
<th>Frontage Zone</th>
<th>On-Street Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lombard St (west of St. Louis Ave)</td>
<td>60’</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36’</td>
<td>4’</td>
<td>6’</td>
<td>2’</td>
<td>7’</td>
<td>(both sides)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lombard St (east of Portsmouth Ave)</td>
<td>80’</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>50’</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>15’</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7’</td>
<td>(both sides)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivanhoe St (west of Baltimore Ave)</td>
<td>60’</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36’</td>
<td>4’</td>
<td>6’</td>
<td>2’</td>
<td>7’</td>
<td>(both sides)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia Ave (south of Ivanhoe St)</td>
<td>100’</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64’</td>
<td>4’</td>
<td>14’</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All measurements shown in feet.

Figure 1-16

Lombard Street (east of Portsmouth Ave) Typical Cross Section
Figure 1-17
Philadelphia Avenue Typical Cross Section

Figure 1-18
Lombard Street/Ivanhoe Street in St. Johns Town Center Typical Cross Section
Collision Data

Collision data was supplied by the City of Portland for the intersections within the study area. Of the twelve intersections being evaluated, two of these locations were reported in the City of Portland’s High Accident Location (HAL) report. Table 1-9 summarizes the collision activity at study intersections between January 1996 to December 1999.

**Table 1-9**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Total Collisions</th>
<th>Total Fatalities</th>
<th>Collision Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lombard Street/Portsmouth Avenue</td>
<td>#97</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lombard Street/St. Louis Avenue</td>
<td>#101</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The collision rates for intersections are calculated as the number of collisions per million vehicles entering the intersection annually. A ratio over 1.00 generally indicates that the intersection has a higher number of collisions than expected, and a further detailed safety evaluation should be conducted.

Travel Model Traffic Patterns

The City of Portland travel demand forecast models (1994 base year and 2020 strategic plan year) provide a tool to analyze where trips go to and come from that use a specific roadway within the Portland metro area. The City’s model provides PM peak hour information. Several locations within the north Portland peninsula area were chosen for focused analysis in each model. With this information, general travel patterns within the study area can be determined. The key findings include:

- The base and future year models indicate the majority of traffic volumes on Lombard Street (east of the town center) are local trips within St. Johns. Approximately 60 to 70% of the trips begin or end within the St. Johns or nearby areas. The remaining 30 to 40% trips travel across the I-5 Interstate Bridge and to the east of I-5.

- The base year model shows approximately 35 to 45% of traffic volumes on Lombard Street (west of the town center) travel across the St. Johns Bridge. The remaining trips begin or end locally within the St. Johns or nearby areas. Minimal trips from the west end of Lombard Street travel east of I-5. The future model shows approximately 30 to 35% of traffic volumes

---

on Lombard Street (west of the town center) travel across the St. Johns Bridge. The remaining trips begin or end locally within the St. Johns or nearby areas.

- The base year model found the majority of traffic volumes on Columbia Way and Fessenden Street are through (non-local) trip. Approximately 70 to 80% of traffic volumes traveling on Columbia Way and Fessenden Street travel across the St. Johns Bridge, the I-5 Interstate Bridge and to the east of I-5. The remaining 30% of the trips begin or end within the St. Johns area. The future model shows approximately 50% of traffic volumes traveling on Columbia Way and Fessenden Street are non-local with trips traveling across the St. Johns Bridge and the I-5 Interstate Bridge.

- The base year model shows approximately 40 to 45% of traffic volumes traveling from the St. Johns Bridge (eastbound) have destinations within the study area. As a result, approximately 55 to 60% of these trips have non-local destinations (outside St. Johns) including (in descending priority) the I-5 Interstate Bridge, Columbia Boulevard to the east, Lombard Street to the east and the north Portland marine terminal area. The future model shows approximately 60% of traffic volumes traveling from the St. Johns Bridge (eastbound) have destinations within the study area. As a result, approximately 40% of these trips have non-local destinations (outside St. Johns) including (in descending priority) the I-5 Interstate Bridge, Lombard Street to the east, Columbia Boulevard to the east and the north Portland marine terminal area.

- The base year model indicates approximately 30 to 35% of traffic volumes traveling to the St. Johns Bridge (westbound) begin within the study area. As a result, approximately 65 to 70% of these trips have non-local destinations (outside St. Johns) including (in descending priority) the I-5 Interstate Bridge via Denver Avenue, the north Portland marine terminal area, Columbia Boulevard to the east and Lombard Street to the east. The future model indicates approximately 55% of traffic volumes traveling to the St. Johns Bridge (westbound) begin within the study area. As a result, approximately 45% of these trips have non-local destinations (outside St. Johns) including (in descending priority) the I-5 Interstate Bridge via Denver Avenue, the north Portland marine terminal area and Lombard Street to the east.

- The base and future year models indicate approximately 20 to 25% of traffic volumes traveling on Willamette Boulevard cross the St. Johns Bridge. Another 25 to 30% of traffic volumes continue of Willamette Boulevard to areas to the south and east. The remaining 45 to 55% of the trips begin or end within the St. Johns area.

**Travel Model Growth Trends**

The City of Portland travel demand forecast models (1994 base year and 2020 strategic plan year) provide a tool to estimate future growth trends for traffic volumes in the study area. The 26-
year growth increment from 1994 to 2020 is determined for each travel direction and converted to an annualized growth rate. The St. Johns Bridge, Lombard Street (at the east end of the study area) and Fessenden Street were chosen for focused analysis.

Based on the models, the future annualized growth rate on the St. Johns Bridge is approximately 0.75% per year in both travel directions. The majority of growth on the St. Johns Bridge is attributed to traffic from the St. Johns town center and traffic on Lombard Street from areas to the east of the study area. Lombard Street has a future annualized growth rate of 1.5% per year in the eastbound direction and 1.4% per year in the westbound direction. Traffic from the St. Johns town center and areas to the east of the study area attribute to the growth on Lombard Street. The future annualized growth rate on Fessenden Street is approximately 2.0% in the eastbound direction and 0.6% in the westbound direction. The majority of growth on Fessenden Street is attributed to traffic from Columbia Boulevard/Columbia Way in the eastbound direction.

**Parking**

Vehicle parking within the St. Johns Town Center area and on the Lombard Main Street is provided both on-street and off-street within private or public parking lots. On-street parking is allowed at approximately 60% of the available roadway curb. Approximately 930 on-street parking spaces are provided within the town center area (roughly bounded by St. Louis Avenue, Richmond Avenue, Ivanhoe Street and Central Street). The Lombard Main Street (located from Tyler Avenue to Woolsey Avenue and the adjoining side streets one block to the north and south) has approximately 800 on-street parking spaces.

The majority of on-street parking in the study area is unrestricted with no parking time limit although some areas are limited to two-hour, one-hour, 30 minute or less than 30-minute time limits. The restricted parking on Lombard Street is concentrated between John Avenue and St. Louis Avenue, Oswego Avenue and Buchanan Avenue and intermittent blocks to the east and west of Portsmouth Avenue. Additional restricted on-street parking is located on various street blocks throughout the town center including Ivanhoe Street, Leavitt Avenue, Charleston Avenue and Chicago Avenue and on various side street blocks to the north and south of Lombard Street. The breakdown of the available on-street parking in the study area is 75% unrestricted, 6% two-hour limit, 13% one-hour limit, 4% 30-minute limit and 2% less than 30-minute limit.
SUMMARY OF FACTS

Motor Vehicle

- The existing operating conditions at the signalized intersections within the St. Johns town center and along Lombard Street are acceptable with level of service D or better during both the a.m. and p.m. peak hours.
- On several roadways within the study area, the surveyed 85th percentile vehicle speeds were four miles per hour greater than the posted speed limit. These roadways include Charleston Avenue (north of Hudson Street), Ivanhoe Street (west of Richmond Avenue) and St. Louis Avenue (south of Smith Street).
- Vehicle classification survey data conducted over a 24-hour period show daily traffic volumes on Lombard Street consist of 20% heavy vehicles west of St. Louis Avenue and 6% heavy vehicles east of Heppner Avenue. The St. Johns Bridge daily traffic volumes consist of 12% heavy vehicles.
- Based on the City of Portland travel demand forecast models, future annualized growth rates are estimated to be 0.75% per year on the St. Johns Bridge, 1.5% per year on Lombard Street and on Fessenden Street 2.0% per year eastbound and 0.6% per year westbound.

Bicycle

- Designated on-street bicycle lanes are provided on St. Louis Avenue, Smith Street, Columbia Way, Portsmouth Avenue, Willamette Boulevard, Ida Avenue and Fessenden Street in the St. Johns area.
- Lombard Street does not contain on-street bicycle lane but is designated a City Bikeway by the City of Portland.23

Pedestrian

- Within the study area, the public right-of-way is predominantly improved with sidewalks on both sides of the street. There are a few exceptions with gaps in the sidewalk network.
- The character (traffic volumes, speeds and sight distance) of the Lombard Street/Richmond Avenue/Jersey Street intersection and the Ivanhoe Street/Richmond Avenue can create difficult areas for pedestrians to cross.

Several signalized pedestrian crossings are provided on Lombard Street, however there are several gaps with spacing between crossing locations greater than 1,500-feet.

The study area includes a number of accessibility deficiencies. Most corners on the arterial streets in the study area have at least one curb ramp. However, all along Lombard, there are few curb ramps for crossing Lombard. Most of the ramps are oriented for crossing the side streets only.

Transit

Seven Tri-Met bus routes currently service the St. Johns area: #1-Greeley, #4-Fessenden, #6-MLK Blvd, #16-Front Ave/St. Johns, #17-NW 21st Ave/St. Helens Rd, #40-Mocks Crest and # 75-39th Ave/Lombard.

Connections to the MAX light rail (lines red and blue) are currently provided by route #75. Routes #4, 6 and 75 will connect to the Interstate MAX light rail line which is planned to begin operation Fall 2004.

The existing transit coverage in St. Johns in fairly good with approximately 90% located within the transit coverage area.

Parking

Approximately 930 on-street parking spaces are provided within the St. Johns Town center area. The Lombard Street corridor area as approximately 800 on-street parking spaces from Tyler Avenue to Woolsey Avenue.

The breakdown of the available on-street parking in the study area is 75% unrestricted, 6% two-hour limit, 13% one-hour limit, 4% 30-minute limit and 2% less than 30-minute limit. The majority of restricted parking is located in the town center and along Lombard Street near retail land uses.
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I. INTRODUCTION

This chapter analyzes demographic and economic data for the St. Johns town center and Lombard main street. It supports the development of a St. Johns/Lombard Plan, which will identify an urban design concept, including land use and transportation components.

While planning processes help to define what land uses will be allowed, the market—sometimes impacted by public programs or funding—also influences which of these allowed uses will be developed, or whether new development or redevelopment will occur at all. The inclusion of economic data and analysis promotes a plan that responds to the unique economic opportunities and constraints impacting St. Johns and Lombard Street.¹

This analysis recognizes the St. Johns Business District Marketing Study and Plan, developed for the City of Portland Bureau of Housing and Community Development and for the St. Johns in the 21st Century Committee in May 2002. That study focused upon customer surveys to identify strengths and opportunities within the district. This chapter builds upon its insights, analyzing quantitative data on both household demographics and retailers within the market area and providing a qualitative assessment of redevelopment sites.

This chapter is organized according to the following topics:

- Geographic Area Assessed
- Demographic Trends
- Housing & Commercial Trends
- Retail Development Potential
- Evaluation of Redevelopment Sites
- Summary & Highlights

The chapter’s conclusion includes a discussion of the conditions necessary to help move St. Johns from a largely neighborhood commercial district, as it currently functions, to a true town center that serves the community and also attracts customers from outside of the St. Johns primary market area.
II. GEOGRAPHIC AREA ASSESSED

The primary market area represents the geographic area from which businesses within the St. Johns town center and Lombard main street can expect to draw customers for day-to-day convenience goods and services (such as grocery stores, banks, dry cleaners, bakeries, florists or gift stores). Hereafter, this chapter refers to the primary market area as the market area.

The St. Johns market area is unique, due to its evolution as an independent city, its relative geographic isolation and limited access routes, and the high number of industrial jobs that surround the town center. Because of these influences—and despite a limited number of destination retailers—the St. Johns town center and Lombard main street ‘capture’ retail dollars of nonresidents (particularly area employees), although this spending is focused within a limited number of retail categories. The impact of area employees and the market area’s intended development as a town center—rather than a neighborhood retail district—are incorporated into the analysis, as detailed in remainder of this chapter.

Market area boundaries were determined by evaluating the location of competing commercial districts or businesses, primarily those along Lombard Street east of the plan boundary, NE Interstate Ave., NE Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd., and Jantzen Beach. Washington County retail was also considered in determining the market area’s western boundary, across the Willamette River from St. Johns. Travel distances and barriers were also taken into account, such as the poor westward road access available to Linnton residents, and the single bridge access to Sauvie’s Island at the island’s southern boundary. The market area excludes the Rivergate industrial area due to its lack of residential development.
Figure 1. St. Johns Market Area

III. DEMOGRAPHIC TRENDS

Demographic and economic trends are an important determinant of demand for retail and services and housing preferences. Trends considered here include population and household growth, resident age distribution, income, and employment.

POPULATION & HOUSEHOLDS

In 2000, the St. Johns market area contained just under 31,700 residents in roughly 11,500 households. This is an increase of 1,365 households from 1990. The market area’s household growth rate of 13% is below that of the city (at 19%), but substantial for a residential neighborhood that is by and large built out.

Figure 2. Population & Households (1990-2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Market Area</td>
<td>27,282</td>
<td>31,667</td>
<td>4,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Portland</td>
<td>437,398</td>
<td>529,121</td>
<td>91,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Market Area</td>
<td>10,157</td>
<td>11,522</td>
<td>1,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Portland</td>
<td>187,262</td>
<td>223,737</td>
<td>36,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Market Area</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Portland</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, E.D. Hovee & Company.

Within the market area, the greatest household growth occurred in block groups within the town center and along the town center’s northern boundary (Columbia Boulevard). In contrast, several block groups near the University of Portland declined by up to 10 households each. The census reports close to 100 fewer households in the Columbia Villa area in 2000 than it did in 1990.

Household size within the market area (at 2.63 persons) remains larger than the city average (at 2.30), corresponding to the market area’s significantly higher portion of family households and predominately single family housing stock. The average household size increased both for the market area and the city during the 1990s.

Metro estimates that market area population and household growth rates over the next 20 years will remain at compound rates of between 1.0% and 1.5%. However, the relationship between the two rates is expected to change. Between 1990 and 2000 population was growing faster than households indicating an increasing average household size. The projected population and household growth numbers indicate faster growing household numbers and a declining average household size.
### Figure 3. Market Area Population & Household Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>Net Change</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>31,667</td>
<td>40,602</td>
<td>8,935</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>11,522</td>
<td>15,523</td>
<td>4,001</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Metro Data Resource Center and E.D. Hovee & Company.

## Age Distributions

This section considers two measures of age: age of population, and age of household head.

### Age of Population

Market area residents tend to be younger than is typical for the City of Portland. Nearly 40% of market area residents are under 25, compared with 31% for the city as a whole. The University of Portland contributes significantly to this age distribution with approximately 3,000 undergraduate students (9.5% of the market area’s total population), 97% of who live on campus. Age distribution impacts consumer demand, as earning and spending patterns correlate to age. A younger population base may mean less buying power to support local retailers. However, when these students are removed from the market area population, the age distribution within the market area is similar to that of the city.

The market area experienced a large increase in residents age 45-65 during the 1990s, a trend witnessed nationwide as baby boomers entered this age cohort. This increase outweighs the decade’s increase in all residents under the age of 35. Following trends evidenced throughout North and Northeast Portland, the number of seniors living in the market area fell by almost 450 persons during the 1990s. Seniors have less impact as consumers due to typically smaller budgets, but this trend may be of note to St. Johns town center and Lombard main street planning efforts.

### Age of Householder

Age distribution can also be described through age of householder, a demographic measure that excludes students living in dormitories and other residents living in group quarters (non-households). Changes over the past decade in age of householder mirror changes in the population’s age distribution. The market area saw the biggest increase in households headed by baby boomers (in 2000, 45-54 years olds), representing an increase of close to 1,000 households. The 1990s saw a slight decrease in the number of younger households (25-34 year olds) and a larger decrease of almost 300 households headed by seniors.

In 2000, the market area was within two percentage points of the city for all age of householder cohorts, with the largest gap (2% less) in households headed by a 25-34 year old, and an almost 2% higher distribution of households headed by a 35-44 year old.
HOUSEHOLD TYPE

In 2000, the market area hosted a significantly larger portion of family households than average for the City of Portland: 63% versus 53%. The largest component of this difference was the market area’s higher portion of single parents (14% versus 8% for the city).

Household type has remained fairly constant within the market area over the past decade, with close to equal numbers of both families with children and single parents. The 1990s did witness a decrease in roughly 550 family households that were not classified as married-couple families, or families with own children under the age of 18. These family types could include adult children living with their parents and grandchildren living with grandparents. This decrease brought the total percentage of family households down from 66% of market area households in 1990 to 63% in 2000.

In estimating consumer demand, household type is of secondary importance to the age and income structure of the market area’s population. Household type plays a larger role in allocating lifestyle preferences, which provide a more narrative understanding of a consumer base and its spending patterns.

RACE & ETHNICITY

In 2000, the market area reported a higher percentage of minority residents than did the city as a whole: 30% versus 22%. The City of Portland became more diverse during the 1990s, moving from 15% minority to 22% in 2000. The market area became more diverse as well, with close to 100 fewer residents self-classified as Caucasian in 2000 than in 1990.
The exact nature of the market area’s racial change is difficult to quantify due to new census categories. Singular racial categories remained relatively constant: African Americans comprised 9% of the population in both years, Native Americans comprised 2%, and Asians/Hawaiians/Pacific Islanders increased by only 1%.

**Figure 5. Race & Ethnicity (2000)**

Source: U.S. Census Bureau.

The increase in market area diversity occurred in the ‘some other race,’ ‘two or more races’ and Hispanic categories. ‘Some other race’ increased from 2% to 7% of the market area population; this category tends to loosely correlate to the ethnic category of Hispanic, which experienced a significant jump during the decade. The largest market area minority increase was in residents who classify themselves as two or more races, a new category in the 2000 Census that 6% of residents chose. It is unknown how residents would have classified themselves if asked to select a single race category (as in the 1990 Census).

In contrast, the market area’s ethnicity indisputably diversified: the portion of Hispanic residents increased from 4% to 13%. This increase mirrors citywide trends, but was larger in scale.

Racial and ethnic distributions primarily impact consumer demand through spending patterns, which correlate to both race and ethnicity. The spending model that estimates existing and future consumer demand (discussed in this chapter’s Development Potential section) incorporates assumptions on the race and ethnicity of the consumer base.
**Household Income**

The market area’s median household income was $37,702 in 2000. This was 94% of the city’s median income of $40,146, up from 92% in 1990. In both geographies, inflation-adjusted incomes grew over the past decade: 15% within the market area and 12% in the city. The market area median household income experienced a real increase of just under $5,000 during this time period.

**Figure 6. Income Distribution (2000)**

![Income Distribution Chart](image)

Source: U.S. Census Bureau.

In comparison to citywide incomes, the market area has a greater percentage of low (less than $25,000) and middle range ($35,000-$75,000) household incomes in 2000. Households in the lower end of the market area's income range tend to cluster within and near the St. Johns town center, and along the market area's northern boundary (Columbia Boulevard). Higher income pockets are clustered near the University of Portland, and west of the Willamette River.

**Employment of Residents**

The types of jobs held by market area residents contribute to the list of demographic measures that describe spending patterns and preferences, and help to identify both types of stores that would likely succeed within the market area and appropriate themes around which to strengthen a district identity. This section considers both employment sector and occupation type.
Employment Sector

Figure 7 identifies the industries in which market area residents work. Similar to the city as a whole, the majority of market area residents are employed in the services sector. The market area population base is more closely tied to the industrial lands that surround it than typical citywide.

Approximately 19% of market area residents work in the manufacturing sector, compared with 13% of residents citywide. The market area also hosts a slightly larger percentage of employees in the transportation, communication and public utility sector. Correspondingly, the market area houses a smaller percentage of residents working in the finance and services sectors than is true for the city on average.

Figure 7. Industry Distribution for Employed Residents (2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Percent of Employed Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Market Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale trade</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail trade</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, communication, public utilities</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, insurance, real estate</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services (personal and business)</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau.

Industrial employment of market area residents has decreased only slightly over the past 10 years: agriculture, construction and manufacturing each decreased in share by 1%, and transportation, communication and public utilities decreased its share by 2%. Despite a slightly decreasing share, over 400 more residents reported work in the industrial sector in 2000 than did so in 1990. Residents employed in the wholesale trade and transportation sectors, however, decreased by just over 200. The largest changes in sectoral job distribution were in services and retail. Service employment is up from 31%, a trend common throughout the city; more surprisingly, retail decreased from 18% to 11%.

Occupation

Occupation describes the type of tasks performed by a worker—e.g. managerial, sales, service—rather than the sector in which he or she is employed. The market area has increased its numbers of managers and professionals since 1990, when those occupational categories combined reflected only 21% of employed residents (compared to 25% today). However, its occupational distribution remains distinct from that of the city—where these occupational categories encompass 38% of workers.
The market area has a higher proportion of residents employed in production occupations. Manufacturing, shipping and distribution jobs (encompassed within the production, transportation and material moving occupational class) employed 20% of market area residents in 2000 (compared to 14% citywide). Another 9% of area residents are employed in construction, extraction and maintenance. The market area continues to house a population with employment more closely tied to adjoining industrial areas—such as Swan Island, Rivergate, and Northwest Portland.
IV. HOUSING & COMMERCIAL TRENDS

This section provides an overview of housing and commercial space trends.

HOUSING TRENDS

Discussed are the characteristics of and changes within the market area’s housing stock, trends in home sales prices, and current rent levels in north Portland and the metro region.

Housing Tenure & Stock

Homeownership is slightly more prevalent within the market area than within the city: 59% versus 56%. The difference is small given the larger discrepancy in housing type.

In 2000, 72% of all market area units were identified as detached single family compared with 61% for the city. Attached and multi-family structures with up to four units were second in prevalence, at 12%, and structures with more than 10 units comprised another 10% of the housing stock. Medium-sized multi-unit structures (5-9 units) and ‘other’ housing types (boats, RVs, etc.) both constitute small portions of the market area’s housing stock.

Figure 9. Market Area Housing Stock (2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure Type</th>
<th>Market Area Number</th>
<th>Percent of Stock</th>
<th>City of Portland Percent of Stock</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single family detached</td>
<td>8,266</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4 units</td>
<td>1,435</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9 units</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+ units</td>
<td>1,112</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11,517</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

Single family units are important for St. Johns area renters as well as homeowners: 96% of owner-occupied and 36% of renter-occupied units were single family detached homes in 2000. In comparison, 91% of owner-occupied and 21% of renter-occupied units were single family detached citywide. In both areas, the majority of all attached and multi-family structures were rented in 2000.

New construction—approximated through building permit data—fell in line with the market area’s single family housing trend between 1995 and 2000. During this time period, 71% percent of all units issued new building permits were single family structures (compared to 72% of the over-all housing stock).6
### Figure 10. Residential Building Permits (1995-2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SFR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFR (units)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total New</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Fourteen new rowhouses were also built from 1997 to 2000. These units are not called out specifically prior to 1997 so an exact count for this time period is not readily available.

Source: Metro’s RLIS (May 2002 update).

New construction has been generally dispersed throughout the market area, although the area between the town center and Columbia Boulevard, north of the railroad cut, attracted what appears to be a greater amount of new development (approximately 150 new housing units). Multi-family construction appears to have been equally dispersed throughout the market area. The town center saw two new 3-4 unit buildings built over this time period, and around 10 rowhouses. New single family development along Skyline Boulevard also contributed to market area household growth.

permit data also reveals that very few (permitted) renovations and demolitions have occurred within this time period. This data does not reflect home renovations and investments that either do not require permits, or for which permits were not obtained.

**Housing Values**

Market area homes have experienced the same high rate of appreciation—in fact, higher than average—that has brought both benefits and challenges to eastside neighborhoods over the past decade. Over the last five years, single family homes experienced a compound annual rate of appreciation of 5.2%, slightly higher than the rate for North Portland as a whole (5.1%), and above the rates of Northeast (4.8%) and Southeast Portland (4.1%) as well. Compound appreciation in the four-county metro region was 3.0% over the same period of time.

High appreciation resulted in an average (year-to-date) sales price for the market area (in December 2001) of $137,000. The market area average is about $3,000 higher than the North Portland average (at $134,000), but well below those of Northeast and Southeast Portland ($182,000 and $163,100, respectively).
Figure 11. Single Family Median Housing Prices and Appreciation (1997-2001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Compound Annual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Market Area</td>
<td>$106,400</td>
<td>$124,500</td>
<td>$120,632</td>
<td>$127,000</td>
<td>$136,800</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>$104,800</td>
<td>$115,600</td>
<td>$125,200</td>
<td>$124,500</td>
<td>$134,100</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>$144,200</td>
<td>$153,700</td>
<td>$164,700</td>
<td>$169,800</td>
<td>$182,000</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>$133,300</td>
<td>$139,700</td>
<td>$152,900</td>
<td>$153,900</td>
<td>$163,100</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Area</td>
<td>$173,000</td>
<td>$181,000</td>
<td>$195,800</td>
<td>$198,600</td>
<td>$201,000</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Metro’s RLIS (May 2002 update), RMLS Market Action.

St. Johns area townhome and rowhouse sales in 2001 (both for existing and new units) ranged between $99 and $128 per square foot (or $126,500 to $175,000 per unit). These sales values are similar to the average price for single family homes near the town center in 2001 (at approximately $99 per square foot).

Rents

Apartment rents in North Portland were below the regional average rents for comparable units, more than $100 less for one-bedroom apartments and an average of $78 less across all unit types. However, rents per square foot were higher in some types, due to an apartment stock that on average offers smaller unit sizes than is typical regionwide.

Figure 12. Average Apartment Rents & Vacancies (Spring/Summer 2002)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geography/Type</th>
<th>Pre 1980 Construction</th>
<th>Constructed 1980-1995</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Rent</td>
<td>Rent per SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Portland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Bedroom</td>
<td>$493</td>
<td>$0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Bedroom</td>
<td>$598</td>
<td>$0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (all types)</td>
<td>$559</td>
<td>$0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Bedroom</td>
<td>$595</td>
<td>$0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Bedroom</td>
<td>$638</td>
<td>$0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (all types)</td>
<td>$637</td>
<td>$0.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Average rent levels are only available at larger geographies; market area rents are included within the North Portland geography.


North Portland’s low vacancy rates—well under 5%—for one bedroom units indicates a clear need for more smaller-sized rental units in the area. Although one bedroom units appear to be oversupplied for the region as a whole (with a 13.5% vacancy rate for units constructed between 1980 and 1995), this is not true for North Portland. North Portland’s over-all apartment market appears to be fairly stable, with vacancies at or below 5%—the normalized rate typically assumed by residential developers and property managers.
In summary, the market area has been historically and continues to be a primarily single family residential area. Multifamily construction in recent years has consisted of mostly small two to six unit projects, with only two bigger projects at 18 and 22 units each.

Home sales prices in the market area are higher than typical for north Portland but lower than other adjacent areas. Apartment rents are also considered low to moderate.

**Commercial Trends**

This section discusses building permit trends for commercial properties in the market area and current rent levels in north Portland and the metro region.

**Construction Trends**

Commercial construction activity in the St. Johns area in recent years (as represented by building permits) has consisted primarily of renovations though some new construction has occurred. Over the five year period from 1997 through 2001, nine permits were issued for new commercial construction and 27 for commercial building renovations. Only four permits were issued for new commercial office construction and all prior to 1999 (totaling just over 20,000 square feet of space).

**Figure 13. Commercial & Office Building Permits (1997-2001)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure &amp; Permit Type</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total New</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: These permits are for the north Portland portion of the market area only. Renovations include additions and alterations. Square footage is reported inconsistently and so is not included in the table. Square feet of new office space was reported for the four permits and totals 20,200 SF.

Source: Metro’s RLIS (May 2002 update) and E.D. Hovee & Company.

**Rents**

Office space rents in St. Johns area are more reasonable generally (at $6.00 to $17.33 per square foot triple net) than eastside locations as a whole (at $10.00 to $21.00 per square foot) and the Portland metro area market (ranging from $8.18 in Vancouver to $29.50 per square foot in central city locations such as the Lloyd District and Downtown).
### Figure 14. Office Space Rents (2002)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Vacancy Rate</th>
<th>Avg. Asking Lease (SF/YR/NNN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastside</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>$10.00 to $21.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd Center</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>$10.00 to $29.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Way</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>$13.25 to $21.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>$8.18 to $24.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Total</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>$8.18 to $29.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$6.00 to $17.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Source: CB Richard Ellis and E.D. Hovee & Company.

Though little information was readily available on retail rents in the area, asking rates vary widely by location and possibly tenant. The lowest asking lease rates occur on Lombard, while higher rates are achieved in the town center. The highest rents are paid by national and regional chain (or well known) tenants in town center locations.

### Figure 15. Retail Space Rents (2002)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Vacancy Rate</th>
<th>Avg. Asking Lease (SF/YR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukie/OR City</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>$12.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>$14.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastside</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>$15.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Portland</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>$15.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Total</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>$15.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$3.60 to $8.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: St. Johns data collected by E.D. Hovee & Co. staff in September 2002, remaining data from CB Richard Ellis, vacancy rates for 2nd Quarter 2002, lease rates from 4th Quarter 2001 – they have since declined but not readily available in same detail.

Source: CB Richard Ellis and E.D. Hovee & Company.

The lower asking lease rates at $3.60 to $8.00 per square foot are well below average asking rates in north Portland and other eastside markets generally (at $12.69 to $15.45 per square foot). While a few tenants may be paying significantly higher rents (as much as $21.00 per square foot), the majority of St. Johns area spaces are available at low to moderate costs.
**V. BUSINESS DISTRICT ANALYSIS**

The business cluster maps that follow are intended to identify dominant and emerging business concentrations. These clusters are useful to future business recruitment and planning efforts, identifying both existing strengths and possible weaknesses.

Clusters identify business types and locations upon which new, complimentary businesses (businesses that share a customer base) can build. They also identify the kinds of goods and services for which town center shoppers currently visit the district.

*Figure 16. St. Johns Town Center Retail Clusters*

Note: Business locations are estimates within each block. Only businesses that offer neighborhood-serving goods and services are identified on these maps: stores that a resident might visit, rather than businesses that serve other businesses, wholesalers, manufacturers, etc.


*St. Johns Town Center*

The St. Johns town center is home to four distinctive clusters that exhibit a dominant or emerging use, two of which include dining. Along Philadelphia Street—between Lombard Street and the St. Johns Bridge—Our Daily Bread and Dad’s Restaurant anchor a dining cluster with the center’s two largest dining establishments, both of which are well-established and cater to St. Johns families and...
working class residents. Also in this area is a U.S. Bank branch, a good customer draw to the
district.

Dining continues along Lombard within the Dining & Apparel cluster, which encompasses lunch
options such as Kokiyo Teriyaki and the Home Plate Deli & Fountain, as well as Starbuck’s Coffee
– a relative newcomer to the district. Apparel is represented by The Man’s Shop and Ann
Murdock’s Lingerie.

Apparel continues as a theme in the adjoining cluster, Bargain & Specialty Merchandise, which
features an unusually dense concentration of second hand general and specialty merchandise and
bargain outlets. Businesses include the Salvation Army Thrift Store, Vinyl Resting Place, St. Johns
Liquidators, St. Johns Value Giant, and Adam’s Bargain Outlet. This cluster also includes a variety
of other establishments, such as the Johns Street Café, the long-established Tulip Pastry Shop, and
the Muliken Medical Center.

North along Lombard Street is a personal services and eating/drinking places cluster, which
incorporates three hair dressers along with the Wishing Well restaurant/lounge, the Bluebird
Tavern, and Shagnasty’s exotic dancing.

Other than Philadelphia Street, all clustering of neighborhood-serving businesses within the town
center appear to primarily occur along Lombard Street between Richmond and Chicago Avenues.
Safeway will redevelop the former Rite Aid/Kenow’s location at Ivanhoe Street and Richmond
Avenue and may expand town center retail by attracting more businesses south, to adjoining
properties along Ivanhoe Street.

Lombard Main Street

Lombard main street differs from the town center chiefly in its auto-orientation, more dispersed
development style (facilitated by General Commercial zoning), and incorporation of more services,
primarily health services. The street’s most westward cluster features a series of automotive uses,
including a Honda dealership, a used car dealership, and three auto repair shops. Just east is a fast
food cluster, next to Fred Meyer. As one of the market area’s two supermarkets, Fred Meyer likely
attracts significant customer activity. The fast food restaurants are situated to capitalize on Fred
Meyer high visitor counts.

East of the railroad cut, another automotive cluster features Norpac new & used vehicle sales and
two additional repair shops. Further east, a healthcare & dining cluster encompasses 7 healthcare
offices, including Providence Family Medicine, Unity Inc psychiatric hospital, and numerous
independent medical practitioners. Dining in this cluster includes the Fishwife, Papa Murphy’s,
Redd’s Harbor Restaurant, and the Portsmouth Club.

Further east, the dining and personal services cluster includes University Deli Station and two pizza
parlors, as well as three hair dressers and a dry cleaners. The small adjacent services cluster
includes Check N Go and two realtors. Finally, more automotive services including repair and a
dealership anchors the eastern end of the study area.
Figure 17. Lombard Main Street Retail Clusters


These fairly distinct clusters in both the town center and along Lombard Street provide guidance in both locating new businesses and focusing pedestrian improvements. Lombard’s dining and services clusters are much better candidates for true pedestrian districts—improved by, for instance, additional street crossings or curb extensions—than are the large lot automotive dealerships and auto repair businesses.
VI. RETAIL DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL

This section describes the existing supply and demand for selected neighborhood-serving retail and services, and estimates supportable commercial growth within the market area. A brief overview of trade area concepts is included to provide context for the analysis.

Trade Area Concepts

Businesses within a commercial district cater to populations within different geographic trade areas. The following discussion and diagram are intended to illustrate the varying market area sizes needed to support a range of retail and service businesses.

Convenience retailers and services (also called neighborhood serving commercial) cater to the day-to-day needs of area residents and workforce. Examples include supermarkets, banks, restaurants and coffee shops. These businesses serve a primary market area, the focus of this section.

Traditionally, comparison retail—businesses selling department store merchandise, which customers frequently ‘compare’ between stores—anchored downtown shopping districts and main streets. Comparison retailing now occurs most frequently in big box power centers such as nearby Jantzen Beach. Lastly, destination retailers attract customers from beyond the primary and secondary trade areas due to of the reputation of an individual business or a district’s atmosphere and charm.

Figure 18. Trade Area Concepts

Source: E.D. Hovee & Company.

In the past, neighborhood retail districts (such as St. Johns town center) have focused on either the local convenience market or repositioned themselves as regional destinations. The most successful neighborhood commercial districts serve both neighborhood and destination functions. It is
important to keep these trade area distinctions in mind when considering businesses that St. Johns
town center and Lombard main street might target under various revitalization scenarios.

**Retail & Service Supply & Demand**

There are currently approximately 800 businesses located within the market area, operating either
full or part-time. Of those, 158 are neighborhood-serving retail and services. Within these
businesses, there are notable concentrations in auto maintenance & repair, dining, groceries,
medical care, and auto sales. A count of businesses by type, both for the market area and within St.
Johns town center/Lombard main street, is included in Figure 19.

The following leakage analysis compares consumer demand with commercial supply to determine
whether local buying power is going elsewhere (leaking), because the area does not offer the goods
and services that residents want. It also determines whether non-resident buying power is being
attracted into the market area. A leakage analysis compares demand for selected business types
(based on the number, income and demographic characteristics of market area households) with the
existing retail and service business mix to estimate a commercial district’s potential for growth.

The relationship between consumer demand and supply is expressed as a *capture rate*. In other
words, how much of the market area household buying power/spending is being captured by market
area businesses. If the business district(s) are capturing less of the market area buying power than
typical, then local buying power is going elsewhere to make purchases. If the business district is
capturing more of the market area buying power than is typical, non-resident buying power is likely
being captured.

Current capture rates suggest that an estimated $89 million of market area buying power is ‘leaking
out’ of the market area annually. Some leakage is expected as residents would not purchase all their
goods and services in the area. However, there is room for improvement.

In general, the total capture rate for the market area (at 55%) is more akin to a neighborhood
commercial district than to a successful regional town center that attracts both neighborhood-
serving and destination retailers. However, the total market area capture masks the occurrence of
high and low capture rates occurring in individual retail and service categories.

Assuming an improvement in the town center and Lombard Street business districts’ sense of place,
and an increased capture rate (of 64%), a total of approximately 81,400 additional square feet of
retail and service businesses could currently be supported within the St. Johns market area. Many of
these businesses could occupy currently vacant and ready to use commercial space.

The number of market area households is estimated to increase by 17% or 2,000 households by
2010. Given this increase and projected income growth, the market area may support a cumulative
total of 311,000 square feet of selected categories of commercial space by 2010. While business
growth is generally discussed as number or square footage of new firms, it can also be realized
through the expansion of existing businesses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Type</th>
<th>Town Center/ Lombard Inventory</th>
<th>Total Market Area Inventory</th>
<th>Percent of Current Demand Met</th>
<th>Est. Achievable Capture Rate (2000 &amp; 2010)</th>
<th>Additional Supportable SF (Current)</th>
<th>Additional Supportable SF (2010)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apparel</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>8,700</td>
<td>21,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maint. &amp; Repair</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>179%</td>
<td>no change</td>
<td></td>
<td>21,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books &amp; Periodicals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>3,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>10,700</td>
<td>42,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Services</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>35,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasoline &amp; Oil</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>no change</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groceries</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>113%</td>
<td>no change</td>
<td></td>
<td>43,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Improvement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>23,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Furnishings</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>16,100</td>
<td>33,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Care</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>no change</td>
<td></td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Entertainment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>13,100</td>
<td>42,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New &amp; Used Vehicles</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>no change</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Care</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>12,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pets, Toys &amp; Sporting Goods</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>6,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy &amp; Medical Supplies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>5,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>81,400</td>
<td>311,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All analysis is based upon the total market area business inventory. Additional supportable square footage to 2010 is cumulative, and assumes that currently high capture rates remain constant. Total percent of current demand met and estimated achievable capture rate reflects square footage (total square footage of existing/estimated achievable space divided by square footage of total supportable space).


The high number of jobs adjacent to the market area—without accompanying retail to serve daytime employee needs—adds to the demand for some types of market area goods. While in general, employees contribute far less demand for goods and services than do market area households, the high capture rates reported for some business types—especially dining and grocery, which incorporates convenience markets—likely reflect industrial-area employee contributions.10
Market Area Business Types with High Capture Rates

By business type, proportion of current market area demand met varies dramatically from 179% (auto repair) to 19% (books and periodicals). The district clearly serves as a destination for auto services, including parts and repair shops, and new, used, and recreational vehicle dealerships.

The market area also appears to be a net attractor for grocery stores. This is atypical for North and Northeast Portland which is underserved in the grocery category in some areas. Of the 26 groceries in the market area, over half are convenience stores, ethnic groceries, or groceries that feature locally-grown fruit and vegetables. Grocery supply is estimated at 113% of market area demand, an indication both of the influence of industrial area workers, and possibly of St. Johns’ status as a destination for the fresh produce grown across the river and sold both on Sauvie’s Island and within the St. Johns town center/Lombard main street. This high capture rate may also be due in part to the prevalence of smaller, specialty groceries that may realize sales below the national averages (used to estimate sales per square foot of retail space).

Competing commercial districts near St. Johns town center/Lombard main street offer a similar grocery selection (Hayden Island Safeway, Interstate Fred Meyers). Residents may currently leave the area to seek higher-end groceries not offered within the current business mix but there are few nearby options; likely destinations include Four Seasons (on NE 33rd Avenue), Northwest Portland, Northeast Portland’s Nature’s (on NE Fremont Street), and the future Hayden Island Zupan’s.

Medical services are also well represented in the study area (a 98% capture rate), as they are throughout North and Northeast Portland. Providence Family Medicine and numerous chiropractic clinics serve as anchors for the many independent practitioners within the market area. Medical services are an example of perhaps the most successful professional services cluster within the market area.

The market area’s dining supply is also high in comparison to other business types, with an 87% capture rate. Many of the area’s dining options comprise smaller, independently-owned establishments catering to working class families and/or older clientele. Some of these establishments function as both restaurants and lounges. Fast food also makes a sizable contribution to the area’s dining supply. Dining’s high capture rate indicates that it is a key business type to which the nearby employment base likely contributes. The estimated achievable capture rate of 100% assumes employee spending contributes to revenue within this business type, compensating for households dining outside of the market area.

Dining represents an important area for business growth and is frequently one of the first kinds of retail to cluster in a growing commercial district. A successful dining cluster will bring visitors to the street, increasing the street’s attractiveness for start-up businesses or businesses seeking new locations. The current limited range of dining options presents an opportunity for growth, especially with the area’s trend toward increasing numbers of professional households. Notable competing business districts for this cluster include the family-oriented and affordable dining options on Jantzen Beach, and higher end dining options along NE Broadway Street and in Northwest and downtown Portland.
**Market Area Business Types with Low Capture Rates**

Apparel, books, household furnishings, and sporting goods are all business types that once appeared in department stores along main streets. Today they are now found in larger-format department stores, in big box, often discount retailers (e.g. Target, Old Navy, Barnes & Noble), or in specialty stores that rely upon high pedestrian traffic counts, as found in centers that have successfully combined neighborhood-serving and destination retailers.

Within the market area, the capture rate for all of these specialty comparison categories is less than 40%. This indicates that St. Johns town center/Lombard main street is not functioning as a town center with a diversified retail mix. As with dining, the existing supply of apparel, books, household furnishings and sporting goods falls within a narrow band. Both furniture and apparel are comprised in part by in used merchandise dealers, liquidators, and antique dealers. A modest increase in all of these categories produces an additional 29,000 square feet of retail space in the short-term.

Competing districts for apparel, books, household furnishings and sporting goods are many. Families will be attracted to the discount, one-stop shopping opportunities at larger retail centers such as nearby Jantzen Beach or Lloyd Center. Shoppers seeking higher-end or specialty goods within these categories may travel to NW Portland and/or NE Broadway Street.

The market area’s ability to attract apparel, books, household furnishings and sporting goods is dependent upon its development of an active street presence and a sense of place. St. Johns town center’s older architecture and pedestrian-oriented evolution provide an excellent basis for a sense of place.

Entertainment is another category that is difficult for revitalizing commercial districts to capture. The market’s 31% capture rate incorporates video rentals, music stores, health clubs and theatres. Like dining, entertainment businesses are an excellent draw to bring shoppers to the area. McMenamin’s St. Johns Pub is now advertising its conversion to a theater-pub, increasing the district’s options and bringing the town center’s theatre total to two, a virtual feat for a commercial district of this size. St. Johns is in an excellent location to capture theatre-goers due to the relative absence of theatres in North and Northeast Portland, and across the Willamette north of the bridge.

**Commercial Land Supply**

As indicated previously, Figure 19 estimates the square feet of additional supportable business space over the next 10 years, given existing and future demand for business and retail services, and given certain investments in the district (e.g. improving the district’s pedestrian environment, storefronts, etc).

The other side of this discussion is whether there is sufficient commercial land supply to accommodate this growth. Figure 20 compares the square footage of existing and supportable businesses (by 2010) with the St. Johns town center/Lombard main street supply of land designated for commercial uses within the Comprehensive Plan.\(^{11}\)

The estimated capacity square footage is calculated assuming likely floor area ratios within the plan area, from 0.55 in taxlots designated General Commercial (requiring on-site parking) to 1.00 in Neighborhood Commercial and Urban Commercial designations. These floor area ratios are below...
the maximum limits set by the Comprehensive Plan, but reflect likely development patterns given plan area rents and land prices.

**Figure 20. Commercial Land Capacity**

This figure shows a significant excess of capacity for commercial space based on the amount of land designated for commercial uses, even given the growth anticipated in both market area population and capture rates by 2010. Assuming the town center and Lombard main street areas contained all 861,000 square feet of retail and service business potential identified (to 2010), commercial land supply/capacity (at over 2.3 million square feet) would still exceed demand by nearly three times.

The plan area’s excess of land designated for commercial uses indicates that re-zoning may be appropriate for a portion of this land. Allowing for increased residential development, for instance, may better support the success of plan area retail by further increasing demand through the addition of new households and their buying power.

VII. EVALUATION OF REDEVELOPMENT SITES

As part of this project the City of Portland Planning Bureau has identified a number of development and redevelopment opportunity sites within the St Johns/Lombard Plan study area. Sites on Lombard Street include the Eagles site and vacant parcels at Huron and Haven Avenues. Potential opportunity sites in the town center area include the old Safeway site, the St. Johns Racquet Center, and a City-owned lot adjacent to Jowers. On the hillside and riverfront, sites around Crawford and Burlington and the MarCom site have been identified.

Figures 21 & 22 identify opportunities and constraints for commercial and residential development on these sites by geographic location.

Figure 21. Commercial/Residential Opportunities and Constraints by Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lombard Street</th>
<th>Commercial development unlikely to include structured parking in 20 year timeframe.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the foreseeable future, commercial infill development and redevelopment is likely to be done by business/property owners for their own use. Prime candidates are owner/operators who either live in neighborhoods surrounding the business location or have other connections to the community, or are drawn in by availability of cheap space and interest in being part of a renaissance of business districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Commercial development unlikely to include structured parking in 20 year timeframe.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the foreseeable future, residential developments more dense than townhouses or 2-3 stories with surface parking could require non-profit developers, subsidy or public-private partnership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public-private partnerships could be necessary for innovative or pioneering developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attracting new residential development to areas currently characterized by a mix including auto-oriented commercial uses may require a commitment on the part of the city to change the character of the area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>St. Johns Town Center</th>
<th>Downtown St. Johns is in a better position to support more dense development than Lombard Street.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business/property owners for their own use and those attracting developer/investors and/or tenants willing to pay more are most likely to create commercial infill or redevelopment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Again, prime candidates for new businesses are owner/operators who either live in neighborhoods surrounding the business location or have other connections to the community, or are drawn in by availability of cheap space and interest in being part of a renaissance of business districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structured parking is unlikely to be included in commercial projects (without subsidy or public-private partnership).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Condominiums could be accomplished by converting existing rental units, attracting residents willing to pay higher prices to support new construction, construction by a non-profit developer, or a public-private partnership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Townhomes and garden apartments (of 18 to 25 units per acre) are likely to be feasible. Residential projects with a higher number of units per acre would likely require attracting residents willing to pay higher rents to support new construction, construction by a non-profit developer, or a public-private partnership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A stronger sense of energy and place will enhance the opportunity for increasing rents/sales prices and likelihood for new development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public-private partnerships will probably be necessary for innovative or pioneering developments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: E.D. Hovee & Company.
Cathedral Park
Hillside

- Townhomes and garden apartments (of 18 to 25 units per acre) are likely to be feasible. Residential projects with a higher number of units per acre would likely require attracting residents willing to pay higher rents/sales prices to support new construction, construction by a non-profit developer, or a public-private partnership.

Willamette Riverfront

- The best opportunity for continued industrial use is to attract small service oriented and light industrial users (such as those currently located in the Central Eastside) and businesses that serve other industrial users in Rivergate and Northwest Portland.
- Likelihood of incorporating live/work into these areas depends on compatibility of uses.
- Business park development along the waterfront (if viable) could encourage location of family wage jobs in the area and provide a suitable transition from the river to hillside residential. Potential tenants include businesses serving surrounding industrial areas as well as those attracted to the location and views.
- Residential village development will require focus on amenity of river access and views of the bridge and west hills, and face similar market conditions as identified for Hillside and Downtown areas.

Source: E.D. Hovee & Company.

**Specific Site Assessments**

More specific assessment of redevelopment potential for three sites selected by the City follows. Market opportunities/potential uses are assessed based on location, adjacent development patterns, site constraints (such as size and shape), and parking availability.

**Figure 23. Safeway Site**

The first site is the soon to be vacated Safeway site bounded by Burlington and Leavitt Avenues, Central and Kellogg Streets. This roughly 104,700 square foot (2.4 acre) site is located adjacent to single family residential uses to the northeast and northwest, St. Johns Community Center to the north, St. Johns Elementary School to the southeast, St. Johns Racquet Center to the southwest and surface parking lots behind storefronts to the south. Bus stops are located on two sides of the site. On-street parking is available adjacent to the site where driveways and bus stops do not prevent them.

Source: Metro’s RLIS (May 2002 update) and E.D. Hovee & Company.
Though this site currently functions fairly well for anchor retail tenant it would be considered a secondary location for smaller storefront activity. This is primarily because most nearby commercial activity fronts onto Lombard Street and there are not compelling reasons to move (as a pedestrian) along side streets to this location, except to access parking. In addition, there are a number of residential amenities immediately adjacent (schools, parks, the racquet and community centers) and just beyond (such as the St. Johns Library).

This substantial site represents a prime opportunity to introduce additional housing into the town center area. North Leonard Avenue could be returned as a through street or as a pedestrian access only street. The north portion of the property could house townhomes/rowhouses to compliment adjacent single family residential and act as a transition to a more densely developed south block of housing.

**Figure 24. Willamette Riverfront Area Sites**

The second area assessed is an agglomeration of parcels located on Burlington Avenue and Crawford Street and straddling the railroad. The waterfront site is nearly 9 acres in size (391,660 sf) of which roughly half falls within the 100 year floodplain. The adjacent parcels across the railroad tracks when combined total roughly 4.5 acres (196,000 square feet). The third parcel is approximately 1.2 acres (51,850 sf in size). Currently the immediate area is light industrial in use. Streets and sidewalks are unfinished. The waterfront site is bounded by the Bureau of Environment Services Water Lab to the west and Willamette Cove to the southeast. Up the hill to the north is the Cathedral Park residential neighborhood.
Site amenities include the riverfront, views of the bridge and west hills. Site constraints include the railroad, floodplain issues, scenic overlay, and categorization as high priority expanded preliminary assessment sites by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality for contaminants (such as PCBs, arsenic and various metals).

Redevelopment of these areas for other uses would likely require some level of cleanup and containment and a public-private partnership. Best opportunities for redevelopment include housing development or a business park.

Housing development would likely not exceed the woodframe limitation of five stories and could potentially succeed at lower densities providing a mix of townhouse, condominium, and potentially apartment projects developed in phases.

Development as a business park would require marketing the views and proximity to Rivergate and Northwest Portland. Because of the lack of freeway access, and other transportation constraints it might be viewed as a secondary location for this type of use. However, the primary owner of this property has historically been involved with developments of this sort.

Figure 25. Small Lombard Site

The final site assessed is located on Lombard Street between Olin and Huron Avenues. This small 0.36 acre (15,750 square foot) site is located adjacent to a range of uses. To the east adjacent properties are primarily automotive repair and a single multifamily structure. Across the street to the north is a meat market and a church. To the west are commercial uses in single family residential buildings then storefronts and behind the property are single family homes.

The site is currently zoned commercial, but with little adjacent on-street parking as the property has a bus stop both directly in front and across the street, and driveways of an automotive use limit on-street parking on Huron. Movement of bus stops, curb extension version bus stops, or other solutions that allow for additional on street parking would be helpful in development of this site.
The most likely redevelopment opportunity is a commercial development built by an owner/operator for their own use. Rear loading livework townhouses might be possible if this product could be brought in at a reasonable price. Purely residential reuse would also likely be townhomes, but would probably require a commitment on the part of the city to transition the character of adjacent auto-oriented commercial uses.
VIII. SUMMARY DISCUSSION

The plan area’s primary strengths include its unique position on the peninsula (providing a captive if smallish market), the town center’s evolution as a pedestrian oriented downtown, and the name recognition that St. Johns enjoys as a distinct entity within the metro region.

Demographics:
Market area demographics currently support a greater diversity of retailers than are on the street at present, particularly in the apparel, household furnishings, and books categories. Growth should be encouraged within these retail categories as well as across categories, as the market area currently provides a narrow range of options within business types.

Successful businesses will provide goods and services that respond to area demographics. A slowly growing professional base calls for higher-end dining and retailers—currently, largely absent—as well as the value retailers that families and working class households desire. The area’s rapid Hispanic growth provides another market for businesses to target.

Business Improvement:
The area’s ability to capture increased market share rests upon its ability to create a positive sense of place and an active street presence. Unmet demand is not enough to secure a district’s success: improving vacant commercial spaces, storefronts, and the pedestrian environment are critical first step.

Town center retailers are already engaging in building rehabilitations, with the help of PDC’s Storefront Improvement Program. Improving the attractiveness of a district can attract customers and retail sales, which allows for rent increases to a level that can support further reinvestment in the town center and main street building stock.

It is also important to make sure the space inside the buildings is shell ready. Shell ready means that the commercial space is clean, adequately wired, adequately plumbed, has a working heating system that can be activated and has an attractive and business-like appearance from the street.

In the near term, the most likely candidates for new business operations are owner/operators who either live in neighborhoods surrounding the business location or have other connections to the community, or are drawn in by availability of inexpensive space and interest in being part of a renaissance of business districts. These may be entrepreneurs or local businesses expanding into the St. Johns area.

Vehicles & Pedestrians:
For retailers to thrive in the town center, vehicular access and parking are necessary. At the same time, an active street presence requires a pedestrian-friendly retail core. Resolving this on-going tension is of primary importance.

Supportable Retail:
Assuming an improvement in the town center and Lombard Street business districts’ sense of place, and an increased capture rate (of 64%), a total of approximately 81,400 additional square feet of
retail and service businesses could currently be supported within the St. Johns market area. Many of these businesses could occupy currently vacant and ready to use commercial space.

The number of market area households is estimated to increase by 17% or 2,000 households by 2010. Given this increase and projected income growth, the market area may support a cumulative total of 311,000 square feet of selected categories of commercial space by 2010. While business growth is generally discussed as number or square footage of new firms, it can also be realized through the expansion of existing.

**Business Mix & Clustering:**
Clustering retail creates a critical mass so that synergistic relationships can build between stores. Given the size of the plan area, revitalization efforts need to focus on nodes in order to produce the maximum benefit. The town center already enjoys a high density of storefronts, although some of these retailers may need to update their merchandising, displays and storefront image to attract a broader market to the town center. The town center is well-situated to benefit from new business starts and the expansion or renovation of existing businesses.

Along Lombard Street, fairly distinctive clusters provide guidance for new investment. In a commercial district that spans a traffic corridor—such as Lombard Street—it is especially important that new investment is concentrated, and that retail options are encouraged within walkable distances.

**Business District Comparisons:**
Comparing the St. Johns town center and Lombard main street to other Portland commercial districts illuminates the district’s strengths and weaknesses, and helps to identify its unique characteristics. The plan area is most similar Lents in its increasing ethnic diversity and working class family history. It shares with Sellwood the challenge of no direct freeway access. The St John’s town center also shares the distinction of having a movie theatre with Hollywood, Hawthorne, and Sellwood.

With other revitalizing N/NE Portland business districts it shares both the opportunity of an underserved population but also the constraint of being perceived as soft market – not having enough density or disposable income to support the success of their business – the Broadway business district being the notable exception. New businesses that are attracted to the N/NE area are also typically start-up neighborhood retail and service oriented owner/operator businesses which tend to be challenged by undercapitalization and a sometimes owner/operators that lack of business experience.
### Commercial District & Main Street Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Image/Market</th>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Business Clusters</th>
<th>Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns</td>
<td>Small town downtown/neighborhood &amp; area employment</td>
<td>Working class families, industrial jobs base, ethnically diverse</td>
<td>Eating &amp; drinking places, bargain merchandise, retail for industrial workers</td>
<td>N Lombard, no freeway access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lombard (main street)</td>
<td>Auto sales, older commercial corridor/neighborhood &amp; some regional serving businesses</td>
<td>Working class families, industrial jobs base, ethnically diverse</td>
<td>Automotive, chain dining, medical services. Mixed retail and housing, no strong central node</td>
<td>Some distance from I-5, serves as major access road to peninsula &amp; Sauvie’s Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW 23rd</td>
<td>Trendy, urban/neighborhood &amp; regional destination</td>
<td>Upper income local neighborhoods, childless professionals, dense</td>
<td>Fine dining, boutique apparel and household furnishings, miscellaneous specialty</td>
<td>I-405, adjacent to central business district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE Hawthorne</td>
<td>Alternative/neighborhood &amp; regional destination</td>
<td>Middle income local neighborhoods, alternative household types, dense</td>
<td>Ethnic dining, pubs, alternative apparel and specialty retail</td>
<td>99E, I-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sellwood</td>
<td>Antiques/neighborhood &amp; regional destination</td>
<td>Middle income, stable local neighborhoods, families</td>
<td>Antiques, dining</td>
<td>99E, poor freeway access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollywood</td>
<td>Traditional utilitarian full-service center/neighborhood &amp; eastside destination</td>
<td>Mixed income (high &amp; middle) local neighborhoods, families, professional</td>
<td>Similar to neighborhood commercial retail, furnishings, professional services</td>
<td>I-84, NE Sandy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lents</td>
<td>Working class, older commercial corridor/neighborhood</td>
<td>High ethnic &amp; racial diversity, working class</td>
<td>Appliances, home improvement, automotive</td>
<td>I-205, SE 82nd, SE Foster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. (main street)</td>
<td>Diversity, commercial nodes/neighborhood &amp; N/NE Portland</td>
<td>Working class &amp; mixed income, high diversity</td>
<td>Ethnic foods and retailers, non-neighborhood serving uses mixed with housing, no strong central node</td>
<td>I-5, serves as major access road to N and NE neighborhoods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: E. D. Hovee & Company

**Concluding Observations:**

St. Johns’ small town history and proximity to both the industrial sanctuary and agriculture west of the Willamette provide a foundation for the plan area to build upon and to celebrate. To increase its status as a destination commercial district, the district must cultivate a vibrant environment that is both attractive and unique.

The most probable market niche for St. Johns is an expansion on the small town character for which it is known. Additional housing within the town center and possibly the waterfront can provided added buying power and enhance the small urban village character. Courting a variety of entrepreneurs and local chain businesses can enhance the current business mix. Creating a pleasing and pedestrian environment and wayfinding enhancements can also help to enhance the appeal of the commercial districts.
This chapter has been prepared for the Portland Bureau of Planning by the economic and development consulting firm E.D. Hovee & Company. The Oregon Department of Transportation has provided funding for this project through the Transportation Growth Management Program. Information contained in this chapter is taken from sources generally deemed to be reliable. However, the accuracy of information derived from third party is not guaranteed. Observations and findings are those of E.D. Hovee & Company and should not be construed as representing the opinion of any other party without that party’s express endorsement, whether in whole or part.

The St. Johns market area was defined according to census block group boundaries. It includes the following 25 block groups (four digit census tract precedes block group number or range): 39.01 4 & 5, 39.02 4, 40.01 1-4, 40.02 1-5, 41.01 1-4, 41.02 1-4, 42.00 1 & 2, and 43.00 1.

The block group to which Rivergate belongs extends east to the I-5 river (the block group is larger than is typical due to its low population density). This block group was excluded because the majority of its residential development is along the Columbia River, adjacent to Jantzen Beach, and beyond an appropriate market area.


Market area median household income was estimated using a weighted average of the median household incomes of market area block groups.

Permit data for this five year period accounts for less than 30% of the total increase in housing units reported by the census for 2000, implying that the bulk of new housing development occurred prior to 1995 (geocoded data is not available for this time period).

Businesses within the St. Johns town center and along Lombard main street were mapped using Inside Prospects, a geocoded business license database maintained by Metro. Clusters of similar businesses were then identified using two-digit Standard Industrial Classification codes.

Neighborhood-serving retail and services across the Willamette and south of NW 60th were excluded, because those businesses are more oriented to Northwest Portland than to market area residents. The census tract was included within the market area to reflect the residential development—mostly north of the St. Johns bridge—that contributes to market area demand.

This estimate is based on a number of variables including housing capacity. It does not include any potential population growth that may result from future planning actions, such as increasing (or decreasing) residentially zoned land within the market area.

Rather than estimate annual employee expenditures, this analysis projects achievable capture rates above rates that would otherwise be considered for the market area (e.g., a 100% capture rate for dining).

Existing and supportable business square footage numbers reflect only business types considered in this chapter (see Figure 19), and exclude other businesses (such as warehousing or industrial businesses) that may be located within St. Johns town center/Lombard main street. These numbers also reflect all businesses (within the types considered) within the market area, rather than only those businesses located within St. Johns town center/Lombard main street. Even given this over-representation of existing business supply, capacity exceeds supply by a factor close to 3.

This estimate is based on a number of variables including housing capacity. It does not include any potential population growth that may result from future planning actions, such as increasing (or decreasing) residentially zoned land within the market area.
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Introduction

As part of the St. Johns/Lombard Plan process, residents, business people, and other interested parties participated in a series of four neighborhood walks. The walks were sponsored by the Portland Bureau of Planning, and conducted with Zimmer Gunsul Frasca (ZGF) Partnership, a local architecture/planning/design firm, during the spring of 2002. The neighborhood walks were designed to:

- Allow people to explore parts of the St. Johns/Lombard Plan study area at the street level in detail;
- Provide people with an opportunity to share their views and ideas about the St. Johns/Lombard Plan area and its future with each other and City staff; and
- Provide planning staff with valuable input to help in the creation of an urban design concept and vision statement for the St. Johns/Lombard Plan.

The walk areas are identified on the map shown.

Neighborhood Walk Areas

Lombard East    Lombard Central    Downtown St. Johns    Cathedral Park/Riverfront
Nearly 100 community members participated in the walks. Participants were asked to form groups for the walk, and respond to a number of questions related to issues and specific locations along the walk route. General comments from participants were also welcomed. Staff from the City and ZGF Partnership accompanied walk participants to facilitate discussions, document participants’ impressions of the neighborhood, and record and sketch ideas for future change. At the conclusion of each walk, participants reconvened and discussed the ideas that were generated. Participants also filled out brief questionnaires about each walk area.

This document is a summary of the walk results that illustrates many of the ideas and comments heard from walks participants. This information is organized by walk area; it includes photographs and many of the sketches generated during the walks.

A companion summary of the walk results includes a compilation of the notes recorded by the note takers during each walk, as well as citizen comments from the questionnaires. That document is available from the Bureau of Planning by request and on the Bureau’s web site:
http://www.planning.ci.portland.or.us

What’s Next?

The information gathered during the walks and follow up workshop will be used by planning staff and the project consultant team in crafting an urban design concept and refining a vision statement for the St. Johns/Lombard Plan. An urban design concept and vision summary report is anticipated in fall/winter 2002.

For more information on the St. Johns/Lombard Plan, please contact:

Barry Manning, Senior Planner, Project Leader
Portland Bureau of Planning
1900 SW 4th Avenue, Suite 4100
Portland, Oregon 97201
Phone: 503/823-7700
Fax: 503/823-7800
TDD: 503/823-6868
E-Mail: stjohnslombard@ci.portland.or.us
Neighborhood Walk Areas

Neighborhood Walk #2 – Lombard Street Central

Lombard East  Lombard Central  Downtown St. Johns  Cathedral Park/Riverfront
Neighborhood Walk Areas

Neighborhood Walk #3 – Downtown St. Johns

Lombard East  Lombard Central  Downtown St. Johns  Cathedral Park/Riverfront
Neighborhood Walk Areas

Neighborhood Walk #4 – Cathedral Park/Riverfront

Lombard East  Lombard Central  Downtown St. Johns  Cathedral Park/Riverfront
Commonalities

A number of themes and issues emerged on the walks that have applications throughout the St. Johns/Lombard plan area. This section discusses some of these commonalities.

Common Themes

Enhance the Public Realm

Improve the Transportation System

Improve Existing Development

Foster Compatible Development
Enhance the Public Realm

These sidewalks were identified as good examples:

- Residential sidewalk including trees, a planted parking strip, and well maintained front yards.
- Commercial area with generous sidewalks, trees, and active use ground floor retail.
Trees were considered an asset - they improve the appearance of the street. The regular pruning and maintenance of street trees are necessary in some areas. Appropriate species selection and ongoing maintenance would enhance the streetscape and improve visibility of business signage.
More trees are desired along Lombard. Ideally, trees should be placed to minimize conflicts with business signage and utility lines. The trees cut to accommodate utility wires (shown above) were not visually appealing to walk participants.
Enhance the Public Realm

Pocket Parks

The desire for additional green public space was mentioned on each of the four walks. Some of the existing vacant parcels were identified as an opportunity for pocket parks.

Lombard East       Lombard Central       Downtown St. Johns       Cathedral Park/Riverfront
Enhance the Public Realm

Alleys

Alleys were viewed as a mixed blessing. Those that were well maintained and visible from nearby properties were seen as assets; others were considered unsafe.
Enhance the Public Realm

Keeping Streets Clean

Participants felt that better litter control and screening of commercial trash/utility areas would improve the streetscape.
Improve the Transportation System

Bus Stop

Some bus stops do not include waiting area amenities. New shelters and benches would make the stops more appealing for transit riders and pedestrians.
Improve the Transportation System

Street Crossings

Street crossings were frequently mentioned as a concern on the walks. Key locations identified include those that assist school children and serve other important pedestrian routes and community functions.
Improve Existing Development

Screening

Participants noted that some existing development in the plan area would benefit from landscaped screening measures.

People would prefer that chain link be used less and other security and visual barriers be used.
Improve Existing Development

Screening

Parking for retail business should be screened in ways to fit in with residential areas. In some cases parking requirements may be excessive. Perhaps opportunities for shared parking should be explored.
Signage clutter was identified as an issue. More uniform signage would be preferable.
Foster Compatible Development

There are many examples in North Portland where different housing types coexist. Design compatibility is key to achieving successful infill projects.
Foster Compatible Development

Buildings to Face Street

Tall retail windows are thought to be valuable, where people inside are visible. Buildings with windows offer more opportunities for people to watch the street.

Walk attendees recognized the value of transparent street frontages. Big windows add life to the street making a safe place for pedestrians.
Unique Attributes

Lombard East

The Lombard East area contains some of the best retail and housing development along North Lombard Street. Accessible by pedestrians and automobiles, it has many components of a great main street.

The existing commercial area along North Lombard between Fiske and Portsmouth provides valuable services to the surrounding neighborhoods. Community members would like to extend and enhance the pedestrian character and mix of uses along this section of Lombard.

Areas east of Fiske have great potential to capitalize on the mature trees, small-scale commercial buildings, and housing near Columbia Park. Multi-family housing, compatible with existing commercial and residential buildings, was envisioned here.

The area west of Portsmouth has developed primarily with auto-oriented uses and services. The scale of this development and the street traffic are not always friendly to pedestrians. Opportunities for new housing and commercial development were identified that could improve the pedestrian environment over time.
Unique Attributes

Themes:

• Foster a More Pedestrian-Friendly Main Street
• Reduce Pedestrian/Vehicle Conflicts
• Integrate New Housing and Mixed Use Development
• Think Creatively about Opportunity Sites
Foster a More Pedestrian-Friendly Main Street

There was general support for a pedestrian-friendly main street from Fiske to Portsmouth. This building was seen as an example of good design, incorporating commercial and residential uses.
Foster a More Pedestrian-Friendly Main Street

Before

Buildings could be made to front and provide entries onto Lombard. This would enhance the pedestrian environment.

After
Integrate New Housing and Mixed-Use Development

This section near North Newman Street has a mix of residential and commercial uses. Many felt that more housing in this area would be appropriate.
Integrate New Housing and Mixed-Use Development

Build Housing That Fits

Many felt that housing should be set back along Lombard to allow generous, well planted, sidewalk areas. Design measures could also allow taller housing structures to fit in with smaller homes nearby. Vacant sites provide the opportunity to build more housing, or mixed-use projects that may include housing with retail at ground level.
Integrate New Housing and Mixed-Use Development

Build Housing That Fits

Row houses were seen as an option that could fit with the older auto oriented retail businesses along Lombard.
Integrate New Housing and Mixed-Use Development

Transit-Oriented Development

Before

New housing and mixed use development would be well-served by transit. Some envision a trolley line on Lombard or improvements to transit that would increase the amount of services and amenities along North Lombard.

After
Some hoped that the intersection of North Portsmouth and Lombard could develop with more pedestrian oriented businesses and street improvements. Suggestions included incorporating new offices, stores, and a theater.
Think Creatively about Opportunity Sites

In the future, the Eagles Lodge could be redeveloped to improve its pedestrian orientation, by adding a mix of uses and design enhancements.
Think Creatively about Opportunity Sites

In the short term, the parking lot at the Eagles Lodge could be enhanced with landscaping and used for a weekly open-air market or other on-going temporary uses.
Unique Attributes

Lombard Central

Between Portsmouth and St. Johns, businesses have provided the surrounding neighborhoods with a variety of retail uses and services. Much of the development is oriented to provide convenient auto access. Some offer pedestrian improvements along the street, while others do not; the lack of pedestrian facilities is a concern to many.

The railroad cut and the Peninsula Crossing Trail have the potential to connect North Lombard to other trails and neighborhoods - an exciting opportunity recognized by the community.

Near the railroad cut, North Ida Street is at the crossroads of many trips in the area. This important pedestrian and vehicle crossing is the source of much congestion.

North Lombard between North Ida and North Buchanan is narrower than other sections of Lombard. Many hope that the scale of the street and development along it will be maintained over time.
Unique Attributes

Themes:

• Improve the Pedestrian Environment
• Integrate Housing and Mixed-Use Development
• Improve the Railroad Cut
• Reduce Pedestrian/Vehicle Conflicts
• Accommodate Autos at Key Locations
Improve the Pedestrian Environment

Storefront areas could offer pedestrian amenities while screening the parking. Aesthetic improvements such as street furniture, decorative paving, and landscaping could create a more pleasant place for customers and pedestrians.
Some businesses have covered their windows, compromising the aesthetics of both the street and building frontage. Windows allow “eyes on the street” and create a safer environment; they can enhance public safety and have visual benefits as well.
Integrate Housing and Mixed-Use Development

The area between North Ida and North Polk Avenues was recognized for its unique qualities: narrow street and compatibility between commercial and residential uses. New development in this area should be designed to respect these qualities.
Integrate Housing and Mixed-Use Development

There are vacant or undeveloped sites around North Ida Avenue and the railroad cut. This area offers opportunities for infill development serving both pedestrian and people arriving by car.
Improve the Railroad Cut

Participants wanted to investigate ways to improve the crossing.
Improve the Railroad Cut

Participants had many suggestions for improving the bridge over the railroad cut.

- Abutment pilasters with a marked crossing of Peninsula Trail.
- Arches built with residential and retail redevelopment.
- Build pedestrian signals into new pilasters of the bridge.
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Improve the Railroad Cut

Peninsula Crossing Trail

Developing housing and other uses along and above the Peninsula Crossing Trail could improve public safety. One idea was to develop housing or live/work areas nearby, to provide “eyes on the green space” and take advantage of the visual benefits of the Peninsula Crossing Trail.
Improve the Railroad Cut

Peninsula Crossing Trail

There were a number of ideas for how to enhance the entrance to the Peninsula Crossing Trail. Adding street furniture and signage could enhance the connection to Lombard and better mark the trail.
Development adjacent to the railroad cut should recognize its amenity as a green space. Future buildings could face onto this green space and take advantage of the views and access.
Reduce Pedestrian/Vehicle Conflicts

Participants considered ways to reduce vehicle and pedestrian conflicts along North Lombard intersections. This roundabout idea may work in selected locations.
Participants generally acknowledged the need for some auto-oriented businesses in the area. It was hoped that their design could better complement nearby residential and pedestrian-oriented retail uses along North Lombard.
Unique Attributes

Downtown St. Johns

Downtown St. Johns has a wonderful scale and visual character, but its vitality could be improved. Many believe that additional residential development around the downtown could help foster a more active commercial district. Connections between the downtown, surrounding neighborhoods, and the riverfront area call for careful consideration.

St. Johns has many civic institutions - some consider it the heart of the peninsula. Public plazas, parks, the library, James John Elementary School, and views of the west hills and the St. Johns Bridge are tremendous assets that provide a strong foundation for revitalization of the area. How to make the most of these assets, and ensure convenient connections and access, will be an important consideration in the development of the St. Johns/Lombard Plan.
Unique Attributes

Themes:

- Foster a Vital Downtown
- Improve Gateways and Connections
- Reduce Pedestrian/Vehicle Conflicts
- Enhance Public Gathering Places and Amenities
- Look for Development Opportunities
Foster a Vital Downtown

Lombard Street

The street frontage is wonderfully diverse and unique, but could be more vital as a commercial area. New housing was seen as a way to enliven the area without compromising the existing frontage. Housing could be built behind the storefronts to increase the resident population living and shopping downtown. The street could be enhanced with curb extensions and lighting to improve the pedestrian experience.
Foster a Vital Downtown

North Ivanhoe East of Philadelphia.

The north side of North Ivanhoe has a pedestrian oriented retail frontage.

Many wanted the south side of North Ivanhoe to develop in a more pedestrian oriented way.
Several ideas emerged for the redesign of this intersection. One idea was to configure the intersection to make safer pedestrian crossings at curb extensions and to control vehicle turning movements. Another was to use “Ivy Island” as pedestrian refuge, extending the crossing opportunities and adding landscaping.
Improve Gateways and Connections

Burlington and Ivanhoe

Participants discussed how to better mark North Burlington as a direct access route to the Willamette River from Downtown St. Johns. Planting a different species of tree, or limbing-up existing trees, would allow filtered views of the St. Johns Bridge, the North Precinct, and North Burlington Street, and improve visibility of the access route.
Reduce Pedestrian and Vehicle Conflicts

North Ivanhoe and Richmond

Pedestrian safety is a concern at this and other similar intersections with free right turns. It was suggested that it be modified to eliminate free right turns, provide crosswalks, curb extensions, and possibly include a traffic signal.
Reduce Vehicle and Pedestrian Conflicts

Ivanhoe East of Philadelphia

This street has limited crossing opportunities and was identified as a safety concern, particularly for children. The organization of street lights and trees, and new pavement materials, patterns, or markings could be used to identify pedestrian crossings.
Enhance Public Gathering Places and Amenities

Civic Center

Participants mentioned the need for visual connections between James John Elementary, the library, downtown, and other community related services in St. Johns.

There were a number of suggestions for how the playground could become a more pleasing visual connection between North Lombard and the school.
Enhance Public Gathering Places and Amenities

The Plaza

Participants shared several ideas for improving the aesthetics and safety of the plaza. Ideas included: opening views to North Lombard, reworking Philadelphia Street to make it two way, and enhancing the vista from the St. Johns Bridge to downtown St. Johns.
Enhance Public Gathering Places and Amenities

The Plaza

The walks generated a number of exciting new ideas for the plaza’s use and design; as well as how to transform this key entryway into downtown St. Johns.
Enhance Public Gathering Places and Amenities

The Plaza

Possibilities for reconfiguring North Philadelphia and North Lombard, and relocating the plaza were discussed.
Look for Development Opportunities

Ivanhoe West of Philadelphia

Many parking lots fronting North Ivanhoe serve businesses on North Lombard. Some felt that the parking was a good use, considering truck traffic, and needed to remain. People generally supported the option to build over or around parking areas over time. The street crossings of North Ivanhoe could be improved with curb extensions to slow vehicle traffic.
Look for Development Opportunities

Redevelopment of large sites presents the opportunity for significant change to support downtown businesses and improve pedestrian circulation. It was mentioned that the path along the south side of the Racquet Center facility feels unsafe. A paved and landscaped pedestrian promenade extending to the elementary school was suggested as a possible improvement. Some mentioned the idea of converting the Racquet Center to an aquatic center. Others felt this and other large sites offered an opportunity for new housing or mixed-use development.
Look for Development Opportunities

North Kellogg Street was identified for its redevelopment potential. Participants mentioned the need for new housing and retail, development that could help revitalize downtown St. Johns. Maintaining parking in this area was a concern to many.
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Unique Attributes

Cathedral Park

Cathedral Park is blessed with a slope between downtown St. Johns and the Willamette River. As a result, many of the properties have tremendous views of the west hills, the St. Johns Bridge, Cathedral Park, and the Willamette River. At the same time, some of the streets leading to the river are very steep, and some are not paved and lack sidewalks.

The residential areas are generally well maintained, and feature a mix of housing types. Employment and housing are seen as desirable in the area close to the river; integrating these land uses will require careful consideration. Participants voiced support for maintaining industrial/employment opportunities. However, good design and screening is a key concern.

There are a number of opportunities for improved river access. Cathedral Park, the Water Pollution Control Lab, sandy beaches, restored riverbanks, a boat ramp, and docks, benefit from being near the St. Johns Bridge. Connecting the riverfront to downtown St. Johns is a key opportunity recognized by community members.
Unique Attributes

Themes:

- Provide Clear and Direct Connections
- Foster Diverse Housing Opportunities
- Develop Underutilized Properties
- Maintain and Attract Employment Opportunities
- Celebrate the River
- Celebrate the St. Johns Bridge
Provide Clear and Direct Connections

Participants discussed how to integrate the track crossing of North Burlington with sidewalk and street furnishings to mark this street as an important connection to downtown St. Johns.
Provide Clear and Direct Connections

Charleston and Willamette

Steep, unimproved streets restrict pedestrian and vehicular access. Some favored paving or other improvements to create better connections; others felt they could be best used as green space. The white oak tree on this street was seen as an asset that should be preserved.
Provide Clear and Direct Connections

The railroad track could be improved to provide newer pedestrian/bicycle connections; linking Cathedral park to regional trails, such as the Peninsula Crossing Trail and 40 Mile Loop. Some thought that the existing tracks could also be used for a trolley to downtown Portland.
Foster Diverse Housing Opportunities

Housing that conforms to the area’s unique topography was seen as desirable. New housing should take advantage of views of the St. Johns Bridge and west hills through a step-down design.
Foster Diverse Housing Opportunities

There was a concern about the scale and fit of housing northwest of the St. Johns Bridge. The existing base of this building was thought to conflict with nearby residential uses. Addition of landscaping and modification to the lower floor could improve compatibility with surrounding residential uses.
Foster Diverse Housing Opportunities

Participants liked much of the new multi-family housing in the area. They were supportive of additional row houses and moderately sized apartment buildings with compatible design.
Develop Underutilized Properties

Participants discussed the possibility of including the Mar Com property, an industrial area located west of Cathedral Park, in the plan. Residential, retail, and employment were possible future uses discussed for the site.
Maintain and Attract Employment Opportunities

Participants mentioned the need for family-wage jobs in the area. It was suggested that major employers could locate here along with other uses. Residential, commercial, mixed-use, and industrial development can function harmoniously with compatible design.

Clean up the street frontages and develop businesses that complement those that are existing.

One idea was to build a Portland Community College Work Force Training Center to serve industrial businesses.
Celebrate the River

Water Activities

Walk attendees recognized the potential of a cleaner Willamette River at Cathedral Park, and supported new beach access and opportunities for swimming and other recreational activities.
Celebrate the River

Continuous Greenway

Walk participants liked the greenway path next to the Water Pollution Control Lab. It provides river views that could be augmented with structured overlooks. Participants suggested expanding public access and greenway along the riverfront.
Celebrate the River

Riverfront

There were many ideas for the riverfront. Participants mentioned creating new river access pathways and developing restaurants and river related businesses at select locations.
Celebrate the St. Johns Bridge

Under the Bridge

Pedestrian amenities, landscaping, and parking were mentioned as possible ways to improve the area under the St. Johns Bridge.
Under the Bridge

Walk attendees identified possible improvements to the area under the bridge in Cathedral Park. Ideas included building additional amphitheaters and addressing landscape furnishings such as seating, lighting, and picnic facilities.
Preliminary Ideas From the Neighborhood Walks map:
The Preliminary Ideas From the Neighborhood Walks map summarizes some of the key transportation and land use ideas and characteristics identified and discussed on the St. Johns/Lombard Plan neighborhood walks. It will serve as a basis for more detailed land use and transportation plans for the area in the concept development stage of the planning process.
Summary Maps
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**WALK #1, Lombard East:** This walk focused on N. Lombard Street between N. Woolesey and N. Wall Street.
**Meeting Place:** Columbia Cottage, 4339 N. Lombard
**When:** May 4, 2002
10:00 AM to 1:00 PM

**WALK #2, Lombard Central:** This walk focused on N. Lombard Street between N. Wall Street and N. Polk Avenue.
**Meeting Place:** St. Johns Family Center, 6443 N. Lombard
**When:** May 8, 2002
6:00 PM to 9:00 PM
WALK #3, Downtown St. Johns: This walk focused on downtown St. Johns between N. Richmond and N St. Louis, including N. Lombard Street and the immediate surrounding area.

**Meeting Place:** Pioneer United Methodist Church; 7528 N. Charleston

**When:** May 18, 2002

10:00 AM to 1:30 PM

WALK #4, Cathedral Park/Riverfront: This walk covered the areas between downtown St. Johns and the Willamette River.

**Meeting Place:** Water Pollution Control Lab, 6543 N. Burlington

**When:** May 22, 2002

6:00 PM to 9:00 PM
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For more information about the St. Johns/Lombard Plan, please contact:

Barry Manning, Project Leader

Portland Bureau of Planning
1900 SW 4th Avenue, Suite 4100
Portland, Oregon 97201
Phone:  503-823-7700
FAX:  503-823-7800
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Please visit our web site.  Go to www.planning.ci.portland.or.us and click on the St. Johns/Lombard Plan.
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Introduction

As part of the St. Johns/Lombard Plan process, residents, business people and other interested parties participated in a series of four neighborhood walks. The walks were sponsored by the City of Portland Bureau of Planning, and conducted with Zimmer Gunsul Frasca Partnership (ZGF), a local architecture/planning/design firm, during the spring of 2002. The neighborhood walks were designed to:

- Allow for detailed exploration of the St. Johns/Lombard Plan study area at the street level in detail;
- Provide community members with an opportunity to share ideas about the St. Johns/Lombard Plan area and its future with each other and City staff; and
- Provide planning staff with valuable input to help create a vision statement and an urban design concept and vision statement for the St. Johns/Lombard Plan.

The walk areas are identified on the map, and briefly described below.
WALK #1, Lombard East: N. Lombard Street between N. Woolsey and N. Wall Street.
Meeting Place: Columbia Cottage, 4339 N. Lombard Street
When: May 4, 2002, 10:00 AM to 1:00 PM

WALK #2, Lombard Central: N. Lombard Street between N. Wall Street and N. Polk Avenue.
Meeting Place: St. Johns Family Center, 6443 N. Lombard Street
When: May 8, 2002, 6:00 PM to 9:00 PM
WALK #3, Downtown St. Johns: Downtown St. Johns between N. Richmond and N. St. Louis, including N. Lombard Street and the immediate surrounding area.
Meeting Place: Pioneer United Methodist Church, 7528 N. Charleston Avenue
When: May 18, 2002, 10:00 AM to 1:30 PM

WALK #4, Cathedral Park/Riverfront: Area between downtown St. Johns and the Willamette River.
Meeting Place: Water Pollution Control Lab, 6543 N. Burlington Avenue
When: May 22, 2002, 6:00 PM to 9:00 PM
Nearly 100 community members participated in the walks. Participants were asked to organize into small groups, and respond to a number of questions related to issues and specific locations along the walk route. General comments from participants were also welcomed. Staff accompanied walk participants to facilitate discussions, document participants' impressions of the neighborhood, and record and sketch ideas for future change. At the conclusion of each walk, participants reconvened and discussed some of the ideas that were generated. Participants also filled out brief questionnaires about each walk area.

The facilitators’ notes from each walk, along with citizen comments from written questionnaires, are compiled in this document. This information is organized by walk area, and divided into sections corresponding to the questions that were asked on the walks. When a similar comment was recorded by more than one group or individual, the frequency of the comment is noted in parentheses.

A summary document of the results that includes photographs and some of the sketches generated during the walks is also available from the Bureau of Planning at: www.planning.ci.portland.or.us, or by request.

**What’s Next?**

The information gathered during the walks and related public events will be used by project staff and the consultant team in crafting an urban design concept and refining a vision statement for the St. Johns/Lombard Plan area. An urban design concept and vision summary report is anticipated in Fall/Winter 2002.

For more information about the St. Johns/Lombard Plan, please contact:

Barry Manning, Senior Planner, Project Leader  
Portland Bureau of Planning  
1900 SW 4th Avenue, Suite 4100  
Portland, Oregon 97201  
Phone: 503/823-7700  
Fax: 503/823-7800  
TDD: 503/823-6868  
E-Mail: stjohnslombard@ci.portland.or.us
Summary

On each of the neighborhood walks, participants identified issues and concerns, and shared their observations and ideas about the area. This document contains lists of comments received on the walks as recorded by staff, and as indicated by citizens on written questionnaires. In compiling the information, some common themes and ideas for desired future changes began to emerge. The following section summarizes these common themes as well as the highlights from each of the walks.

The following themes emerged from comments heard on all the walks.

**Foster compatible development**
- Focus on the relationship of the building to the street, and the scale of buildings
- Provide for a mix of uses along most of the Lombard main street and in the St. Johns town center

**Enhance the public realm**
- Improve sidewalks, bus stops and street crossings
- Plant street trees and provide street furnishings in appropriate places
- Remove litter in the area; clean up alleys

**Improve the transportation system**
- Enhance safety for pedestrians and bicyclists
- Improve vehicular movement while calming traffic
- Make transit more user-friendly

**Encourage housing and mixed use development**
- Provide new housing that enhances the vitality of commercial areas and provides choices for residents of all ages and income levels
- Pay attention to scale and design

**Improve existing development**
- Encourage better screening of parking and utility areas, and better signage
- Add landscaping and windows to enhance pedestrian areas

**Issues from Specific Walks**

Each walk focused on distinctly different sections of the study area. Many unique issues and attributes were discussed, but broader themes also emerged on each of the walks, as described below.
Walk 1: Lombard Street East

The Lombard East area contains some of the best retail and housing development along North Lombard Street. Accessible by pedestrians and automobiles, it has many components of a great main street.

The existing commercial area along North Lombard between Fiske and Portsmouth provides valuable services to the surrounding neighborhoods. Community members would like to extend and enhance the pedestrian character and mix of uses along this section of Lombard.

Areas east of Fiske have great potential to capitalize on the mature trees, small-scale commercial buildings, and housing near Columbia Park. Multi-family housing, compatible with existing commercial and residential buildings, was envisioned here.

The area west of Portsmouth has developed primarily with auto-oriented uses and services. The scale of this development and the street traffic are not always friendly to pedestrians. Opportunities for new housing and commercial development were identified that could improve the pedestrian environment over time.

Walk 1 Ideas/Themes:

Integrate new housing and mixed use development
Lombard offers opportunities for infill development; many felt that adding housing would be appropriate and could help provide customers for local businesses.

Foster a more pedestrian friendly main street
There was a desire to see the area between N. Fiske and N. Portsmouth develop as a more pedestrian-friendly main street to serve local needs.

Reduce pedestrian/vehicle conflicts
Several intersections on Lombard were identified as needing crossing improvements.

Think creatively about opportunity sites
Opportunities for infill development on vacant sites for housing and small-scale mixed-use buildings were identified. Potential locations for urban green spaces were noted. Ideas for mixed-use redevelopment of specific sites were discussed.

Walk 2: Lombard Street Central

Between Portsmouth and St. Johns, businesses have provided the surrounding neighborhoods with a variety of retail uses and services. Much of the development is oriented to provide convenient auto access. Some offer pedestrian improvements along the street, while others do not; the lack of pedestrian facilities is a concern to many.
The railroad cut and the Peninsula Crossing Trail have the potential to connect North Lombard to other trails and neighborhoods - an exciting opportunity recognized by the community.

Near the railroad cut, North Ida Street is at the crossroads of many trips in the area. This important pedestrian and vehicle crossing is the source of much congestion.

North Lombard between North Ida and North Buchanan is narrower than other sections of Lombard. Many hope that the scale of the street and development along it will be maintained over time.

**Walk 2 Ideas/Themes:**

**Improve the pedestrian environment**
Additional landscaping, screening, and windows facing the street would make the area more visually pleasing.

**Integrate housing and mixed use development**
Lombard offers opportunities for infill development; many felt that adding housing would be appropriate and could help stimulate local businesses.

**Improve the railroad cut**
Participants mentioned archways, banners and fence repair as examples of beautification measures that would enhance the aesthetics of the bridge over the railroad cut and tie together the east and west portions of Lombard. Suggested improvements to the Peninsula Crossing Trail greenspaces ranged from adding signage and park amenities to allowing for housing or other development adjacent to the area.

**Reduce pedestrian/vehicle conflicts**
A few intersections on Lombard were identified as needing crossing and circulation improvements.

**Accommodate autos at key locations**
Participants recognized the need to accommodate automobiles in commercial areas. It was hoped that the design of these uses could complement nearby residential and retail development.

**Walk 3: Downtown St. Johns**

Downtown St. Johns has a wonderful scale and visual character, but its vitality could be improved. Many believe that additional residential development around the downtown could help foster a more active commercial district. Connections between the downtown, surrounding neighborhoods, and the riverfront area call for careful consideration.

St. Johns has many civic institutions - some consider it the heart of the peninsula. Public plazas, parks, the library, James John Elementary School, and views of the west hills and the St. Johns Bridge are tremendous assets that provide a strong
foundation for revitalization. How to make the most of these assets, and ensure convenient connections and access, will be an important consideration in the development of the St. Johns/Lombard Plan.

**Walk 3 Ideas/Themes:**

**Foster a vital downtown**
There is a strong desire to foster a thriving retail district with shops and services that meet the needs of area residents. Adding housing was seen as a way to increase commercial vitality. Providing better access, safety and circulation for pedestrians and vehicles was also mentioned as being key to the success of the area.

**Improve gateways and connections**
Many indicated the need to better connect downtown St. Johns with the Willamette River through physical and visual enhancements. The need for connections to other locations outside the area, through enhanced transit service and trail networks, was also identified.

**Reduce pedestrian/vehicle conflicts.**
Areas along Ivanhoe with heavy traffic, including truck traffic, were noted as problematic for pedestrians. Intersections with free right turns were also identified as needing improvement, as were sections of Lombard, particularly near James John Elementary School.

**Enhance public gathering places and amenities**
Several ideas emerged for improving the St. Johns plaza, to best take advantage of its potential as a vibrant community gathering place. The area between the library, James John Elementary and the Racquet Center was noted for its potential to create a civic center environment, through enhanced connections, landscaping improvements, and design enhancements.

**Look for development opportunities/catalysts**
Several larger sites within the area offered opportunities for significant change. New housing and mixed-use development ideas were discussed.

**Walk 4: Cathedral Park/Riverfront**

Cathedral Park is blessed with a slope between downtown St. Johns and the Willamette River. As a result, many of the properties have tremendous views of the west hills, the St. Johns Bridge, Cathedral Park, and the Willamette River. At the same time, some of the streets leading to the river are very steep, and some are not paved and lack sidewalks.

The residential areas are generally well maintained, and feature a mix of housing types. Employment and housing are seen as desirable in the area close to the river; integrating these land uses will require careful consideration. Participants voiced support for maintaining industrial/employment opportunities. However, good design and screening is a key concern.
There are a number of opportunities for improved river access. Cathedral Park, the Water Pollution Control Lab, sandy beaches, restored riverbanks, a boat ramp, and docks, benefit from being near the St. Johns Bridge. Connecting the riverfront to downtown St. Johns is a key opportunity recognized by community members.

### Walk 4 Ideas/Themes:

**Enhance clear and direct connections**
Many indicated the need to better connect downtown St. Johns with the Willamette River through physical and visual enhancements. The need for connections to other locations outside the area, through enhanced transit service and trail networks, was also identified.

**Foster diverse housing opportunities**
Maintaining and encouraging a diversity of housing types was desirable. Potential locations for houses, apartments, and live/work units were discussed, along with ideas for scale and design compatibility.

**Develop underutilized or overlooked properties**
Several properties in the area were considered underutilized and appropriate for redevelopment with housing, employment or limited commercial uses. Some participants called for retaining industrial uses in the area.

**Maintain some employment opportunities**
Many participants identified the unique opportunity offered by existing employment areas to provide local family wage jobs. Ideas for how to appropriately integrate employment with other uses were discussed.

**Celebrate the Willamette River**
The Willamette River was mentioned as a major asset. Many participants favored increasing public access to the riverfront, enhancing Cathedral Park, and providing compatible uses nearby.

**Celebrate the St. Johns Bridge**
The St. Johns Bridge is considered one of the most prominent features of the area. A number of ideas were generated about how to best utilize the space under the bridge and strengthen the connection between downtown St. Johns and the river.
Walk #1: Lombard East

1. Although Lombard is primarily commercial, residential uses exist as well. Where are the most appropriate locations for housing along Lombard?

Specific Locations
- SW corner of Lombard/Newman, Lombard/VanHouten, Lombard/Berkeley, Lombard/Fiske are good places for apartments.
- Encourage multi-family between Columbia Park and Fiske. (2)
- This isn’t a good place for commercial (between Columbia Park and Fiske), though mixed use okay. 2 – 3 story good, full build out with multifamily acceptable (example at N. corner of Dwight/Lombard).
- Many feel that Lombard could benefit from infusion of housing – mostly apartments.
- University Apartments’ character blends well with neighborhood. (Lombard between Dwight and Fiske)
- Some like the apartment building (U-shaped, with parking in center) at Newman because it’s well cared for, but vehicle access is difficult – central driveway onto Lombard. Some liken it to hotel living. (NE corner of Newman/Lombard)

General Locations
- Multifamily should be kept on Lombard rather than mixing it in with single family to the north.
- College apartments work well mixed in with the neighborhood.
- Current housing is appropriately placed (Dwight through Fiske, Haven through Hodge)
- Locate multi-family housing near Columbia Park.
- Keep multifamily on Lombard, away from single family neighborhoods. (Dwight through Fiske, Haven through Hodge, Portsmouth, Van Houten)
- Higher density housing that looks like single family would be okay in single family areas, if scale is small. (Dwight through Fiske, Haven through Hodge, Portsmouth, Van Houten)
- Discourage huge multifamily complexes along Lombard – should be 10 – 12 units maximum.
- Single family homes should be zoned to allow for future commercial or multi family next to Weir’s Cyclery.
- Single family will not be the best use of the land here in the future (Dwight through Fiske, Haven through Hodge)
- East of Wall is a good place for housing.
- Some empty lots and run down buildings on Lombard should be used for housing.
- Mixed use buildings that enhance the area architecturally are appropriate on Lombard.
- Multifamily housing should be developed with driveways off of Lombard onto side streets.

Other Ideas/Observations
- Alleys should be used for access.
- More quality architecture is needed.
- Residential is preferable to auto sales lots.
- Courtyard style buildings are good.
- Walk-up style apartments are good.
- Tuck-under parking would be preferable to at-grade lots.
- Ground level residential should be set back from the street.
- Many areas of existing (or zoned) residential uses seem appropriate to keep/expand; may be too much commercial.
- Parking areas in middle of U shape buildings could become courtyards.
- There should be assistance programs for elderly to help them remain in their homes for as long as possible.
- Residential housing needs off-street access.
- Residential on top of retail is okay.
- Residential should locate behind commercial buildings.
- The commercial component of the Lombard/Fiske mixed use building has been vacant for 6 years
2. Community members have indicated a desire for Lombard Street to be a convenient, safe, and pleasant place to walk. What measures would enhance the pedestrian experience along Lombard?

Ideas

- Crosswalks with lights where businesses are.
- Softening measures.
- Benches.
- Sidewalk widening (2).
- Sidewalk repair and maintenance – they are a safety hazard. (2)
- More specialty, unique stores.
- Water fountains.
- Bike lanes and racks.
- Covered bus stops for rain protection. (2)
- Green parking strips.
- Less traffic fumes.
- Smaller stores.
- More trees and greenery. (8)
- Trash receptacles and litter removal.
- Tree trimming.
- More benches.
- More crosswalks. (2)
- More independently-owned restaurants.
- Cleaning sidewalks from Portsmouth to Fiske.
- More pedestrian amenities – bubblers, decorative paving, etc., especially in front of Fabric World.
- Business fronts with windows – this would encourage strolling. (2)
- Install lower level street lights for pedestrians on Lombard. (3)
- Less traffic along Lombard. (2)
- No parking lots on Lombard.
- Decorative sidewalks – different paving materials and patterns.
- Median strip on Lombard, like MLK Jr. (2) to provide a safer opportunity for crossing.
- Public trash cans/beverage container recycling all along Lombard, and at the bus stops and outside Taco Bell. This will cut down on our huge litter problem.
- No speed bumps on Lombard because need to allow for emergency vehicles.
- Crosswalks at Lombard/Newman and Lombard/Haven.
- Driveways/entrances to businesses/housing located off of Lombard - access from side street instead.
- Eliminate some redundant driveways on Lombard - driveways on Lombard take away on-street parking. (Between Dwight and Fiske, near Portsmouth)
- Underground utility lines along Lombard.
- Fix drainage problem on Lombard across from Weir’s Cyclery - during heavy rains, the area floods all the way to the sidewalk. Area looks and smells bad.
- Provide and maintain planting strips in residential portions of Lombard.
- Address traffic noise.
- Devise a schedule for neighbors for when the City is going to clean the streets – the streets along Lombard are dirty, some areas not cleaned as cars obstruct areas near curbs.
- Commercial buildings should include windows, and not tun away from the street; add landscaping.
- Reduce the size and number of curb cuts.
- Fix sidewalks at alley transition at sidewalk (gravel across sidewalks).
- Clean up clutter and garbage (along the street and at some businesses).
- Provide more protected (signalized) crossings.
- Keep existing quality single family homes on Lombard – in some cases, it would be okay to convert existing single family structures for commercial use.
- Columbia Villa needs better bus service to Lombard to help make it a more active street.
- Bus shelters are needed at the Portsmouth intersection.
• Encourage business to take out some parking and add landscaping. Reopen painted windows. Add shutters or other interesting façade element. Add low level landscaping or a short wall along length of parking – create a mural.
• Reduce the concrete and asphalt at Hodge/Lombard – there’s too much.
• Create a focal point for Lombard - it has no center, no dominant structure.
• Develop a pocket park on grassy area next to church (Lombard/Fiske). Landscaping, benches, area for meeting and people-watching. Use awnings, compatible signage at pedestrian level.
• Add free-standing facades to parking areas adjacent to sidewalks. These facades can be used instead of fences – incorporate canopy, landscaping, murals, benches. (See Patricia’s drawing.)

Comments
• The traffic lights keep speeding down – signal timing is appropriate – they’re timed for 35mph.
• Fish store owner tried to get a crosswalk at Lombard/Haven and the City wouldn’t do put one in.
• Smog and fumes are awful on Lombard – too polluted for pedestrians – they prefer Willamette.
• There’s a good crosswalk on Lombard/Hodge.
• The entrance to Delaunay Services on Lombard/Hodge is not necessary.
• There are nice plantings in sidewalk between VanHouten and Clarendon.
• Lombard is very loud and not pedestrian friendly.
• Sidewalk width is okay.
• Large trees are nice, but affect sidewalks from Dwight to Fiske.
• Hard surface is okay in commercial areas, but need street trees.
• Street trees are a great asset. Overhead wires have damaged the great trees.
• Lombard is a wide street to cross at non-signalized intersections; drivers do not stop for pedestrians.
• Signal timing encourages speeding, especially between Fiske and Portsmouth.
• Cars running red lights on Lombard is a problem - at Portsmouth intersection and others.
• People tend to cross mid-block, particularly in Fiske to Portsmouth area. Need pedestrian refuge in center.
• Tall cyclone fence (Don Lee Motors at Dwight) is not conducive to good environment, but it’s okay because it provides needed security for the business. When pedestrian activity increases, fence could be altered – lower, more attractive materials.
• Ed’s Tire Treads needs screening at sidewalk.
• Sidewalks - most people feel that the width of the paved portion (~6 ft.) is adequate. If widened, should come from the property side. The generous planting strips are a major plus, good buffer. Some want the planting strip to remain as grass, others want to encourage unique landscaping. (Area between Columbia Park and the Portsmouth main street portion of Lombard)
• Most feel secure walking most of Lombard at night, except for Columbia Park.
• Bus #1 runs on Portsmouth, turns at Willis on its way to Columbia Villa. Connections for CV residents to Lombard are not adequate. There is no direct connection. (See Patricia’s concept drawing.)
• Everyone loves the trees and streetscape on Stockton, south of Lombard.
• The parking lot at Farrell Realty is nothing but paving and building turns its back to Lombard.
• Everyone likes the mixed use building on at Fiske and wants to see more developments of this type.
• Research why office/retail space is not being leased at Fiske/Lombard – try to correct problem.
• Too much visual pollution from cell tower, related facilities. (Odd Fellows building at Jordan)
• The city code should be changed to require co-location. A good example is the Odd Fellows building. Light standards and buildings should be used wherever possible before construction of a tower.
• The south side of Lombard at Fiske is appealing to walk. The buildings and sidewalk are good.

3. Community members have voiced concern about traffic conditions along Lombard. What are your concerns?

Concerns/Observations
• Too much fumes.
• Traffic does not invite to shop, patronize restaurants, sidewalk cafes.
• Traffic is too fast. (2)
• Drivers need to realize that street lights are timed at 30mph.
• Cars running red lights is a problem, especially at Lombard/Portsmouth. Need more police. (2)
• Lack of good left-hand turn lanes, backing up traffic.
• Lombard acts like a water hose, forcing a given volume into a smaller space.
• If we get rid of center lanes and install bike lanes, won't traffic back up when someone wants to turn left?
• Speeding isn’t really a problem along Lombard because there’s so much traffic that cars have to go slow.
• Stops and go create pollution.
• There is more speeding on the smaller streets than on Lombard.
• The sidewalks are wide enough.
• Stops and go create pollution.
• Crossings not safe, too few, kids not safe (especially on Haven).
• Too much congestion; poor utilization of left turn lanes / signal timing; too much green time for Portsmouth.  (Portsmouth/Lombard)
• Transit stops are crappy.
• How would full signal affect street/traffic operations?
• Crossing is difficult at best. Existing lights are located at Woolsey, Fiske, Hodge, Portsmouth, and Wall.
• Hodge intersection light is pedestrian activated, which is okay.
• Bicycling is unsafe since there are infrequent parked cars, traffic moves too fast.
• It’s hard to park because traffic moves too fast.
• Distance is too long between lights from Fiske to Hodge.
• Many parking lots are underutilized and some businesses have none.

Suggestions
• Add benches and trash containers.
• Provide green spaces (trees/shrubs/flowers).
• Add crosswalks along Lombard, between Taco Bell and Lombard Market, and at Newman, Haven and Montieth. (3)
• Add more trees and center island with trees.
• Install crosswalk lights.
• One side of the street should be “No Parking” at Haven/Lombard - with cars on both sides, the street is too dangerous for cars moving in both directions.
• Install bike lanes or white lanes so cyclists feel safe from cars.
• Signal timing should be extended all the way in to St. Johns.
• There should be a sign that says signals are timed for 35mph.
• Bike lanes are a good way to slow down traffic, but would eliminate parking.
• A free bus service along Lombard would decrease traffic.
• Time the streetlights for better traffic flow along Lombard.
• Taco Bell is very popular; however, it creates traffic cueing. Stop traffic for left and right turns; instead, create turn lane on Lombard at Haven and have parking driveway on Haven instead.
• Provide more pedestrian-activated crossings along Lombard.
• Install bike lanes on Lombard to slow down traffic and promote alternative transportation.
• Traffic flow should be improved to take pressure off of Willamette. More lanes? Maybe.
• Provide more protected left turns along Lombard.
• Trolley/streetcar connection to Interstate MAX would increase the capacity of Lombard.
• Empty trash cans at bus stops. Arrange with Tri-Met to have advertising revenue at transit stop reinvested into neighborhood. Encourage stop amenities. Incorporate shelters into building designs (awnings, etc.)
• Do not allow advertising on transit stop walls- security problem.
• Hodge may be good location for crosswalk.
• Haven may be better location for crosswalk than Hodge.
• Haven provides a connection to Columbia Villa – need a signalized crosswalk here on Lombard.
• Establish crosswalks at Newman, Haven, Berkeley. Worried about safety of crosswalks without traffic signal. Lights needed at Western Market (Newman), Haven and Berkeley.
• Hodge intersection needs a bus shelter.
• Encourage shared parking agreements.
• Narrow existing curb cuts wherever possible.
• Add landscaping wherever possible.

4. The Proposed Portsmouth Plan supports development of a stronger main street character along Lombard between Fiske and Portsmouth. What do you think of this idea? What measures would encourage this?

Ideas
• Should block off the entrance to Auto Zone so that it’s not coming off Lombard, but use is okay.
• Need more trash receptacles.
• Slow down traffic with traffic devices on main streets sections such as Fiske/Lombard, Portsmouth/Lombard.
• Support small businesses.
• Mixed use and mix of building types is good - 3 stories is appropriate. (Fiske to Portsmouth)
• Encourage local, neighborhood serving shops, though some regional attractions okay (be careful). Fiske to Portsmouth
• Merge Fiske and Portsmouth nodes.
• CN2 zoning would be appropriate. (Fiske to Portsmouth)
• A new library would be good here. (Fiske to Portsmouth)
• Add special lighting at nodes- more pedestrian scale. (Fiske/Portsmouth)
• Portsmouth node is a key intersection - should be made ‘grander’ than Fiske - more dense, taller development.
• Encourage more office and employment types of uses along with neighborhood, pedestrian oriented retail. (Portsmouth node)
• Reduce auto oriented land uses here (gas stations need to go). (Portsmouth node)
• Auto Zone building needs improvement – windows, awnings, benches. (Fiske)
• Encourage building design that draws cars into the building’s ground floor for gas, services. (Portsmouth node)
• 4 story mixed-use would be appropriate for the Bingo site. Portsmouth/Lombard
• Need to bring buildings up to street.
• Shared parking could help – e.g. Nicolas uses Odd Fellows parking.
• Three story buildings are fine, four stories may be too tall (depending on context).
• People cross mid-block – possibly need center pedestrian refuge.
• Buildings should be brought closer to street with fewer blank walls (Taco Bell).
• Bus stops need shelters.
• Mixed use good in the general location between Haven and Hodge.
• Some commercial uses (Weir’s) zoned residential – maybe mixed use zoning would be appropriate.
• Need better maintenance of public realm – trash cans at bus stop is overflowing. (Portsmouth/Lombard)
• Consider placing buildings at corners and move gas stations. (Portsmouth/Lombard)
• Need façade rehab at Fabric World – good location for library. (Portsmouth/Lombard)
• Maybe the gas stations could move to the Eagles site. (Portsmouth/Lombard)
• Encourage transit – development of streetcar line.
• Allow large murals to be used in other places on Lombard.
• Area is so small – maybe main street should extend to Chataqua/Macrum.
• Nice trees, streetlights, benches would help.
• Tri-Met and a trolley would support libraries, grocery stores, restaurants/cafes, movie theater. (2)

Comments
• Okay to have multiple pools of calm for pedestrians between auto-oriented uses.
• The Lombard Market is okay – nice that it isn’t a chain.
• There are great facades and architecture in some places(e.g. Antique store that’s always closed between Hodge and Hereford) – just needs to be cleaned up and better maintained.
• Great architecture at Lombard/Stockton.
• Traffic too loud, does not invite sidewalk cafes, strolling.
• We need a new hardware store.
• Boutiques, furniture stores may have items too expensive for neighbors.
• Handsome two story building on SE corner of Lombard/Fiske is not working. Residential units are being used,
but retail isn’t; may be too pricey.
- Subway restaurant (Lombard/VanHouten) works as a location and aesthetically. It is small, lined with large trees, popular destination.
- The old style storefront commercial building, recently rehabilitated at Fiske/Lombard, is good – quality building materials.
- Zoning encourages too much parking.
- Church setback is okay – provides greenspace. (Fiske)
- Auto store parking – additional lot – is underutilized.
- Portsmouth is a critical intersection.
- Gas stations are necessary element for community. (Portsmouth/Lombard)
- Gas stations do not create a “place” at intersection.
- General agreement with Portsmouth Plan.
- Current max location is inconvenient.
- Like Delauney Building at Hodge. Landscaping is good, but tall sign pole is an issue with this site and others. Like the mural on the west side of building. Current rules wouldn’t allow it.
- Smaller “destination” traffic attracted by smaller, specialized shops will generate funds for the community and make business area thrive.
- Portsmouth to Van Houten needs to be included in this vision.
- Eagles lot holds huge potential.
- Good, but what about Portsmouth itself?
- Area retains small-town feel. Local business and people from elsewhere should support the area.
- Good idea to enhance main street character. (2)

5. **Community members have indicated support for businesses that directly serve the surrounding neighborhoods. What types of shops/services are needed, and what types should be discouraged?**

**Ideas**
- Need hardware store. (3)
- Need furniture store. (2)
- Need fabric store.
- Auto Zone is a destination store that you drive to – shouldn’t locate here.
- Lombard should have both pedestrian and auto uses – can’t support boutiques all along street – need to have bigger franchises too.
- We need a grocery store. (8)
- There are plenty of fast food places already – need other restaurants though. (5)
- Need antique store.
- A movie theater at Portsmouth/Lombard should be considered.
- Needed: lighting store, clothing, shoes, restaurants, grocery, bookstore, hair salons, music, thrift stores, better video rentals, bakery, coffee, natural food store, toy shop.
- No more auto repair, tire, auto parts, used cars.
- Need non-fast-food restaurants. (4)
- Small shops that are not nationally known should locate here.
- Nationally known businesses are needed. (2)
- More sit-down restaurants on Lombard are needed, especially those that serve breakfast.
- A new, small grocery that carries basic as well as some hard to find items is needed. Fred Meyer is not appealing for shopping—it’s like traveling on a highway when you want the neighborhood street. (2)
- A Trader Joe’s would be nice in North Portland.
- Locati’s is good, but another small grocery store is needed too.
- Auto Zone is a perfect location for a grocery (it used to be one).
- Fabric World would be a great location for a new grocery store.
- Asian grocery on Portsmouth is positive element. (Portsmouth, north of Lombard)
- There are huge franchise opportunities (Auto Zone), small is ok (e.g. Baskins and Robbins), lots of markets.
Auto oriented uses are appropriate west of the cut.

Discourage the obvious: car shops, chain stores/restaurants.

No more liquor stores. (2)

No more strip clubs. (2)

Comments

Okay to attract people from outside the area to the Lombard retail/commercial areas – need customers and big draws in order to notice the little guys (2).

Storefront improvements are needed.

Changing demographics of neighborhoods, including Latino population and young couples – shops/services need to accommodate.

There are no amenities on McKenna and Lombard.

Attract new businesses into stores that are currently closed or abandoned.

Traffic is too fast to provide support for businesses.

Lombard is a destination, most of it is not a pleasant place to walk, or browse. Too many curb cuts.

Establish more on-street parking on Lombard. Eliminate some curb cuts.

Twilight Room is a good neighbor but late-night activity can be an impact. Generally like the fenced seating area.

Twilight Room should add opening to fence, and fenced outdoor seating. Need more windows to the façade. Extend the planting strip.

University Cleaners is a good neighbor. Trouble is the site has too much paving. Their sign is too big and way too tall.

Episcopal Center and William Temple House are good community resources. (Hereford)

Public/private resources should be used to help improve this building. (Hereford)

To frame sidewalk area at Hodge, add wall with openings, benches, awning, painted mural, landscaping. Revise signage so it is not so prominent. (See Patricia’s drawing.)

Difficult to find desirable services within walking distance.

Fiske intersection is a good start at a walkable destination for daily goods and services. This area is in transition.

Encourage use of awnings, and other building design elements. (Fiske)

University Drug building used to be a video poker business. The tinted windows should be replaced with clear glass. (Fiske)

Need parking restrictions, enclosed parking. (Portsmouth)

Pizza hut (Gloucester) used to be sit down (?) now just take out/delivery (unfortunate?); too much parking, needs landscaping and windows.

Stores should serve neighborhood needs.

Stores should keep the area tidy.

Mixed feelings about bringing in more auto traffic.

For some reason, hard for businesses to succeed at Lombard/McKenna – 3 restaurants have been in same location in under a year.

Not okay to mix auto and pedestrian uses because auto-orientation will bring in more cars and detract from pedestrian environment.

Smaller, independent places are more pedestrian oriented.

Boutiques, furniture stores may have items too expensive for neighbors.

6. In some areas, commercial uses along Lombard abut residential areas. Are there smooth/workable transitions between the existing businesses and residential areas?

Transition Ideas/Comments

Use rowhouses as a transition, as long as the design blends with existing homes.

Consider alternatives to single family - this will not be the best use of the land in the future. (Dwight through Fiske, Haven through Hodge)
• Keep multifamily on Lombard, away from single family neighborhoods. (Dwight through Fiske, Haven through Hodge, Portsmouth, Van Houten)
• Higher density housing that looks like single family would be okay in single family areas, if scale is small. (Dwight through Fiske, Haven through Hodge, Portsmouth, Van Houten)
• Avoid large complexes.
• Ensure adequate lot depth for commercial; full block depth okay.
• Provide height step-downs (if large buildings) to adjacent residential areas.
• Pull facades of buildings closer to streets facing residential – not the backs of buildings.
• Use alleys to access parking.
• These businesses (Auto Zone, Taco Bell) and others that are adjacent to residential areas should be required to enter into a good neighbor agreement to help control litter, and ensure maintenance of landscaping.
• Trees are needed in this area.
• Some locations could use more friendly fences.
• Trees and shrub plantings would help.
• Build continuity with wider sidewalks, trees.
• Okay to have residential and commercial right next to each other – not a problem.
• Don’t want more commercial encroaching back on to SF area, but current pattern is fine.
• Transition is good as is – no buffer zone needed.
• Fine to have multifamily between single family and commercial, but not a necessary separation.
• Transition okay at Lombard/Montieth.
• Housing seems to be appropriately placed. (Dwight through Fiske, Haven through Hodge)
• Idea of having multifamily be a transition between commercial areas and single family is sound. (Along Lombard, Portsmouth, Haven)
• Good idea to mix business/residential and ensure there is infill of residential to support businesses.
• Alleys work as transitions (2).
• Freemont, Belmont, Hawthorne, Alberta are good examples of good transition.
• Commercial to multi-family to single family residential transition works well.
• Smaller business would mean less transition areas.
• Some areas have smooth transitions.

Other Comments
• Parking across from the Auto Zone alley not maintained – there are impacts on residential.
• Litter can be a problem at Auto Zone and Taco Bell. Neighborhood impacts should be monitored.
• Auto Zone has too much parking – most often the lot is empty.
• Haven sees a lot of vehicles and pedestrians. Flow of cars and pedestrians from Columbia Villa to Lombard – with this comes a constant flow of litter.

7. Unimproved alleys are found on several blocks adjacent to Lombard. Are they functioning well? How do you envision them in the future?

Ideas
• Would help to have better policing or neighborhood watch program.
• Paving alleys would encourage more traffic – better to keep them green – maybe plant trees and make it a pedestrian zone.
• Owners along alley should make improvements.
• If improved, they could provide access to parking areas to keep traffic off Lombard. (2)
• Alleys should not be paved, but maintained.
• If improved, they might serve as off-Lombard access to behind-the-business-parking as well as emergency vehicle access.
• Where residential is abutting, alleys should be used primarily for residential; business use could be too disruptive for residences.
• Keep the alleys unimproved because this will keep traffic slow.
• Maintain alleys – don’t necessarily improve them.
• Use alleys to provide access to parking and garages.
• People should treat the alley like their own lawn.
• Need a schedule of when street sweeping occurs.
• Allow commercial access from alleys.
• Keep alleys well-maintained, trees trimmed. (between Fiske and Haven, Monteith and Portsmouth)

Comments
• Alleys are useful for many reasons. They act as buffers, but need to be maintained and be used by cars and bikes.
• Alleys are currently not being taken care of, not functioning well. (2)
• We have had vandalism and break ins from nearby alley.
• There is often a lot of trash and broken bottles at Lombard/Haven.
• Alleys are okay because kids and bikes can use them.
• Homeowners have had their car vandalized when parked near alley – now they park on Lombard in front of house. (Lombard/Haven)
• No system for keeping alleys usable – very inconsistent.
• Owners throw yard debris in alley – they don’t maintain it.
• Alleys are a good buffer between commercial and single family homes. (Lombard/Haven)
• Alley by Taco Bell works okay.
• Alleys don’t have a real safety problem.
• Alleys at night are not as safe; they are dark, isolated, and residents may not like it.
• Alleys are not maintained – often are muddy, rutted, with standing water. Used for depositing yard debris.
• Generally, people like the alleys; they are good for walking.

8. In many places, apartments or townhouses have been used as a transition between commercial uses and single dwelling residential areas. What do you think about this approach?

• Nice to have a variety of housing type and architecture.
• Senior Center on Portsmouth is nice – fits well with neighborhood.
• Duplexes/triplexes look like single family homes, which is good.
• Good to have multifamily between commercial and single family areas – apartments smooth the transition – good approach.
• Idea seems fine.
• Keep scale small, especially on Hereford.
• Make multifamily look like single family, blend with rest of the neighborhood. (Hereford, along Lombard and residential streets)
• Design of multifamily is good, duplexes, triplexes look like single family. (Lombard, Portsmouth)
• Create a hierarchy of uses along busy streets. (Lombard, Portsmouth)
• Apartments provide needed inexpensive housing.
• Density in a mobile society needs to consider the auto.
• Allow flexibility for areas adjacent to expanding commercial- strong buffer not always needed, let commercial extend full block depth.
• Apartment building next to Methodist Church (Fiske?) is a good example of buffer.
• Transitions from commercial to multifamily to single family are fine (make sense), but multifamily needs to be designed and maintained better.
• General agreement with this approach.
• Unattractive multifamily development at Hereford.
• Rowhouse design would be preferable at Hereford.
• Litter is an issue. Many people use their front yards for auto repairs. Garages are needed for apartments so people have an opportunity to work on their cars inside.
• Put the auto entrances on side streets.
• Commercial to multi-home to residential works well.
• This is an excellent approach!
• Good approach.
• Approach works well enough, as long as the areas taken for said housing doesn’t explode all over the landscape, and height is kept to a minimum, reasonable level.
• Mixed use with storefronts on the ground level would be a good transition.

9. The area from Portsmouth to Wall is less defined as a pedestrian-friendly main street. What of the existing character should remain? What should be changed?

Ideas for Change
• Move buildings up to street.
• Add landscaping in sidewalk.
• Gas stations could be softened with landscape treatments. (Lombard and Portsmouth)
• Keep area tidy; it’s dirty and garbage cans are full.
• Level the sidewalks on Lombard. (S side of Lombard)
• Redeveloping the Eagles site is a good idea (5).
• Eagles site needs landscaping and street trees.
• Eagles would be a good grocery store site; could be mixed use with more housing at rear of site and tuck-under parking.
• No one likes Eagle’s asphalt parking. Main street gets lost with this site.
• Eagle’s site - trees are needed. Possibly develop shallow storefront buildings at edge of sidewalk.
• This area generally could be more residential in character.
• More outside seating needed.
• More bus shelters needed.
• Houses could be converted to businesses.
• Turn empty lot on south side of Lombard/Montieth into a number of cool businesses.
• Change everything and make it safer.
• Awful empty structure across the street should be torn down. Replace with a multi-store front building, family-friendly pub, or small library. (Lombard/Montieth)
• Fabric World store has great potential to be something great.

Ideas for What Should Remain
• Current level of auto orientation should remain – need auto traffic to make businesses viable.
• Les Schwab is okay – should stay. Would be great to have little shops nearby so you could walk around and shop while you wait for tires.
• Gas stations are needed for neighbors and outsiders. (2) (Lombard and Portsmouth)
• Les Schwab is a needed community resource; some auto uses are necessary.desirable.
• Eagles building is okay, but needs aesthetic improvements.
• Keep Eagles building, just build on some of the parking. (See Patricia’s drawing.)
• Parking is okay; it encourages outside visitors.
• Fishwife Restaurant and Les Schwab are positive elements at this location.
• Comet Club is a halfway house located on Exeter (west of Eagles) – it’s a positive element in the community.

Other Comments
• Multifamily is appropriate here, not single family.
• All the uses/buildings here are needed, but they’re not pedestrian friendly.
• Okay to have auto uses mixed with more pedestrian friendly places.
• Sidewalks are interrupted by street-level ill-maintained driveways. (S side of Lombard)
• Restaurant location on McKenna and Lombard has had 3 restaurants in 1 year.
• Quality of restaurant important, but there is also the perception that traffic behaves like a freeway in this section, with no reason to stop, shop. (McKenna and Lombard, Portsmouth to Wall)
• Car wash – hard to address impact - possibly better vegetation/buffer would help.
• Small businesses do exist but get drowned out.
• Walking along strip, good to be away from main pedestrian area.

10. Vacant or underutilized sites along Lombard may have development potential. How do you envision these sites in the future?

Eagles Site (see Question 9 for additional ideas)
• Eagles site is an okay use but needs more trees and other aesthetic improvements – benches, paint job, mural, windows.
• Eagles site might be a good place for farmers’ market out front – need uses for parking lot when it’s vacant.
• Huron is a good location for new library, residential, or possibly mixed use; single story commercial not best use- depends on particular use.

Lombard/Newman
• Parking lot is okay here – would serve nearby businesses – needs more screening though. (SW corner of Newman and Lombard)
• SW corner of Newman and Lombard is a good place for new development.

Lombard/Montieth
• Parking could move behind the building. (Lombard/Montieth)
• Monteith is a good location for multifamily residential.

Other Locations and Ideas
• The site east of Weir’s Cyclery could be used to add more storefronts, with residential above, compatible with Weir’s, or don’t build on it. Turn it into a pocket park, a place of respite. Grass, benches, possibly combined with a plaza. Area of congregation – chess tables, bookstore or knitting place.
• Great site for a bookstore.
• Height should stay the same.
• A public plaza would be good at the N Huron Merck Realty site; there was a farmers’ market here at one time.
• Need more transitional, less expensive living.
• Residential uses close to parks is good for kids.
• Apartment housing would be a good use.
• No more used-car lots.
• Service-oriented business needed.
• Restaurants, specialty shops needed.
• Farmers market is a good idea. (2)
• Perhaps pocket parks with trees, benches, or café seating for small restaurants.
• Good uses: bakery, coffee, natural food store, toy shop.
• Discourage the obvious: car shops, chain stores/restaurants.

Additional Comments
• In-fill, in-fill, in-fill, yes, but it requires ensuring green spaces or pocket parks to meet needs of denser neighborhoods, and places for people to gather as a community.
• Overhead wires have always been an eyesore to me. Could they be incorporated into sidewalks and retain accessibility? How about set under covers along the center-line of the streets?
• I like the idea to venerate the existing old trees (sidewalks must go around them and we should remove the wires above that get in the way.
• I realize the need for gas stations, but must they be so ugly?
• It would be beautiful if the City hired local artists (like Vienna’s Friederich Hundertwasser) to transform our neighborhood.
• We love this area, especially its natural beauty (Sauvie Island, Forest Park). However, now that we have a family, we wish for so much more. From a student’s perspective, there is no where within walking distance to go out, except the Tea. Room. No decent restaurants to take parents to. No decent park within walking distance,
safe play structures, and other amenities.
Walk #2: Lombard Central

1. Community members have indicated a desire for Lombard Street to be a convenient, safe, and pleasant place to walk. What would enhance the pedestrian experience along Lombard?

- Crosswalk needed at Macrum and 1-2 blocks east.
- The City should enforce nuisance code regarding trees blocking the sidewalk.
- Bus stops need improvement, especially the shelter at Macrum.
- Nobody stops at the crosswalks for pedestrians (Cut median).
- Sidewalk width is adequate - large planting strip is desirable.
- Encourage innovative landscaping of planting strip.
- Encourage expanded sidewalk areas adjacent to cafes.
- Incorporate ‘green street’ design/ BES storm drainage credits.
- Remove chain link fence at Locati’s.
- There are too many billboards.
- More awnings needed.
- Keep sidewalks clean.
- Enforce nuisance odes –remove obstructions.
- The narrow portion of Lombard (west of Fred Meyer) has a better pedestrian feel. Small mom and pop stores contribute to the village feeling.
- Need a crosswalk at Lombard/Westana.
- Add hotdog stands.
- Pave streets with gold.

Lombard/Ida
- Orientation of McDonalds has been good for increasing pedestrian activity.
- Curb extensions would help here.
- Pedestrian crossing is tricky because of cars turning left.
- Maybe all the lights should stop at once to allow for crossing.
- Bricks would be a good pedestrian amenity for texture and color.
- The walk light and signal time should be increased.
- There are a lot of people walking here – many children.

2. Community members have voiced concern about traffic conditions along Lombard. What are your concerns?

- Speeding is a major problem. Need lights to slow down traffic.
- West arterial roadway for trucks (second deck above RR) is a good idea.
- West arterial is a bad idea. Problem is that they’ll exit on to Willamette. If it were built they it’d be pointless to do any pedestrian improvements. The instinct would be to turn your back on it. It would further split the community. There are other ways to address the truck issue.
- LRT option might reduce traffic.
- There are too many utility poles.
- Wall/ Lombard intersection could be enhanced to become a commercial node.
- Consider a roundabout on Wall.
- Street is too wide.
- Need a crosswalk at Westanna.
- Improve/change signal timing – traffic moves too fast.
- Add signals in certain places to slow/calm traffic and aid pedestrians.
- Cars don’t stop for pedestrians.
- Cars go by too fast.
- Make pedestrian-activated light at Wall change faster to walk when you press it.
3. Community members have indicated support for businesses that directly serve the surrounding neighborhoods. What types of shops/services are needed, and what types should be discouraged?

- Should have regional destinations – need to attract people.
- Natural areas may be a better attraction than shops/services – they could enhance the pedestrian/bike environment.
- Maybe have bird viewing at Smith and Bybee Lakes.
- Could have canoe rentals and bike shops.
- Need to clean up the river.
- Small shops are good uses – they add to village character – just need better maintenance – would benefit from storefront improvement program, especially in Lombard/Alma area.
- Prevalence of auto-oriented uses is not as a major concern east of the Cut.
- West of the Cut: uses okay, but too low density.
- Regional attractions are okay, to a limited extent.
- More mixed use (housing/commercial and pedestrian/ auto oriented) and higher density needed.
- Redesign Fred Meyer site to orient more to the street.
- Some auto dealers are okay, but we don’t want this to become 82nd Ave.
- Chain link fences are unsightly and should be removed. Paint and remove barbed top.
- Discourage auto-oriented uses.
- Encourage local eateries, cheap ethnic food.

4. Although Lombard is primarily commercial, residential uses exist as well. Where are the most appropriate locations for housing along Lombard?

- Actual density is closer to R7 than R5 – density is less than it was 20 years ago, but there is more housing than 10 years ago – smaller households.
- Residential near Alma is good, especially the older single-family homes. Nice to have these homes mixed in with commercial uses – shouldn’t convert to multi-family housing.
- Can keep house structures and have commercial uses inside.
- R2.5 might be appropriate at Lombard/Alma.
- Multi-family is generally appropriate between Wall and Polk - 2 to 3 stories (example at west corner of Lombard/Wall).
- Storefront commercial type buildings are good with neighborhood serving uses - can mixed throughout Lombard.
- Farther west (where street narrows) is good environment for smaller scale, neighborhood oriented retail, using existing single-family housing stock.
- Lombard from Ida to Buchanan may be a good area to add more residential; tough commercial location.
- Keep small, older, single-family residences – they add character and indicate what the neighborhood is about.
- Street setbacks: commercial should come up to sidewalk; residential at ground floor should be set back – upper floors may be okay at sidewalk.
- Provide/keep planting strips on residential streets.
- Street trees needed for both commercial and residential areas.
- 3 story residential is okay, but keep heights down (2+ story) near smaller R5 dwellings/lots.
- Part of the charm of the area is the authentic looking buildings.
- Residential areas seem to stop at Buchanan.
- Anywhere from Woolsey to Buchanan would be appropriate for housing.

5. The area from Wall Street to Ida does not have a strong pedestrian-friendly main street character. How do you use this area? What changes would you like to see?
• Everyone loves Locati’s – this would be a good area for multi-family.
• Make Wall/Lombard intersection into higher intensity node.
• Buildings should have little/no setback to frame intersection.
• Locate a bike shop near the Cut.
• Sites adjacent to the Cut could be used for more active uses – shops, live/work or possibly residential.
• Cut improvements should take advantage of the greenspace.
• I bike to Fred Meyer.

6. Vacant or underutilized sites along Lombard may have development potential. How do you envision these sites in the future?

• They will do the unexpected.
• Pull buildings up to the street on/over Fred Meter site at Ida.
• Eliminate Fred Meter blank wall on Lombard to add vitality to street.

7. Unimproved alleys are found on several blocks adjacent to Lombard. Are they functioning well? How do you envision them in the future?

8. The Peninsula Crossing Trail is part of a regional trail system, the 40-mile loop. How could it be improved to better connect nearby communities to the commercial activity of Lombard?

• The path should be continued and there should be a good place to stop.
• Add a destination at the Cut – restaurant, market, kiosks, trail maps, coffee shop, hot dog stand, etc.
• Lombard should be more bicycle friendly in general – need consistent bike lanes.
• A covered rest area would be appropriate at the Cut, with a community bulletin board. But there would be vandalism and safety issues.
• Gas lights could light the bridge over the Cut.
• Fred Meyer (Lombard/Ida) is an okay use, but should design it like 122nd and Glisan with housing above.
• New Seasons or Natures would be preferable to Fred’s, or else smaller shops.
• Fred Meyer buildings should come up to the street, with parking behind.
• Arches would be a good feature at the Cut - same design as St Johns Bridge.
• Put planter baskets on bridge.
• Refurbish the fence on the bridge over the Cut.
• This would be a great place for gateway feature.
• Put a pocket park at trailhead on the east side of the Cut.
• Screen substation with landscaping or art fence – it’s ugly. Redevelop?
• Consider Sharon Nasset concept - use Cut for new transportation link between NW Portland and Vancouver.
• Attractions at edge of trail would draw people in - add shops (juice/coffee/snacks) and kiosks.
• Connections at ends of trail (here/others) not good – people feel lost.
• Add a map/business directory board for trail users (bikes) to let people know where they are and what is nearby.
• Develop arch across Lombard and add other unifying elements above the Cut (use St. Johns Bridge and cathedral motif).
• Improve/renovate the railing over the Cut.
• Eliminate chain link and replace with better more correct (design) material.
• Add restrooms/facilities for trail users.
• Paint the bridge.
• Add a landscaped trail on the north side.

9. The railroad cut acts a boundary between neighborhoods since there are limited crossings. What are your suggestions for unifying elements/measures? What form of development do you envision for adjacent sites?
• An arch on either side would visually connect the two sides of the Cut – maybe repeat the themes from the St. Johns Bridge.
• Need another crossing over the Cut because it’s a long way north from the Lombard crossing.
• Add more landscaping to the transition areas near the Cut to tie in with green corridor.
• Add benches to the space adjacent to the Cut.
• Pedestrian-oriented retail in this location might not work – not enough density nearby, however some small retail to serve trail users might work.
• Residential near the Cut might work but a potentially noisy location.
• Commercial or live/work (residential?) would be appropriate on side streets. It should face the Cut or greenspace area rather than Lombard.

Lombard/Macrum Site
• More landscaping is needed in the area to camouflage the electrical transformer station – same with the public storage facility – needs to blend in with green surroundings.
• The greenery should be extended to the east from here.
• There’s residential nearby but it’s hidden.
• Landscaping currently goes along Macrum but it stops as it approaches Lombard – should be extended to go all the way.
• A narrow pocket park with benches would be a good use here.
• The public storage facility used to be a lumber yard. It currently serves a need for the community – should remain, but become more aesthetically pleasing.
• Housing might work to replace public storage facility, but there might be noise issues from the trains.
• The public storage facility – add landscaping in setbacks and parking areas.

10. In some areas, commercial uses along Lombard are adjacent to residential areas. Are there smooth/workable transitions between the existing businesses and residences?

• Yes, transitions are smooth.
• Provide appropriate transitions to R5 areas – heights of new development need to consider privacy of residences.
Walk #3: Downtown St. Johns

1. Some people see the James John Elementary School, St. Johns Library, YWCA, and St. Johns Community Center functioning as a civic area for St. Johns. What do you think about this idea? How could this area be improved to enhance that function?

Ideas
- Improve visibility for kids.
- Playground could be used for special events outside of school hours.
- Playground area could have nicer fence and act like a plaza. (2)
- Fence sections could be removed to allow movement in and out. Or remove fence, replace with a permeable low wall – green aspects? That can be opened to Lombard, but secure during school hours.
- Break up the large expanse of black top on the playground.
- Add more large canopy trees.
- Put a bench on the outside for elderly to watch kids play.
- Establish more street trees in the schoolyard and along Charleston.
- Establish benches along Lombard at schoolyard, especially ones that face toward the playground for interested seniors. Double sided benches?
- Put greenery in and around the elementary school playground.
- Redevelop the playground/parking lot with retail – this could be an anchor of a new pedestrian walkway.
- One easy improvement would be replacing the fence at the school with a more attractive one that could open, and allow the playground to double as a plaza, farmers market, etc.
- Build connections with special street crossings (brick, etc.) and greenways/pathways providing connections from the Library to the Tennis Center.
- Connect the Library and YWCA by using the natural thoroughfare (pedestrian and bike) that extends at each end of Kellogg from Charleston to New York.
- Use different types of materials on road. Brick paving, something that would make people slow down-accentuate buildings.
- Paving structures would integrate School and Library, slow down traffic, and make it more beautiful. (3)
- Put in raised crossings between library and Leonard Street.
- Don’t put in speed bumps - they slow down emergency vehicles.
- Slow down traffic on Central.
- Establish a stop sign near the community center to slow traffic on Central.
- Improve transit service on Lombard – bus should come more frequently.
- The alley connecting New York to Chicago should be extended to the elementary school to make a nice pedestrian way – people currently come here to drink and then leave their trash – it needs to be cleaned up and extended.
- There should be a pedestrian link from the school to the current Safeway area, to downtown.
- Need a crossing between the library and school – a visual tie.

Comments
- Community Center is farther away. Maybe two different places.
- Playground looks like a kid prison.
- Very attractive buildings.
- There is general agreement on the idea of a civic center.
- People use the library and school – need to have better access.
- I like the idea, though the Community Center is outside the area. I especially like the idea of focusing civic activities at the school/library area.
- I like the idea. I would like to see Safeway move across Richmond and free up that block for redevelopment as part of a civic center.
- I think focusing on that within the next 20 years would be a waste of resources.
- Library and YWCA are visually and physically isolated from the rest of the downtown by the schoolyard, and the Community Center is isolated by the Safeway and its parking lot.
• Great idea.
• Traffic is dangerous for kids going to and from school.
• Traffic is too fast on Central.

2. Community members have indicated strong support for existing small businesses and a desire for a more diverse mix of businesses that serve the community. What measures could provide a healthy environment for existing and new businesses?

Development Suggestions/Comments

• Mixed use is needed/desired - 2-3 story buildings with retail at the bottom and housing on top.
• There should be fewer second-hand stores; middle class is forced to buy outside the area.
• Foster niche businesses.
• Need for a new hardware and drugstore.
• Be careful not to gentrify the area as redevelopment occurs. Maintain business and residential options for people of all incomes.
• Storefront buildings but entrances area at the back with parking.
• Good development sites: Pelican, Richmond St.
• The area from Ivy Island to Charleston is opportunity for redevelopment. The Mulliken building doesn’t have entrances onto Lombard. Entrances are to the rear—it’s not easy to walk along here, mainly due to fast traffic speed and curved roadway.
• The area needs an anchor, a significant business to draw people. Storefront commercial development/zoning is good for this block. (Lombard, from Ivy Island to Charleston)
• Everyone likes the development on the Tulip Pastry block.
• Garbage cans need to have the lids sealed.
• Should attract more unique shops.
• There should be a theme – need a reason for people to come here and shop – a niche like antiques in Sellwood.
• An entertainment theme would work well – bars, theater, restaurants, etc.
• Natures would be good here.
• Saturday Market would be a good use.
• We don’t want to be overwhelmed by people from outside the area; new development should reflect that.
• More restaurants should locate here.
• The Men’s Shop brings people from all over Portland – great prices and quality products – we need more shops like that.
• Clean up storefronts.
• US Bank is a good site for a small grocery store like Trader Joe’s.
• Possibly allow additional height on bank site for tower to terminate vista from bridge.
• Area needs a bookstore like Powells – maybe it could feature a small museum that highlights the area’s history.
• More housing in Town Center-2 or 3 story minimum (4-5 story maximum) to bring people back to the downtown, and support business. I would like to see 1,000 to 1,500 units located here, within 2-6 blocks of Lombard.
• More people equals more customers! Increase density.
• More density and vehicles to bring more density to the area.
• Off of Lombard there are some very large buildings along Kellogg that should be divided into smaller retail shops that can realistically be supported. Convert the rear sides of these stores into small booths, convert the alley to a walkway and start a “Saturday Alley.”
• Incentives for new retailers.
• Older businesses are great. Some type of these needs to prevail. Keeping franchises out would be best.
• Facades would improve appearances.

Transportation Suggestions/Comments

• Make sure Lombard/Jersey traffic doesn’t divert to Central; traffic control needed.
• Put in a stop sign at Lombard/Jersey.
• Move south and make 2-way traffic north of plaza so it is adjacent to it.
• Use different paving treatment on specific sites throughout the area.
• ODOT needs to update its signs.
• Parking is really not a problem for customers in the town center. It is never a problem to find parking in downtown St. Johns. (2)
• Transit routes 16, 17, 40 converge here. (Lombard/Charleston)
• Add historic, pedestrian-scale lights.
• General consensus that people like on-street parking.
• Busses should have designated pullouts so they don’t block traffic.
• Blind corner is extremely dangerous – can’t safely cross the street. (Lombard/Charleston)
• There should be traffic calming throughout the area to make it better for pedestrians.
• Cars already avoid the town center because through traffic goes on Ivanhoe – some should be diverted onto Lombard to give support to businesses.
• Need higher density of parking – PDOT should get rid of the wide yellow lines between on-street parking spaces in the town center.
• On street parking is critical – on site parking should be at rear of buildings.
• Coming off the bridge you cannot see the Lombard retail area because of current streetscape. Alter the bridge area and Philadelphia St.
• On street parking is needed here to help slow traffic. (Lombard, from Ivy Island to Charleston)

3. Development on blocks adjacent to Lombard supports main street businesses. How should these areas develop in the future to best serve the area?

Development Suggestions/Comments
• Live-work mixed-use developments (commercial and residential), 3 stories.
• There aren’t enough people to support the commercial area. We need more residents in the area adjacent to Lombard.
• This is a good street to put housing or live/work spaces. Housing should be suited to families and allow for ownership. More housing options such as town homes or condos, a lot of people don’t want yards. (Kellogg/John)
• Housing should be an element. Can see some small-scale commercial development with housing above. (Kellogg/John)
• Make loans available for subdividing large sites so there can be 3 – 4 stores facing in different directions, where now there’s only one under-utilized parcel.
• Need to get rid of blank walls.
• Lombard is the best shopping street in Portland.
• Need density here to support businesses – more housing.
• Mixed-use development would be a good idea.
• A lot of housing is needed to support these very large retail sites.
• The loading docks on the backs of main street buildings need to be made more attractive. If they’re not actually being used any more for loading, then they can be re-designed as entryways onto side and back streets – need to be attractive and usable from all sides.
• Residential would be the best use.
• Multistory mixed-use buildings, plus non-storefront business (like the new Safeway) that would draw consumers to the people.
• Increase housing with multi-family units and apartments not really suited for commercial (except the Safeway/Rite Aid complex). (South side of Lombard)
• Develop civic center idea and increase density, keep parking. (North side of Lombard)
• Medium density housing to 45 feet would be nice. (North side of Lombard)
• There is a “dead spot” between Crouchley Plumbing, Tennis Center, Shagnasty’s, Jowers, and Bark of America that invites illegal activity. This is a hugely underutilized area.
• There should be a buffer between taller commercial/residential buildings on Lombard and the houses on streets behind.
**Transportation Suggestions/Comments**

- Street feels like a wide alley. It needs more lights.
- Make it a one way street with angle parking?
- Create a service entrance for James John school.
- Parking meters are desirable on Lombard but not on side streets.
- There’s a lot of paving.
- The existing bollards are ugly - add new ones with artistic characteristics. This design can be repeated elsewhere in the downtown to unify – as with paving treatments. (Kellogg /John)
- Add street trees. (Kellogg /John)
- There is a debate about metered parking at Kellogg /John.
- Introduce low level lighting, on street parking, without meters to encourage people to park behind Lombard. (Kellogg /John)
- Is this an area used for pick-up/drop-off for James John students? Turn the north leg of John/Kellogg into a one-way (north on John, west on Kellogg) and add angled on-street parking.
- Kellogg is a dead street.
- Parking is needed to support businesses – you can always find a space on neighborhood streets off Lombard – it should stay this way.
- Parking is already adequate – there’s plenty of it, but it’s not clear where it’s located.
- Put little islands like NW 25th to slow traffic on Ivanhoe but still allow a steady stream of traffic.
- Need better signage directing people towards parking areas.
- The area behind stores on Lombard is OK for parking – but clean it up.

4. **Large sites downtown may offer opportunities for change. How do you envision these areas in the future?**

- Big development area with much potential.
- Clean up the area.
- Stop using the back of buildings to place parking and dumpsters.
- Need for structured parking.
- Put historic, pedestrian-scale lights.
- Parking structure for town center?
- Affordable, density housing?
- Need to establish visual anchors between Safeway and Plaza.
- Seems to be an important pedestrian path behind the Racquet Center that connects Chicago to Burlington. Do people use this to get to Safeway? Appears that path is mostly on city property except site adjacent to Chicago.
- Look into establishing a more formal connection here for pedestrians and bikes.
- Restore alley.
- Open up Leonard through redevelopment of Safeway site-pedestrian path to school.
- Medium density residential would be good here.
- This block goes totally dead because of the playground in the middle – disrupts pedestrian activity.
- Put in a pedestrian expressway from the elementary school through where Crouchley Plumbing is – past the racquet center.
- Create 2 or 3 little pedestrian nodes that people will travel between.
- This is the heart of St. Johns – the fact that it’s a transit center gets overlooked – needs to be better indicated.
- Housing on Safeway site might be OK
- Redevelopment of Safeway site for new commercial/grocery makes sense.
- Assuming that at least one major grocery (Safeway?) and drugstore (Rite- Aid) are here, the larger sites that remain should be considered for “landmark” mixed-use, 4-5 story building with 70-100 housing units.
- Change Baxter Auto site to mixed-use like the Health Clinic.
- Break large buildings into smaller shops.
- Vacate Kellogg and use for parking (?); reorient Safeway/development on site and use back areas on Central differently (housing?)
Safeway Site Comments
- Safeway site should have underground parking with senior housing.
- Turn the Safeway lot into a community swimming pool.
- Safeway has too much parking.
- Safeway to rebuild with building-oriented to Lombard—could use housing on top.
- Senior housing in front of Safeway, or new store at the street (Kellogg) with parking and housing behind it. Or housing on top of store.
- Modernize Safeway—turn it into a mixed-use development.
- 12-story mixed use development of office and housing would be good for the Safeway site—appropriate scale.
- 12-stories would be too high for the Safeway site, but mixed use makes sense.
- Safeway is not well used.

Racquet Center Site Comments
- Racquet center is fine, brings people in.
- Tennis center is City-owned.
- How much is the tennis center used? Replace with outdoor courts elsewhere.
- Move racquet center. Site is prime real estate and appropriate for housing.
- If racquet center stays, open it up so people can see what is going on inside.
- Racquet center is used—but no one seemed to know how much. Many people walk to it.
- Really want an aquatic center. Generally okay with moving existing recreational activities of the racquet center to the community center.
- Housing would be appropriate on Burlington in front of the racquet center.
- Put the racquet center closer to the community center.
- People don’t use the racquet center—it’s extremely expensive and people here don’t play tennis. There are already courts in Columbia Park and Pier Park, and at other locations—they’re not needed here.
- A water park would be good here—it would become a destination.
- There’s a dead zone right next to the racquet center—people hang out and drink there.
- Put in pedestrian improvements by the racquet center, with greenery.
- The racquet center architecture is awful.
- The large block that holds the tennis center could be a major focus of PDC redevelopment. This is the critical piece of the puzzle that the PDC could use to spur other development in St. Johns.
- There is a lot of wasted space here.
- Replace parking with housing or more retail.
- Extend housing through the racquet center.
- Tennis facility is not well used.
- Put a swimming pool here.
- Tennis center may not be best use of this site—could become housing/mixed use, but might be appropriate to include some parking for the town center areas.

5. Much of the residential area north of downtown is single dwelling development on 5,000 square-foot lots. How do you envision this area in the future?
- This is a very quiet single family neighborhood, very close to downtown. Better to put high rises here than at the waterfront, but where to put park and address traffic transition?
- Single family to duplexes to townhouses or apartments.
- Need more density to support commercial area.
- Residential area is in transition—renovations in process.
- Leave the zoning pattern and allow the residential area to remain at same density. Concentrate efforts on developing housing along Lombard and fringe commercial areas.
- Suggest drawing zoning lines through block centers, instead of in the middle of streets. This way, development will be similar on both sides of the street, providing better relationship.
- Need higher density.
• Tall buildings wouldn’t be appropriate here. They should be 2 – 3 stories maximum. (New York/Kellogg)
• Having town houses fronting on to New York would be a good buffer between Lombard and single-family homes.
• This area could possibly accommodate higher density.
• Need to consider gradual transitions between commercial, higher density residential, and single dwelling residential uses.
• No change to single family zoning north of Central/John, as the area is just beginning to stabilize. Shaded areas on your map [area where Comprehensive Plan zoning differs from existing zoning] are also stabilizing, and the trend toward home ownership should be reinforced.
• Keep it the way it is now! Don’t force density into the residential community. Increase density on Lombard and maybe one block on each side.
• New developments should use impervious surfaces.
• These areas have stabilized and should be left alone; small parcels are hard to consolidate.
• Need to ensure adequate parking for residential projects.

6. St. Louis and Lombard (east of downtown) currently carry considerable truck traffic through primarily residential areas. How do you envision these streets in the future?

• S-curve - study to signalize for crossing.
• Fessenden - lots of multi-family and children.
• St. Louis is in need of grocery store and refuge from traffic.
• Busiest times for traffic are mid morning and mid afternoon on Fridays. Traffic at the intersection creates a lot of noise. (St. Louis/Lombard)
• This is part of the truck route to Rivergate and SW Washington. Left turns from St. Louis onto Lombard (heading north) are slow and difficult. Sometimes, truck drivers will go straight through the intersection, cutting through the neighborhood. Establish photo radar to determine how many/which trucks cut through the neighborhood.
• Residential uses should remain here.
• After 6pm the truck traffic dies off, so not an issue for residents.
• More businesses here would be a good use – it would make people want to live here.
• Landscaped islands would help to slow traffic.
• There should be a stop sign by Plaid Pantry so trucks and cars won’t speed around the corner.
• Free right turns are problems for pedestrians.
• Fessenden and St Louis Streets need planning attention – grocery store (Fessenden) needs to be part of plan (CN2 areas?)
• Apartments on Lombard – use conflicts with truck traffic. Consider larger setbacks from the street for buildings on truck routes.
• Need to calm truck traffic, make area safer for kids.
• Increase pedestrian safety.
• Consider signalized pedestrian scramble phases where all vehicles stop.
• The streets should be managed to provide a fixed amount of truck traffic, with an emphasis on traffic calming and pedestrian crossing at all legs of all intersections.
• The long-term solution to the truck traffic issue is to create another river crossing. The interim strategy of the City, Port and ODOT plan to make more of an S-shaped intersection here at the northwest corner, to facilitate truck movement. General feeling was that the neighborhood could not change that, but they have more control over what happens on the corners south of St. Louis. Provide pedestrian amenities, better street facing development on the south side of St. Louis

7. Ivanhoe (between St. Louis and Philadelphia) carries considerable truck traffic; land uses along this corridor include parking, housing, and services. Given that truck traffic will likely continue here, how should this area develop?
Development Suggestions/ Ideas

- Turn empty parking lots into transition areas, with open space features such as green space and small events. (Ivanhoe/Baltimore)
- Area is already a transition area between commercial and residential. (Ivanhoe/Baltimore)
- Use corner lots to create large (4-5 story mixed-use buildings). (Ivanhoe/Baltimore)
- Live/work or studios, mixed-working.
- Incubator buildings (e.g. sell flowers, studios, food, fish tackle), storefronts along Ivanhoe sidewalks.
- There is a good mix of housing and services – the area is fine as it is.
- Apartments are okay here – good buffer for the SF homes behind.
- Little businesses/services are okay here – they work better than retail would.
- The health center should have located here.
- It might make sense to encourage residential here instead of having empty office space.
- Church use might be okay.
- Mixed-income housing would be good here.
- Medium density housing would be good – rowhouses oriented on side streets instead of on Ivanhoe.
- Could be appropriate for live/work situations with light industrial/commercial at ground level.
- Improve substation – needs maintenance.
- Good place for a gas station.
- Ivanhoe should develop more intensely.
- Multi-family housing would be appropriate on the south side of Ivanhoe.
- Place utility lines underground. (Ivanhoe)
- New development should include more flowers and trees. (3)

Transportation Suggestions/ Comments

- Create a straight connection to river and in the other end to the Racquet Center in some type of recreation trail. (Ivanhoe/Baltimore)
- Truck oriented.
- Plant street trees on Ivanhoe that do not grow so massively.
- City parking would be nicer than parking lots on Baltimore and Ivanhoe.
- Good stretch for motorists to get speed. They speed to get the green light at Philadelphia.
- People avoid walking because of traffic.
- Add islands.
- Really hard to cross.
- Traffic speed is too fast on Ivanhoe, especially off-peak hours. Rarely will people park their cars on this street due to safety concerns. Hard to cross this street. We saw someone park a car partially on the landscape strip to avoid the traffic. Create landscape medians in the center, or widen existing landscaping strip to slow traffic speed. Add curb extensions.
- The trees add a lot of benefit on this street. Potentially a great walking street, but it’s very noisy.
- This parking area is in a great location, but it is in bad repair. Also, it’s not clear who can use this parking lot. This is a great resource, but it is not well used. (Parking lot at Baltimore and Ivanhoe)
- The parking lot should be re-paved and landscaped, especially at property line. It needs to be clear that the parking lot can be used by customers. Potentially, it can be a shared resource for the whole community. A great parking location for the theatre. (Parking lot at Baltimore and Ivanhoe)
- The trees make the street nice.
- Streets are nice and quiet at night.
- Pedestrian crossings are basically okay.
- Traffic calming circles should be considered but wouldn’t work with truck traffic.
- Maybe parking should be reduced along here.
- Parking in this area is important to town center businesses – parking possibly a good short term solution
- Streets should be managed to provide a fixed amount of truck traffic in anticipation of an improved connection (new bridge) in the future.
- Area won’t develop if truck traffic continues.
• Keep parking on the north side of Ivanhoe.
• If sites are built, restore on-street parking on the north (Lombard) side of Ivanhoe to provide parking and buffer traffic.

8. The Ivanhoe/Philadelphia intersection is an important gateway to downtown. What changes to vehicular and pedestrian circulation could help business vitality? What changes could improve connections to Cathedral Park and the river?

Transportation Suggestions/Comments
• Install a median in the middle of intersection. (Ivanhoe/Philadelphia)
• Install pedestrian refuges on Ivanhoe.
• Different surfaces would create a path for pedestrians.
• Make Burlington the prime and most attractive pedestrian route from plaza to bridge and Cathedral Park. Sidewalks should be wide. Make it a five point intersection: Burlington, Ivanhoe, and Philadelphia (terminus). Crosswalks should be established to slow traffic through this area.
• A traffic circle with a sign would be good.
• Pedestrian enhancement - add signage for pedestrians connecting downtown to the river and park. (2)
• In the next 20 years there won't be trucks traveling on Ivanhoe and the bridge.
• Modify the intersection to a design that optimizes the roundabout bridge-to-Ivanhoe truck traffic, and improves pedestrian access between St. Johns and the Cathedral Park area.
• Build cobblestone side/pedestrian streets adjacent to bridge (Philadelphia) to river.
• Create a traffic circle?

Development and Design Suggestions/Comments
• Create a gateway to area.
• Build a public information center.
• Enhance old City Hall.
• Plant thinner trees in green space so as to not cover City Hall from the downtown plaza. (West of Ivanhoe at Philadelphia)
• Signs shouldn’t be taller than Gateway sign.
• Preserve views in this area. (5)
• Need a visual connection between downtown and bridge. Apply height restrictions so that views of bridge and forest park are maintained from this location. Identify a landmark or building that becomes the height limit, similar to the Eiffel Tower.
• Sign height should be limited. (5)
• There should be gateway signage before you get to the intersection.
• The St. Johns identity markers – “Welcome to St. Johns”, etc. - should start on the other side of the bridge, not after you've already landed in St. Johns.
• The precinct plaza should be larger – people feel hemmed in.
• Better signage is needed to indicate business district entrance.
• Provide more permeability to downtown SJ – open view in, and frame with buildings
• Create a more significant info kiosk at entry.
• Trees block view of Precinct – limb up or thin out.
• Most don’t like Dad’s building.
• Noise level is too high.
• Trees in plaza may obscure views of downtown – cause loss of business and activity.
• Improve the connections to river on Baltimore.
• Improve it as a gateway to downtown by increasing the visibility of Lombard stores from the bridge.
• Eliminate mocendy trees on Burlington.
• Okay as it is.
9. The plaza area is at the heart of the St. Johns business district. How could it be improved to create a better downtown?

Development and Design Ideas

- Remove brick walls, redistribute benches, open up plaza with a nice, warmer design.
- Place plaza across Lombard, around the Starbucks area, and realign Lombard.
- Need to allow for views down Burlington to the river (North Prescient too).
- Plaza needs to become a real meeting place. Right now it is too concrete—not friendly and cluttered with buildings.
- Dads needs to go.
- Need signature buildings—current buildings are very memorable.
- Main street - ideal site for grocery store at US Bank building.
- Better to remove buses to perimeter.
- Build a Police Station.
- Allow taller buildings. Postcard views.
- Build a 3 to 4 story building.
- Art in square should be in tradition with older neighborhood.
- Either demolish Dad’s, move it, or shave off 15–20 feet of the building to allow clear views up and down Burlington. This axis is important since it provides prominent views of the bridge and forest park on one end, the downtown in the center, and the community center is at the northern end.
- The plaza needs a significant building to elevate it; existing buildings around the plaza are of no interest. City Hall is nearby, but views are blocked by Dads and trees.
- Most agree that moving or removing Dads is a good idea.
- The horse fountain now in Washington Park was originally located here; should be returned to St. Johns.
- Establish a low-level wall around plaza to frame it.
- Statue of James John? (2)
- Plaza needs more greenery – needs to be softened – it’s just concrete and brick.
- Close off the Burgerville alley.
- Create an esplanade going down to the river.
- The plaza is located in the right place; keep it here.
- The plaza is too small; should be expanded.
- The view corridor from the plaza of the river, bridge, precinct and west hills is obstructed – trees on Burlington get in the way – should consider removal.
- The view of the retail area is blocked by trees – if you weren’t from here, you wouldn’t know stores were here – need better visibility.
- Need more lighting.
- The seating is okay, but more is needed.
- Brick walls don’t make sense.
- Improve the plaza with a restaurant or other use that opened to plaza.
- Bigger buildings adjacent would be okay.
- Oldest surviving gas lamp is a feature that should be maintained.
- Storefronts on opposite sides of Lombard and Philadelphia should be better linked with the Plaza.
- Replace Dads with major “signature” mixed-use developments at signaled intersections
- Extend plaza view to focus on old City Hall and the bridge.
- Move the plaza away from Dads so it is not “Dads’ front porch.”
- Get rid of brick walls in place of actual seating. Orient seating towards view of hills and increase visibility.
- Get rid of all concrete pillars.
- Limb up the trees to 20 feet so people can see the business.
- Expand Plaza to Ivanhoe/Philadelphia intersection.

Development and Design Comments

- Bank has no entrance on Lombard but a parking lot instead. Once site was developed like across the street, with shops that fronted the street.
• The plaza isn’t inviting. (3)
• Poor selection of trees.
• Plaza acts as front porch for Dads.
• Benches are too close to Dads, facing it.
• People hang out in the plaza but it could be better.
• Area is home to too many bars, making the plaza unsafe at night.
• Illegal drug activity occurs at the plaza, a block away from the police precinct.
• I like the trees.
• European feel to disconnected streets.
• Most like Dad’s and its owner, but think the building and use is unattractive and not appropriate for the heart of downtown. A bar does not mirror the civic nature of the plaza.
• Dad’s blocks views to the bridge, river, and downtown.
• The clock is a wonderful feature.
• In Europe there would be a tower to terminate bridge entry.
• The plaza gets a lot of use.
• Dad’s makes people feel uncomfortable – it’s ugly.
• The alley next to Burgerville doesn’t make people feel welcome.
• The plaza feels unsafe.
• Skateboarders are rude and careless here and the police don’t do anything about it.
• The plaza needs to be more than a bus stop.
• The plaza is too “hard”.

Transportation Ideas/Comments
• Put parking off street, but nearby.
• The plaza is at a point where four different street grids meet. This a unique characteristic about St. Johns to be celebrated; street locations should remain as they are.
• One street design option would straighten the alignment of Burlington, taking out the one way Philadelphia piece, creating more of a t-intersection with Lombard. The plaza could be moved to the US Bank side.
• Another street design option leaves the street alignment, but adds more plaza area to the Dads location.
• Keep the Philadelphia segment but make it two way traffic.
• Incorporate bollard design that may appear near Ivy Island, Kellogg. Incorporate unique paving characteristics on adjacent roadway paving to tie in with Ivy Island, Kellogg.
• Traffic needs to slowed around plaza.
• Crosswalk is needed at Baltimore.
• Lights should be synchronized.
• Traffic uses Philadelphia/Lombard to get to Rivergate – should use Ivanhoe to Lombard.
• A two-way Philadelphia might make sense.
• Street grid doesn’t match up so it is more interesting, makes people slow down.
• Cut through traffic is a problem.

10. Ivanhoe east of the bridge is less impacted by truck traffic, but is still a busy street. There is a mix of auto- and pedestrian-oriented developments along it. How do you envision this street in the future?

Transportation Suggestions/Comments
• New crosswalks needed.
• Put a stop light at Richmond and special paving crossings for visibility/guidance.
• It’s usually not hazardous to cross the street as a pedestrian, but maybe signals should be added.
• Community likes traffic to move quickly through here – might not be a good idea to slow it down for pedestrians.
• Because Ivanhoe is an emergency vehicle route, it shouldn’t be slowed down too much.
• Activated pedestrian lights could help.
• No right turn without a light at Richmond. Make turning radius more intense.
Pedestrian crossing at John is needed.
Ivanhoe is seen as the service street to Lombard; appropriate to provide larger scale uses and parking.
Ivanhoe and Richmond needs a 4-way stop.
Need to increase through-traffic to get national tenants along Ivanhoe.
Ivanhoe should be a designated transit street so that setbacks are reduced.
If elementary school moved to the Safeway area, there might be a safety issue because students would have to cross the heavy Ivanhoe traffic.
No free right turns on Richmond/Ivanhoe and Willamette/Richmond
Need 4-way stop on Richmond.
Would traffic circle work?
Need better signage to bridge.
Re-establish street grid through Pan Pacific property.
Punch Charleston and Syracuse through Pan Pacific site as multi-mode or at least pedestrian streets.
Need to handle parking on Pan Pacific site – courtyard or tuck under.
Provide pedestrian connections (signalize?) across Ivanhoe – possibly at John Street.
First step would be to remove ODOT and City signage that refers to “Highway 30 Bypass”.
Ivanhoe is currently difficult to cross but its is also an important thoroughfare for traffic. Traffic islands would slow it down for pedestrians but keep it useful for cars.
Dangerous crossings for kids. Safety is main issue.
Corner at Richmond is very confusing for motorists and dangerous for pedestrians.
Trucks avoid light at Lombard/Richmond by going through east of Richmond.
When Ivanhoe gets too stopped up at rush hour, people use Willamette instead.

Development Suggestions/Comments
This would be a great place to live – housing should go in along here.
Rite-Aid/Blockbuster site should have been developed with a more pedestrian-friendly design.
It should become mixed use – housing with retail below – but would be hard to finance. (Ivanhoe/John)
Redevelop Rite-Aid/Blockbuster site, placing parking in the back (Syracuse) and building to the sidewalk. 2-3 story housing above it.
Put parking behind new mixed-use, multi-story buildings.
3-4 stories, well designed, with a step-down to back would be appropriate.
We want a reasonable grocery store.
Need to increase density to get national tenants along Ivanhoe.
Safeway would be good here, but 2 previous supermarkets haven’t been successful here – need more density.
Grocery store site should be developed with mixed-use, but it should be 4 stories or less because if it’s too tall the view would be blocked.
Maybe the school should be moved to the vacant Safeway area and then the existing school could have residential uses.
Need grocery store.
Height (Pan Pacific): 4-story is OK – transition at edges.
Need to start building 3-4 story “signature” mixed-use developments at signalized intersections.
Develop Safeway site. Encourage Safeway to relocate to Ivanhoe to free up present site for a civic center.
Encourage housing density on the North side of Ivanhoe.
Commercial site here stays vacant because the customer base is too small – the lease income won’t support tenant improvements.
Ivanhoe is to NW 25th Ave. as Lombard is to 23rd.
Design is big issue for Pan Pacific site.

11. Ivy Island, at the eastern entrance to St. Johns, directs westbound Lombard traffic onto Ivanhoe and into downtown St. Johns. How could the area be changed to improve viability of the commercial core while maintaining a pedestrian friendly character?
Ideas

- Create right turn, slow down.
- Consider a 4-way stop.
- Need sign to approach bridge.
- Could we envision public art in the island?
- If island stays, plant roses and install seating.
- Create a gateway into St. Johns business community.
- Install stop sign before Ivy Island. Create new/different roadway paving patterns, colors, or materials. These techniques can be used similarly at other locations, such as near St. Johns plaza, to unify the district, indicate special locations.
- Establish curb extensions on side streets, to slow vehicles turning from Lombard.
- Remove 30 Bypass sign – it no longer applies.
- Work with ODOT to re-design.
- Straighten out intersection; make are a four-way intersection again by moving Ivy Island to south to connect with sidewalk on Lombard. Ensure that traffic doesn’t use Jersey as a cut through.
- Flatten it, plant roses, create a plaza!
- Should have a 4-way stop at Ivanhoe/Richmond.
- Straighten out the curve so it’s not blind coming around the corner.
- Put matching arches on either side of the island.
- Shrink the island to create straighter access into the town center – make it more like a T.
- Keep the island as is – it works okay – basically functional.
- Traffic should stay diverted from the town center.
- Keep the view clear across the island – don’t re-plant with shrubs or anything that would block the view.
- The utility wires here should be made less visible.
- Landscaping is okay as is, but should consider ivy removal – another groundcover would be preferable.
- Don’t change it - island is visually good – marks entry.
- Traffic needs to move through the town center.
- Make island a peninsula – attach to mocha property on Lombard
- Make motorists turn right onto Lombard rather than veer off – redesign island/peninsula
- New signage indicating location/route to bridge and downtown St. Johns.
- Create a 4-way stop or signal to slow down traffic entering the town center at Richmond/Ivanhoe, Charleston/Lombard.
- Charleston/Lombard is an extremely dangerous intersection to try and cross Lombard. Any solution must alter the angle of approach for cars moving west on Lombard.
- Improve visibility.

Comments

- Hard to turn.
- Not pedestrian friendly.
- Island is usually pleasing.
- Least safe intersection - almost impossible.
- Disagreement over the need for easy auto access on Lombard.
- Curve invites speeding.
- Not visually pleasing - need to make it more attractive a place.
- There’s no formal travel route so people walk through ivy and leave garbage.
- Traffic is too fast around Ivy Island and the curve of Lombard prior to Charleston; traffic from the east is diverted from downtown at this point.
- Difficult to cross Ivy Island – it's a refuge from traffic but hard to get across.
- Ivy is ugly.
- Ivanhoe/Richmond is a blind, unsafe corner.
- Traffic on Lombard “deadly” for pedestrians (blind curve for vehicles with school zone)
- Free right turns on Ivanhoe are a problem – changes may cause problems further up.
- Lombard is used as a cut through to Rivergate (2) – island design facilitates cut through.
• I like the gateway, though the signage is a bit dated!
• Ivy Island improvements are a low priority.

Additional Comments
• Nobody will or should be expected to, invest in Lombard west until the issue of public drinking is addressed.
• No one has discussed more bike routes to and within the peninsula. Young professionals have told me that this would attract them to St. Johns.
• Baxter Auto should become a mixed-use development – 3 stories max. It should be brought up to the street.
• The style of the health center is good.
• Alleys should be enhanced for pedestrian connections.
• West Arterial! Build the proposed by-pass over the cut.
• The Sharon Nasset idea about reducing traffic makes sense.
Walk #4: Cathedral Park/Riverfront

1. Community members have expressed a desire for changes to underutilized industrial/employment land near the river. What uses and development do you envision in this area, both short- and long-term?

Residential Ideas/Comments

- Multi-family housing would work well.
- Senior housing should go here.
- Residential uses would make sense because of proximity to the river – pretty setting that should become prime real estate.
- There should be disincentives for industrial uses because this is prime residential land and residential uses would decrease truck traffic compared to industrial.
- Redevelop for housing and mixed use but provide a public greenspace along river – at least 200 feet from waterline, at Lampros and other sites.

Mixed-Use Ideas/Comments

- Mixed-use development would be appropriate.
- Some like the industrial nature of the area and would like to see some parts of it retain while allowing new, higher density residential development (RH okay).
- Develop mixed use with light manufacturing, artist loft space, small amounts of retail, and work/live space below residential.
- Housing/PCC/park-open space = good uses.
- I would like to see small shops, coffee shop, restaurants, housing.
- I prefer residential and office/commercial, but not dominated by retail locations.
- The uses I envision for the area are primarily moderate and high density residential with neighborhood commercial uses such as a market, restaurants, park/river related small businesses (such as boat/bike rentals/sales) and small mixed-use (live/work) developments. I do not recommend any large commercial destination development such as amusement park, retail center or office complex because of transportation issues. High density residential within walking distance of Downtown St. Johns, Cathedral Park, and hopefully a natural area park at Willamette Cove and an active use park at the McCormick and Baxter site with ball fields for organized sports seems a perfect match.

Industrial/Employment Ideas/Comments

- There’s a problem with sewage disposal so residential isn’t possible - industrial uses make sense here.
- Some industrial uses should be maintained, particularly if they provide jobs.
- Attract campus/headquarters for a company like Columbia – to create jobs.
- Industrial uses should have to go through design review.
- Need to attract employment, but jobs don’t have to be from industrial uses – offices or company headquarters would be preferable.
- Heavy industrial doesn’t make sense - the infrastructure that would be needed to allow for thriving industry wouldn’t be worth putting in.
- PCC should have a campus here.
- A custom boat factory would be a good use.
- The new Moonstruck Chocolate Factory (Crawford/Baltimore) is a great use and provides employment.
- Metal working district around Lampros area.
- Industrial zoning really impacts public use of the river. Existing industrial uses are not river dependent.
- The industrial uses near water lab and along river SE of lab are marginal.
- Bring in more jobs, more jobs.
Other Ideas/Comments

- There should be more trees, and fewer fences or more decorative fences.
- There should be a greenway all along the river, but other uses could locate farther back.
- Businesses have left behind vacant, unsightly buildings near the riverfront.
- Lampros breaks up the greenspace. It has too much underused/unused property.
- Set the existing fence back to allow continuation of the greenway trail. Storage area should be surrounding by landscaping buffer. This area could support restaurant with view of river!
- Riverfront uses should be open space/recreational.
- View from railroad tracks is stunning.
- Tracks are used only for freight.
- Don’t want to lose tracks. Could provide trail connections to other pedestrian paths – Smith and Bybee Lakes?
- Could the tracks be used for light rail? If not, what about a trolley, similar to the one in Lake Oswego?
- Difficult to get to the river from neighborhoods.
- Provide historic continuity by allowing some industry.
- Put in a green bar along river… trolley to connect, bike path along terminal at the Port Authority into? Marina area could be like downtown floating Newport.
- Ideas - island with a moat, accessible by boat, and bridges; businesses in the middle, a park, and a place for summer and winter festivals.

MarCom Site Comments

- Proposed mixed-use multi-family housing development would be a good idea.
- There is great enthusiasm for redevelopment.
- This property is locked in between Port property and boat ramp.
- The owner is willing to sell; a working boat yard is not compatible with major redevelopment.
- Port has authority to condemn property for car terminal expansion and thus prevent redevelopment.
- Marina, hundreds of residential units, live-work; workshops – proposal makes sense.
- Redevelopment here; relocation of boat ramp; and changes or elimination of Lamphros site would create a walkable greenway all the way to Willamette cove.
- There is lots of interest and ideas for reuse/redevelopment of 15 acre site - could include housing, some commercial, marina.
- Too much commercial here may affect viability of downtown St Johns commercial district – need to balance.
- This could be a site for major employer/reuse – Adobe software in Seattle Fremont District example.
- Need to address traffic impacts of redevelopment.
- This property is a perfect end to the park, with restrooms, a day use marina, small business, and housing.
- This property, on the Northwest side of Cathedral Park, is ideally situated for a high density residential (condominium) development with park/river related commercial uses on the ground level and a marina on the river, which would fit into the general vision. Such a development would provide an effective buffer between Cathedral Park and the Port of Portland industrial land adjacent to the Mar Com Property.
- A high density residential/commercial/marina mixed-use development could prove to be a catalyst for the whole area to develop.
- The target market for high density residential housing for this property in the Cathedral Park area would be young professionals that commute downtown across the St. Johns Bridge, and active empty nesters that have the discretionary income to spend and time to enjoy what Cathedral Park and the St. Johns town center have to offer.

2. This area, within walking distance of shops, service and transit in downtown St. Johns, is currently planned for multi-family residential use (apartments, condos, rowhouses, etc.) How can new residential or mixed-use development best be integrated into the area?
Ideas

- Put higher density near river, taper back up the hill towards rowhouse type density.
- RH zoning would be too intense for the neighborhood; the nature of the neighborhood is still single-family homes.
- Change zoning to less intense zoning. Place intense development along Baltimore commercial areas.
- Look at pockets for zoning - find strategic sites and opportunities in the plan area.
- This type of multifamily use should be extended all the way down to the river, maybe at higher densities – Good design – reminds me of the Bay Area. (Burlington/Willamette)
- Mixed-use development probably wouldn’t make sense in the Burlington/Willamette vicinity and down towards the river.
- Make sure apartment buildings don’t block views.
- Rowhouses are appropriate because they blend with the neighborhood. (6)
- Most prefer R1 type development, either townhouses or 2 to 3 story apartment/condominium buildings.
- Some think the area planned for RH is okay; many disagree. Most feel 75 feet is too tall for the neighborhood.
- Depending on the location, some of the unimproved rights-of-way do not need to be improved to city standards. Some (perpendicular to the river) could be improved with just pedestrian/bicycle access (north/south). Or construct stairs, similar to the west hills.
- Rowhouses are a good scale; some apartments work well too when scale is considered (Crawford/Baltimore).
- Don’t block views – be sensitive to design.
- Make sure that residential buildings (multifamily) have adequate parking – on street parking is limited.
- More owner occupancy needed.
- No high rises (5 or more stories).
- Limit height.
- Good architecture/design is needed.
- Mixed rate housing would be appropriate.
- Be selective with zoning.
- Development should be low impact (low height, built-in parking).
- Use common sense about density and parking, for safety of the elderly and children.
- Change the zoning of the existing industrial properties to promote redevelopment into moderate and high density residential - over time this will reduce and eliminate conflicting uses.
- View corridors featuring the St. Johns Bridge should be optimized and building heights within the view corridor should take into consideration the slope of the hillside.

Comments

- In the last 20 years of zoning for development, only two buildings have been built.
- Good examples of multi-family housing: 8314 Edison, Princeton/Leavitt, Burlington/Willamette, 8649 Willamette.
- Bad example of multi-family housing – 8320 Edison.
- This design is blah - Willamette/Charleston, to the west.
- The staggered style is attractive, but overall the design could be improved - 8610 Willamette.
- Good example of townhouse design – nice alley access and porches - 8640 Willamette.
- The Schrunk Tower is ugly and too tall – looks out of place. It would be better over on Lombard.
- Traffic is an issue – 3 car families moving in to 2-bedroom apartments.
- High-rise housing is a negative when it blocks sun, blocks views of river, causes additional parking congestion and gated communities.
- There are poor sidewalk conditions, especially around industrial areas.
- A lot of street rights-of-way are unimproved or not improved to city standards with curb and sidewalks.
- The most important vehicular routes are the east-west streets.
- The rowhouses at Willamette and Philadelphia are preferable to the rowhouses at Burlington. Garage location, materials, and design of street facing façade play important role.
• Parking on street is problem with narrow streets.
• This part of Cathedral Park is not part of town center (doesn’t seem connected or as close to St. Johns as it is).
• The fact that it is in walking distance does not necessarily make it accessible.

Baltimore/Edison Comments
• Okay to have multi-family here, but not at 75 feet.
• Rowhouses are a much better fit than high rises (5 stories plus).
• Existing streets are too narrow for fire trucks.
• Proposed high rises are too monolithic.
• Avoid gated communities.
• This looks like an ugly motel, but the density is okay.
• Consider solar exposure.
• Consider preventing monolithic building forms.
• 3 to 4 stories is okay but 7 is too tall.
• On Baltimore, just west of Edison, are three craftsman houses (1900s) that have historic relevance. They were cottages for workers/foreman for either factory or mill; evidence of St. Johns blue collar history.

3. In some locations, commercial uses along Ivanhoe are adjacent to residential areas. Are there smooth/workable transitions between businesses and homes? How could transitions be improved?

• Multi-family, with some mixed use along west edge, would improve transition. Can be tall.
• Rowhouses provide a good transition.
• Build places with studios and shops.
• Town houses might be okay along Princeton, W of Charleston – just not too tall.
• Height is a big issue – need to avoid tall blank walls.
• Don’t remove buffer between commercial and residential zones.
• Commercial/residential transition not a big problem, but commercial uses need to maintain sites and buildings (litter, landscape, repairs, etc.)
• No, there are not smooth/workable transitions.
• Use low height rowhouses for transition.
• Maintenance must be good to blend.
• Schrunk Tower is an eyesore, but otherwise not a nuisance - appropriate as transition.
• Such transitions are always difficult for adjacent residential properties. Design requirements should lessen impact of large blank walls. Where feasible, introduction of small service and office spaces or live/work mixed-use developments along the back of large commercial buildings could provide a buffer.
• Retail is impractical along west edge of Ivanhoe - too many truck traffic conflicts.
• Rarely will people park on Princeton – there’s no need. Traffic speeding is an issue.
• Truck traffic makes Ivanhoe difficult to cross as a pedestrian.
• Add signaling, tunnel, or bridge.

Charleston/Princeton (Rite Aid Site) Comments
• A development proposal has been reviewed for this site – land use review has been approved that will allow for a blank wall here – not good.
• Most don’t the like solid wall that fronts on Princeton. But it’s good that the wall is set back and there is a mature landscape buffer between the street and the wall. It helps reduce noise levels.
• Landscaping requirement needed.
• This commercial area is completely disengaged from the pedestrian.
• Landscaping is pleasant but redevelopment could bring loading docks directly across street from houses.
• Could traffic calming measures be employed on Princeton? Addition of small stores could slow traffic down – people would use on-street parking.
• Some would like to see the commercial site of Rite Aid with better grocery store – such as Trader Joe’s. The east part of the property could be used for small-scale mixed use – coffee shop on ground floor with 2 to 3 stories of residential above. This development could be oriented to Princeton.

4. Community members have expressed a desire for better access to the Willamette River. What are your suggestions for enhancing vehicle, pedestrian, and bicycle connections?

Ideas
• Clear the blackberries on John Street to create a path – there would be lots of pedestrian ways to the river if you cleared them out.
• John Street has an unimproved section that would be a good route for pedestrians.
• Leavitt is a good auto route to the river. This street should be paved.
• Everyone likes the old white oak tree on Leavitt between Princeton and Willamette. Is it in the right-of-way? Could design of paved street celebrate it in some way (curve street around tree, employ different paving materials, patterns, put in a bench, plaque)?
• Establish a turnaround at Willamette, to avoid cut through traffic.
• Connect Cathedral Park to Eastbank Esplanade.
• Create a bike path along the river from St. Johns to downtown Portland. (3)
• Remove trucks from Baltimore and Burlington, etc. Bring trucks via Terminal 4.
• Blend downtown to Cathedral Park with the area under the bridge. Need better control of bridge. Maybe commercial blends better.
• Create a straight shot from the new town center plaza, by the police station, lights in the intersection, make straight shot to the park and river.
• Vehicle connections are admittedly a problem for the Cathedral Park area. N. Richmond Ave., N. Burlington Ave. and N. Baltimore Ave. should be improved and St. Louis St. be extended to N. Bradford St. (currently dead ends between N. Edison and N. Decatur St.) to adequately handle forecasted traffic volumes. Together, these would provide good access into the Cathedral Park area. Cross circulation is hampered by Cathedral Park itself. I propose that N. Bradford St. be improved between N. St. Louis Ave. and N. Burlington Ave. and N. Crawford St. be improved between N. Burlington Ave. and N. Richmond Ave. Improving the road infrastructure is critical to attracting the high density residential development envisioned above. I don’t know what the best way to finance these road improvements should be, City funded, local improvement district, late comer fee or ??.. However, these road improvements need to be made first and not as disconnected half street improvements as new developments occur.

Comments
• Once past Willamette, you are home free.
• This would be great access.
• Currently there is a guard rail installed at the end of paving on John Street.
• Unsure whether Leavitt should go through to river.
• Burlington/Willamette is a very bad intersection - too wide, too much paving.
• Best connections to the river are on Baltimore and Burlington.
• This is an example of an issue that this process elevates to higher prominence than it deserves, since the real problems that need to be solved are elsewhere.
• The City of Portland has an ambitious plan of bike paths and trails that feature the 40 mile loop trail and the Willamette Greenway Trail. These two major pedestrian/bike paths are to become linked together via the Peninsula Crossing Trail that also runs near the Bybee/Smith Lake Wildlife Area (a protected natural area which at 2,000 acres is the largest protected wetland within an American City). Portland’s Willamette River Atlas shows Cathedral Park area as the north start/end point for the
conceptual N. Portland Trail, which extends along the Willamette River through Willamette Cove, by the University of Portland, around the Swan Island Lagoon and connecting with McCarthy Park and other planned bike path extensions. The Cathedral Park area could become a destination/start area for bicycling and hiking along the Willamette River, the Columbia River and around the Bybee/Smith Lake protected nature area.

5. The St. Johns Bridge is a defining landmark of the Peninsula. What are your ideas for improvements to better integrate it and connect it with the surrounding areas?

- Improve the amphitheater - maybe cover it without blocking views. Add terrace seating (like Pioneer Square).
- Create a pedestrian ramp from the bridge to near Edison.
- Instead of trying to improve pedestrian facilities on the St. Johns Bridge, try to build a bike/pedestrian connection over the railroad bridge.
- There should be protected views from St. Johns.
- Improve access to Forest Park – it currently does not attract many people to it.
- Encourage banners, flower baskets along the route from downtown along Philadelphia to Cathedral Park.
- Possibly phase out housing adjacent to bridge – open up the space.
- Improve the pedestrian connections off the bridge – make sure there are sidewalks.
- The access to the bridge and Cathedral Park is not well marked – add good, clear connections.
- How about a tram across the river?
- Maybe commercial blends better.
- Create a straight shot from the downtown. Make the existing plaza 15-20 feet to the left so we can have a two-way street by the bank and Dads.
- Truck traffic on the Bridge should be limited to local traffic only and not a through way for I-5 traffic to Highway 30. Truck traffic on the Bridge should be limited to the extent possible to the weight limits the bridge was designed to carry. N. Lombard St. should not be a Highway 30 alternate route for trucks except during an emergency (traffic stoppage on main routes). Truck traffic should be routed around the St. Johns Towncenter/N. Lombard St. mainstreet and not through it.
- The St. Johns Bridge should have a safe bike/hike path. I would like the bridge to be attractively lighted at night. This would serve to visually connect the St. Johns area with the Northwest Portland Area and Downtown Portland at night. A lighted bridge would also provide a visual focal point for the St. Johns/Cathedral Park area at night.
- St. Johns is not appealing to walk or bike – would be unpleasant even with added bike lanes, due to trucks, mainly.
- The view corridor is from the bridge looking out.
- Maintenance may be a more pressing issue for the bridge.
- North side of Philadelphia, adjacent to the bridge, is widely used by Cathedral Park residents.
- This is an issue that is elevated to higher prominence than it deserves.

Under the Bridge Ideas/Comments

- Emphasize the cathedral view under bridge that gives the park its name.
- Create a pedestrian way with seats near pillars – landscaped promenade.
- Keep some parking here because it’s needed for Cathedral Park visitors.
- Maybe a pedestrian-friendly use wouldn’t make sense here because there’s too much noise from the bridge to make for a nice place to sit and relax – why would you stay here when you can just take a few more steps and you’re in the park?
- A little museum about the bridge and St. Johns history would fit well here.
- This would be a great route to the park and the river.
- Reconfigure the parking and sidewalks (see drawing by Brian).
- It’s a great space to see the arches, but noisy and dirty.
- Consider establishing a plaza and farmers market.
- Traffic noise on bridge might make some uses under the bridge impractical.
Make a well-marked and attractive pedestrian/bicycle route to the river.
Area under bridge is not a problem.
Okay to use this area for parking.
Hold a Saturday Market here.
Maybe extend the parkway under the bridge to connect bridge head and Cathedral Park.

6. Community members have requested better pedestrian and bicycle connections in the area. What improvements are needed/desired?

- Connect Pittsburg to Burlington (pedestrian connection).
- Create a commuter train link to downtown using existing tracks, with a station at the park. Have Tri-Met work with industrial employers (Rivergate, Swan Island).
- Put in a little landscaped island and maybe a “Welcome to Cathedral Park” sign at Burlington/Willamette – need better directions to the park and river.
- Need to extend the sidewalk along Baltimore to encourage pedestrian activity between the park and downtown St. Johns.
- Make better connections between the plaza and the park – should be easily walkable.
- Allow pedestrian access by the police precinct (Philadelphia/Syracuse) – it’s very hard to cross the street here – basically impossible.
- A bike route along RR track (Bradford) would be nice, but need to keep the rail functional too.
- There should be a bike/pedestrian connection along the river all the way to the Steel Bridge and downtown.
- Most strongly support the idea of a bike route within the Bradford right-of-way.
- Create bicycle and pedestrian paths along river, connections to existing trails up and down river.
- Tracks could be used for trolley between St. Johns and University Park.
- Add bike and pedestrian amenities/facilities to make it a useful trail.
- Better crossings are needed on St. Louis, Ivanhoe
- Traffic calming is needed on St. Louis, Ivanhoe
- Create a bike path to Steel bridge.
- Complete greenbelt along the Willamette.
- A well-lighted dedicated bike/hike path from Cathedral Park to the St. Johns town center should be constructed. Because of the rather steep slope a method of assisting bikers/hikers to the top of the hill, especially during peak usage times in the summer would increase biker/hiker interaction between Cathedral Park and the town center. One option is for electric powered tour cars for passengers pulling a special trailer for their bikes.
- Tour cars could run along the greenway between Cathedral Park/Willamette Cove/McCormick & Baxter (Park) increasing usage among families with young children, elderly and disabled. The concept could be expanded to connect with the Peninsula Crossing Trail to increase public enjoyment of Smith and Bybee Lakes Wildlife Area.
- Bicycle and pedestrian connections generally are good.
- Maintenance is the main issue, not design.
- Railroad tracks see little use.
- There’s too much asphalt at Burlington/Willamette.
- Coming up Baltimore, there’s no visibility on Edison.
- Trains still run along the tracks in Bradford - primarily cars from the Port’s car import facility, sometimes metal scrap. (Bradford Street in the vicinity and north of Cathedral Park.)
- Who currently uses the tracks? Still a viable industrial spur.

7. Cathedral Park has become a year-round destination, attracting residents from all over Portland. What changes do you envision here in the future?

Park/Waterfront Ideas and Comments
- The park is a great place, I love the new marsh area.
• More summer events are needed - both regional as well as local.
• Park is isolated at night - not safe. Safety also an issue in the morning.
• Maybe add public phones.
• The park gets muddy in the winter.
• The cathedral view that gives the park its name should be highlighted somehow.
• There should be a St. Johns logo or some kind of decoration in the park under the bridge along the RR tracks - paint, etc. - maybe a heron motif - on the shield symbol in the park that’s carved on the bridge pillars.
• The park is fine as is – it shouldn’t be changed.
• A covered amphitheater would be good here – make St. Johns a theatrical hub – Shakespeare in the park, etc. There could be historic plays about the bridge and area.
• Canoe rentals and bike rentals would be good.
• Safety isn’t a big concern here. (3)
• Make a boardwalk like at Riverplace, with benches and lighting.
• Build a gazebo.
• The fishing pier could be expanded into an esplanade with lighting and benches.
• People swim and fish here – water should be cleaned up.
• The park is dark at night and there’s little activity – safety concern. (3)
• Most enjoy the park the way it is.
• Need to improve the Lewis and Clark memorial. The landscaping is too tall and shields activities – it’s been subject to vandalism. Limb up trees, take out the landscape berm.
• The park is not widely used beyond local population - fairly quiet and peaceful.
• Establish educational signs around the park – focus on wildlife.
• Build new pier extending out over the river.
• Park area is quiet, especially after dark – there is currently no reason to go there (no housing, commercial, etc).
• Move Cathedral Park boat ramps to the cove.
• Put boat ramp by McCormack/Baxter - remove from Cathedral Park.
• Add play equipment and other park amenities at Metro-owned sites.
• Having a regional draw is good – should be encouraged.
• There used to be a Chinook Indian village down by the river – this theme could be featured in the park.

Nearby Use Ideas and Comments
• Add housing near the park – on former industrial sites – puts more eyes on the park and could increase positive activity.
• Add shops/commercial in strategic locations near Cathedral Park.
• Don’t make this another Johns Landing – keep public greenspace and access to river. The existing openness is desirable - avoid narrow constricted space. (3)
• Keep the park open and encourage shops to locate nearby.
• Nearby industrial/employment uses should be phased out.
• Nearby warehouses should change use – possible housing or mixed use.
• Locating retail near river may be inappropriate because of conflicts with St. Johns revitalization efforts. Commercial activity near the park may compete with businesses in the town center. (3)
• Attracting more people to Cathedral Park is not a goal. It might be a by-product of this process, but it is not a goal.
• Mixed-use developments/residential developments adjacent to park would be appropriate as long as park land not incorporated into projects.
• There are probably at least 100 acres in the park, of which 50 acres could be developed at moderate (20 units per acre) to high density (40 units per acre) residential housing. Assuming an average of 30 units per acre, there could be 1500+ new units in the Cathedral Park area. With an average household size of 2 people, 3000 new residents could move into the area. Every $1,000 in discretionary income per new resident that is spent in the St. Johns town center would equate to $3,000,000 in economic stimulus to the area. This is the kind of stimulus that could attract new businesses to locate in the St. Johns town center.
• Address parking - there is limited parking for boaters and this is a growing user group.

Access/Connection Ideas and Comments
• Pedestrian access is generally not an issue, except coming directly from the town center (crossing Ivanhoe).
• Make Baltimore the main pedestrian route.
• Need to be able to easily go up to the town center from the park.
• When people come here for festivals, they just go straight to the park and then leave – they need a reason to go up to St. Johns.
• Need better pedestrian /bike access – not just car.
• Maybe parking should only be located in the town center, so that people would have to park there and would see the shops before coming down in to the park.
• There is a pretty beach in front of the Water Lab, by the fishing pier, but you can’t get to it – need to create access.
• Should put in an asphalt path.
• Need a state-funded greenway along river.
• The current walkway by the Water Lab is used a lot – people would really benefit from having it extended.
• There should be a bike path/walkway all along the river – it should go all the way into downtown.
• Important to provide for ped, bike and auto access modes.
• Need better more direct access – hard to find park and get here.
• Extend the Park/greenspace to downtown St Johns as a visual/physical connection to river.
• Keep public access to the river.
• Better signage is needed to tell people how to get to park.
• Need better beach access south of fishing dock.
• Create a bike path to Steel bridge and trolley to MAX line.
• Ensure good access to the park. Consider the island concept like they have in San Antonio, TX - island water and bridge area.
• Connect riverfront greenspace all the way to Willamette cove, even if it restricts/eliminates Lamphros Steel. (4)
• Need to improve streets other than Burlington to connect Cathedral Park to the St. Johns town center – maybe Baltimore?
• A Street Car line utilizing the existing railroad tracks could run from St. Johns (Pier Park or short extension up St. Louis right-of-way to the town center) along the river though Willamette Cove, McCormick & Baxter (future park ?), University of Portland, Swan Island, Albina Yard and connect with the Interstate Light Rail line.

Additional Comments
• The Johns Community Gardens is a great use here on Edison.
• When you think of St. Johns, you don’t think of the waterfront.
• Unimproved roads (John, Leavitt) could become nice little pockets of nature. Put in landscaping to encourage bird habitat, etc. These shouldn’t be paved or made into through-streets.
• Don’t forget to put trolley, and no tracks on bridge on your yellow sheet.
• Most of St. Johns residents have a fairly short list of desired neighborhood enhancements, I assert. An enhanced greenbelt, better control of density, and better grocery stores downtown retail are among these. I am concerned that this process might be used to distract the discussion from these issues. Other priorities include truck traffic and other road design issues.
• For the St. Johns town center to thrive an influx of new residents within close proximity (preferably within walking distance) is needed. This will attract new businesses to the town center. Together, a relatively few new residents/businesses can provide a catalyst to revitalize the whole area. Convenience is the key. If people have to get into a car and travel more than a couple minutes then convenience is no longer key and price/selection become paramount. People are then willing to travel out of the area for shopping and services.
The Cathedral Park area has the potential with its splendid views of the St. Johns Bridge, Willamette River and Forest Park to attract an affluent core that can support nice restaurants, specialty shops and personal services. Once an affluent residential core/new business trend becomes established there can be a surge of additional new residents and more new businesses. I foresee St. Johns as one of the most dynamic and vibrant areas in the City of Portland.
For more information about the St. Johns/Lombard Plan, please contact:

City of Portland Bureau of Planning
1900 SW 4th Avenue, Suite 4100
Portland, Oregon 97201
Phone: 503-823-7700
FAX: 503-823-7800
TDD: 503-823-6868

Email: stjohnslombard@ci.portland.or.us

Please visit our web site: www.planning.ci.portland.or.us

Si necesita informacion en español, por favor llame a Mauricio Leclerc 503-823-0805
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Introduction: Outreach Efforts to Hmong and Latino Communities

In order to understand the planning issues important to the community, outreach is a significant part of the St. Johns/Lombard planning process. An outreach strategy of the plan is to establish relationships with a wide range of groups. That strategy is particularly meaningful for North Portland, the city’s most racially and ethnically diverse community.

The Latino and Hmong communities were initially contacted for outreach since they represent two of the area’s most populous ethnic groups. This report details the process and the outcomes of outreach to these two groups. Other outreach efforts of the plan are ongoing, including those with the community at-large, the African-American community, seniors, students, and neighborhood and business groups.

For this outreach effort, the Bureau of Planning and the Office of Transportation worked with community organizations — the North Portland Neighborhood Office, St. Johns in the 21st Century, Frente Comun, the Hmong-American Unity of Oregon, and the Latino Network. These partnerships allowed residents to participate and express their ideas and concerns in their native language and in a more familiar setting. In addition, the partnerships were vital in tailoring the forums to meet specific needs, overcoming language and cultural barriers, reaching out to residents not familiar with the city’s traditional outreach methods, helping build trust, and strengthening the organizations’ role as a broker for their community.

Several focus group forums were conducted with the Latino and Hmong communities in August and September 2002. The forums represented the first effort in the process to establish relationships with the Hmong and Latino communities, and provided an opportunity for these communities to share their aspirations and perspectives on planning issues. For most participants, this effort was an introduction to the St. Johns/Lombard Plan, as well as to city planning and civic participation in general.

In addition to the efforts of the agencies and organizations cited above, the forums were made possible through funding from a Project Interwoven Tapestry grant.
St. Johns/Lombard Plan Background

The St. Johns/Lombard Plan will be a guide to implement the community’s vision over the next twenty years. Essentially a framework for community growth and development, the plan will address many facets of livability such as land use, transportation, housing and recreation. The plan is guided by the city’s and the region’s plans and policies, which promote the efficient use of land through compact urban development. Both the St. Johns town center and Lombard main street are envisioned as pedestrian-friendly places that provide a mix of shopping, entertainment, housing, service, and employment opportunities.

A goal of the St. Johns/Lombard Plan is to enhance the livability of the area by identifying community needs and desires, and public and private strategies and actions that will improve existing and future conditions. Public meetings will be held at milestones throughout the process to inform and obtain feedback from members of the community. The plan will culminate in City Council adoption of planning strategies that will provide a vision for the future, a framework for evaluating and implementing public investments, and direction for private projects.

Study Area Description


St. Johns/Lombard Plan Study Area
Hmong Community Background

Several million Hmong live mainly in China, Thailand and Laos, and speak a variety of Hmong dialects. There are roughly 170,000 Hmong people living in the United States, largely concentrated in Wisconsin, Minnesota, and California. Most of the Hmong in the United States came from an agrarian culture in Laos, as refugees after the Vietnam War.

The Asian population in the plan area is the second largest minority group, comprising about six percent of the population. While the Hmong population in the St. Johns/ Lombard Plan area is not known, they compose a significant number of the Asian residents in the area.

Latino Community Background

The Latino population in the United States is identified as those whose ancestry comes from Spanish speaking countries in Latin America. Latinos may be of any race.

Several million Latinos live in the United States, concentrated primarily in the Southwest and Atlantic and Pacific coasts. Latinos make up the largest minority group in Oregon.

The Latino population is the largest minority group in the plan area, comprising roughly fifteen percent of the population. This figure is one of the highest in the region. The overwhelming number of participants traced their ancestry to Mexico. The remaining participants are from Central America.
Hmong Forums

Two forums were held in at the Baha’i Center, located at 8720 N. Ivanhoe Street in Portland, on August 26 and August 28, 2002. The expectation was to have close to 20 people per session. A total of 24 people attended both sessions. The goals of the forums were as follows:

♦ explain the city planning process and the St. Johns/Lombard Plan;
♦ increase knowledge of civic organizations;
♦ build relationships with the Hmong community; and
♦ provide another avenue for the Hmong community to express their views and opinions.

Partners

The Hmong-American Unity of Oregon, Inc. together with the City of Portland was awarded an Interwoven Tapestry grant by the Metropolitan Human Rights Center. The funds paid for the costs of administration, space rental, and refreshments. The mission of Hmong-American Unity of Oregon is to:

1. provide mediation services that address community and family problems;
2. assist the Hmong American community find community resources;
3. provide outreach to the mainstream society and other organizations;
4. maintain Hmong cultural activities; and
5. organize community events.

Format

The forums began with a brief explanation of the St. Johns/Lombard planning process, a description of the goals of Hmong-American Unity of Oregon, and how the goals intersect with the planning process. The facilitator spoke in the Hmong language, and translated participant comments and questions in English. Written information about the plan process was available in Hmong.

Participants were asked three basic questions:

• What do you like about your community/area?
• What don’t you like or would like to see changed?
• Do you see yourself here in the future? Why? Why not?
Participants were asked to relate the questions to topic areas of housing, transportation, commercial and work areas, and recreation/cultural places.

In closing, participants were invited to participate in the broader planning process by attending future public workshops.

**Summary of Results**

Overall, participants of the forums are satisfied and committed to the North Portland neighborhoods where they live; many of the participants have been residents for twenty years or more. Most responses focused on transportation issues, specifically speeding, traffic/pedestrian safety, and transit use. Specific problem intersections were discussed in detail. Some participants noted a lack of paved streets and sidewalks in the area around Roosevelt High School. Most participants were satisfied with the area’s housing; it is estimated that ninety percent of the Hmong living in the St. Johns/Lombard area own their homes. The current mix of businesses in the town center was not seen as an asset, most participants noted that they did not visit local stores. A desire for larger “chain” stores was noted.

**Results**

The following results are categorized according to the issues of transportation, commercial, housing, community and social, recreation, and schools.

**Transportation**

**Traffic Issues**
- Would like to see left turn lanes along Lombard, especially at Wall and Woolsey.
- Merge movements are difficult when Lombard phases from four lanes to two lanes.
- Speeding is a problem on Lombard and on residential streets. Would like to see residential streets posted with speed limits. Speed limit signs are needed around Clarendon Elementary School. Also, there are no patrol officers or crossing guards at George Middle School.
- Speeding. Concern is mainly on residential streets. Smith Street, from Ida heading east, needs to be regulated.
- Speed bumps needed:
  - Lombard Street to Central by James John;
  - Clarendon Street; and
  - Fessenden Avenue.
- More speed signs on all residential areas-especially near James John School, Clarendon School, and Roosevelt High School.
Traffic Issues, continued
• Discussion on traffic control devices. Most participants prefer speed bumps to curb extensions, medians, and landscape circles, etc.
• Expand street width to include St. Johns to Columbia Park (without medians/trees).
• More visible speed limit signs to include surrounding streets of Lombard and Wall Avenue.
• Would like to see traffic light at the intersection of Westanna Avenue and Lombard Street.
• Many participants do not ride bicycles, except perhaps for the younger people. They voiced concern about potential for bicycle/auto conflicts they see as a result of the proliferation of bike lanes.

Intersections
• Intersection of Wall and Fessenden is a problem for drivers due to location of stop sign. It’s set back 50+ feet from the intersection so you can’t see traffic on Fessenden if you stop at the sign. It was noted that if you advance closer to the intersection, you risk getting a ticket. Many said that police wait near the intersection to catch people violating the stop sign. They request that the stop sign be moved closer to the intersection.
• Intersection of Ida/Lombard. This is an important, busy intersection. They want better crossings, signals, and sidewalks.
• Intersection of Charleston/Lombard is very dangerous. This intersection is important due to library and school on Charleston. Yet there is no crosswalk or signal; also, the curve on Lombard to the east limits sight, drivers tend to travel fast around the curve.
• Intersection of Westanna/Lombard should have crosswalks/signal.
• Crosswalks and/or signals are needed at Wall/Lombard and Portsmouth/Lombard. It is a long distance between these intersections; currently there are no marked crosswalks.
• Dangerous intersections: Wall/Fessenden (previously noted) and Greeley/Portsmouth.

Pedestrian Issues
• Concern about absence of sidewalks along some residential streets, especially around Roosevelt High School. Northeast of the school, three properties east of Ida on the south side of Smith, there is a worn grassy path. Why is this not improved?
• Accessible sidewalk ramps. Would like to see these installed at every intersection along Lombard. Right now, it is not consistent.
Pedestrian Issues, continued
• Walking signals — would like to see bigger, more visible signs for pedestrians; also prefer symbols to words, so all can understand. Would also like to see more pedestrian-activated crosswalk signals. Visible crosswalks sign on intersection — Hmong elders do not understand signs.
• School signs needed — Peninsula, Philadelphia, Ivanhoe.
• Wheelchair accessible on all block of Lombard Street.
• Clearer crosswalk marks on intersection, especially around school areas.
• Sidewalks on corner of Smith Street and Ida Avenue.
• Crosswalks needed (no crosswalks after two blocks in school zone):
  - James John on Central Street (by community center);
  - YWCA on Central Street;
  - James John & library;
  - Richmond Ave & Lombard Street; and
  - South of Roosevelt High School and west of Ida Street.

Transit Issues
• Some participants work at Rivergate and take the #75 bus. They request that service be expanded, since it runs during rush hour only. If the last bus is missed, they must find another way to get to work.
• More shelters are needed at bus stops.
• More trash receptacles are needed at bus stops.
• More frequent service need — longer service to Rivergate businesses.
• Better lighting at bus shelter.
• Bike lanes needed on Lombard Street.
• More bus shelter and trash cans on Lombard Street.
• Better transit access to Rivergate and northeast industrial areas is needed.

Street Improvement
• Twenty year resident, wants to see residential streets paved. This should be a priority for the city, not the main streets. In order for a city to be great, it must address all streets, even the small residential streets. Streets highlighted are N. Ida, north of Roosevelt High School. Also, there are unpaved streets between Fessenden and Smith.
• Twenty-year resident, request for traffic poles instead of lights that are strung by wires.
• Signal light standards. Strongly prefer light poles rather than overhead wires. Feel that as drivers, lights on poles are easier to see and look better in the landscape.

Parking
• Participants had no issues with parking. They generally like the fact that there are no meters.
Commercial

- Would like to see large stores such as Target and restaurants such as Country Buffet. Feel it is too far to go to Jantzen Beach.
- The existing Asian market on Lombard is fine, but too small and limited in its selection. Would like to see an expanded store.
- Young people would like to see more variety in fast-food style restaurants.
- Most participants like their neighborhood close to the town center. Housing is affordable and families live close by. Would like to see larger magnet stores in the area, such as Target, Food 4 Less, etc. Are happy about the proposed Safeway project.
- The town center doesn’t have enough variety, the clothing for sale is not to their taste. Big retail stores are preferred. They find that the customer service in the small town center stores is unfriendly, business owners are not receptive, and feel prejudice may be the reason.
- Fred Meyer was criticized for not having a bilingual staff. Many participants have been residents for over twenty years, but feel that Fred Meyer has not been a good community member.
- High school students need more variety along Lombard. Some go to Delta Park for lunch.
- Juan Mayoral noted that there is funding through PDC’s St. Johns storefront improvement program — only enough funds for three businesses. Some thought that the Asian grocery on Lombard could benefit from this program.
- Farmers market.
- Discrimination by some business owners: seldom hire members of Hmong community; and some have been residents for the past twenty years and have not seen a community member work for any of stores in St. Johns — Fred Meyer, Safeway, Rite Aide, or any other smaller stores in St. Johns business district area.
- Customer services improvement needed.
- Incentives are needed to have new businesses start up — i.e., Asian grocery stores.
- Improve quality of products/services.
- Improve business district.
- Not enough retail stores i.e. clothes, department stores.
- Participants prefer chain stores such as Target, Kmart.
Housing

- Many participants own homes in the community (ninety percent of Hmong families in St. Johns are homeowners).
- Clean up of streets, homes, neighborhood cleanup
- Affordable homes are a plus.
- Hmong families that are established in St. Johns are interested in helping to improve the community.
- Considered home to the Hmong families.
- Would like to see additional housing opportunities along Lombard Street and in downtown St. Johns.

Employment

- Meaningful employment is too far away. The Hmong community tends to hold production jobs. When the economy is good, there are no problems finding work, but during slow periods, these jobs get cut.
- Better transit access to Rivergate and northeast industrial areas is needed.

Community and Social

- Most participants said they are here to stay, noting that they feel at home in the community, with families close by. They would like to see more opportunities for them to interact with the mainstream community.
- Participants provided background on Baha’i Center. A prominent woman willed $120,000 to the Hmong Community to purchase the post office building. She realized the strong need for a place to gather. The Baha’i Center offers much needed community services.
- Litter is a problem, especially around schools. Trash receptacles are needed around schools.
- Litter is a big issue, especially cigarette butts and fast food packaging. More garbage receptacles are needed at Ida/Lombard. Also, the businesses of Fred Meyer and McDonald’s, and Roosevelt High School should be made aware of litter problem around their properties.
- Trash cans along Ida Ave — East of Roosevelt High School for students to use for smoking.
- Car theft was noted as an issue. Street lighting may not be adequate. Sometimes street trees can block light.
- Some of the female participants remarked that they did not feel safe to walk around their neighborhood or along Lombard Street at night.
- Do not use the plaza, but would support improvements.
- Some have had bad experiences using the Multnomah Health Clinic. They see it as too strict, difficult, and unfriendly.
Community and Social, continued

- Would like to see more clinics that are open-minded — there is perceived discrimination with existing clinic. More medical clinics needed - family doctor.
- Emergency interpreters are needed. Hmong elders cannot communicate in English.
- Social Service for Hmong elders — interpreters needed
- Unemployment office is too far.
- Add trees on sidewalks along Lombard Street from the railroad tracks to Columbia Park.
- Immigration — deportation.
- Child disciplining — some do not agree with American laws.
- Not enough communication from the mainstream community to Hmong community.

Recreation

- Cathedral Park. Most participants like the park very much but would like to see better facilities for children, such as play equipment. Also mentioned were more benches, barbeque equipment and more parking.
- The language barrier is an impediment to using many of the recreational and community facilities (St. Johns community center and library noted).

Schools

- Wanted to know why bus service is limited to James John Elementary, and wanted more information on student transfers.
- School cleanup — Roosevelt, James John, George Middle School.
- School bus service needed for James John students in front of Roosevelt High School.
Latino Forums

Three forums were held for the Latino community: the first and second forums were held at the University Park Community Center in Columbia Villa, on August 20 and August 27, 2002, respectively; the third forum took place at the St. Johns Community Center on September 26, 2002.

A total of thirty-four people participated in the process. The expectation was to have close twenty people per session.

Partners

The Latino Network, Frente Común, working together with the City of Portland, applied for and received an Interwoven Tapestry grant through the Metropolitan Human Rights Center. The funds were used to pay for the costs of administration, space rental, food, and childcare.

Frente Común Latinos del Norte de Portland (Common Front of Latinos of North Portland) or “Frente Común” is a grass-roots organization that strives to serve as a voice of the Latino Community in North Portland. It has recently opened a center located in St. Johns, and provides a wide range of service information, classes, and programs.

The Latino Network is a coalition of organizations and individuals that advocate for the Latino community. Much of its work includes serving as a bridge between the Latino community and mainstream culture. It is regionally based and uses the method of ‘popular education’ to educate/empower marginalized groups. By using techniques that make learning and participation fun and interesting, it helps Latinos better understand and more effectively participate in community issues.

Format

The forums were organized around three main sections: a socio-drama, small group discussions, and an evaluation process using an activity or dinámica called Tortilla Caliente (Hot Tortilla).

The socio-drama intended to provide a frame of reference for participants by enacting a skit depicting everyday life and showing how the issues most relevant to the St. Johns/Lombard Plan are also ones important to everyday life in the peninsula.

The socio-drama helped highlight the local reality and set the context for participants to discuss what they saw as existing
problems in the area. It also offered them the opportunity to brainstorm possible options for enhancing the livability of the St. Johns/Lombard area.

Following the socio-drama, participants were divided into small groups and asked three basic questions. They were:

- What do you like about your community/area?
- What don’t you like or would like to see changed?
- Do you see yourself here in the future? Why? Why not?

The Tortilla Caliente was a fun interactive activity where a (supposedly hot) tortilla was passed around the circle until the music stopped. Whoever was left with the tortilla had to share a comment on the process, the issues discussed, or what they had learned.

In closing, participants were invited to participate in the broader planning process by attending future public workshops.

**Summary of Results**

Overwhelmingly, participants felt satisfied with the area and see themselves living in the peninsula in the near future. Most stated that they enjoy the area’s parks, schools, housing stock and the Latino community.

Some have lived in the area for many years and are homeowners; others were relatively new to the area. Participants provided a wealth of information on what they like about the area and what needs to be improved. Many suggestions are beyond the scope of this project. However, all comments are included.

Some of the most important concerns dealt with safety, especially areas frequented by children, such as schools and parks. Also mentioned were the need for better transit service, more crosswalks, better lighting, slower traffic, more Latino stores, a cleaner and more active downtown St. Johns, and less racial profiling by police and discrimination by employers. Participants found the area to be relatively affordable, yet many stated that it was becoming less so.
Results

The following summary results were categorized in the same manner as the small group discussions.

What they like

- Parks. Enjoy taking their children to them. Enjoy the Willamette River and other natural amenities. More areas for children would make them even better.
- Cordialness. Members appreciated neighbors welcoming them.
- Latino Community. Participants liked living in close proximity to members of their same culture. They appreciated being able to visit a local church with service in Spanish.
- Mexican shops, to find specialty goods and traditional meals. They also serve as community gathering places.
- Supermarkets, to conveniently buy groceries. Participants shopped regularly at Fred Meyer and Safeway.
- Transit. Tri-Met bus stops are within walking distance from homes.
- Schools, despite problems, provide adequate services and help. Many participants had children and the quality of schools is very important to them.
- St. Johns downtown is a nice place to shop, visit, and walk to.
- Housing is still affordable in the area. There seems to be a variety of housing options. Many residents were renters, and some were owners.

What they dislike/like to change

Security and Parks

- More security and funds for schools. Specifically asked for were security personnel.
- More security in parks, including better lighting and personnel. Several participants have witnessed illegal activities in parks in the evening and night. Many avoid parks or are careful where they take their children.
- Parks that need more lights and security include George Park, Northgate Park, and Columbia.

Transportation

Transit Issues

- Tri-Met busses are infrequent and not punctual, and weekend service is inadequate. Busses #4 and #75 generated the most complaints. Participants widely held the perception that drivers do not stop for them.
- Better plan for bus service in the area. Many stated that they had to wait for long periods of time, especially for early morning and weekend service.
Transit Issues, continued
- One participant stated that it’s better to have smaller buses and more frequent service.
- Better bus service needs to be provided for the Rivergate area. Some mentioned they walk long stretches before the bus arrives.
- Very important to have frequent and reliable service in the morning. Some have reached their places of employment before the bus arrived.
- Some stated that some buses don’t come during some scheduled times.

Traffic Issues
- Less traffic, more crosswalks. Identified areas included intersections in downtown St. Johns, Ivanhoe, St. Louis, Fessenden, and Lombard.
- Speed bumps near schools. Children’s safety is compromised when cars go by so fast.
- More traffic lights on Lombard, Columbia, and Fessenden.
- Some suggested that traffic flow along Lombard would be improved with synchronized lights.
- More speed signals. Locations included Lombard, St. Louis, Columbia, Ivanhoe, and Fessenden.
- Improve truck traffic on Lombard east of St Louis. Two family members express their frustrations of seeing the large number of trucks pass by their home in Lombard everyday, causing air and noise pollution and raising safety concerns.

Commercial
- More Latino stores. Participants stated that they often frequent local Mexican stores to buy groceries and goods. There seems to be a lack of competition, variety and diversity of products. Residents often travel as far as Gresham and Hillsboro in search of specialty goods, where there are bigger stores, more choices and lower prices.
- More stores in the area, especially small, locally-owned. On weekends many stores are closed and residents have to travel to other places to shop, such as Jantzen Beach, Vancouver Mall, and Lloyd Center. Some would like a place like WinCo in St Johns.
- Fewer bars in St. Johns.
- Downtown St. Johns needs more “life”: more street and commercial activity, more amenities to make it an interesting and unique place.
- More places to go dancing.
- Improve the St. Johns Plaza. Make it more inviting. It is dirty, looks abandoned, and is frequented by drunkards and drug users and dealers.
Community and Social

- Improve image of St Johns. Many felt that St Johns’ problems are not as bad as they are perceived in the region. There is an image of delinquency and poverty that is not consistent with reality.
- Racism targeted at Latinos, especially at workplace and by police. It manifests itself most clearly in hiring practices and police’s response time and racial profiling.
- Drugs and gangs, which are making a comeback in the area, especially in parks and schools.
- Improve the vacant and abandoned areas near the rivers; they are unkempt and invite crime next to residential areas.
- More workplace training, including English and computer classes. Participants were informed that Frente Comun has opened a community-gathering place that will offer English lessons, computer classes, and a class on immigration issues.
- More places to go dancing and interact with other Latinos.
- Some participants have witnessed prostitution on Fessenden Street.
- More services (e.g. pharmacies, health clinics, retail, real estate) with personnel that can speak Spanish.
- Untidiness of streets and properties: many thought that it is the responsibility of all to clean and maintain their community. Others asked the City for better maintenance in the area.
- Community gathering place for Latinos is desired. Many were informed and were happy to hear that Frente Comun has opened a community-gathering place in downtown St. Johns.
- More community places for children and the elderly population, including bilingual childcare service.
- Latinos should work more together and participate in community events. Many were grateful for this opportunity and recommended having more community meetings to discuss issues that affect Latinos.

Housing

- Housing is still affordable but it is quickly becoming less so. Some participants own their own home and showed general satisfaction with the neighborhood and local schools.
- Area needs more affordable housing.
- Columbia Villa is seen as dangerous but affordable; better maintenance would improve it. Most, but not all, participants from Columbia Villa were aware of the redevelopment of Columbia Villa. Staff gave a brief summary of the current HOPE VI project.

Do you see yourself living in the area in the future?

Overwhelmingly, participants responded positively, assuming area does not deteriorate. They made special mention of certain amenities such as the Willamette River and parks, the community and affordable housing.
Conclusion

The community forums provided a wealth of information about the St. Johns/Lombard plan area, and the opportunity to reach out to residents who typically do not participate in community planning. Both the Hmong and Latino communities expressed their concerns and aspirations on a wide range of issues. This document will be shared with members of the St. Johns/Lombard Plan Citizens Working Group. Many of the concerns raised, especially those regarding transportation and pedestrian issues, will be addressed through the plan recommendations.

Below is a summary of the main outcomes of this effort.

- Both the Latino and Hmong communities enjoy living in the area and feel established in North Portland. Participants would like to continue living in the area and are interested in helping to make it a better place to live.

- Most planning issues discussed in these forums reflect similar comments expressed by the mainstream population in previous St. Johns/Lombard outreach events, including the open house held in October 2001, a public workshop held in April 2002, and neighborhood walks held in May 2002.

- Issues particular to the Hmong and Latino communities include the need for gathering places for their communities, bilingual services, more Asian and Latino stores, immigration issues, and more opportunities to interact with the mainstream community.

- Discrimination is another issue common to the Hmong and Latino communities. Many participants expressed that they feel discriminated against in places of employment, shopping areas, as well as by police and Tri-Met bus drivers.

- Participants appreciated the opportunity to learn about and contribute to our planning process. They also appreciated being able to do so in their native language and with other members of their respective communities.

- This outreach effort allowed residents to establish closer ties with community groups and helped establish new partnerships between the City of Portland and Hmong and Latino community organizations.
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**Introduction**

This document describes the process taken to develop the *St. Johns/Lombard Plan* urban development concept.

Participants of public outreach events - community open house, vision workshops, neighborhood walks, and a series of urban design workshops - have played a significant role in determining this framework for future development. Over the past year the plan’s citizen working group and technical advisors have also provided review and guidance. The Preliminary Urban Development Concept for the St. Johns/Lombard plan area reflects many of the ideas gathered from the community throughout the plan process.

The urban development concept represents a big-picture vision for future land use, transportation, and open space within the plan area, and identifies places of special interest for the community. It encompasses the goals of the plan, which address community identity, commercial revitalization, housing, transportation, open space, and environmental quality. The concept provides guidance for development of specific land use and transportation plans and implementation strategies. An in-depth study to refine land use and transportation plans will take place in the spring of 2003.

See page 33 for a detailed graphic and narrative description of the Preliminary Urban Development Concept.
Background

An important milestone in the development of the St. Johns/Lombard Plan is the creation of an urban development concept for the future development of the plan area. The urban development concept is intended to serve as a framework for the plan. It will direct the pattern and intensity of land uses, indicate how public spaces can be enhanced, and specify where transportation improvements and other public investment can be made to enhance the livability and economic vitality of the plan area.

To develop the concept, the City of Portland, in collaboration with Lennertz Coyle & Associates, LLC (LCA) hosted two community workshops in the fall of 2002. An invitation to both workshops was sent to over 700 people on the plan mailing list. Workshop participants (over 100 people) had the opportunity to express their preferences for future development of the St. Johns/Lombard Plan area and to give direction to City staff and the consultant team in developing and refining the ideas and goals embedded in the concept.

Why Plan?

The St. Johns/Lombard Plan is a planning effort designed to articulate the community’s vision for the area over the next twenty years. It focuses on two Metro Region 2040 mixed-use areas: the St. Johns town center and the North Lombard main street. The Bureau of Planning is conducting this planning effort in collaboration with the Portland Office of Transportation and the North Portland community. The planning effort, which began in the fall of 2001, focuses on issues such as land use, transportation, housing, and commercial and economic vitality. The plan is expected to be completed, with Portland City Council adoption, in the fall of 2003.

A key element of the St. Johns/Lombard planning process is identification of local community desires and needs, to be balanced with adopted city and regional plans and policies. The planning process also includes a review of existing conditions to identify issues that can affect realization of the vision for the plan area. The St. Johns/Lombard planning effort will conclude with the development of implementation strategies that combine a mix of regulations and public investment with actions to be implemented by community groups and other stakeholders. When adopted by City Council, the plan will provide a shared vision for the future of the plan area and a framework for future community growth and development for the St. Johns town center and North Lombard main street areas over the next twenty years.
Previous Community Input

Although the urban development concept for the St. Johns/Lombard Plan began to take physical form during two urban design workshops held with the community in October and November of 2002, the concept first began to take shape during a series of events held early in the planning process.

Over 100 community members attended a kick off open house for the St. Johns/Lombard Plan, held October 18, 2001. During the open house community members provided responses to questions about transportation, the built environment (buildings, plazas, etc.), and natural and recreational areas. Common community priorities included a desire to support and enhance local business activity, and to address vehicle and pedestrian transportation concerns in the area.

A community vision workshop, attended by over 75 people, was held on April 3, 2002. During the workshop facilitated by City staff and Lennertz Coyle & Associates LLC (LCA), participants were asked to respond to a series of preliminary vision ideas that were in part developed from citizen input at the open house. These ideas addressed community identity and livability, transportation, commercial areas, housing, riverfront and river view areas, industrial uses, natural and recreational areas, and social and community services. Responses from these workshops were integrated into the vision statement for the St. Johns/Lombard Plan by staff, consultants, and the plan’s citizen working group. The vision statement has also helped shape the foundation for the plan’s goals, which can be found on page 5.

The vision workshop was followed by a series of four neighborhood walks in the spring of 2002, each held in a different segment of the plan area: Lombard Street East; Lombard Street Central; Downtown St. Johns; and, Cathedral Park/Riverfront. Over 100 people participated in these walks facilitated by City staff and Zimmer, Gunsul, Frasca Partnership (ZGF). Participants identified issues and concerns, and shared observations and ideas about the area. Their ideas and observations were recorded by plan staff and sketched by designers from ZGF and LCA. From the recordings and sketches, the following five themes emerged.
Key Themes from the Neighborhood Walks

**Foster compatible development**
- Focus on the relationship of the building to the street, and the scale of buildings
- Provide for a mix of uses along most of the Lombard main street and in the St. Johns town center

**Improve the public realm**
- Improve sidewalks, bus stops and street crossings
- Plant street trees and provide street furnishings in appropriate places
- Clean up litter in the area; clean up alleys

**Improve the transportation system**
- Enhance safety for pedestrians and bicyclists
- Improve vehicular movement while calming traffic
- Make transit more user-friendly

**Encourage housing and mixed-use development**
- New housing may enhance commercial area vitality and provide choices for residents of all ages and income levels
- Pay attention to scale and design

**Improve existing development**
- Encourage better screening of parking and utility areas, and better signage
- Add landscaping and windows to enhance pedestrian areas

In addition to the above, themes unique to each individual area emerged. These themes played a significant role in the development of the vision statement for the *St. Johns/Lombard Plan*, as well as the conceptual urban development concepts prepared for the first and second urban design workshops. A wrap-up meeting, designed to share the vision statement and findings from the neighborhood walks, was held in June 2002, and was attended by about fifty people.
Plan Goals

The following project goals were developed as a synthesis of the community-driven vision statements and local and regional planning policies. They are used to evaluate plan concepts and implementation efforts to ensure that objectives of the community and city and regional planning policies are balanced.

Enhance the identity of the St. Johns and Lombard area
- Celebrate citizens, local history and distinctive architecture
- Respect the unique characteristics of St. Johns and emphasize human scale in new development

Implement the Region 2040 town center and main street designations in this area
- Create a complete community by providing opportunities for housing, shopping, and employment within the area
- Strive to retain and attract family-wage jobs on the peninsula

Foster revitalized St. Johns and Lombard Street commercial areas
- Enhance opportunities for residents to walk or bike to shops or leisure facilities
- Promote locally-owned and community-oriented businesses
- Provide for adequate parking opportunities

Provide opportunities for new housing along the Lombard main street and near the St. Johns town center
- Promote compatible and high quality housing design
- Provide for a broad range of housing choices for residents of all ages, income levels, and abilities

Provide for a balanced multi-modal transportation system
- Enhance the safety, convenience and attractiveness of walking, transit, and bicycling
- Improve circulation on the main street and in the town center while calming traffic
- Strive for freight movement solutions that improve livability

Unify the community with safe, accessible, and attractive parks and open spaces
- Strengthen connections between the town center and the Willamette and Columbia Rivers
- Respect the diverse ecology, wildlife and landscape features of the rivers and nearby natural areas

Promote sustainable development practices and environmental quality
- Support efforts to improve water quality of the Willamette River and Columbia Slough
- Preserve tracts of native vegetation and protect and expand the urban forest on the peninsula
- Promote the development and redevelopment of a built environment utilizing sustainable development techniques and practices
Citizen Working Group members share ideas with the project team at a monthly meeting.

Citizen and Technical Review Groups

A citizens working group (CWG), made up of residents and business leaders from the plan area, serves as an advisory body that considers the diverse interests of the community and represents a range of perspectives on planning issues. While not a decision making body, the CWG provides feedback on information provided by staff, associations and other community groups. The CWG brings knowledge and insight based on personal knowledge of the study area. To date the CWG has played a significant role in shaping the vision statement for the plan, and refining the plan goals and the urban development concept alternatives.

A technical advisory group (TAG), composed of representatives from government agencies and City bureaus, helps evaluate the technical feasibility of plan proposals. The TAG also keeps the planning team informed of related projects and polices that affect implementation of the plan.

Consultant Team

A consultant team, funded through the State of Oregon’s Transportation Growth Management (TGM) grant program, joined the planning effort in the summer of 2002. The leading consultant is Lennertz Coyle & Associates LLC, Architects and Town Planners (LCA). Economic expertise is provided by E.D. Hovee & Company. Transportation expertise provided by DKS Associates, and Ellen Vanderslice. The consultant team will assist in the refinement of the urban development concept and alternatives for the St. Johns/Lombard Plan.
Summary of Existing Transportation and Economic Conditions

This section summarizes relevant transportation, demographic, and economic data used in the development of the urban design concept for the plan area. While the planning process helps define the community’s aspirations for land uses, improvements, and design objectives, market forces and transportation conditions influence what uses will actually be developed. By considering these conditions, the plan team will respond to the unique opportunities and constraints affecting future development of the plan area.

Transportation
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The following is a brief summary of the findings regarding the existing transportation conditions in the St Johns/Lombard area, listed by transportation mode.

Motor Vehicle

- The existing operating conditions at the signalized intersections within the St. Johns town center and along Lombard Street are acceptable with level of service D or better during both the a.m. and p.m. peak hours.
- On several roadways within the study area, the surveyed 85th percentile vehicle speeds were four miles per hour greater than the posted speed limit. These roadways include Charleston Avenue (north of Hudson Street), Ivanhoe Street (west of Richmond Avenue) and St. Louis Avenue (south of Smith Street).
- Vehicle classification survey data conducted over a 24-hour period show daily traffic volumes on Lombard Street consist of 20% heavy vehicles west of St. Louis Avenue and 6% heavy vehicles east of Heppner Avenue. The St. Johns Bridge daily traffic volumes consist of 12% heavy vehicles.
- Based on the City of Portland travel demand forecast models, future annualized growth rates are estimated to be 0.75% per year on the St. Johns Bridge, 1.5% per year on Lombard Street and on Fessenden Street 2.0% per year eastbound and 0.6% per year westbound.
Bicycle

- Designated on-street bicycle lanes are provided on St. Louis Avenue, Smith Street, Columbia Way, Portsmouth Avenue, Willamette Boulevard, Ida Avenue, and Fessenden Street in the St. Johns area.
- Lombard Street does not contain on-street bicycle lanes, but is designated a City Bikeway by the City of Portland.

Pedestrian

- Within the study area, the public right-of-way is predominantly improved with sidewalks on both sides of the street. There are a few exceptions with gaps in the sidewalk network.
- The character (traffic volumes, speeds and sight distance) of the Lombard Street/Richmond Avenue/Jersey Street intersection and the Ivanhoe Street/Richmond Avenue can create difficult areas for pedestrians to cross.

Economics
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The plan area’s primary strengths include its unique position on the peninsula (providing a captive, albeit small, market), the town center’s evolution as a pedestrian oriented downtown, and the name recognition that St. Johns enjoys as a distinct entity within the metro region.

Demographics

Market area demographics currently support a greater diversity of retailers than are on the street at present, particularly in the apparel, household furnishings, and books categories. Growth should be encouraged within these retail categories as well as across categories, as the market area currently provides a narrow range of options within business types.

Successful businesses will provide goods and services that respond to area demographics. A slowly growing professional base calls for higher-end dining and retailers—currently, largely absent—as well as the value retailers that families and working class households desire. The area’s rapid Hispanic growth provides another market for businesses to target.
Business Improvement
The area’s ability to capture increased market share rests upon its ability to create a positive sense of place and an active street presence. Unmet demand is not enough to secure a district’s success: improving vacant commercial spaces, storefronts, and the pedestrian environment are critical first steps.

Town center retailers are already engaging in building rehabilitations, with the help of the Portland Development Commission’s (PDC) Storefront Improvement Program. Improving the attractiveness of a district can attract customers and retail sales, which allows for rent increases to a level that can support further reinvestment in the town center and main street building stock.

It is also important to make sure the space inside the buildings is shell ready. Shell ready means that the commercial space is clean, adequately wired, adequately plumbed, has a working heating system that can be activated and has an attractive and business-like appearance from the street.

In the near term, the most likely candidates for new business operations are owner/operators who either live in neighborhoods surrounding the business location or have other connections to the community, or are drawn in by availability of inexpensive space and interest in being part of a renaissance of business districts. These may be entrepreneurs or local businesses expanding into the St. Johns area.

Vehicles & Pedestrians
For retailers to thrive in the town center, vehicular access and parking are necessary. At the same time, an active street presence requires a pedestrian-friendly retail core. Resolving this ongoing tension is of primary importance.

Supportable Retail
Assuming improvement in the town center’s and Lombard Street’s sense of place, and an increased capture rate (of 64 percent), a total of approximately 81,400 additional square feet of retail and service businesses could currently be supported within the St. Johns market area. Many of these businesses could occupy currently vacant and ready to use commercial space.

The number of market area households is estimated to increase by 17 percent, or 2,000 households by 2010. Given this increase and projected income growth, the market area may support a cumulative total of 311,000 square feet of selected categories of commercial space by 2010. While business growth is generally discussed as number or square footage of new firms, it can also be realized through the expansion of existing firms.
Neighborhood walk participants pass a sidewalk sale in downtown St. Johns, May 2002.

**Business Mix & Clustering**

Clustering retail creates a critical mass so that synergistic relationships can build between stores. Given the size of the plan area, revitalization efforts need to focus on nodes in order to produce the maximum benefit. The town center already enjoys a high density of storefronts, although some of these retailers may need to update their merchandising, displays, and storefront image to attract a broader market to the town center. The town center is well situated to benefit from new business starts and the expansion or renovation of existing businesses.

Along Lombard Street, fairly distinctive clusters provide guidance for new investment. In a commercial district that spans a traffic corridor—such as Lombard Street—it is especially important that new investment is concentrated, and that retail options are encouraged within walkable distances.

**Business District Comparisons**

Comparing the St. Johns town center and Lombard main street to other Portland commercial districts illuminates the district’s strengths and weaknesses, and helps to identify its unique characteristics. The plan area is most similar to Lents in its increasing ethnic diversity and working class family history. It shares with Sellwood the challenge of no direct freeway access. The St John’s town center shares with Hollywood, Hawthorne, and Sellwood the distinction of having a movie theater. With other revitalizing North and Northeast Portland (N/NE) business districts (the Broadway business district being the exception) it shares both the opportunity of an underserved population and the constraint of being perceived as soft market – not having enough density or disposable income to support the success of their business. Also, new businesses that are attracted to the N/NE area are typically start-up neighborhood retail and service oriented businesses which tend to be challenged by undercapitalization and owner/operators that lack business experience.
Creation of the Urban Development Concept

Based upon the vision developed during prior workshops and neighborhood walks, the consultant team in collaboration with City staff started developing an urban development concept for the study area. For the purpose of this first conceptual plan, the study area was divided into seven sub-areas, each with a distinct character. The consultant team prepared several different development scenarios for each sub-area. Each scenario was illustrated with plan views and/or street elevations to better explain the possible physical form of new development.

The map on the following page shows the sub-areas: Lombard East, Lombard Central, the Cut, Lombard West, Downtown St. Johns, Cathedral Park Hillside, and Willamette Riverfront. In addition to the sub-areas, the map also indicates neighborhood or community corners, existing parks and civic sites, and important vehicular and pedestrian connections within the plan area and to and from adjacent neighborhoods.

Following the map is a brief description of the proposed development scenarios, illustrated with drawings prepared for the urban design workshop.
Development Scenarios

North Lombard Street

North Lombard Street was divided into four sub-areas:

- **Lombard Street East (Sub-area 1).** Woolsey Avenue in the east to Van Houten to the west.
- **Lombard Street Central (Sub-area 2).** A segment from Van Houten Avenue in the east to the BNSF railroad line to the west.
- **The Cut (Sub-area 3).** The area associated with the bridge crossing the BNSF railroad line.
- **Lombard Street West (Sub-area 4).** From Gilbert Avenue in the east to Tyler Avenue to the west.

Four urban design scenarios were considered for the sub-areas along North Lombard Street. These urban development scenarios are described on the following pages.
- **Full Main Street** – This scenario features the highest quality pedestrian main street environment. Buildings with retail, office, and residential uses front on North Lombard Street and complement a streetscape with street trees and furniture. Neighborhood-serving uses may be focused on “community corners” that provide enhanced access to and from the neighborhoods.

- **Partial Main Street** – This scenario features a pedestrian friendly environment. Features commercial retail, services and office uses mixed with residential. Neighborhood serving uses may be focused on “community corners” that provide enhanced access to and from the neighborhoods. Pedestrian improvements are focused at “community corners.”
• **Commercial Corridor** – This scenario features auto accommodating commercial uses and off-street parking, mixed with limited residential. The pedestrian environment around “community corners” is improved to provide better access to and from the neighborhoods.

• **Residential Corridor** – This scenario features a mix of row houses, townhouses and multi-dwelling residential development; limited neighborhood commercial opportunities is possible at key locations such as “community corners.”
Downtown St. Johns

The following three urban design scenarios were considered for downtown St. Johns.

- **Community Commercial Center** – Storefront commercial structures and uses along Lombard Street; auto accommodating uses with off-street parking areas along adjacent commercial streets. Preserve and enhance pedestrian environment – may include improved public plaza.

- **Town Center** – Storefront commercial structures and uses along North Lombard Street; other streets would have two to five story mixed use structures with ground floor retail, office uses, or residential units. Preserve and enhance pedestrian environment – may include improved public plaza.

- **Urban Center** – Similar to Town Center, but with intensified commercial and mixed-use structures on Lombard and in surrounding areas (two to eight stories). Other streets in town center would have mixed use structures with ground floor retail, office, or residential units.
**Cathedral Park Hillside**

The urban design scenarios considered for the Cathedral Park hillside are as follows.

- **Hillside Residential Neighborhood** – A mix of detached and attached single dwelling structures and small multi-dwelling residential development (duplex to fourplex), similar to what is built today. Commercial uses would be prohibited. There may be improved streets, sidewalks and pedestrian crossings.

- **Hillside Urban Neighborhood** – A mix of higher density multi-dwelling buildings along key streets, transitioning to row houses and smaller multi-dwelling buildings and detached houses. Neighborhood serving retail in mixed-use structures could be allowed along primary streets such as North Burlington and North Baltimore Avenues. Selected streets, sidewalks and pedestrian crossings are improved.
- **Hillside Village Neighborhood** – A mix of moderate-scaled multi-dwelling development (apartments and condos), single-dwelling, attached and detached houses. Small retail uses could be located in mixed-use buildings on primary streets such as North Burlington Avenue or at key intersections. Improved streets, sidewalks and pedestrian crossings.

![Hillside Village Neighborhood Diagram]

**Willamette Riverfront**
The following urban design scenarios were considered for the Willamette riverfront.

- **Employment/Industrial District** – Industrial and employment land uses, similar to today with limited live/work residential. Pedestrian environment would be improved on key streets to ensure access to the river and downtown St. Johns. Public waterfront access to and along riverbank would be improved.

![Willamette Riverfront Diagram]
- **Riverfront Village** – Moderate density residential development with limited workshops (live/work), and community-serving commercial uses (restaurants, etc.). Pedestrian environment would be improved as redevelopment occurs. Public waterfront access to and along riverbank would be improved.

- **Riverfront Regional Attractor** – Visitor-oriented institutional, recreational, recreational/open space, or commercial uses. Uses could include specialty education/research facility, marina/recreational use, or retail/restaurant. Limited residential development may also be included. Public access to and along riverbank would be improved.
Urban Design Workshop I

The first urban design workshop was held on October 23, 2002. During the workshop participants reviewed the development scenarios for different sub-areas and provided feedback. A main objective was to assess which scenarios best reflected the community’s desire for the future of the area. The following sections summarize the community’s assessment of the scenarios.

Lombard Street

Based on comments provided by participants, the plan team summarized the urban design preferences for each sub-area.

- **Lombard Street East (Sub-area 1).** Participant responses favored the Full Main Street scenario. Some participants noted that the area from Fiske Avenue to Columbia Park should be residential in nature.

- **Lombard Street Central (Sub-area 2).** Participants chose the Partial Main Street scenario. Participants desired full pedestrian amenities, development of business nodes at Fortune and Wall Avenues, and a balanced land use-housing mix including mixed-use development. Participants recognized the need to provide for some auto-accommodating or auto-related uses.

- **The Cut (Sub-area 3).** This area received mixed responses. Some were inclined towards the Partial or Full Main Street alternatives, whereas others preferred the Commercial Corridor scenario. Participants commented on the need to recognize “the cut” as the eastern gateway to the St. Johns neighborhood, the need for more storefronts and less parking, the crucial role of design controls, and the need for more ADA-compliant improvements.

- **Lombard Street West (Sub-area 4).** Participants were split evenly between the Partial Main Street and Residential scenarios. Comments included: change the boundaries of the sub-area, consider speed bumps, provide better shopping alternatives, provide for more row houses and townhouses, eliminate drinking establishments, and foster design in keeping with the pre-war residential style.
Generally, North Lombard Street received less attention from workshop participants than other areas within the plan area. Comments were varied, multiple, and sometimes conflicting. Many comments reflected the desire to treat all of Lombard as a single unit, as a Full Main Street or Partial Main Street throughout. Other comments included:

- the need to allow more height and mass at corners,
- encourage active uses,
- the need for good transit and pedestrian amenities,
- the need to add more crosswalks and curb extensions,
- eliminate truck traffic, and
- avoid displacement and gentrification.

**Downtown St. Johns**

Community input regarding the urban design scenarios for downtown St. Johns indicated a strong preference for the Town Center scenario. Elements and amenities addressed by this scenario, such as an enhanced pedestrian environment and a mix of retail, commercial, residential and civic land uses, were received positively by participants. Workshop participants largely noted a preference for retaining and enhancing the older storefront elements along North Lombard Street, while allowing larger scale/more intense mixed-use development along the other downtown streets.

Many members of the community considered the current site of the Safeway grocery store a potential opportunity site for future redevelopment. Participants expressed a range of desired uses: an aquatic center, mixed-use development, and a Boys & Girls Club. Although opinions varied on how the site should be redeveloped, most participants consider the site significant due to its proximity to the heart of downtown St. Johns. Redevelopment efforts should be focused on a use that serves a broad spectrum of the community.
Cathedral Park Hillside

Comments submitted by workshop participants regarding the Cathedral Park hillside did not indicate a preference for any one particular design scenario, but participants repeated general themes. Participants noted that a mix of detached houses, townhouses, apartments, and condominiums, were acceptable, excluding tall, high-density development (similar to what is allowed under the existing RH plan designation). Participants stated a preference for development of owner occupied, market rate housing. Preservation of views and high-quality design also are important issues.

As noted previously, community input did not result in strong support for any one scenario. A range of opinions were submitted, from support of an urban form similar to what exists today, only with higher design quality, to support of a higher density form with a mix of residential and neighborhood retail. The community prefers to focus commercial and retail use in downtown St. Johns, with minimal, if any, commercial and retail uses on the hillside. They also felt that downtown St. Johns is the appropriate place for high-density development, and that the downtown should be enhanced to better serve the hillside. Design quality is an issue for new development on the hillside.

Willamette Riverfront

Comments from workshop participants regarding the Willamette riverfront indicate a desire to make the riverfront more accessible to North Portland residents and to introduce a mix of land uses and amenities that support and enhance the area. Community input indicated a preference for the Riverfront Village scenario. Amenities such as restaurants, an improved and expanded greenway trail, and marina were seen as positive elements. Comments indicated support for commercial development, as long as it does not conflict with commercial uses in downtown St. Johns. Participants desire moderate-scaled development and enhancement of the park-like atmosphere along the along the waterfront. Some workshop participants indicated support for continued industrial/employment uses along the waterfront, although others suggested that these uses contribute to unwanted truck traffic in the area. Others stated that industrial uses are phasing out of the area.
Refinement of the Urban Development Concept

Following the first urban design workshop, staff and the consultant team began the process to refine the urban development concept in order to reflect community input. A series of illustrative framework concept maps were prepared for community review:

1. Urban Design Framework,
2. Transportation Framework & Activity Centers,
3. Land Use Intensities, and
4. Opportunity Areas.

These maps reflect the early urban development concept and the range of community comments and preferences. In addition, a list of key transportation issues for each sub-area was developed. The maps serve to articulate the community’s vision and preferences, and are balanced by city and regional plans and policies.
Urban Design Framework

The Urban Design Framework map outlines the sub-areas and identifies locations of great importance within the study area. These locations may receive a special treatment to signify their importance as gateways, focal points, attractions, community corners, or primary streets. These treatments may include special landscaping, lighting, paving, street furniture, and public art. Special places generally have more rigorous architectural requirements and are envisioned as active and attractive pedestrian environments. Also shown on the map are important parks and civic sites as a frame of reference.
Transportation Framework & Activity Centers

The Transportation Framework & Activity Centers map identifies major transportation streets, freight routes, and pedestrian and bicycle trails. The shaded areas indicate activity centers, which are envisioned to be places with a great amount of pedestrian, commercial or civic activity. Activity centers are located in downtown St. Johns, along the eastern portion of Lombard, and along the riverfront.
Land Use Intensities

The Land Use Intensities map conceptually shows the intensity of building within the St. Johns/Lombard Plan area. Darker shading indicates higher density and taller buildings, lighter shading indicates lower density and buildings. This map links the development scenarios prepared for the first workshop to smaller and more refined sub-areas. The table on page 27 further defines the types of development anticipated in the sub-areas. Also shown are public parks and civic sites.
**Land Use Intensity Chart**

This chart describes some of the prototypical types of development desired and anticipated in each of the sub-areas identified on the Land Use Intensities map on page 26.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Typical Building Height</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Building Types</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Setbacks</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Density Residential</td>
<td>R-A</td>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>detached SF; attached SF, small MF buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium density residential</td>
<td>R-B</td>
<td>2 - 4</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>attached SF, MF buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-use Waterfront</td>
<td>MX-W</td>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>residential, limited commercial, employment</td>
<td>mixed-use buildings, MF buildings, live/work, employment</td>
<td>uses and design compatible with residential; no drive-thru businesses</td>
<td>N*</td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-use Town Center</td>
<td>MX-TC (+)</td>
<td>2 - 5 (7)</td>
<td>retail, office, residential, civic</td>
<td>mixed-use buildings, commercial buildings, MF buildings</td>
<td>drive-thru businesses limited</td>
<td>N*</td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Main Street</td>
<td>MS-A (+)</td>
<td>2 - 4 (6)</td>
<td>retail, office, residential</td>
<td>mixed-use buildings, commercial buildings, MF buildings, attached SF</td>
<td>no drive-thru businesses</td>
<td>N*</td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial Main Street</td>
<td>MS-B</td>
<td>2 - 4</td>
<td>retail, office, residential</td>
<td>mixed-use buildings, commercial buildings, MF buildings</td>
<td>drive-thru businesses limited</td>
<td>N*</td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Typical building heights shown as stories. SF = single family residential; MF = multi-family residential.

* residential uses may be set back from sidewalk
Opportunity Areas

Opportunity areas are parcels of land that are likely to redevelop or that are otherwise significant. These areas could function as catalysts and spur improvements on surrounding properties. Also shown on the map are important park and civic sites as a frame of reference.
Urban Design Workshop II

The second urban design workshop was held November 21, 2002. City staff and the consultant team presented the draft urban development concept plan that reflected the comments from participants of the October 23 workshop, in addition to staff recommendations. Maps identified and explained in the previous section were available for review: (1) Urban Design Framework, (2) Transportation Framework & Activity Centers, (3) Land Use Intensities, and (4) Opportunity Areas. Working in small groups with facilitators, participants reviewed and discussed the components of all four maps, focusing on the Urban Design Framework and Land Use Intensities maps. Participants also identified their priorities for future improvements to the transportation system. Comments and ideas were recorded on paper. A summary of the responses follows.

North Lombard Street

The following statements summarize participant comments about the urban development concept, and specifically, the four framework plans.

- Most participants found concepts acceptable, including community corners.
- There is general agreement that the area from Fiske to Portsmouth be a "full main street." How to treat the remaining sections of Lombard is still in question. Some participants did not want commercial development to be limited in residential focus areas, others agreed with the concept. Some wanted limits on drive-through development while others found auto-accommodating uses to be necessary.
- Auto parking is an issue - how to accommodate it and how to address its impacts.
- While many participants noted support for residential uses, there was no agreement about the character of residential development. A range of housing types was suggested: row houses, three story apartments, single-dwellings, and mixed-use residential above retail/services.
- Generally, participants desire a strong pedestrian emphasis along entire length of Lombard, not just between Portsmouth and Fiske, and emphasized unity in design of pedestrian elements such as safe crossings, lighting, paving, and landscaping.
- There was much discussion but no consensus about building height. A majority of people wanted building height limited to four stories; others suggested limits of two or three stories; others agreed with five to six stories, but only at key corners or sites.
- There was much discussion about enhancing the railroad cut area to make it more than just a gateway but a strong community focal point. People noted a desire to see unity of areas on both sides of cut and aesthetic improvements to the bridge (incorporate elements of St. Johns Bridge).
Transportation Design Directives

As noted above, workshop participants were also asked to prioritize a list of potential transportation improvements along North Lombard Street and to provide comments about other potential transportation projects that may be necessary. Participants identified the following projects, in order of priority.

- Improve pedestrian crossing safety, convenience between signalized intersections.
- Enhance the quality and safety of sidewalk area (lighting, street trees, benches, trash cans, etc.).
- Improve quality and convenience of transit stops (shelters, lighting, etc.).
- Provide for safe/convenient bicycle travel within Lombard corridor.
- Maintain/enhance vehicle capacity on Lombard.
- Improve frequency of transit service, regional connections.
- Provide missing curb ramps, wheelchair accessibility.

Downtown St. Johns

The following themes emerged from participant comments about the urban development concept and framework plans for downtown St. Johns.

- Overall there appears to be support for a mix of uses in downtown.
- There is general support for focusing more intense development in downtown.
- Quality of building design is a significant issue.
- Little/no support for seven story buildings, participants more comfortable with four story buildings, with some acceptance of five; six stories at key sites only, specifically the old Safeway site.
- There are many different ideas about how to redevelop the old Safeway site; a mix of uses with residential component was desired/acceptable to many. Other ideas, such as aquatic center, office, or other civic/recreational use were also discussed.
- There is concern about how to accommodate parking for new development.
- Participants desire to see a decrease (“step down”) in building heights from downtown core to adjacent residential areas.
- Participants would like to see a higher quality mix of retail/commercial services, especially restaurants.
Transportation Design Directives

Participants prioritized potential transportation improvements for the downtown as follows.

- Improve pedestrian crossing safety along Ivanhoe Street.
- Mitigate impacts of truck traffic on Ivanhoe west of Philadelphia.
- Improve vehicle access into the town center core (Ivanhoe/Philadelphia and Lombard/Richmond intersections).
- Enhance the quality and safety of sidewalk area (lighting, street trees, trash cans, etc.).
- Improve frequency of transit service, regional connections.
- Re-connect the street grid around the town center.
- Maximize parking opportunities.
- Provide for safe/convenient bicycle access and circulation.

Cathedral Park Hillside

As previously noted, a preferred scenario for the Cathedral Park Hillside was not identified during the first urban design workshop. However, community comments provided guidance in the revision of the Hillside Village scenario.

**Revised Hillside Village Neighborhood** – A mix of moderate-scaled multi-dwelling development (apartments and condos), and single-dwelling, attached and detached houses. Higher intensity residential development would be located on key streets such as Burlington, Richmond and Baltimore Avenues, or at key intersections. Improvement to streets, sidewalks and pedestrian crossings are part of this scenario.

Participants were asked to review and comment on the revised scenario, and respond to specific questions. The following is a summary of the community’s response.

- General agreement with scenario, with more intense development on Richmond and Burlington.
- Desire to preserve some aspects of the existing hillside neighborhood, such as single dwelling residential areas, and relatively low building height (generally limited to three stories).
- Preservation and protection of views a dominant theme - building heights should be related to slope.
- Parking access and availability is a concern to many.
- Pedestrian access to river and downtown is important to most participants.
Transportation Design Directives
Participants prioritized potential transportation improvements for the Cathedral Park Hillside as follows.

- Improve existing streets to City standards for sidewalks.
- Improve missing links of the street grid.

Willamette Riverfront
The community noted the following themes regarding the revised urban development concept and framework plans.

- Strong support for a mix of uses, with a blend of employment, residential, and limited retail uses near the river.
- Significant support for enhanced access to and along Willamette River. Also support for enhancement and expansion of green space along river.
- Many people like the idea of an attractor and discussed a wide range of possibilities for the focus – marine life, local history, science, education.
- Retention of views is important to many hillside residents.
- No specific residential type was consistently noted, but a general desire for medium density development as opposed to high intensity - some noted the concept heights (up to five stories) as too tall.

Transportation Design Directives
Workshop participants prioritize potential transportation improvements for the Riverfront as follows:

- Establish clear and direct pedestrian routes from downtown St Johns to riverfront.
- Enhance pedestrian connections to trail system (Greenway Trail, Peninsula Crossing Trail).
- Provide direct access to transit service to support new development.
- Establish new collector roadway system for auto access and circulation.
- Improve missing links of the street grid.
Description of the Urban Development Concept

The Urban Development Concept represents a synthesis of the concepts developed throughout the process of the St. Johns/Lombard planning effort and reflects extensive public input. The concept plan responds to the existing built environment, natural features such as topographical constraints, and land use and intensity considerations developed during public urban design workshops.

Key Features of the Concept

Downtown St. Johns: A civic and commercial core has been identified, allowing for a mix of land uses while offering the highest level of pedestrian environment in the plan area. The objective here is to promote a vibrant mixed-use district with people living in close proximity to the Lombard main street and civic functions. Redevelopment opportunities in this area may become a catalyst for improvements in the greater downtown area.

Lombard Main Street: The Lombard main street concept focuses neighborhood serving, pedestrian friendly development in key locations and encourages additional housing that may help support commercial areas, while continuing to provide opportunities for auto-accommodating land uses and activities.

Willamette Riverfront: The riverfront amenity, views, and river-accessible frontages suggest a more intense use of the area. The riverfront area provides opportunities for redevelopment that may strengthen the overall economic vitality and livability of the area. The area between North Richmond and Cathedral Park, currently dominated by light industrial uses and vacant or underutilized land, has been identified for future housing development. Riverfront areas between the park and the industrial sanctuary to the northwest provide opportunities for employment, business start-ups, and marine-recreational facilities.

Other Features: Public realm features such as community corners, gateways and important streets with an enhanced pedestrian environment are identified.

Descriptions of the map symbols and sub-areas can be found on the following pages.
Preliminary Urban Development Concept
Map Symbols and Area Descriptions

**Gateways**
Gateways are located at key places or intersections and identify the entrance to a district or area. Development adjacent to gateways should contribute to the sense of entry and level of importance through appropriate building scale, character, and orientation. Right-of-way features such as landscaping, public art, landmarks or special signage, lighting or paving may be used to help signify gateways.

**Attraction/Focal Point**
This symbol indicates an area or place that draws people from nearby neighborhoods as well as citywide. The retail/civic area of downtown St. Johns, Cathedral Park, the Willamette Riverfront, and Peninsula Crossing Trail are attractions/focal points in the plan area. Focal points may have special architectural or landscape features, and may incorporate public art.

**Community Corners**
Community Corners are active pedestrian places located at key crossroads along Lombard Street. They are the primary pedestrian crossing locations. The cross streets serve as the main routes to significant places north and south of Lombard, such as the University of Portland (Portsmouth) and Roosevelt High School (Ida), as well as to and from the neighborhoods. Community Corners should be architecturally reinforced as significant places by promoting pedestrian-oriented storefront development. They accommodate community services such as restaurants, pubs, cleaners/laundry, and corner stores. The public realm at Community Corners may have enhanced treatment, consistent with other important pedestrian locations in the plan area.

**Primary Framework Streets**
Primary framework streets are the key streets that provide identity and connect important places within the plan area. These multi-modal streets may be the focus of more intense land uses and higher levels of pedestrian activity, and may receive the highest level of public realm amenities within the area.
Secondary Framework Streets

Secondary framework streets serve as important routes for pedestrian and vehicle activity in the plan area, and may be the focus of more intense land use activity. These streets may receive a higher level of public realm amenities than other streets in the area.

Enhanced Pedestrian Connections

Enhanced pedestrian connections are envisioned as links between downtown St. Johns and the Willamette riverfront where pedestrian movement is the priority. These connections may be developed with innovative designs that provide stormwater benefits or green space amenities.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Trails

Existing or planned trails linking to the regional trail system.

Civic/Public Open Space:

These are areas developed as parks or designated as public open space.
Lombard Main Street:

The Lombard Main Street area is conceptually divided into the following sub-areas:

- East (from Woolsey to Van Houten),
- Central (Van Houten to the railroad cut),
- The Railroad Cut, and
- West (from the railroad cut to downtown St. Johns).

Each sub-area has a somewhat different characteristic, as described below.

**Lombard East**

The easternmost segment of this sub-area, bounded by Fiske and Woolsey, is envisioned as a residential focus area that includes a mix of housing and mixed-use buildings. This area offers housing opportunity sites, which help support commercial activity in adjacent sections of the Lombard main street.

The area between Fiske and Portsmouth is conceptualized as a location for pedestrian friendly retail activity and housing. This area is the heart of the Lombard main street, a place where neighbors shop and socialize. To encourage and maintain this neighborly environment, auto-related land uses, such as drive through restaurants and quick vehicle servicing establishments, are discouraged. Higher levels of design and building quality are desired for this area to enhance its special quality as a center of community activity. Buildings meet the sidewalk to create a continuous building frontage in this area, making walking a more interesting experience. The preferred location for parking in this area is at the rear of buildings, accessed via alleys.

**Lombard Central**

The central portion of the Lombard main street is envisioned as becoming more pedestrian-friendly, with an increase in housing over time. Within this area, the community corners are envisioned as places with the most pedestrian-friendly development, ideally in mixed-use buildings. However, the area will continue to be a place where neighbors and passersby can access convenience and auto-oriented retailers and services. This area will provide opportunities for automobile sales and servicing, businesses with drive-througths, and other land uses and activities that could conflict with areas of the most intense pedestrian activity.
Railroad Cut
The bridge over the railroad cut could be visually improved and help create a gateway between adjacent neighborhoods. The Peninsula Crossing Trail runs along the cut and intersects Lombard just east of the cut, creating an opportunity for a marker in conjunction with the bridge crossing.

Lombard West
The western portion of the Lombard main street is envisioned as becoming more pedestrian-friendly, with an increase in housing over time. Within this area, the community corners are envisioned as places with the most pedestrian-friendly development, ideally in mixed-use buildings. The area around Ida is envisioned to remain a focus of commercial activity in the future. New development will be oriented to the sidewalk, providing a more pleasing streetscape and easier accessibility from transit. West of Ida, Lombard narrows, providing an intimately scaled streetscape that serves as the entry into downtown St. Johns. New, moderately scaled multi-dwelling housing (apartments and row houses) is encouraged in the residential focus area between Ida and Buchanan, providing housing opportunities and an increased customer-base for local retailers.
St. Johns Town Center

The St. Johns town center area is conceptually divided into the following sub-areas:

- Downtown St. Johns;
- Hillside Neighborhood; and
- Mixed Use Riverfront

Each sub-area has different characteristics, described below.

Downtown St. Johns

Downtown St. Johns features a broad mix of commercial activities, community services, and housing, and is the heart of the St. Johns town center. A retail/civic focus area is envisioned as the heart of downtown St. Johns, and the town center area. The area along Lombard Street is the core of this focus area and includes a strong, pedestrian-oriented retail presence. To the north of Lombard is a civic area that includes the St. Johns Community Center and Park, James John School, St. Johns Branch Library and Portland Racquet Center. In the future this area will be bolstered with additional housing, and the location of additional community-serving activities. The retail/civic focus area is surrounded by residential and community-serving land uses (churches, social services, recreation, etc.) that support the town center.

Hillside Neighborhood

The Hillside Neighborhood portion of the town center supports the town center with a mix of moderately scaled multi-dwelling development (apartments and condos), and single-dwelling attached and detached houses. North Burlington Avenue functions as a key street, providing a clear pedestrian link between downtown St. Johns and the riverfront. Several key streets are proposed for enhanced pedestrian environments, and features that provide stormwater benefits and green space amenities.
Mixed-Use Riverfront

The Willamette riverfront is envisioned to provide a continuous, publicly accessible riverfront from Port of Portland Terminal 4, through Cathedral Park, and east beyond Willamette Cove. Land uses adjacent to the river will transition over time. The area between Cathedral Park and Richmond Avenue is envisioned to transition from an employment character to a mixed-use character, featuring residential development that takes advantage of the area’s riverfront and view amenities. This area may also be appropriate for a facility such as a river-related science/nature/educational facility. Along Crawford Street, between Cathedral Park and the Industrial Sanctuary to the northwest, land uses continue to be employment-related, with office and flex-space to allow an expansion of employment.

Riverfront Greenway:

The riverfront greenway is envisioned as a publicly accessible open space along the Willamette River. Building setbacks within the Riverfront Greenway may vary, but bank treatment should provide environmental and habitat values, while acting as an urban amenity for neighbors, the community, and city.
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Introduction

The St. Johns/Lombard Plan is a planning effort designed to develop a shared community vision for the area over the next twenty years. It focuses on two Metro Region 2040 mixed-use areas: the St. Johns town center and the North Lombard main street. The Bureau of Planning is conducting this planning effort in collaboration with the Portland Office of Transportation and the North Portland community. The planning effort, which began in the fall of 2001, focuses on issues such as land use, transportation, housing, and commercial and economic vitality. The plan is expected to be completed, with Portland City Council adoption, in the fall of 2003.

The purpose of this document is to:
- analyze to what extent the St. Johns/Lombard Plan and its implementation measures achieve the plan’s goals;
- analyze how well the proposed comprehensive plan map fulfills the urban development concept’s directives;
- analyze the plan’s economic feasibility.

An important milestone in the development of the St. Johns/Lombard Plan was the creation of an urban development concept for the future development of the plan area. The urban development concept is intended to serve as a framework for the plan. It will direct the pattern and intensity of land uses, indicate how public spaces can be enhanced, and specify where transportation improvements and other public investment can be made to enhance the livability and economic vitality of the plan area.

The Urban Development Concept was developed in Task 3 of the project and later refined. Its stated purpose is to represent “a big picture vision for future land use, transportation, and open space within the plan area, and identify places of special interest for the community. The concept provides guidance for development of specific land use and transportation plans and implementation strategies.”

The Urban Development Concept represents a synthesis of the concepts developed throughout the process of the St. Johns/Lombard planning effort and reflects extensive public input. The concept plan responds to the existing built environment, natural features such as topographical constraints, and land use and intensity considerations developed during public urban design workshops.
The Urban Development Concept identifies distinct subareas within the St. Johns/Lombard area:

**Lombard Main Street:** The Lombard main street concept focuses neighborhood serving, pedestrian friendly development in key locations and encourages additional housing that may help support commercial areas, while continuing to provide opportunities for auto-accommodating land uses and activities.

**Downtown St. Johns:** A civic and commercial core has been identified, allowing for a mix of land uses while offering the highest level of pedestrian environment in the plan area. The objective here is to promote a vibrant mixed-use district with people living in close proximity to the Lombard main street and civic functions. Redevelopment opportunities in this area may become a catalyst for improvements in the greater downtown area.

**Hillside Neighborhood:** The Hillside Neighborhood portion of the town center supports the town center with additional housing. The neighborhood is a mix of moderately scaled multi-dwelling development (apartments and condos), and single-dwelling attached and detached houses. North Burlington Avenue functions as a key street, providing a clear pedestrian link between downtown St. Johns and the riverfront.

**Willamette Riverfront:** The riverfront amenity, views, and river-accessible frontages suggest a more intense use of the area. The riverfront area provides opportunities for redevelopment that may strengthen the overall economic vitality and livability of the area. The area between North Richmond and Cathedral Park, currently dominated by light industrial uses and vacant or underutilized land, has been identified for future housing development. Riverfront areas between the park and the industrial sanctuary to the northwest provide opportunities for employment, business start-ups, and marine-recreational facilities.
This report examines the Urban Development Concept and evaluates its consistency with the plan goals that came out of the project’s visioning and public involvement process. The report examines the proposed changes to the Comprehensive Plan that have been guided by the Urban Development Concept. Furthermore, this report quantitatively evaluates the financial feasibility of building prototypes which illustrate potential approaches for achieving elements of the Urban Design Concept. Lastly, the report documents illustrative development scenarios of opportunity sites, based on previously established building prototypes and influenced by site-specific opportunities and constraints.
Qualitative Analysis of the Urban Development Concept

The purpose of this section is the analysis of the Urban Development Concept. It evaluates qualitatively how the Urban Development Concept supports and achieves the plan goals.

**Plan Goal: Enhance the identity of the St. Johns and Lombard area**

The Urban Development Concept enhances the identity of the St. Johns/Lombard area by defining distinct subareas that have unique characteristics. The proposed development pattern for each subarea recognizes natural features, the history of the place and its built environment, and the community’s vision for each subarea.

For example, Lombard Street has been broken up into distinct segments rather than one homogeneous corridor. The different segments emphasize pedestrian friendly storefront retail, auto-accommodating retail uses, or mixed-use residential areas respectively. The existing building stock, previous neighborhood plans that identified the opportunity for main street commercial, and the recognition of the needs of land and business owners shaped a plan that balances various needs and aims to improve the physical characteristics of Lombard over time.

In the Downtown St. Johns area, Lombard Street will retain much of the scale and character it historically had and which is valued by the community. In the future, higher intensity development is envisioned on the current Safeway site and the city owned racquet center site where larger footprint buildings already exist.

The Urban Development Concept envisions opportunistic infill of smaller scale multi-family and attached single-family buildings throughout the Hillside Neighborhood. Redevelopment of individual lots or lot assemblies will increase the number of people living in the area incrementally over time.

The proposal for the Waterfront area calls for the most dramatic changes in land use as well as built form. While the area north of Cathedral Park will generally retain industrial and employment uses, the area south of the park is planned to become a mixed-use area with opportunity for a significant residential component. While use and built form may change, the plan envisions the area to retain its industrial character through material and architectural detail.
Plan Goal: Implement the Region 2040 town center and main street designations in this area
The Urban Development Concept proposes a well-balanced mix of residential, commercial, employment and civic uses. The plan proposes to enhance existing uses where they are appropriate and to allow for the change of use over time where different uses seem appropriate. The overarching goal is to achieve a balance of complementary uses within close proximity, so residents can comfortably live, shop, recreate and possibly work within the area.

In order to provide sufficient housing to support the retail and commercial uses, the Urban Development Concept identifies opportunities for higher density residential in the downtown core and in the riverfront area, and incremental residential infill in the hillside neighborhood and along portions of Lombard Street.

The concept provides for commercial areas with distinct characters along segments of Lombard Street, downtown, and limited retail on the riverfront.

The concept retains some industrial and employment uses within the area to provide job opportunities nearby. This also recognizes the adjacency of heavy industrial land and physical constraints that would make residential uses in portions of the riverfront area inappropriate.

Plan Goal: Foster revitalized St. Johns and Lombard Street commercial areas
The Urban Development Concept strengthens commercial viability by defining retail areas with distinct characters: the Full Main Street segment of Lombard Street provides a pedestrian oriented storefront appeal, while the Partial Main Street segment accommodates auto-oriented uses more liberally. The downtown segment of Lombard is similar in character to the Full Main Street segment, however, it also comprises civic uses and is part of a larger mixed-use area that includes Ivanhoe. Specialty retail, restaurants and other destination-type businesses may be part of a riverfront redevelopment and provide amenities as well as attractors for both residents and visitors.

The concept calls for improved sidewalks and pedestrian crossings and proposes an enhanced transportation system that includes bike routes and lanes, improved bus service and safer intersection. The concept also identifies the opportunity for a shared parking in the town center area.
Plan Goal: Provide opportunities for new housing along the Lombard main street and near the St. Johns town center

The Urban Development Concept identifies opportunities for residential infill and redevelopment of commercially used properties as residential or mixed-use projects. Segments of Lombard Street have been identified as Residential Focus Areas, recognizing existing residential uses in the general area as well as the need to provide a range of housing options nearby transit and shopping.

The concepts facilitates future redevelopment of the Safeway and racquet center sites as higher density residential with a mixed use component to provide for more housing in the heart of Downtown St. Johns. The adjacent Hillside Neighborhood has potential for smaller scale residential infill and incremental redevelopment.

Plan Goal: Provide for a balanced multi-modal transportation system

The concept calls for improved sidewalks and pedestrian crossings and proposes an enhanced transportation system that includes bike routes and lanes, improved bus service and safer intersections. The concept also identifies the opportunity for a shared parking concept in the town center area.

The transportation system of the hillside/waterfront area may be enhanced by a network of collector streets that would provide easy and safe access to the more intense development along the riverfront.

Improvements to the pedestrian realm may include marked crosswalks, additional traffic signals, curb extensions at intersections to reduce the crossing distance, median refuge islands that create a safe stopping place and cut the crossing distance in half, additional or improved ramps for the handicapped, and enhanced street lighting to improve visibility. The concept identifies key pedestrian routes that connect the downtown with the waterfront.

Improvements for bicyclists may include bike lanes along portions of Lombard where possible, and designated bike routes on parallel streets. Both bike lanes and parallel routes shall tie into a continuous network of bikeways that allows for safe and convenient access to the St. Johns/Lombard area.

Improvements to the transit system may include express buses and a bus rapid transit system that utilizes curb extensions, bus lanes and signal priority for buses to make operations more efficient. Amenities such as bus shelters, information kiosks and lighting at bus stops may be added or enhanced.

Intersection enhancements may include the redesign of the Philadelphia/Ivanhoe, Lombard/Richmond and Ivanhoe/Richmond intersections to improve the clarity of the traffic operations and pedestrian crossing.
Plan Goal: Unify the community with safe, accessible, and attractive parks and open spaces

The Urban Development Concept proposes a continuous public greenway of no less than 100 feet in width along the Willamette River connecting Cathedral Park with a future park in the Willamette Cove area. The greenway will offer recreational facilities to residents and visitors, but will also provide habitat for fish and wildlife.

The concept identifies routes for improved pedestrian and bike connections between downtown and the riverfront, and along the proposed greenway. There are several unimproved street rights-of-way in the Hillside and Waterfront areas, some of which could be developed as pocket parks with pedestrian and bike trails.

Plan Goal: Promote sustainable development practices and environmental quality

The concept calls for a continuous riverfront greenway that would provide habitat for fish and wildlife and offer the opportunity for more native vegetation on the peninsula.

The concept proposes more efficient and compact infill redevelopment of developed areas, and the transformation of some industrial “brownfield” sites to residential or mixed-use. The concept also promotes a balanced mix of residential, retail and employment uses within the study area. The proposed land use pattern would help ease the development pressure on undeveloped “greenfield” sites in outlying areas. The proposed compact mixed-use development would also reduce the dependency on the automobile and reduce average trip lengths by providing services daily needs close by.

The concept identifies several unimproved street rights-of-way in the Hillside and Waterfront areas that could be developed as pocket parks with pedestrian and bike trails. These parks could help improve the microclimate and would provide child friendly recreational space within a short walk from many households.

The streets and sidewalks throughout the study are would be improved with new development, adding a significant number of street trees over time.
Proposed Comprehensive Plan Changes

The St. Johns/Lombard Plan will result in changes to the City’s Comprehensive Plan. The Urban Development Concept has been developed to guide these changes. This section examines the proposed changes to the land use pattern and its consistency with the Urban Development Concept, and evaluates the ratio of different land uses.

Land-Use Intensities

One of the facets of the Urban Development Concept is the idea of land-use intensities, which describes varying density, building height and land-use throughout the study area. This concept is more illustrative and its implications are understood more easily than typical comprehensive plan or zoning designations. The Land-Use Intensities map and table were developed to illustrate the concept for the public, and to inform subsequent changes to the Comprehensive Plan.

The Land Use Intensities map and table conceptually show the intensity of building within the St. Johns/Lombard Plan area. Darker shading on the map indicates higher density and taller buildings, lighter shading indicates lower density and buildings.
The chart below describes the proposed land use intensities for each of the sub areas. The designations are rough measures of building intensity, not to be confused with zoning map or comprehensive plan designations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Typ. Building Height</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Building Types</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Setbacks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Density Residential</td>
<td>R-A</td>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>detached SF; attached SF, small MF buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium density residential</td>
<td>R-B</td>
<td>2 - 4</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>attached SF, MF buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-use Waterfront</td>
<td>MX-W</td>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>residential, limited commercial, employment</td>
<td>mixed-use buildings, MF buildings, live/work, employment</td>
<td>uses and design compatible with residential; no drive-thru businesses</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-use Town Center</td>
<td>MX-TC (+)</td>
<td>2 - 5 (7)</td>
<td>retail, office, residential, civic</td>
<td>mixed-use buildings, commercial buildings, MF buildings</td>
<td>drive-thru businesses limited</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Main Street</td>
<td>MS-A (+)</td>
<td>2 - 4 (6)</td>
<td>retail, office, residential</td>
<td>mixed-use buildings, commercial buildings, MF buildings, attached SF</td>
<td>no drive-thru businesses</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial Main Street</td>
<td>MS-B</td>
<td>2 - 4</td>
<td>retail, office, residential</td>
<td>mixed-use buildings, commercial buildings, MF buildings</td>
<td>drive-thru businesses limited</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comprehensive Plan Proposal

The following two maps illustrate the first draft proposed changes to the City’s Comprehensive Plan as a result of the St. Johns/Lombard Plan. Following the maps is a chart that translates the Urban Development Concept designations into Comprehensive Plan designations and tools. The chart and maps are the result of an alternatives analysis process in which a number of different scenarios were discussed. The goal was to find zoning designations and tools that most effectively and efficiently achieve the plan’s goals while creating the greatest level of comfort for all affected landowners and residents.

The first map shows the draft proposed Comprehensive Plan map for the entire study area. The plan proposal is based upon the Urban Development Concept and translates the urban development concept into an implementable plan and code language. The Comprehensive Plan map will guide future development in the plan area. The map reflects a refinement of many of the ideas first developed in the land use intensities maps shown above.

The second map highlights the areas where the draft proposed Comprehensive Plan map differs from the existing Comprehensive Plan map. A key principle of the map development was to only change the comprehensive plan designation of a property if it is necessary to achieve the St. Johns/Lombard Plan’s goals. Rather than a wholesale change throughout the study area that may be confusing and unsettling to many residents and landowners, existing comprehensive plan designations that seemed in general compliance with the broader ideas were left unchanged. This method prevents unnecessary impact on landowners in the study area while providing good measures for change where needed.

The chart following the maps juxtaposes the Urban Development Concept designations - as described in the land use intensities map and chart – with implementable comprehensive plan designations and tools. The comparison shows that the comprehensive plan proposal generally follows the urban development concept while incorporating some adjustments to reflect more recent input.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subarea</th>
<th>UDC Designation</th>
<th>Comprehensive Plan Designations and Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Lombard Full Main Street     | MS-A            | ▪ Urban Commercial (UC) Designation to promote urban pedestrian-friendly development  
▪ Commercial storefront (CS) and mixed use commercial (CM) zones  
▪ General Commercial (CG) Designation to allow auto accommodating uses  
▪ General Commercial zone  
▪ Medium density multi-family – R1 zone (in some locations) |
| Lombard Partial Main Street  | MS-B            | ▪ Neighborhood Commercial designation (CN1) to allow compatible commercial  
▪ Apply main street corridor overlay to promote housing through extra height  
▪ CS designation in most areas to promote pedestrian orientation;  
▪ CG designation in some areas where key auto uses are still important  
▪ Apply main street node overlay to promote pedestrian orientation, limit parking on street frontage, enhance ground floor windows |
| Lombard Residential Focus area | MS-B            | ▪ Use CS designation on/near Lombard  
▪ Keep CN2 designation on super blocks and in locations with more traffic (Ivanhoe), but provide bonus height and FAR for development with housing  
▪ Strategic changes to residential to allow multi-family development and row houses  
▪ Apply design review in most areas  
▪ Removed RH designation (75 foot height limit) in most of area  
▪ Use R1 multi-dwelling (1 unit/1,000 sf; 45’ max) in most of area  
▪ Reduced minimum density in R1 to allow row houses and encourage owner-occupancy  
▪ Apply design review except for single dwellings  
▪ Created “employment” and “residential” focus areas  
▪ Removed some properties west of park from industrial sanctuary and re-designated as mixed employment to allow broader array of employment uses while buffering industrial from new housing  
▪ Maintained industrial sanctuary (IH and IG zones) west of park and Columbia Sportswear  
▪ Used Central Employment (EX) near the park east to Richmond to allow housing and transition to mixed use character  
▪ Retained Mixed Employment (EG) at riverfront east of park due to access and other issues associated with railroad, and future planning for riverfront. This area to be reconsidered as part of River Renaissance project.  
▪ Apply design review to EX and possibly EG areas to improve design quality on new development in riverfront areas. |
Land Use Allocation Evaluation

This section of the report discusses the comprehensive plan land use allocations based on projected household growth and total demand for commercial retail/service space (existing and projected potential). The table on the next page illustrates how proposed changes to the comprehensive plan impact acreage within the study area by designation.

The existing economic conditions report compared market area demand for commercial and selected service businesses (for 2010) with commercial land capacity within the study area. The analysis determined that assuming commercial development and infill below maximum allowable densities, the estimated potential supply of commercial and selected service space exceeds demand, even providing for growth anticipated in both market area population and capture of resident and employee spending.

The effect of comprehensive plan changes is a small net reduction in the acreage allocated specifically to commercial use. The maximum commercial capacity (in terms of commercial floor area ratio build-out) is reduced somewhat due to changes in zoning. These zoning changes should also result in more compact, urban, and pedestrian friendly commercial development and redevelopment.

The net effect of the comprehensive plan changes proposed on residential development or capacity based on land areas zoned for residential exclusively are likely to be negligible. However an important component of the plan are overlays that are intended to induce residential development through height bonuses and strategic code changes intended to make small residential lot infill projects easier by reducing minimum densities. In addition, residential projects will be easier in areas being converted to Central Employment (EX) from other employment or industrial zones. Designations as proposed encourage more medium density development around the town center and more low density multi-dwelling and townhouse/row house development on the hillside and in the residential focus areas on Lombard.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Existing Conditions</th>
<th>Proposed Plan</th>
<th>Net Chg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CG - General Commercial</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>-32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC - Neighborhood Commercial</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC - Urban Commercial</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Commercial</td>
<td>129.1</td>
<td>127.2</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX - Central Employment</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME - Mixed Employment</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>-42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS - Industrial Sanctuary</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Employment</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>-28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5 - Residential 5,000</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>-64.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2.5 - Residential 2,500</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>60.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2 - Low Density Multi-Dwelling</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1 - Medium Density Multi-Dwelling</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>108.7</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RH - High Density Multi-Dwelling</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Residential</td>
<td>207.5</td>
<td>205.9</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS - Open Space</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total All Land Uses</td>
<td>450.9</td>
<td>450.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Development Prototype Feasibility

Financial feasibility analyses were conducted for several development concepts/prototypes which illustrate potential approaches for achieving elements of the Urban Design Concept. The financial pro formas explore what is needed for the prototypes to be financially viable and/or what implementation tools would be most effective to encourage a specific type of development. The pro formas and assumptions are provided in the appendix of this report. The six development prototypes assessed reflect previous market research as well as the Urban Development Concept and proposed Comprehensive Plan changes.

The first two concepts, *typical* and *live-work townhouses*, reflect current market acceptance of townhouses/rowhouses in the study area and the opportunity for infill development of this type in the residential focus areas of Lombard, on the hillside, and potentially the waterfront.

**Typical Townhouse** – Three story building with four townhouse units, wood siding and wood frame constructed with average materials and workmanship. The residential living area totals 1,500 square feet with a built-in single car garage on the first floor. Total lot size for all four units is 10,000 square feet or 2,500 square feet per unit.

**Live-work Townhouse** – Also a three story building with four townhouse units, wood siding and wood frame constructed with average materials and workmanship. The residential living area totals 1,600 square feet. The first floor consists of a built-in single car garage and 500 square feet of unfinished space for commercial purposes or additional living space. Total lot size for all four units is 10,000 square feet or 2,500 square feet per unit.

The typical townhouse appears feasible allowing for a 14% developer profit if sold at $120 per square foot for a total price of $180,000. The per square foot price is close but not quite top of the local market for smaller units. However, the sales price is notably higher than most units have gone for recently.

Townhouse units recently constructed and sold in the St. Johns area have been primarily two stories with detached garage or basement garage and somewhat smaller at 1,050-1,350 square feet of living area. These units and garage configurations are less expensive to build than our prototype development.

Live-work townhouses are untested in the study area market. The prototype does not appear feasible at the sales price of $100 per square foot or $210,000 unless developed by a non-profit developer or developer/contractor. At $115 per square foot and a sales price of
$241,500 these units would provide a developer return of 15%. Locations in the towncenter, on the hillside near the park, or on the waterfront are most likely to be able to generate higher prices.

**Infill Apartment** – This ten unit apartment prototype is a three story wood frame building with exterior finish of stucco on concrete block. Ten parking spaces for residents are provided in a surface lot on the property. Total lot size is 10,000 square feet.

For this prototype apartment to be feasible either changes in the market (i.e. significant rent increases) or development incentives/assistance would be required. At an average rent of $910 per unit (or $0.85 per square foot – typical for the market today) this prototype has an approximately $31.00 per square foot funding gap including developer profit. This project appears to be feasible at an average rent of $1.24 per square foot – a 46% increase above current average rents.

**Mixed-Use Storefront with Apartments** – The mixed use storefront prototype includes 8,000 square feet of commercial storefront space, 24 apartment units, residential and commercial parking spaces on a 20,000 square foot lot. Residential construction is wood siding on wood frame over a split face concrete retail and podium parking structure.

Feasibility of this prototype also depends on either changes in the market (i.e. significant rent increases) or development incentives/assistance. The addition of commercial space reduces the funding gap to $29.00 per square foot (compared to the infill apartment prototype) by providing lower cost space that generates higher rents. This project appears to be feasible at a blended rent (weighted average of commercial and residential rents) of $1.29 per square foot.

The final two prototype developments are a variation on theme. They both address the introduction of larger medium density projects into the study area to support commercial retail and service providers.
**Mid-Rise Mixed-Use Apartment** – The apartment prototype concept is 96 rental units of housing over 10,100 square feet of commercial storefront space and podium parking. Construction is wood siding on wood frame over a steel joist/split face concrete retail and podium parking structure. Total lot size is 40,000 square feet – a full city block.

Feasibility of this prototype apartment would require either changes in the market (i.e. significant rent increases) or development incentives/assistance. At an average rent of $14 per square foot per year for commercial and $705 per month for apartment units (or $0.85 per square foot – typical for the market today) this prototype has a funding gap of approximately $36.00 per square foot including developer profit. This project appears to be feasible at a blended rent (weighted average of commercial and residential rents) of $1.33 per square foot.

**Mid-Rise Mixed-Use Condominium** – The condominium prototype concept is basically the same configuration: 96 units of housing over 10,100 square feet of commercial storefront space and podium parking. However, finishes and construction are more sophisticated for the owner occupants and consist of steel joist throughout and brick facing with concrete block back-up for the residential stories over split face concrete retail and podium parking structure.

This concept includes both income-producing (commercial) and for-sale (condominium) components. At an average rent of $14 per square foot per year for commercial and average sales price of $105,000 per condominium unit (or $127 per square foot – top of the St. Johns market today) this prototype is nearly feasible for a non-profit developer – with a funding gap of approximately $12.00 per square foot not including developer profit. This project appears to be feasible with a 15% developer return at an average condominium sales price of $135,000 per unit or $163 per square foot – a 28% increase above current top of the market condo sales prices.
Opportunity Site Development Scenarios

Three specific sites in the study area were chosen to “test” the prototypes in a realistic setting. The drawings on the following pages show illustrative development scenarios for each of the opportunity sites. The development program for each site is based on the Urban Development Concept’s vision for each sub area. While meant to be realistic and feasible, the site designs are for illustrative purposes only and are not actual development proposals.

The following sites were studied:

- Eagles site – located at the northwest corner of Lombard and Exeter, the site is approximately 1.8 ac in size. It currently houses the Eagles Lodge and is one of the largest sites along Lombard. Its location offers an opportunity to anchor the western end of Lombard’s full main street section.

- Safeway site – located in downtown St. Johns, bounded by Burlington, Central, Leavitt and Kellogg, the site is approximately 2.4 ac in size. It currently houses Safeway, scheduled to move to a new location south of Ivanhoe. Its location in the heart of downtown and its high development potential make it especially interesting.

- Hoff site – located on both sides of Salem Ave. between Edison and Crawford, the site is approximately 2.5 ac in size. The site is currently on the market and has high development potential. Its location in the waterfront district offers an opportunity to explore development that takes advantage of the park and potential view amenities.
Eagles Site

The scenario shows a 25,000 sf grocery store fronting on Lombard with approximately 30 senior housing units on two stories of above. A parking lot behind the building is accessed from the side streets – Van Houten and Exeter. Eight to ten townhouses along either side street screen the mid-block parking lot.

The grocery store provides an anchor at the western end of Lombard’s Full Main Street section. Senior housing is a good complementary use with a low parking count. It gives seniors the advantage of living close to many services.

The townhouses provide a transition from the busy main street to the quieter neighborhood behind while offering good housing options close to retail and transit.

The overall density is approximately 26 units/acre, in addition to the retail space, the overall floor area ratio (exclusive of parking) is approximately 1.1:1.

Note: This scenario could be modified to accommodate the Eagles lodge on the second floor of the grocery store. Parking for lodge users may be accommodated on-street, or shared on-site by arrangement with the grocery store during non-peak hours.
Safeway Site

On the southern portion of the site, the scenario shows a 3 to 4 story courtyard residential building on top of ground floor parking podium. The podium is lined with retail or residential uses on Burlington and Richmond to ensure a ground floor presence. The building provides approximately 96 residential units in addition to approximately 5,000 sf of retail. Leonard Street is continued through the site as “woonerf”, allowing vehicular access to the parking garage and bike and pedestrian through movements.

On the northern portion of the site, the scenario shows a mid-block parking area wrapped with approximately 14 townhouses to the north and east, and a 3 story apartment building with approximately 35 units to the west. A tree lined path connects the Leonard woonerf with the public park to the north. The townhouses provide a transition in scale between the higher intensity development closer to Lombard and the smaller, residential scale neighborhoods surrounding the park.

The overall density is approximately 60 units/acre, the overall floor area ratio (exclusive of parking) is approximately 1.5:1. If the courtyard building has one additional story, the density increases to about 70 units/acre, the floor area ratio (exclusive of parking) goes up to about 1.7:1.
Hoff Site

The scenario shows a mix of approximately 16 town houses and approximately 105 apartments/condos in mid rise residential buildings with approximately 10,000 sf retail. Taking advantage of the slope, parking is located on the lower level, partially buried in the ground.

Generally, lower buildings are located toward the top of the hill while taller buildings are located toward the bottom, thus respecting views from the hillside neighborhoods. A 5 story building at the corner of Salem and Burlington is the exception. The building creates a focal point and helps enclose a triangular plaza that may be used for outdoor restaurant seating.

The overall density is approximately 48 units/acre, the overall floor area ratio (exclusive of parking) is approximately 1.6:1.
Appendix

The following financial analyses illustrate six prototype uses (or potential developments) in two worksheets – the first worksheet reflecting the upper end of current market rents and sales values and the second worksheet based on rents and values likely required to make each project feasible. These worksheets are preceded by a table outlining many of the assumptions used.

Each pro forma involves projection of rents/values vs. construction costs and operating expense (for rental properties), owner/developer financing and resulting rate of return. The pro formas are intended for illustrative purposes only and are not location or project specific.

The six prototypes illustrated include:
- Traditional Townhouse
- Live/Work Townhouse
- Mid-Rise Mixed Use Apartment (with Retail)
- Mid-Rise Mixed Use Condominium (with Retail)
- Storefront with Residential (Apartments above)
- Infill Apartment

Assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Townhouse</th>
<th>Mid-Rise Mixed-Use</th>
<th>Storefront w/Residential</th>
<th>Infill Apartment</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Typical</td>
<td>Live/work</td>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>Condo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Site Size (nsf)</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Footprint</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>31,222</td>
<td>31,222</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Units</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. Parking Spaces</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Area (sf)</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>93,666</td>
<td>93,666</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Parking (sf)</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>29,900</td>
<td>29,900</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Area (sf)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>10,100</td>
<td>10,100</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Parking (sf)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Building Area</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>9,600</td>
<td>133,666</td>
<td>133,666</td>
<td>36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Area Ratio (FAR)</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density (Units per Acre)</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>104.5</td>
<td>104.5</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Cost (per space)</td>
<td>$13,522</td>
<td>$13,522</td>
<td>$8,399</td>
<td>$8,399</td>
<td>$4,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Building Parking Cost (sf)</td>
<td>$45.07</td>
<td>$45.07</td>
<td>$25.84</td>
<td>$25.84</td>
<td>$25.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Area Construction Cost</td>
<td>$46.86</td>
<td>$46.86</td>
<td>$63.16</td>
<td>$72.01</td>
<td>$63.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail/Shell Construction Cost</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$45.07</td>
<td>$62.58</td>
<td>$62.58</td>
<td>$62.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### St. Johns Town Center/Lombard Prototype ProForma Analysis

(Upper Current Market Conditions for New Construction of Commercial & Residential Uses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Per Square Foot Estimates</th>
<th>Townhouse</th>
<th>Mid-Rise Mixed-Use</th>
<th>Storefront</th>
<th>Infill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Typical</td>
<td>Live/work</td>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>Condo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Development Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Acquisition</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Demolition</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Preparation</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Cost per Land Area</td>
<td>$12.50</td>
<td>$17.50</td>
<td>$23.75</td>
<td>$23.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSF of Building Area (excl. parking)</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td>103,766</td>
<td>103,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Construction</td>
<td>$46.86</td>
<td>$46.43</td>
<td>$63.10</td>
<td>$71.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>$9.01</td>
<td>$6.44</td>
<td>$7.45</td>
<td>$7.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect (Soft) Cost</td>
<td>$21.01</td>
<td>$19.55</td>
<td>$26.20</td>
<td>$27.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Construction Cost</td>
<td>$97.72</td>
<td>$93.25</td>
<td>$104.90</td>
<td>$115.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Operating Budget (Rental)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Rental Rate</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$0.88</td>
<td>$1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Rental Rate</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$10.57</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less Vacancy</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Operating Income</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$10.04</td>
<td>$13.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less Expenses</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-35%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Operating Income</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$6.53</td>
<td>$11.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Sales Revenue (Owner)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Sales</td>
<td>$120.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$127.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less Sales Expense</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Sales Revenue</td>
<td>$111.60</td>
<td>$93.00</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$118.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Completed Valuation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitalization Rate</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
<td>9.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Efficiency Factor</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Value</td>
<td>$111.60</td>
<td>$93.00</td>
<td>$69.35</td>
<td>$103.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost % Supported by Value</td>
<td>114%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Gap ( ) w/ profit for rental products</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>($35.55)</td>
<td>($12.12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D. Development Assumptions**

| Residential Units: | 4 | 4 | 96 | 96 | 24 | 10 |
| Residential Unit Size (GSF) | 1,500 | 1,600 | 829 | 829 | 900 | 1071 |
| Unit Sales Price/Rent | $180,000 | $210,000 | $705 | $705 | $765 | $910 |
| Parking Spaces per DU | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.92 | 1.0 |
| Residential Density (DU/Ac) | 17.4 | 17.4 | 104.5 | 104.5 | 52.3 | 43.6 |

| Parking & Site Area: |
| Parking Area per Space | 300 | 300 | 325 | 325 | 182 | 300 |
| Cost per Space | $13,500 | $13,500 | $8,400 | $8,400 | $4,700 | $1,102 |

| Scale & Cost: |
| # of Floors | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| Building Footprint (% of Site) | 24% | 32% | 78% | 78% | 60% | 42% |
| Indirect/Soft Cost Rate | 35% | 35% | 35% | 35% | 35% | 35% |
| Site Size | 10,000 | 10,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | 20,000 | 10,000 |

Note: These pro formas are for illustrative purposes only and is not specific to any particular site. Actual project conditions will vary from estimates.
### St. Johns Town Center/Lombard Prototype ProForma Analysis

(Required Market Conditions for New Construction of Commercial & Residential Uses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Per Square Foot Estimates</th>
<th>Townhouse</th>
<th>Mid-Rise Mixed-Use</th>
<th>Storefront w/Residential</th>
<th>Infill Apartment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Development Budget</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Acquisition</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Demolition</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Preparation</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Cost per Land Area</td>
<td>$12.50</td>
<td>$17.50</td>
<td>$23.75</td>
<td>$18.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSF of Building Area (excl. parking)</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td>103,766</td>
<td>103,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Cost per SF Bldg.</td>
<td>$20.83</td>
<td>$20.83</td>
<td>$9.16</td>
<td>$11.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Construction</td>
<td>$46.86</td>
<td>$46.43</td>
<td>$63.10</td>
<td>$71.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>$9.01</td>
<td>$6.44</td>
<td>$7.45</td>
<td>$7.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect (Soft) Cost</td>
<td>$21.01</td>
<td>$19.55</td>
<td>$25.20</td>
<td>$27.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Construction Cost</td>
<td>$97.72</td>
<td>$93.25</td>
<td>$104.90</td>
<td>$115.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. Operating Budget (Rental)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rental Rate</th>
<th>Monthly Rental Rate</th>
<th>Annual Rental Rate</th>
<th>Gross Operating Income</th>
<th>less Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$1.41</td>
<td>$16.92</td>
<td>-35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$1.37</td>
<td>$16.44</td>
<td>-30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$16.19</td>
<td>-35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C. Sales Revenue (Owner)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sales Revenue</th>
<th>Unit Sales</th>
<th>less Sales Expense</th>
<th>Net Sales Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$120.00</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>$111.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$115.00</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>$106.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D. Completed Valuation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valuation</th>
<th>Capitalization Rate</th>
<th>Building Efficiency Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.00%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.00%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.00%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.00%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Value</td>
<td>$111.60</td>
<td>$106.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost % Supported by Value</td>
<td>114%</td>
<td>115%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Gap ( ) w/ profit for rental products</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D. Development Assumptions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential Units:</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>96</th>
<th>96</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Unit Size (GSF)</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Sales Price/Rent</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td>$241,500</td>
<td>$1,078</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td>$1,071</td>
<td>$1,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Spaces per DU</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Density (DU/Ac)</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>104.5</td>
<td>104.5</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parking & Site Area:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking Area per Space</th>
<th>300</th>
<th>300</th>
<th>325</th>
<th>325</th>
<th>182</th>
<th>300</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost per Space</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
<td>$8,400</td>
<td>$8,400</td>
<td>$4,700</td>
<td>$1,102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scale & Cost:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Floors</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Footprint (% of Site)</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect/Soft Cost Rate</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Size</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: These pro formas are for illustrative purposes only and is not specific to any particular site. Actual project conditions will vary from estimates.
PROJECT MEMORANDUM

To: Barry Manning, City of Portland Bureau of Planning
From: Denise Whitney & Eric Hovee
Subject: Assessment of St. Johns Waterfront Industrial Areas
Date: July 29, 2003

Portland’s harbor is Oregon’s freight transportation hub, connecting the seaport with regional barge routes, interstate highways, and transcontinental railroads. It is also in close proximity to Portland International Airport. There is no similar place in Oregon with this confluence of significant intermodal transportation facilities – nor is there any expectation that a similar transportation hub will be developed elsewhere in the state for the foreseeable future.

Bureau of Planning research has raised two central questions regarding Portland’s harbor industrial area: Will Portland’s harbor area continue as the focus for the region’s maritime and heavy manufacturing activities? Or, is the harbor area transitioning to a different and as yet undefined future?

This memorandum is intended to begin to address these questions as they relate to St. Johns waterfront industrial areas. It does so specifically by assessing the feasibility of redeveloping waterfront industrial areas southeast of Cathedral Park into mixed use developments and by qualitatively addressing the general viability of continued marine industrial/industrial use of waterfront industrial areas northwest of Cathedral Park. The remainder of this document is organized to cover:

Transitioning Uses and Feasibility of Redevelopment
General Viability of Bradford Street Industrial Area

Transitioning Uses and Feasibility of Redevelopment
This section discusses an evaluation of the feasibility of redeveloping waterfront and upland industrial areas southeast of Cathedral Park into mixed use developments. The approach taken involves adjusting existing illustrative prototype project pro formas, developed previously for the St. Johns Plan process, to reflect the likely conditions faced by waterfront and upland property owners.
The assessment includes two estimates of site-based real costs for transitioning land use, one for waterfront property and one for adjacent upland sites. The assumptions regarding costs associated with the transition of land use follow.

**Waterfront Property**

- In order to use readily available cost information, a 100 foot greenway is assumed. Costs reflect base level improvements as illustrated for North Macadam/South Waterfront in the *North Macadam Greenway Cost Estimate*, October 2002. The pro forma adjustments reflect potential costs to be incurred by the private property owners. The costs are distributed to the developable waterfront land (adjacent to the assumed greenway) on a per square foot basis.
- Recovery of the value of the land for the greenway setback is also included as a cost item and reflects the value of varying zone designations as in the previous pro forma analyses.
- Extraordinary site preparation costs reflect those used for 2000 North Macadam pro forma analyses which were based on redevelopment of an Old Town site near the waterfront. These costs were then inflation adjusted. The costs include pilings, structural slab, venting, limited environmental cleanup, and associated soft costs. Limited environmental cleanup was deemed to be reflective of sites analyzed for this project based on information provided by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality Environmental Cleanup Site Information Database.¹
- Street improvements on Bradford or an internal street are likely to be needed to take advantage of the development potential of this parcel. As a result costs associated with street improvements for 1,014 lineal feet (the length of the property) have been distributed to the developable waterfront land on a per square foot basis. Improvement costs are based on recent estimates for North Macadam/South Waterfront street improvements.

**Upland Property**

- Extraordinary site preparation costs reflect those used for 2000 North Macadam pro forma analyses which were based on redevelopment of an Old Town site near the waterfront. These costs were then inflation adjusted. The costs include pilings, structural slab, venting, limited environmental cleanup, and associated soft costs. Limited environmental cleanup was deemed to be reflective of sites analyzed for this project based on information provided by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality Environmental Cleanup Site Information Database.
- Some street improvements on Bradford or Crawford and an internal street are likely to be needed to take advantage of the development potential of these parcels. As a result costs associated with street improvements for 690 lineal feet (half the length plus the width of the property) have been distributed to the developable land on a per square foot basis.

¹ The database indicated 381 tons of black sand (petroleum and metal contaminated blasting grit used as fill on the site) was removed from the beach and bank of Crawford Street Corporation properties in October of 2001. Potential follow-up actions would be coordinated with EPA’s in-water work with the Portland Superfund Project.
Improvement costs are based on recent estimates for North Macadam/South Waterfront street improvements.

**Financial Feasibility Results**

The results of the evaluation of the feasibility of redeveloping waterfront and upland industrial areas southeast of Cathedral Park into mixed use developments are described in this section. The pro forma worksheets are provided as an appendix to this memorandum.2

The prototypes developed for the St. Johns/Lombard Plan are all residential or mixed use projects. The six prototypes illustrated include:

- Traditional Townhouse
- Live/Work Townhouse
- Mid-Rise Mixed Use Apartment (with Retail)
- Mid-Rise Mixed Use Condominium (with Retail)
- Storefront with Residential (Apartments above)
- Infill Apartment

**Waterfront Property**

Current market rents and sales prices at the upper end appear insufficient to support the cost of transitioning industrial uses to mixed use development. However, the waterfront property currently in use by Lampros Steel represents a potentially unique opportunity for housing on the eastside of the Willamette River. Depending on future land use in the Lloyd District and Eastbank industrial area, this site may be the only potential riverfront residential development area on the eastside between Kelly Point and the Brooklyn neighborhood.

As such, and given the unique view amenities, redevelopment at this site may be able to generate sales values significantly higher than currently represented in St. Johns. The prototype which appears most marketable under conditions required for feasibility is the mixed-use condominium development. This development type, because of its slightly higher density, allows the costs associated with extraordinary site preparation and greenway development to be born by a larger number of units/building square feet.

---

2 The location of the properties near and adjacent to a rail line was not specifically accounted for in the financial feasibility analyses. Final design of potential development projects will impact the degree to which the proximity to a rail line is an issue.

Discussions with property managers at the Yards at Union Station and McCormick Pier, both in Portland’s Central City, indicate that proximity to other amenities such as the Willamette River and downtown help to counteract perceived downsides. Both occasional noise complaints from residents and stated preferences for units not immediately adjacent to the tracks by potential residents do sometimes occur but are not considered the norm.
At an average sales price of $153,000 per unit, these condominiums could be priced comparably to the larger but older units at the St. Johns Edgewater project built in 1980 and reselling at $152,500. Yet they would offer new construction and a unique location. Also assumed in the feasible project illustration are retail rents of $20.00 per square foot. Only national tenants in St. Johns are currently paying comparable prices. But again this unique location should be able to achieve this rent level, especially with higher income residents/clientele as an amenity.

The two townhouse prototypes are a good indicator of cost sensitivity for the product and location. The typical townhouse – which is associated with a lower land value because of a residential zoning assumption built into the model – appears achievable at required market conditions. This could result in a sales price of $226,500 per unit. Though current townhouse sales prices are closer to the $130,000-$140,000 price range, the unique location offered by the site could make a significant difference.

However, the live/work townhouse prototype illustrates the cost/price sensitivity of redevelopment on the waterfront in St. Johns. This prototype includes a slightly higher land price (assuming a mixed use zoning designation) and larger housing product. The result is the need to reach a sales price of $306,600 for feasibility. Even at the waterfront, achieving sales prices over twice the typical St. Johns townhouse price point may not be likely in the near term. Over the long term, or with significant area redevelopment, achieving higher sales prices becomes more likely.

The remaining prototypes are all rental housing or rental mixed-use products. For these prototypes to be feasible either significant changes in the market (i.e. fairly dramatic rent increases) or significant development incentives/assistance (around $50 per square foot of residential area) would be required. A non-profit developer could bring in developments of these types at a lower incentive/assistance level.

The illustrative prototype developments are a good indicator of the sales prices necessary to recoup greenway development and extraordinary site preparation costs. The smaller the redevelopment project the higher the impact of the added costs. Thus small commercial only pad site type redevelopment on the waterfront might only be feasible if the City were to bear the costs of land ownership and preparation.

Upland Property

Redevelopment projects on upland properties immediately adjacent to waterfront sites would likely need to bear some extraordinary costs such as pilings, structural slab, venting, limited environmental cleanup, street improvements, and associated soft costs. But also have a somewhat lesser ability to generate the higher rents/sales values needed to support these costs due to the somewhat less unique location.

The typical townhouse appears feasible allowing for a 12% developer profit if sold at $140 per square foot for a total price of $210,000. However, the per square foot price exceeds the current top of the local market for smaller units and the sales price is significantly higher than most units have gone for recently. The amenities of upland sites are not likely to be significantly different than their
hillside counterparts with which they would compete. As a result these units would be most likely to be built in the near term by developer/contractors or non-profit developers which would allow for a lower sales price. Or they could be built by for profit developers it with development incentives/assistance. Over the long term, as the area redevelops, attracting buyers willing to pay higher prices is more likely.

As with the waterfront prototypes, the development which appears most marketable under conditions required for feasibility is the mixed-use condominium development. At an average sales price of $151,000 per unit, these condominiums could be priced just below their larger St. Johns Edgewater counterparts built in 1980.

To be feasible upland rental housing or rental mixed-use products require either significant changes in the market (i.e. fairly dramatic rent increases) or significant development incentives/assistance (in the range of $44-$47 per square foot of residential area). A non-profit developer could bring in developments of these types at a lower incentive/assistance level.

**General Viability of Bradford Street Industrial Area**

The major components of addressing the general viability of the Bradford Street industrial area include an evaluation of demand for riverfront and upland industrial land and policy questions generally and assessment of Bradford Street properties specifically. E.D Hovee & Company recently completed part two of the *Portland Harbor Industrial Lands Study* (PHILS study). Much of the information in this section is based on the market and site constraint analysis summarized in that report. Additional details on potential constraints associated with the Mar Com site are also provided.

**Market and Policy Discussion**

Industries in the Portland harbor area can be divided into two distinct groups: a) *river-dependent* uses encompassing aggregate firms, marine terminals, and supporting marine services, and b) other non-marine or *non-river dependent* firms including manufacturing, wholesale/distribution and land-holding activities.

Relatively limited demand from existing river-dependent industries for added industrial land is expected – except for auto import facilities for which demand is expected to be stable over the next 15 years. However, if patterns of demand experienced in the past re-emerged (including significant new facilities attracted from outside the region), existing vacant riverfront sites north of the St. Johns Bridge could be depleted within as little as a 7-year period.

Limited availability of vacant riverfront sites (150 acres north of the St. Johns Bridge) occurs at a time when a greater number of sites on the Willamette River lie underutilized or vacant due to industry contractions or closures. The speed of site reuse likely depends on market recovery (from the current recession), Portland’s changing competitive position for non-auto maritime uses, and regulatory conditions – especially cost liability resolution for Superfund sites.
The primary issue distinctive to upland sites relates to maintenance of the existing industrial sanctuary. While continued sanctuary designation appears widely supported, there will continue to be questions surrounding the amount of flexibility to be encouraged in some areas currently zoned industrial sanctuary – for related commercial functions, corporate office, creative service/information technology, and business park/flex space applications. Transitional areas at the interface between harbor industrial districts and adjoining commercial or residential neighborhoods may be candidates for zoning or rezoning consideration to allow those uses.

A continuation of current industry trends coupled with no significant change in the public policy and regulatory environment could result in limited re-investment or disinvestment in waterfront sites, with resolution of Superfund and related harbor planning and regulatory issues being a major factor. Continuation of the status quo also could result in more non-maritime activity and perhaps a shift over time from manufacturing to wholesale-distribution.

In contrast, efforts could be made to strengthen Portland’s distinctive maritime niches and reposition harbor area manufacturing. Investment/reinvestment in multimodal transportation, maintaining harbor industrial sanctuary, and streamlining regulatory requirements could help facilitate a revitalization of the harbors traditional industries. In effect, policies and investments made by the public sector likely will affect the character of private investment, whether in transition toward an alternative set of economic activities or to revitalization of existing industries.

**Property Assessment**

In order to address the long-term viability of utilizing riverfront properties for continued maritime use, E.D. Hovee & Company developed a set of criteria for identifying potential site development constraints. *Threshold criteria* are appropriate zoning and minimum depth barge access. *Other criteria* considered include deep draft shipping, rail/street access, lot depth, site contamination, compatible neighbors, environmental constraints, trail easements, flood plain, and scenic overlay height restrictions.

The harbor industrial area comprises 5,532 acres of industrial land (excluding rights-of-way). Approximately 2,400 acres is upland property – sites located inland and away from the Willamette and Columbia riverfronts. While a detailed quantitative and mapping assessment of these properties was not conducted as part of the *Portland Harbor Industrial Lands Study* (PHILS study), criteria that could be important to assess site suitability and constraints for industrial use include such factors as appropriate zoning, site size, rail/truck and transit accessibility, site contamination, and compatible neighbors.

Bradford Street industrial properties assessed by the PHILS study included Port Terminal 4 (Port T4, Toyota B) and the Mar Com sites.

**Port Terminal 4, Toyota**

Only one constraint has been associated with the Port Terminal 4 property being leased by Toyota. This is that no specific rail spur has been developed for this property. This is considered a non-threshold constraint – meaning that the property is still considered viable for marine related use.
Mar Com Marine Properties

The Mar Com Marine properties are leased from two property owners. The site assessment is split by ownership. The property immediately adjacent to Port T4, Toyota B is called Brix de Armond/ Mar Com Marine. This site has only two constraints: no specific rail spur has been developed for this property and flood risk since 50% of the property lies within the flood plain. Both of those constraints are considered non-threshold and so this property is still considered viable for marine use.

The second or southeastern section is called Langley-St. Johns/Mar Com Marine property. This property has three non-threshold constraints. Like the other Mar Com site, no specific rail spur has been developed for this property and it faces some flood risk since 20% of the property lies within the flood plain. In addition, this site faces a contamination constraint. This property is still considered viable for marine use and relatively unconstrained compared to most of the harbor riverfront.

However, under the circumstances of reuse or redevelopment the contamination constraint identified could impact the viability for continued marine use. The extent of contamination varies widely among harbor sites. The next steps in assessing this site could include estimating or providing an order of magnitude explanation of the potential costs of investigation and clean-up.

In the most extreme cases, environmental requirements may prove to be more costly than the resulting value of the land for industrial reuse – meaning that there is little to no incentive for a current or prospective owner to redevelop unless, as illustrated by our prototype analysis, redevelopment converts to a use which creates value significant enough to cover extraordinary costs. These types of cases can result in pressure to reuse these sites as other than industrial properties. Maintaining a site for industrial use for the long term under those circumstances may require government assistance. If however, the environmental and infrastructure costs associated with reuse are small, these properties should continue to be viable for marine and related industrial use even under the circumstances of reuse and redevelopment.

Upland Properties

As suggested earlier, continued viability of upland properties for industrial use relates to maintenance of the existing industrial sanctuary, infrastructure and environmental costs associated with reuse, and compatibility of adjacent uses. At some transitional locations related commercial functions, corporate office, creative service/information technology, and business park/flex space applications may be considered reasonable neighbors for industrial property. Residential uses typically can be expected to cause conflicts.

---

3 Mar Com signed a voluntary agreement with the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality in November of 2001 to conduct a remedial investigation of both properties. The remedial investigation has been divided between the two parcels (north and south). The north parcel investigation is being conducted first and expected completion is summer of 2003. The south parcel investigation will follow.
Summary

As Portland’s harbor industrial area adapts to changing market and regulatory challenges, the type and intensity of industrial activity that chooses to locate in this area likely will be affected by three specific factors – availability of useable (ready-to-build) land, development and business occupancy costs, and viable alternative locations inside or outside the region.

The degree to which these factors affect land demand in the harbor area may well differ with the perspective of each user or developer. However, for both existing and prospective riverfront and upland users, these considerations can be expected to challenge the harbor area’s long-term viability and competitiveness, particularly at sites facing high environmental remediation costs or in close proximity to residential and commercial areas.

The Bradford Street industrial area appears to be generally viable for continued industrial use over the life of the St. Johns/Lombard Plan. The particular make up of industries located there will likely relate to Portland’s overall industrial policy development.

Redevelopment in this area north of Cathedral Park for non-industrial uses would face greater financial and marketability constraints than redevelopment to the south due to access limitations, rail activity, and conflicts with neighboring industrial properties.
APPENDIX

The following financial analyses illustrate six prototype uses (or potential developments) for each location (waterfront and upland) in two worksheets – the first worksheet reflecting the upper end of current market rents and sales values and the second worksheet based on rents and values likely required to make project feasible. Each pro forma involves projection of rents/values vs. construction costs and operating expense (for rental properties), owner/developer financing and resulting rate of return. The pro formas are intended for illustrative purposes only and are not location or project specific. Actual project conditions will vary from estimates.

**St. Johns Town Center/Lombard Plan Sketch ProForma Analysis Assumptions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Townhouse Typical</th>
<th>Townhouse Live/work</th>
<th>Mid-Rise Mixed-Use Apartment</th>
<th>Condo</th>
<th>Storefront w/ Residential Apartment</th>
<th>Infill</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Site Size (nsf)</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Footprint</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>31,222</td>
<td>31,222</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Units</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. Parking Spaces</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Area (sf)</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>93,666</td>
<td>93,666</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>12,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Parking (sf)</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>29,900</td>
<td>29,900</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Area (sf)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>10,100</td>
<td>10,100</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Parking (sf)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Building Area</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>9,600</td>
<td>133,666</td>
<td>133,666</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>12,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Area Ratio (FAR)</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density (Units per Acre)</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>104.5</td>
<td>104.5</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Cost (per space)</td>
<td>$13,522</td>
<td>$13,522</td>
<td>$8,399</td>
<td>$8,399</td>
<td>$4,699</td>
<td>$1,102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Building Parking Cost (sf)</td>
<td>$45.07</td>
<td>$45.07</td>
<td>$25.84</td>
<td>$25.84</td>
<td>$25.84</td>
<td>$25.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Area Construction Cost</td>
<td>$46.86</td>
<td>$46.86</td>
<td>$63.16</td>
<td>$72.01</td>
<td>$63.16</td>
<td>$63.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail/Shell Construction Cost</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$45.07</td>
<td>$62.58</td>
<td>$62.58</td>
<td>$62.58</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100' Greenway Treatment &amp; Construction</td>
<td>$1.37</td>
<td>$1.37</td>
<td>$1.37</td>
<td>$1.37</td>
<td>$1.37</td>
<td>$1.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Improvements</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraordinary Site Preparation</td>
<td>$26.00</td>
<td>$26.00</td>
<td>$26.00</td>
<td>$26.00</td>
<td>$26.00</td>
<td>$26.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*E.D. Hovee & Company for City of Portland Bureau of Planning:
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### Waterfront Sketch Pro Forma Analysis

#### Upper Current Market Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Townhouse</th>
<th>Per Square Foot Estimates</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Typical</td>
<td>Live/work</td>
<td>Mid-Rise</td>
<td>Mixed-Use</td>
<td>Condo</td>
<td>Storefront</td>
<td>w/ Infill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Acquisition</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Demolition</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Preparation</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraordinary Site Preparation</td>
<td>$6.24</td>
<td>$8.32</td>
<td>$20.29</td>
<td>$20.29</td>
<td>$15.60</td>
<td>$10.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Improvements</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100' Greenway Treatment &amp; Construction</td>
<td>$1.37</td>
<td>$1.37</td>
<td>$1.37</td>
<td>$1.37</td>
<td>$1.37</td>
<td>$1.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                      | $25.71    | $34.53                     | $54.50   | $54.50     | $43.06 | $30.39     |           |          |

|                      | 6,000     | 8,400                      | 103,766  | 103,766    | 32,000 | 12,600     | Living & Commercial areas |

|                      | $42.84    | $41.11                     | $21.01   | $21.01     | $26.91 | $24.12     | Per GSF building area (excl. parking) |
| Building Construction | $46.86    | $46.43                     | $63.10   | $71.09     | $63.01 | $63.78     | Living & Commercial areas |
| Parking              | $9.01     | $6.44                      | $7.45    | $7.45      | $4.06  | $0.87      | On direct construction & site work |
| Indirect (Soft) Cost | $26.68    | $24.46                     | $28.40   | $31.20     | $28.47 | $27.32     | Per GSF building area (excl. parking) |

|                      | $125.40   | $118.44                    | $119.96  | $130.75    | $122.45 | $116.10    |          |

#### B. Operating Budget (Rental)

|                      | --        | --                         | $0.88    | $1.17      | $0.93  | $0.85      | Blended rate (residential and commercial) |
| Monthly Rental Rate   | --        | --                         |         |            |        |            |          |
| Annual Rental Rate    | --        | --                         | $10.57  | $14.00     | $11.15 | $10.20     |          |
| less Rental Vacancy   | --        | --                         | -5%     | -10%       | -5%   | -5%        |          |
| Gross Operating Income| --        | --                         | $10.04  | $13.30     | $10.59 | $9.69      |          |
| less Expenses         | --        | --                         | -35%    | -30%       | -35%  | -35%       |          |
| Net Operating Income  | --        | --                         | $6.53   | $11.97     | $7.41  | $6.30      | Annually per NSF |

---
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### C. **Sales Revenue (Owner)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Value 1</th>
<th>Value 2</th>
<th>Value 3</th>
<th>Value 4</th>
<th>Value 5</th>
<th>Value 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit Sales</strong></td>
<td>$120.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$127.00</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>less Sales Expense</strong></td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Sales Revenue</strong></td>
<td>$111.60</td>
<td>$93.00</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$118.11</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Realized per NSF*

### D. **Completed Valuation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Value 1</th>
<th>Value 2</th>
<th>Value 3</th>
<th>Value 4</th>
<th>Value 5</th>
<th>Value 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capitalization Rate</strong></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
<td>9.00%*</td>
<td>9.00%</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Efficiency Factor</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Value</strong></td>
<td>$111.60</td>
<td>$93.00</td>
<td>$69.35</td>
<td>$103.57</td>
<td>$74.15</td>
<td>$66.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Ratio of net to gross building*

**Cost % Supported by Value**

| Cost % Supported by Value | 89% | 79% | 58% | 79% | 61% | 58% |

**Funding Gap ( )**

| Funding Gap ( ) | ($13.80) | ($25.44) | ($50.62) | ($27.18) | ($48.30) | ($49.17) |

*Owner gap includes profit for rental only*

### D. **Development Assumptions**

**Residential Units:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Value 1</th>
<th>Value 2</th>
<th>Value 3</th>
<th>Value 4</th>
<th>Value 5</th>
<th>Value 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential Units</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential Unit Size (NSF)</strong></td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit Sales Price/Rent</strong></td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
<td>$705</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td>$765</td>
<td>$910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking Spaces per DU</strong></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential Density (DU/Ac)</strong></td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>104.5</td>
<td>104.5</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parking & Site Area:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Value 1</th>
<th>Value 2</th>
<th>Value 3</th>
<th>Value 4</th>
<th>Value 5</th>
<th>Value 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking Area per Space</strong></td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost per Space</strong></td>
<td>$13,500</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
<td>$8,400</td>
<td>$8,400</td>
<td>$4,700</td>
<td>$1,102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scale & Cost:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Value 1</th>
<th>Value 2</th>
<th>Value 3</th>
<th>Value 4</th>
<th>Value 5</th>
<th>Value 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong># of Floors</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Footprint (% of Site)</strong></td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect/Soft Cost Rate</strong></td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Size</strong></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Waterfront Sketch Pro Forma Analysis

#### Required Market Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Townhouse</th>
<th>Per Square Foot Estimates</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Typical</td>
<td>Live/work</td>
<td>Mid-Rise Mixed-Use</td>
<td>Condo</td>
<td>Storefront w/ Infill</td>
<td>Infill Apartment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Development Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Acquisition</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Demolition</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Preparation</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraordinary Site</td>
<td>$6.24</td>
<td>$8.32</td>
<td>$20.29</td>
<td>$20.29</td>
<td>$15.60</td>
<td>$10.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100' Greenway Treatment &amp; Construction</td>
<td>$1.37</td>
<td>$1.37</td>
<td>$1.37</td>
<td>$1.37</td>
<td>$1.37</td>
<td>$1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Cost per Land Area</td>
<td>$25.71</td>
<td>$34.53</td>
<td>$54.50</td>
<td>$54.50</td>
<td>$43.06</td>
<td>$30.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSF of Building Area (excl. parking)</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td>103,766</td>
<td>103,766</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>12,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Cost per SF Bldg.</td>
<td>$42.84</td>
<td>$41.11</td>
<td>$21.01</td>
<td>$21.01</td>
<td>$26.91</td>
<td>$24.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Construction</td>
<td>$46.86</td>
<td>$46.43</td>
<td>$63.10</td>
<td>$71.09</td>
<td>$63.01</td>
<td>$63.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>$9.01</td>
<td>$6.44</td>
<td>$7.45</td>
<td>$7.45</td>
<td>$4.06</td>
<td>$0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect (Soft) Cost</td>
<td>$26.68</td>
<td>$24.46</td>
<td>$28.40</td>
<td>$31.20</td>
<td>$28.47</td>
<td>$27.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Construction Cost</td>
<td>$125.40</td>
<td>$118.44</td>
<td>$119.96</td>
<td>$130.75</td>
<td>$122.45</td>
<td>$116.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### B. Operating Budget (Rental)

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Rental Rate</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$1.53</td>
<td>$1.67</td>
<td>$1.53</td>
<td>$1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Rental Rate</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$18.36</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$18.36</td>
<td>$17.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less Rental Rate</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Operating Income</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$17.44</td>
<td>$19.00</td>
<td>$17.44</td>
<td>$16.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less Expenses</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-35%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>-30%</td>
<td>-35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Operating Income</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$11.34</td>
<td>$17.10</td>
<td>$12.21</td>
<td>$10.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### C. Sales Revenue (Owner)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unit Sales</th>
<th>$151.00</th>
<th>$146.00</th>
<th>--</th>
<th>$184.00</th>
<th>--</th>
<th>--</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less Sales Expense</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Sales Revenue</td>
<td>$140.43</td>
<td>$135.78</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$171.12</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Realized per NSF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D. Completed Valuation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Capitalization Rate</th>
<th>--</th>
<th>--</th>
<th>8.00%</th>
<th>9.00%*</th>
<th>9.00%</th>
<th>8.00%</th>
<th>Ratio of net to gross building</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Efficiency Factor</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Value</td>
<td>$140.43</td>
<td>$135.78</td>
<td>$120.46</td>
<td>$149.79</td>
<td>$122.09</td>
<td>$115.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Cost % Supported by Value | 112% | 115% | 100% | 115% | 100% | 100% |
| Funding Gap ( )           | $0.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 |

Owner gap includes profit for rental only

### D. Development Assumptions

#### Residential Units:
- 4
- 4
- 96
- 96
- 24
- 10

#### Residential Unit Size (NSF):
- 1,500
- 1,600
- 829
- 829
- 900
- 1,071

#### Unit Sales Price/Rent:
- $226,500
- $306,600
- $1,244
- $153,000
- $1,332
- $1,574

#### Parking Spaces per DU:
- 1.00
- 1.00
- 0.96
- 0.96
- 0.92
- 1.00

#### Residential Density (DU/Ac):
- 17.4
- 17.4
- 104.5
- 104.5
- 52.3
- 43.6

#### Parking & Site Area:
- 300
- 300
- 325
- 325
- 182
- 300

In square feet (SF)

#### Cost per Space:
- $13,500
- $13,500
- $8,400
- $8,400
- $4,700
- $1,102

#### Scale & Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Floors</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Footprint (% of Site)</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect/Soft Cost Rate</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Size</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Equal floor area each level
## Upland Sketch Pro Forma Analysis

### Upper Current Market Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Typical</th>
<th>Live/work</th>
<th>Mid-Rise Mixed-Use</th>
<th>Condo</th>
<th>Storefront w/ Residential</th>
<th>Infill Apartment</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development Budget</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Acquisition</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>Assummes existing 0.25 FAR for mixed use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Demolition</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Preparation</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraordinary Site Preparation</td>
<td>$6.24</td>
<td>$8.32</td>
<td>$20.29</td>
<td>$20.29</td>
<td>$15.60</td>
<td>$10.92</td>
<td>Based on building footprint distributed to site land area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Improvements</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Cost per Land Area</td>
<td>$20.84</td>
<td>$27.92</td>
<td>$46.14</td>
<td>$46.14</td>
<td>$36.45</td>
<td>$25.52</td>
<td>Per SF of land area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GSF of Building Area (excl. parking)</strong></td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td>103,766</td>
<td>103,766</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>12,600</td>
<td>Living &amp; Commercial areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Cost per SF Bldg.</td>
<td>$34.73</td>
<td>$33.24</td>
<td>$17.79</td>
<td>$17.79</td>
<td>$22.78</td>
<td>$20.25</td>
<td>Per GSF building area (excl. parking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Construction</td>
<td>$46.86</td>
<td>$46.43</td>
<td>$63.10</td>
<td>$71.09</td>
<td>$63.01</td>
<td>$63.78</td>
<td>Living &amp; Commercial areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>$9.01</td>
<td>$6.44</td>
<td>$7.45</td>
<td>$7.45</td>
<td>$4.06</td>
<td>$0.87</td>
<td>On direct construction &amp; site work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect (Soft) Cost</td>
<td>$25.88</td>
<td>$23.89</td>
<td>$28.22</td>
<td>$31.02</td>
<td>$28.17</td>
<td>$26.94</td>
<td>Per GSF building area (excl. parking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Construction Cost</strong></td>
<td>$116.48</td>
<td>$110.00</td>
<td>$116.56</td>
<td>$127.34</td>
<td>$118.02</td>
<td>$111.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Budget (Rental)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Rental Rate</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$0.88</td>
<td>$1.17</td>
<td>$0.93</td>
<td>$0.85</td>
<td>Blended rate (residential and commercial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Rental Rate</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$10.57</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td>$11.15</td>
<td>$10.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less Vacancy</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Operating Income</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$10.04</td>
<td>$13.30</td>
<td>$10.59</td>
<td>$9.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less Expenses</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-35%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>-30%</td>
<td>-35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Operating Income</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$6.53</td>
<td>$11.97</td>
<td>$7.41</td>
<td>$6.30</td>
<td>Annually per NSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sales Revenue (Owner)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Sales</td>
<td>$120.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$127.00</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment of St. Johns Waterfront Industrial Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>less Sales Expense</th>
<th>-7%</th>
<th>-7%</th>
<th>--</th>
<th>-7%</th>
<th>--</th>
<th>--</th>
<th>Realized per NSF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Sales Revenue</td>
<td>$111.60</td>
<td>$93.00</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$118.11</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D. Completed Valuation**

- **Capitalization Rate**: 100% 100% 85% 85% 90% 85%
- **Building Efficiency Factor**: 100% 100% 85% 85% 90% 85%
- **Estimated Value**: $111.60 $93.00 $69.35 $103.57 $74.15 $66.92
- **Ratio of net to gross building**: |
- **Cost % Supported by Value**: 96% 85% 59% 81% 63% 60%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Gap ( )</th>
<th>($4.88)</th>
<th>($17.00)</th>
<th>($47.21)</th>
<th>($23.77)</th>
<th>($43.87)</th>
<th>($44.93)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Owner gap includes profit for rental only

**Development Assumptions**

- **Residential Units**: 4 4 96 96 24 10
- **Residential Unit Size (GSF)**: 1,500 1,600 829 829 900 1,071
- **Unit Sales Price/Rent**: $180,000 $210,000 $705 $105,000 $765 $910
- **Parking Spaces per DU**: 1.00 1.00 0.96 0.96 0.92 1.00
- **Residential Density (DU/Ac)**: 17.4 17.4 104.5 104.5 52.3 43.6
- **Parking & Site Area**: 300 300 325 325 182 300
- **Cost per Space**: $13,500 $13,500 $8,400 $8,400 $4,700 $1,102

In square feet (SF)

- **Scale & Cost**: 3 3 4 4 3 3
- **# of Floors**: 24% 32% 78% 78% 60% 42%
- **Equal floor area each level**: |
- **Indirect/Soft Cost Rate**: 35% 35% 35% 35% 35% 35%
- **Site Size**: 10,000 10,000 40,000 40,000 20,000 10,000
Upland Sketch Pro Forma Analysis

Required Market Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Townhouse</th>
<th>Per Square Foot Estimates</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Typical</td>
<td>Live/work</td>
<td>Mid-Rise Mixed-Use</td>
<td>Condo</td>
<td>Storefront w/ Residential</td>
<td>Infill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Development Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Acquisition</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Demolition</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Preparation</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraordinary Site</td>
<td>$6.24</td>
<td>$8.32</td>
<td>$20.29</td>
<td>$20.29</td>
<td>$15.60</td>
<td>$10.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Cost per Land Area</td>
<td>$20.84</td>
<td>$27.92</td>
<td>$46.14</td>
<td>$46.14</td>
<td>$36.45</td>
<td>$25.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSF of Building Area</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td>103,766</td>
<td>103,766</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>12,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(excl. parking)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Construction</td>
<td>$34.73</td>
<td>$33.24</td>
<td>$17.79</td>
<td>$17.79</td>
<td>$22.78</td>
<td>$20.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>$46.86</td>
<td>$46.43</td>
<td>$63.10</td>
<td>$71.09</td>
<td>$63.01</td>
<td>$63.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect (Soft) Cost</td>
<td>$9.01</td>
<td>$6.44</td>
<td>$7.45</td>
<td>$7.45</td>
<td>$4.06</td>
<td>$0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Construction Cost</td>
<td>$25.88</td>
<td>$23.89</td>
<td>$28.22</td>
<td>$31.02</td>
<td>$28.17</td>
<td>$26.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Operating Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Rental)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Rental Rate</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$1.48</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>$1.48</td>
<td>$1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Rental Rate</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$17.76</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$17.76</td>
<td>$17.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less Vacancy</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Operating Income</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$16.87</td>
<td>$17.10</td>
<td>$16.87</td>
<td>$16.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less Expenses</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-35%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>-30%</td>
<td>-35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Operating Income</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$10.97</td>
<td>$15.39</td>
<td>$11.81</td>
<td>$10.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                          |                 |                           |                          |                          |                          |                          |

Comments: Assumes existing 0.25 FAR for mixed use. Based on building footprint distributed to site land area. Per SF of land area.

E.D. Hovee & Company for City of Portland Bureau of Planning:
Assessment of St. Johns Waterfront Industrial Areas
### C. Sales Revenue (Owner)

| Unit Sales | $140.00 | $136.00 | -- | $182.00 | -- | -- |
| less Sales Expense | -7% | -7% | -- | -7% | -- | -- |
| Net Sales Revenue | $130.20 | $126.48 | -- | $169.26 | -- | -- |

Realized per NSF

### D. Completed Valuation

| Capitalization Rate | -- | -- | 8.00% | 9.00%* | 9.00% | 8.00% |
| Building Efficiency Factor | 100% | 100% | 85% | 85% | 90% | 85% |
| Estimated Value | $130.20 | $126.48 | $116.52 | $146.51 | $118.10 | $111.80 |

Ratio of net to gross building

| Cost % Supported by Value | 112% | 115% | 100% | 115% | 100% | 100% |
| Funding Gap ($) | $0.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 |

Owner gap includes profit for rental only

### Development Assumptions

#### Residential Units:
- 4 4 96 96 24 10
- Residential Unit Size (GSF) | 1,500 | 1,600 | 829 | 829 | 900 | 1,071
- Unit Sales Price/Rent | $210,000 | $285,600 | $1,227 | $151,000 | $1,323 | $1,521
- Parking Spaces per DU | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.92 | 1.00
- Residential Density (DU/Ac) | 17.4 | 17.4 | 104.5 | 104.5 | 52.3 | 43.6

#### Parking & Site Area:
- Parking Area per Space | 300 | 300 | 325 | 325 | 182 | 300
- Cost per Space | $13,500 | $13,500 | $8,400 | $8,400 | $4,700 | $1,102

#### Scale & Cost:
- # of Floors | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3
- Building Footprint (% of Site) | 24% | 32% | 78% | 78% | 60% | 42%
- Equal floor area each level
- Indirect/Soft Cost Rate | 35% | 35% | 35% | 35% | 35% | 35%
- Site Size | 10,000 | 10,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | 20,000 | 10,000
Supplemental 57 Dwelling Unit/Acre Condominium Pro Formas

The townhouse and mid-rise mixed-use condominium prototypes illustrate feasibility for ownership housing products at very different densities (17.4 vs. 104.5 units per acre respectively). On the next page are provided the same types of pro forma feasibility assessments (for waterfront and upland, current market and required conditions) for a 57 unit per acre condominium project based roughly on the infill apartment prototype.

This supplemental prototype pro forma is intended to assist in assessing ownership housing project viability for these areas assuming a 60 dwelling unit per acre limit for development. The prototype assumes the structure had 13 units at an average size of 824 square feet. Surface parking is provided at one space per unit. Construction materials include steel joists and brick facing over concrete block.

The results of the pro formas are similar to those of the more dense condominium project. However, per unit costs are higher as extraordinary costs (and for waterfront property greenway costs) must be distributed over fewer dwelling units.

At an average sales price of $154,000 to 160,000 per unit, these condominiums would be priced somewhat higher than the larger but older units at the St. Johns Edgewater project built in 1980 and reselling at $152,500. Yet they would offer new construction and in the instance of waterfront properties a unique location. In the near term, feasibility of this development type is better at the waterfront. Over the long term, as the area redevelops, attracting buyers willing to pay higher prices at upland locations is more likely.
### A. Development Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Waterfront</th>
<th>Upland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Acquisition</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Demolition</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Preparation</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraordinary Site Prep</td>
<td>$10.92</td>
<td>$10.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Improvements</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenway Setback Value/Cost</td>
<td>$3.49</td>
<td>$3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100' Greenway Treatment &amp; Construction</td>
<td>$1.37</td>
<td>$1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Cost per Land Area</td>
<td>$36.64</td>
<td>$36.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Property Acquisition    | $15.00     | $15.00  | $15.00     | $15.00   |
| Site Demolition         | $1.25      | $1.25   | $1.25      | $1.25    |
| Site Preparation        | $2.50      | $2.50   | $2.50      | $2.50    |
| Extraordinary Site Prep | $10.92     | $10.92  | $10.92     | $10.92   |
| Street Improvements     | $2.10      | $2.10   | $2.10      | $2.10    |
| Greenway Setback Value/Cost | $3.49      | $3.49   | --         | --       |
| 100' Greenway Treatment & Construction | $1.37 | $1.37 | -- | -- |
| Site Cost per Land Area | $36.64     | $36.64  | $31.77     | $31.77   |

| GSF of Building Area (excl. parking) | 12,600 | 12,600 | 12,600 | 12,600 |
| Site Cost per SF Bldg.          | $29.08  | $29.08  | $25.21  | $25.21  |
| Building Construction           | $72.01  | $72.01  | $72.01  | $72.01  |
| Parking                        | $1.14   | $1.14   | $1.14   | $1.14   |
| Indirect (Soft) Cost           | $30.64  | $30.64  | $30.26  | $30.26  |
| Total Construction Cost        | $132.86 | $132.86 | $128.62 | $128.62 |

### B. Sales Revenue (Owner)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Waterfront</th>
<th>Upland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Sales</td>
<td>$127.00</td>
<td>$187.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less Sales Expense</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Sales Revenue</td>
<td>$118.11</td>
<td>$180.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C. Completed Valuation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Waterfront</th>
<th>Upland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Efficiency Factor</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Value</td>
<td>$100.39</td>
<td>$153.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost % Supported by Value</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>115%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Gap ( )</td>
<td>($32.47)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D. Development Assumptions

#### Residential Units:
- 13.00
- 13.00
- 13.00
- 13.00

#### Residential Unit Size (NSF):
- 823.85
- 823.85
- 823.85
- 823.85

#### Unit Sales Price/Rent:
- $105,000
- $160,000
- $105,000
- $154,000

#### Parking Spaces per DU:
- 1
- 1
- 1
- 1

#### Residential Density (DU/Ac):
- 57
- 57
- 57
- 57

#### Parking & Site Area:
- 300
- 300
- 300
- 300

#### Cost per Space:
- $1,102
- $1,102
- $1,102
- $1,102

#### Scale & Cost:
- # of Floors: 3
- Building Footprint (% of Site): 42%
- Indirect/Soft Cost Rate: 35%
- Site Size: 10,000
This chapter evaluates the preliminary transportation alternatives developed in the previous chapter and assesses potential impacts of the plan to motor vehicle, transit, bicycle and pedestrian modes based on forecasted future 2020 conditions.

Methodology of Evaluation Criteria

The goals and objectives and the urban design concept defined for the St. Johns/Lombard Plan were used as the initial criteria to evaluate the transportation improvements presented in the previous chapter. In general, the objective of the plan is to enhance safety and convenience for all travel modes, improve circulation on main street and town center while calming traffic and accommodating freight vehicles while improving livability. Table 3-1 evaluates the overall preferred improvements for each travel mode against the plan goals.

Table 3-1
Plan Improvement Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>St. Johns/Lombard Plan Goals</th>
<th>Recommended Improvements By Transportation Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motor Vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance the identity of the St. Johns and Lombard Street area</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement the Region 2040 town center and main street designations in the study area</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster revitalized St. Johns and Lombard Street commercial areas</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide opportunities for new housing along the Lombard main street and near the St. Johns town center</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide for a balanced multi-modal transportation system</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unify the community with safe, accessible and attractive parks and open spaces</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote sustainable development practices and environmental quality</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

■ = Plan goal supported by recommended improvements.
The evaluation of the preliminary transportation alternatives included a detailed analysis of potential impacts to motor vehicle, transit, bicycle and pedestrian modes. Several measures of transportation performance were quantified and compared between alternatives to determine the preferred transportation system alternatives and future needs for the plan. The follow sections describe the methodology for the key performance measures including intersection level of service, signal timing optimization, pedestrian enhancements and bicycle network performance.

**Intersection Level of Service**

Analysis of traffic volumes is useful in understanding the general nature of traffic in an area, but by itself indicates neither the ability of the street network to carry additional traffic nor the quality of service afforded by the street facilities. For this, the concept of *level of service* has been developed to subjectively describe traffic performance.

Level of service categories are similar to report card ratings for traffic performance. Intersections are typically the controlling bottlenecks of traffic flow and the ability of a roadway system to carry traffic efficiently is generally diminished in their vicinities. Levels of Service A, B and C indicate conditions where traffic moves without significant delays over periods of peak travel demand. Level of service D and E are progressively worse peak hour operating conditions and F conditions represent where demand exceeds the capacity of an intersection. For signalized intersections, level of service is evaluated based upon average vehicle delay experienced by vehicles entering an intersection. Control delay (or signal delay) includes initial deceleration delay, queue move-up time, stopped delay, and final acceleration delay. As delay increases, the level of service decreases.

The level of service was determined for each study intersection for the existing conditions and the future 2020 alternatives. Intersection mitigations were recommended based on future minimum operating standards.

**Signal Timing Optimization**

Traffic models of the key roadways within the study area were developed for the existing conditions and the future 2020 alternatives to provide a system wide assessment of traffic flow. The measures of effectiveness used in the comparison of alternatives are derived from the simulation of traffic in the future scenarios which provide a more detailed assessment of performance than isolated intersection evaluations. These models were used to determine conditions for signal timing and traffic operations on a system level and to assess the benefits of signal coordination (to vehicles and pedestrians) and forecasting vehicle queue impacts between adjacent intersections.
Pedestrian Crossing Enhancements

An adequate amount of time between vehicles or “gap” must be provided within the traffic stream for a pedestrian to safely walk from one side of the street to the other. In general, unsignalized pedestrian crossing opportunities are improved when the crossing distance is reduced and/or the frequency and length of vehicle gaps is increased. Signalized pedestrian crossings are desired approximately every 500-feet along major corridors and at locations where significant pedestrian crossing volumes are expected. The performance of the alternative pedestrian crossing enhancements as evaluated based on these basic criteria to determine the preferred alternatives.

Bicycle Network

In general, there are several key criteria in establishing an effective bike network. Bicycle facilities should be direct as possible and complete with no missing segments. Conflicts between bicycles and vehicles should be minimized. Traffic designs should accommodate bicycle safety at conflict points such as intersections or major roadway crossings. Bicycle facilities should be provided along commuting routes and connect major attractions.

Guidelines have been established to determine the appropriate bicycle facility based on roadway volumes by the City of Portland.\(^1\) Roadways with average daily volumes under 3,000 vehicles should function as a shared roadway or bike boulevard. Designated bike lanes are recommended on roadways with average daily volumes over 3,000 vehicles. Parallel alternative bike facilities should be provided near roadways with average daily volumes over 20,000 vehicles that cannot accommodate bike lanes due to width constrains and on-street parking needs. The preferred bicycle system alternatives were selected based on these criteria.

---

\(^1\) Bicycle Master Plan, City of Portland, Office of Transportation, May 1, 1996.
Land Use Alternatives

To support the proposed urban design concepts within the study area, several land use alternatives were developed and refined for the plan. These land use alternatives were used as a basis for forecasting 2020 traffic volumes and evaluating the preliminary transportation alternatives. Each future land use alternative evaluated for the plan is described below.

2020 Base Alternative – Assumes land use designations and transportation system improvements provided within the Metro 2020 Regional Transportation Plan comprehensive plan2. This plan assumes continuing build-out based upon the current adopted Comprehensive Plan Map for the study area.

2020 Plan Alternative A – The Metro 2020 model was used as the base for this alternative. This alternative assumes land use and zoning changes in the St. Johns town center area and along Lombard Street to implement the plan urban development concept. Land use on the main street is refined to include concepts such as a pedestrian retail focus area, community corners, and residential focus areas. Land use in downtown St. Johns is refined to allow additional housing and mixed use development in and near the core area to supplement commercial activity. Land use in the hillside area of Cathedral Park is refined to reduce residential density west of the St. Johns Bridge. The mixed-use waterfront area roughly bounded by Richmond, Alta, Decatur, and Bradford is expected to transition to medium density residential and mixed uses (live/work and limited retail) by 2020. The area from Bradford to the river is assumed to remain in an employment designation in the near term, with employment, limited retail and perhaps community service uses.

2020 Plan Alternative B – The Metro 2020 model and the land use modifications incorporated into Alternative A were used as the base for this alternative. The major change in this alternative relates to residential density near the waterfront. Land uses in the mixed-use waterfront area roughly bounded by Richmond, Alta, Decatur, and Bradford are similar to Alternative A, however a higher density build out of the residential uses is assumed.

The projected land uses have been forecasted within the Metro regional travel demand model for the years 1994 (base year) and 2020 (future year). This serves as a baseline scenario to compare the 2020 plan land use alternatives. Table 3-2 summarizes the land use assumptions and the forecasted vehicle trips for each alternative within the Transportation Analysis Zones (TAZs) that cover the plan study area. Land use within an area is typically described in terms of the quantity of households, retail employees and other employees.

A comparison of the 2020 Base land use and the 2020 Plan Alternatives at a detailed TAZ level show a decrease in households and increase in employees for each TAZ except TAZ 922 which include a significant increase in households and decrease in employees. The changes to TAZ 922 are significant enough to sway the land use totals for the entire study area to show the overall plan increases households and decreases employees. The forecasted land uses for Plan

---

Alternatives A and B are the same except for within TAZ 922 where Plan Alternative B includes approximately 300 additional households.

### Table 3-2

**Land Use Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>919</td>
<td>Households</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>1,086</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>1,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retail Employees</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Employees</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trips</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>920</td>
<td>Households</td>
<td>2,412</td>
<td>3,744</td>
<td>3,463</td>
<td>3,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retail Employees</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Employees</td>
<td>1,278</td>
<td>1,681</td>
<td>2,008</td>
<td>2,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trips</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>3,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>922</td>
<td>Households</td>
<td>2,226</td>
<td>2,556</td>
<td>4,134</td>
<td>4,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retail Employees</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>1,957</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Employees</td>
<td>2,730</td>
<td>2,269</td>
<td>1,224</td>
<td>1,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trips</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>5,300</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>5,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>924</td>
<td>Households</td>
<td>1,380</td>
<td>1,588</td>
<td>1,858</td>
<td>1,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retail Employees</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Employees</td>
<td>1,258</td>
<td>1,782</td>
<td>2,117</td>
<td>2,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trips</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Households</td>
<td>6,018</td>
<td>7,888</td>
<td>9,455</td>
<td>9,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retail Employees</td>
<td>1,648</td>
<td>2,452</td>
<td>1,916</td>
<td>1,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Employees</td>
<td>5,266</td>
<td>5,732</td>
<td>5,349</td>
<td>5,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trips</td>
<td>8,800</td>
<td>11,400</td>
<td>11,400</td>
<td>11,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Metro and City of Portland Bureau of Planning

The figure below compares the forecasted vehicle trips (shown in Table 3-2) from the 2000 Metro model to the 2020 Base model, Plan Alternative A and Plan Alternative B within each transportation analysis zone (TAZ). A detailed TAZ level comparison of vehicle trips shows the plan land use alternatives impact TAZ 919 and 920 with a minimal increase in trips (less than 4%) and TAZ 922 with a minimal decrease in trips (less than 7%). TAZ 924 is forecasted to have the largest increase in trips (approximately 15% or 200 vehicle trips) for the plan alternatives compared to the Base Alternative.

An overall comparison of forecasted trips for Plan Alternative A and B to the Base Alternative shows the plan land use has little impact to the overall future trip generation within the study area. When compared to the 2020 Base Alternative for the area, Plan Alternative A increased the total net vehicle trips by less than 1% (less than 100 trips) and Plan Alternative B increased the total net vehicle trips by less than 3% (approximately 200 trips).
Employment/Housing Balance Evaluation

An evaluation of the 2020 travel demand models was conducted to assess the potential for a shift in trip distribution based on land use modifications incorporated within the plan alternatives. These changes could alter the local housing and employment balance within study area and effect the overall origin and destination of trips. During the evening peak hour, housing generated trips are attracted and distributed throughout the regional model differently than employment trips. In general, employment land use distributes trips to the system (vehicles leaving work) and housing land use attracts trips from the system (vehicles arriving home).

A comparison of the future base alternative and the plan alternatives indicated a shift in vehicle trips. In general, the plan land use alternatives resulted in an increase in trips attracted into the study area but had little effect on trips distributed regionally. The most significant shift was observed on Lombard Street and Willamette Boulevard east of the town center. Westbound trips into the study area increased significantly (approximately 20% in Alternative A and 30% in Alternative B) while eastbound trips remained relatively the same. The trip shift observed on the St. Johns Bridge was the reverse with an increase in eastbound trips (approximately 10% in Alternative A and 12% in Alternative B) and relatively the same westbound trips. This shift is attributed to the plan alternative land use modifications in TAZ 922 with an increase in housing and a decrease in employment compared to the base model.
2020 Traffic Volumes

The 2020 land use assumptions for each future alternative were evaluated to forecast vehicle trips during the p.m. peak hour. Forecasting future traffic at the study intersections was conducted using a methodology incorporating existing traffic counts, base travel demand model (1994) volumes and future travel demand model (2020) volumes. A comparison of the forecasted 2020 volumes for each alternative and the 1994 Metro model volumes was used to assess the change in vehicle trips over a 26-year period. The annual increment of volume change was approximated and added to the existing volumes for key corridors and intersections within the study area.

The average daily traffic volumes (ADT) for the existing and forecasted 2020 Base alternative was evaluated to assess the distribution of vehicle trip growth throughout the study area. The figure below compares the existing, 2020 Base and 2020 Plan Alternative A average daily traffic volumes on major roadways within the study area. Comparing existing to 2020 Base, the largest percentage growth was observed on Oswego Avenue north of Lombard Street with an increase of 2,500 trips (175%). Growth at other locations in the study area ranged from 25% to 66%. The largest change in ADT based on net volume was observed on the St. Johns Bridge with a growth of approximately 9,000 vehicles per day (45%).

Comparing 2020 Base to 2020 Plan Alternative A, the ADTs increase consistently throughout the study area with approximately 1,000 to 2,000 additional vehicles per day. The largest percentage change was observed on Lombard Street east of Wall Avenue and west of St. Louis Avenue. This comparison exercise was limited to Plan Alternative A, however Plan Alternative B would be expected to have similar results.
Initial Capacity Improvements

The previous evaluation identified several capacity improvements based on the urban design concept for the plan. These improvements along with projects identified in other regional plans were assumed in place for the future transportation system evaluation and preferred alternative analysis. The improvements could potentially affect the capacity of roadways and intersections within the study area. The improvements are described in the following sections.

Regional Transportation Plan

The 2020 Regional Transportation Plan\(^3\) was reviewed to assess the roadway system improvements assumed in the 2020 Base Alternative. The review found no roadway system improvements impacting motor vehicle capacity at study intersections were identified in the RTP. The projects identified for other modes include:

- St. Johns Bridge Restoration (RTP 1139)
- N/NE Lombard/Killingsworth Traffic Management Improvements (RTP 4012)
- MLK/Lombard Frequent Bus (RTP 1135)
- Freight Mobility Study (RTP 1152)
- North Willamette Crossing Study (RTP 4016)

\(^3\) 2000 Regional Transportation Plan, Metro, August 10, 2000, page 5-41.
Richmond Avenue/Ivanhoe Street

A new traffic signal is recommended at this location to provide adequate operating conditions under future traffic demands, control turning vehicle speeds and provide a signalized crossing for pedestrians. Signal warrants are met at this intersection under 2020 conditions for each future alternative based on p.m. peak hour volumes. The new traffic signal would require coordination with the existing traffic signal at Richmond Avenue/Lombard Street to ensure efficient operation and minimize vehicle queuing impacts. The preliminary cost estimate is $250,000.
Philadelphia Avenue/Ivanhoe Street

The St. Johns Truck Strategy\(^4\) concept promotes efficient truck movements through the St. Johns area by coordinating the traffic signals along Ivanhoe Street from Philadelphia Avenue to St. Louis Avenue at Lombard Street. The coordination of the traffic signal at Philadelphia Avenue/Ivanhoe Street is recommended to potentially minimize vehicle queuing impacts at the study intersection and create vehicle platoons to increase the frequency and length of gaps in the traffic stream available for pedestrian crossing Ivanhoe Street. The preliminary cost estimate to coordinate this location to the entire coordinated system is approximately $10,000.

The addition of a signalized pedestrian crossing on the south approach of the intersection was evaluated to assess possible impacts to operating conditions. The crosswalk would extend approximately 70-feet from curb to curb and require a minimum of 22 seconds of crossing time. Due to the location of the crosswalk, the northbound left (vehicles traveling from the St. Johns Bridge) and eastbound right (vehicles traveling to the St. Johns Bridge) vehicle movements would be stopped by a red light during the pedestrian crossing phase. These movements experience the highest volumes during the p.m. peak hour and additional red time would result in significant vehicle delays.

Baltimore Avenue/Ivanhoe Street

The coordination of the traffic signal at Baltimore Avenue/Ivanhoe Street is recommended for the east-west approaches with the adjacent traffic signals at Philadelphia Avenue/Ivanhoe Street and St. Louis Avenue/Lombard Street. This would be in conjunction with the St. Johns Truck Strategy\(^5\) concept to promote vehicle progression along Ivanhoe Street. This improvement could minimize vehicle queuing impacts at the study intersection and create vehicle platoons to increase the frequency and length of gaps in the traffic stream available for pedestrian crossing Ivanhoe Street. The preliminary cost estimate to coordinate this location to the entire coordinated system is approximately $10,000.

St. Louis Avenue/Lombard Street/Ivanhoe Street

The St. Johns Truck Strategy\(^6\) concept promotes efficient truck movements through the St. Johns area with several recommended improvements. The concept includes reconstructing both St. Louis intersections to increase the turn radius for vehicles traveling to/from Ivanhoe Street in the town center to Lombard Street west of St. Louis Avenue. This would result in additional right-of-way needs. The concept also discourages truck traffic on St. Louis Avenue north of Lombard Street to increase truck use on Columbia Boulevard and Lombard Street. The preliminary cost estimate to reconstruct the intersection is approximately $1 million.

The concept promotes traffic signal coordination along Ivanhoe Street from Philadelphia Avenue to St. Louis Avenue at Lombard Street to potentially minimize vehicle queuing impacts and result in vehicle platoons, which may increase the frequency and length of gaps in the traffic

---


stream available for pedestrian crossing Ivanhoe Street. The preliminary cost estimate to coordinate this location to the entire coordinated system is approximately $10,000.

**Lombard Street Signal Coordination**

A coordinated traffic signal system is recommended for the east-west approaches on Lombard Street from Oswego Avenue to Woolsey Avenue. The coordinated system may include traffic signal controller, detection and communication updates. This improvement could promote vehicle progression on Lombard Street at the signalized intersection and increase capacity. The preliminary cost estimate to coordinate each traffic signal is approximately $10,000. The total coordinated system from Oswego Avenue to Woolsey Avenue would cost approximately $70,000. The Lombard Street coordinated traffic signal system could be extending east of the study area to Interstate Avenue to increase the benefits of the improvement.

**Collector Roadway System**

A collector street system was developed for the Cathedral Park Hillside and Willamette Riverfront area to provide both adequate access and circulation within residential and commercial/industrial areas. Collector streets would require a minimum 36-foot cross-section to accommodate two travel lanes and on-street parking on both sides of the street. Primary local
streets and secondary local streets would require a minimum 28-foot cross-section to accommodate two travel lanes with optional on-street parking.

The purpose of the primary local street designation is to ensure a motor vehicle connection is provided the entire length of the roadway. Primary local streets would help achieve a complete grid system for the area for motor vehicles. The secondary local street designation emphasizes a connection for pedestrian and bicyclists and does not require the street to accommodate motor vehicles. This would allow a parcel that is bisected by a secondary local street to be developed as a whole provided the pedestrian/bike connection is maintained. Secondary local street would help achieve a complete grid system for all modes. The recommended collector roadway network for the plan is shown in the following figure.

Baltimore Avenue, Richmond Avenue and Crawford Street would serve as the collector roadway system within the future hillside and riverfront areas and require a minimum 36-foot cross-section. Currently, these roadways meet the collector width standard except for Crawford Street within Cathedral Park (Pittsburg Avenue to Alta Avenue). In general, Richmond Avenue and Baltimore Avenue meet city standards to serve as a collector with minimal cross-section improvements required. Crawford Street is mostly unimproved with significant pavement, sidewalk, curb and drainage needs to meet city standards for a collector.

Intersection traffic control within the hillside/riverfront area would be limited to stop signs except for the recommended traffic signal at Richmond Avenue on Ivanhoe Street to ensure adequate circulation and access to this area for all modes. A limited number of stop signs are recommended on the collector streets. Richmond Avenue and Baltimore Avenue at Willamette Boulevard and Crawford Street should be controlled by a four-way stop intersection to reduce vehicle speeds and provide an improved crossing location for pedestrians. The remaining intersections should be controlled by stop signs on the side street approaches.
A new roadway connection on Leonard Street is recommended between Burlington Avenue and Leavitt Avenue to help complete the street grid within the town center and increase connectivity for all modes. A secondary local street connection is recommended between the Burlington Avenue/Leonard Street intersection and the Baltimore Avenue/Lombard Street intersection. This new street with an emphasis on serving pedestrians and bicycles would be located within City property designated for park usage.

**Travel Speed Evaluation**

Traffic models of the key roadways within the study area were developed for the existing conditions and the future 2020 alternatives to provide a system wide assessment of traffic flow. An evaluation of forecasted travel speeds on Lombard Street east of the town center was conducted to assess the impacts of future land use alternatives. The findings are summarized in Table 3-3 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>Average Travel Speeds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lombard Street at Ida Avenue</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average travel speeds in miles per hour based on Synchro corridor analysis.

The travel speed evaluation indicated that future travel speeds on Lombard Street will decrease approximately eight miles per hour under the Base Alternative. The land use changes incorporated in the future plan alternatives will have minimal impacts compared to the 2020 Base alternative.

**Traffic Operations Analysis**

The 2020 forecasted traffic volumes were evaluated at the study intersections for each alternative. The recommended traffic signal at the Richmond Avenue/Lombard Street intersection and the traffic signal system coordination within the town center and the Lombard corridor were assumed completed in the analysis. Table 3-4 summarizes the p.m. peak hour operating conditions at the study intersections. The City of Portland’s preferred minimum performance level is LOS E for signalized intersections. ODOT facilities require a volume to capacity ratio (v/c) of less than 0.99 for both the first and second hours of the p.m. peak period for signalized intersections within town centers and on main streets. All study intersections must meet both City of Portland and ODOT standards.
Table 3-4
2020 Future Study Intersection Operating Conditions – PM Peak Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Intersection</th>
<th>Base Alternative</th>
<th>Plan Alternative A</th>
<th>Plan Alternative B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delay</td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>V/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signalized Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis Ave/Lombard St</td>
<td>&gt;80</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>&gt;1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore Ave/Ivanhoe St</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia Ave/Ivanhoe St</td>
<td>&gt;80</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>&gt;1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia Ave/Lombard St</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Ave/Lombard St</td>
<td>&gt;80</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>&gt;1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Ave/Ivanhoe St</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oswego Ave/Lombard St</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan Ave/Lombard St</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ida Ave/Lombard St</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall Ave/Lombard St</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth Ave/Lombard St</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiske Ave/Lombard St</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolsey Ave/Lombard St</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shaded study intersections require mitigation to meet minimum operating standards.

LOS = Level of service
Delay = For signalized intersections, the average vehicle delay in seconds for all movements at an intersection
V/C = Volume to capacity ratio of the intersection

Based on the analysis of the 2020 alternatives, several study intersections are expected to degrade below acceptable operating conditions. Under the Base Alternative, three study intersections are expected to operate below acceptable conditions with LOS F and a v/c greater than 1.0. These intersections are Lombard Street at St. Louis Avenue and Richmond Avenue and Ivanhoe Street at Philadelphia Avenue.

The proposed land use modifications assumed in Plan Alternative A degrade one additional study intersection (Ida Avenue/Lombard Street) to below acceptable conditions. Plan Alternative B land use modifications degrade one additional study intersection (Fiske Avenue/Lombard Street) to below acceptable conditions compared to the analysis of the Plan Alternative A.

The modifications to the housing/employment balance in the study area attribute to the degrade in operating conditions at Ida Avenue and Fiske Avenue on Lombard Street. The forecasted volumes on Lombard Street east of the town center shifted with westbound trips increasing significantly while eastbound trips remain relatively the same. This shift is attributed to the plan alternative land use modifications in TAZ 922 with an increase in housing and a decrease in
employment compared to the base model. The increase in westbound traffic on Lombard Street increases the v/c at both substandard intersections.

**Recommended Study Intersection Improvements**

Several transportation improvements were assumed from the previous evaluation of the urban design concept and other regional plans. The assumed improvements are described in the previous section. Additional mitigations are recommended at the study intersections to meet minimum performance levels. The required intersection improvements for each alternative are described below.

**2020 Base Alternative**

Traffic Signal Coordinated System – St. John’s Town Center

- To optimize vehicle operating conditions, extending the cycle length for the coordinated traffic signal systems within the town center is recommended. The longer cycle length provides more green time for the major approaches, however the trade-off is increased delays for the minor approaches and crossing pedestrians. The extended cycle length would only be appropriate during peak operating conditions and could operate at a short cycle length during off-peak hours. The appropriate peak hour cycle length should be determined based on current operating conditions at the time of the improvement.

Philadelphia Avenue/Ivanhoe Street

- The restrictive right-of-way at this location limits possible short-term mitigations such as additional travel lanes. The St. Johns Truck Strategy\(^7\) concept to coordinating the traffic signals along Ivanhoe Street from Philadelphia Avenue to St. Louis Avenue at Lombard Street was assumed in the analysis.

- Several potential redesigns of the St. Johns town center plaza were presented in the previous chapter of this study. One alternative evaluated opening Philadelphia Avenue between Ivanhoe Street and Lombard Street to two-way traffic to improve circulation in the town center. This would require an additional approach to the Philadelphia Avenue/Ivanhoe Street traffic signal and take signal green time away from the existing approaches. This intersection is forecasted to operate over capacity (v/c greater than 1.0) in the 2020 Base Alternative. The new southbound approach would result in significant delays at the intersection and is therefore not recommended. The plaza roadway currently has a 20-foot cross-section with two lanes and could accommodate two-way traffic with truck restrictions, no on-street parking and no separate turn lanes provided at the Lombard Street or Ivanhoe Street approaches. The preliminary cost estimate is approximately $20,000.

Additional right-of-way would be required if the roadway were widened to provide on-street parking, accommodate truck traffic or separate turn lanes at the Lombard Street or Ivanhoe Street approaches. The following figure shows a layout of the plaza with two-way traffic and on-street parking. The preliminary cost estimate would increase to approximately $200,000.

---

An alternative design for the plaza realigned Philadelphia Avenue at Ivanhoe Street with the existing location of Burlington Avenue at Lombard Street. The street realignment would improve connectivity between the St. Johns Bridge and the town center. However, without opening the plaza to two-way traffic, the benefits of this improvement would be limited to northbound traffic. Trips from the town center to the St. Johns bridge would still require out of direction travel. The roadway realignment would have significant right-of-way impacts on the west side of the plaza. The preliminary cost estimate is approximately $700,000.

A new bridge across the Willamette River from Rivergate to US 30 is discussed in the St. Johns Truck Strategy as a long-range option. A North Willamette Crossing Study is identified in the RTP as a priority system project. An alternative Willamette River crossing location would reduce through traffic volumes significantly (predominately heavy vehicle volumes) at this intersection and improve operating conditions. This improvement would require significant new right-of-way to accommodate the project. The preliminary cost estimate is approximately $50 million.

---
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St. Louis Avenue/Lombard Street

- The restrictive right-of-way at this location limits possible short-term mitigations such as additional travel lanes. The St. Johns Truck Strategy\textsuperscript{10} concept to coordinating the traffic signals along Ivanhoe Street from Philadelphia Avenue to St. Louis Avenue at Lombard Street was assumed in the analysis.

- Signal modifications are recommended to increase the green time provided for vehicles to/from Lombard Street (west) and Ivanhoe Street (east). The green time provided for vehicles on St. Louis Avenue north of the intersection should be reduced to discourage heavy vehicles to use St. Louis Avenue and Fessenden Street as a connection to Columbia Boulevard. The preliminary cost estimate is minimal for these traffic signal modifications.

- A new bridge across the Willamette River from Rivergate to US 30 is discussed in the St. Johns Truck Strategy\textsuperscript{11} as a long range option. A North Willamette Crossing Study is identified in the RTP\textsuperscript{12} as a priority system project. An alternative Willamette River crossing location would reduce through traffic volumes significantly (predominately heavy vehicle volumes) at this intersection and improve operating conditions. This improvement would require significant new right-of-way to accommodate the project. The preliminary cost estimate is approximately $50 million.


\textsuperscript{12} 2000 Regional Transportation Plan, Metro, August 10, 2000, page 5-37.
Richmond Avenue/Lombard Street

- The mitigation includes coordinating the traffic signal at this location with the coordinated system along the Ivanhoe Street-Richmond Avenue corridor from Philadelphia Avenue to Lombard Street to promote vehicle progression. This improvement would result in vehicle platoons and increase the frequency and length of gaps in the traffic stream available for pedestrian crossing Ivanhoe Street. The preliminary cost estimate to coordinate this location to the entire coordinated system is approximately $10,000.

- An additional northbound travel lane on Richmond Avenue is recommended. The lane would begin just north of Ivanhoe Street, continue through the Richmond Avenue/Lombard Street intersection onto Lombard Street and drop approximately 200-feet east of the intersection. The existing roadway width on Richmond Avenue south of Jersey Street and adjacent to the Ivy Island is approximately 42-feet. The existing roadway width on Lombard Street from the Ivy Island to Richmond Avenue (north of Lombard Street) is approximately 52-feet. The recommended additional northbound travel lane could be accommodated within the existing roadway width. On-street parking is restricted on the south side of Lombard Street from Jersey Street to Oswego Street and provided for approximately 80-feet on Richmond Avenue from Ivanhoe Street to Lombard Street. Impacts to on-street parking would be minimal. The preliminary cost estimate is approximately $20,000.
The preliminary design of the improvement may require a longer portion of Lombard Street is needed to drop the additional lane east of Richmond Avenue. This would result in right-of-way impacts and increase the cost estimate approximately $250,000.
2020 Plan Alternative A

The mitigations required for the 2020 Base Alternative plus:

Traffic Signal Coordinated System – Lombard Street Corridor

- To meet minimum operating standards, extending the cycle length for the coordinated traffic signal systems along Lombard Street from Oswego Avenue to Woolsey Avenue is recommended. The longer cycle length provides more green time for the major approaches, however the trade-off is increased delays for the minor approaches and crossing pedestrians. The extended cycle length would only be appropriate during peak operating conditions and could operate at a shorter cycle length during off-peak hours. The appropriate peak hour cycle length should be determined based on current operating conditions at the time of the improvement.

Ida Avenue/Lombard Street

- The mitigations include modifying the eastbound-westbound left turn phasing to protected/permitted and constructing a separate southbound left turn lane. A modification to the cycle length at Ida Avenue would be included with the recommended cycle length modification of the entire Lombard Street corridor. The existing roadway width on Ida Avenue north of Lombard Street is 40-feet and accommodates two through travel lanes and limited on-street parking. The separate southbound right-turn lane could be accommodated within the existing roadway width if the on-street parking was removed between Lombard Street and Leonard Street. The preliminary cost estimate is approximately $20,000.
2020 Plan Alternative B

The mitigations required for the 2020 Base Alternative and Plan Alternative A plus:

Fiske Avenue/Lombard Street

- The mitigation includes extending the traffic signal cycle length. This improvement would be included with the recommended cycle length modification of the entire Lombard Street corridor (see 2020 Plan Alternative A section above). This improvement would have no right-of-way and on-street parking impacts. There are no significant costs associated with this improvement.

2020 Mitigated Operating Conditions

The intersection improvements identified in the previous section were evaluated to determine the resulting operating conditions at the study intersection under each future alternative. The mitigated operational analysis assumed the signal coordination improvements identified at Philadelphia Avenue/Ivanhoe Street and St. Louis Avenue/Lombard Street. Table 3-5 summarizes the future operating conditions at the mitigated study intersections.

Table 3-5
Mitigated 2020 Future Study Intersection Operating Conditions – PM Peak Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Intersection</th>
<th>Mitigated Base Alternative</th>
<th>Mitigated Plan Alternative A</th>
<th>Mitigated Plan Alternative B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delay LOS V/C</td>
<td>Delay LOS V/C</td>
<td>Delay LOS V/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis Ave/Lombard St</td>
<td>&gt;80 F &gt;1.0</td>
<td>&gt;80 F &gt;1.0</td>
<td>&gt;80 F &gt;1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia Ave/Ivanhoe St</td>
<td>&gt;80 F &gt;1.0</td>
<td>&gt;80 F &gt;1.0</td>
<td>&gt;80 F &gt;1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Ave/Lombard St</td>
<td>34.5 D 0.82</td>
<td>42.2 D 0.89</td>
<td>43.2 D 0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ida Ave/Lombard St</td>
<td>50.1 D 0.98</td>
<td>&gt;80 F &gt;1.0</td>
<td>&gt;80 F &gt;1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiske Ave/Lombard St</td>
<td>32.5 C 0.99</td>
<td>34.3 C 0.99</td>
<td>25.0 C 0.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LOS Level of service
Delay For signalized intersections, the average vehicle delay in seconds for all movements at an intersection
V/C Volume to capacity ratio of the intersection

With the identified improvements in place, the future operating conditions at several study intersections continue to operate with substandard conditions (v/c greater than 1.0 and LOS F). The St. Louis Avenue/Lombard Street and Philadelphia Avenue/Ivanhoe Street intersections are forecasted to operate over capacity under each future alternative. A long range option for a new Willamette River crossing was identified to potentially reduce through traffic volumes at these intersections and improve operating conditions. The identified mitigations at Ida Avenue/Lombard Street do not improve the intersection to acceptable operating conditions under both plan alternatives. The widening of Lombard Street to two lanes in the westbound direction would be required to accommodate future forecasted volumes and meet minimum operating standards. However, the objective of the plan to preserve on-street parking and the existing right-of-way would not be supported by widening Lombard Street, therefore the project is not recommended.
Summary

Three future land use alternatives were developed for this plan; 2020 Base, 2020 Plan Alternative A and 2020 Plan Alternative B. Each alternative was evaluated to assess the impacts to the transportation system. Land use changes incorporated in the future plan alternatives had minimal impacts compared to the 2020 Base alternative. The recommended mitigations would be required under each of the future alternatives. The future operating conditions at the study intersections can be improved to meet minimum operating standards at most locations in the 2020 planning horizon. The Ivanhoe Street/Philadelphia Avenue and Lombard Street/St. Louis Avenue intersections will experience over-capacity conditions in 2020 and may require long-term regional improvements to meet minimum operating standards.

Preferred Pedestrian Improvements

Pedestrian crossing improvements are recommended at several locations within the study area. A recent pedestrian study of the St. Johns town center was a source for several recommendations. The appropriate types of crossing improvements identified include curb extensions, median refuge islands and specific enhancements such as traffic signal modifications and enhanced pedestrian signage. The recommended pedestrian improvements were evaluated to assess the potential for impacts to motor vehicle capacity, right-of-way and on-street parking and estimated construction costs.

Curb Extensions

This enhancement extends the sidewalk out into the parking lane. Impacts to on-street parking are minimal with approximately one parking space removed per curb extension. If the curb extensions are provided at an existing crosswalk than there are no impacts to on-street parking. Curb extensions that are constructed to accommodate transit stops remove two spaces on the near side of the intersection and three spaces on the far side of the intersection.

The recommended curb extensions for this plan fit within the existing roadway cross-section and would not have right-of-way impacts. The placement of curb extensions at intersections can impact the drainage of the roadway. Curb extensions do not extend into the vehicle travel lane, therefore impacts to through traffic capacity is limited to traffic calming effects (minor speed reductions). Curb extensions could impact right turning vehicles that use the parking lane to pass stopped through vehicles. However, a vehicle parked within the parking lane would have the same impact. Curb extensions could impact right turn movements for heavy vehicles by reducing the pavement area.

Curb extensions can be designed to accommodate frequent bus service. A bus pullout (curbside bus loading/unloading area) could be located on the far side of the intersection to reduce vehicle blockage with curb extensions on the near side of the intersection. However, bus stops located at curb extensions can operate more efficiently than at bus pullouts. Typically, buses at curbside pullouts do not completely pullout of the travel lane and vehicles are delayed while the bus

---

loads/unload passengers and maneuvers back into traffic. Bus stops at curb extensions can reduce transit travel times and vehicle delays by eliminating the need for the bus to maneuver to/from the curb and provide a direct sidewalk connection for passengers. Tri-Met needs to coordinate with City staff for final transit curb extension locations.

Construction costs for a curb extension range from $10,000 to $35,000 per location depending on site conditions. Potential impacts to roadway drainage are usually the most significant cost determinant. Costs could also increase if the curb extension are transit supportive and special pavement and landscaping are included. If something major, such as a utility pole or controller box, is relocated costs can go up significantly.

**Median Refuge Islands**

This enhancement provides a supplement to marked crosswalks at signalized or midblock locations. Median refuge islands are located in the center of the street to help protect crossing pedestrians from motor vehicles. On-street parking would not be allowed at a marked crosswalk, therefore a median refuge island would have minimal impact to on-street parking. The recommended median refuge islands for this plan fit within the existing roadway cross-section and would not have right-of-way impacts. Median refuge islands do not extend into the vehicle travel lane, therefore impacts to through traffic capacity is limited to traffic calming effects (minor speed reductions).

Construction costs for a median refuge island range from $4,000 to $30,000 depending on the median size and surface materials selected. An asphalt median island would cost significantly less than a raised concrete median island with landscaping.

Each recommended enhancement was evaluated based on the criteria below. The locations meeting including:

- Future land use needs
- Future transit needs
- Future pedestrian needs
- Safety
- Proximity to existing protected crossings

The recommended pedestrian plan within the Lombard main street and St. Johns town center are summarized in the figures below and Tables 3-6 and 3-7.
## Lombard Main Street

### Lombard Main Street Recommended Pedestrian Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Future Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Woolsey/Lombard</td>
<td>Curb extensions at both crosswalks of the signalized intersection across Lombard</td>
<td>Land use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huron/Lombard</td>
<td>Median refuge island combined with curb extensions across Lombard on either side of the unsignalized intersection</td>
<td>Land use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiske/Lombard</td>
<td>Curb extensions at both crosswalks of the signalized intersection across Lombard</td>
<td>Full main street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Priority transit stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haven/Lombard</td>
<td>Median refuge island combined with curb extensions across Lombard on either side of the unsignalized intersection</td>
<td>Full main street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High pedestrian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hodge/Lombard</td>
<td>Curb extensions at the existing pedestrian signal across Lombard</td>
<td>Full main street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford/Lombard</td>
<td>Curb extensions across Lombard on either side of the unsignalized intersection</td>
<td>Full main street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth/Lombard</td>
<td>Curb extensions at both crosswalks of the signalized intersection across Lombard</td>
<td>Community corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Priority transit stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Houten/Lombard</td>
<td>Curb extensions across Lombard on either side of the unsignalized intersection, intersection realignment with redevelopment of adjacent lots</td>
<td>Land use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley/Monteith/Lombard</td>
<td>Curb extensions and a median refuge island between the intersection offset across Lombard</td>
<td>Land use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall/Lombard</td>
<td>Curb extensions at both crosswalks of the signalized intersection across Lombard</td>
<td>Community corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Priority transit stop</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westanna/Lombard</td>
<td>Median refuge island combined with curb extensions across Lombard on either side of the unsignalized intersection</td>
<td>Land use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert/Lombard</td>
<td>Curb extensions across Lombard on either side of the unsignalized intersection</td>
<td>Land use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ida/Lombard</td>
<td>Curb extensions at both crosswalks of the signalized intersection across Lombard</td>
<td>Community corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Priority transit stop</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burr/Lombard</td>
<td>Curb extensions across Lombard on either side of the unsignalized intersection</td>
<td>Land use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan/Lombard</td>
<td>Curb extensions at both crosswalks of the signalized intersection across Lombard</td>
<td>Community corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Priority transit stop</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler/Lombard</td>
<td>Curb extensions across Lombard on either side of the unsignalized intersection</td>
<td>Land use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oswego/Lombard</td>
<td>Curb extensions at both crosswalks of the signalized intersection across Lombard</td>
<td>Community corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Priority transit stop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

St. Johns Town Center

**St. Johns Town Center Preferred Pedestrian Plan**
- Curb Extensions
- Install Traffic Signal
- Specific Enhancements
- Priority Location

---

**St. Johns Town Center/Lombard Plan**
**DKS Associates**
Alternatives Evaluation
June 2003
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Future Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richmond/Ivanhoe</td>
<td>Crosswalks on each approach of the recommended new traffic signal, curb extension at the northwest corner across Ivanhoe</td>
<td>Town center Pedestrian Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston/Ivanhoe</td>
<td>Curb extensions across Ivanhoe on either side of the unsignalized intersection</td>
<td>Town center Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John/Ivanhoe</td>
<td>Curb extensions across Ivanhoe on either side of the unsignalized intersection</td>
<td>Town center Transit Pedestrian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavitt/Ivanhoe</td>
<td>Curb extensions across Ivanhoe on either side of the unsignalized intersection</td>
<td>Town center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia/Ivanhoe</td>
<td>Increase traffic signal green time for pedestrian crossing phase on Ivanhoe west approach</td>
<td>Town center Pedestrian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore/Ivanhoe</td>
<td>Curb extensions at both existing crosswalks across Ivanhoe</td>
<td>Town center Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago/Ivanhoe</td>
<td>Curb extensions across Ivanhoe on either side of the unsignalized intersection</td>
<td>Town center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York/Ivanhoe</td>
<td>Curb extensions across Ivanhoe on either side of the unsignalized intersection</td>
<td>Town center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis/Ivanhoe</td>
<td>Add signage indicated “No Pedestrian Crossing” and direction to the existing signalized crossing at Lombard</td>
<td>Town center Pedestrian Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis/Lombard</td>
<td>Remove unnecessary signage and utility poles to improve sight distance for vehicles and pedestrians</td>
<td>Town center Pedestrian Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago/Lombard</td>
<td>Curb extensions across Lombard on either side of the unsignalized intersection</td>
<td>Town center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore/Lombard</td>
<td>Curb extensions across Lombard on either side of the unsignalized intersection</td>
<td>Town center Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington/Lombard</td>
<td>Curb extensions at both crosswalks of the signalized intersection across Lombard</td>
<td>Town center Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavitt/Lombard</td>
<td>Curb extensions across Lombard on either side of the unsignalized intersection</td>
<td>Town center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John/Lombard</td>
<td>Curb extensions at the existing pedestrian signal across Lombard</td>
<td>Town center Transit Pedestrian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston/Lombard</td>
<td>Curb extensions across Lombard on either side of the unsignalized intersection</td>
<td>Town center Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond/Lombard</td>
<td>Redesign intersection with perpendicular approaches to calm turn movements and a large pedestrian/sidewalk area on the northwest corner (see Special Pedestrian Needs below)</td>
<td>Town center Pedestrian Safety</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Special Pedestrian Needs

The previous evaluation of the Richmond Avenue/Lombard Street intersection focused on three design alternatives. The purpose of the designs was to enhance the westbound traffic movement on Lombard Street into the town center by slowing vehicle speeds and improving the sight distance of pedestrians crossing at Charleston Avenue. Option A could calm westbound vehicles with narrowed travel lanes, however poor sight distance from the roadway curvature still exists with the layout. Option B could reduce vehicle speed with narrow lanes on the westbound approach and improve the driver’s sight line into the commercial core of the town center, but the design retains the westbound free-right turn movement which may encourage cut-through traffic in the town center (not destined for local retail) and the poor sight distance still exists.

Option C was chosen as the recommended design for the intersection. The project would remove the existing traffic island and shift the travel lanes on Lombard Street to the south. The gain in property to the north should be incorporated to a large sidewalk/plaza area. The existing westbound free-right turn movement on Lombard Street would be retained, however vehicle speeds would be reduced by the ninety-degree right turn movement and narrowed lanes. The westbound sight distance is improved significantly with vehicles aligned sight lines directly to pedestrians crossing at Charleston Avenue. This design options fits into the existing right-of-way and does not require additional property. Pedestrian crosswalks and curb extensions are recommended on each leg of the signalized intersection. The high priority level is based on future land use and transit needs and improved pedestrian safety. The preliminary cost estimate is approximately $150,000.
Transit Operation Improvements

Several enhancements to the existing transit system on Lombard Street and within the St. Johns town center have been identified to improve transit travel times, passenger convenience and bus route locations. These enhancements could significantly improve the transit system in the study area. Metro has identified transit service on Lombard Street to receive capital improvements to enhance new frequent bus service from downtown Portland to St. Johns. Tri-Met has selected transit service on Lombard Street for a streamline evaluation within the next year. The streamline evaluation would identify specific improvements along the bus route to improve overall transit service.

Transit Travel Time Improvements

Improvements to the overall transit system are recommended to increase transit service travel times along Lombard Street and between the St. Johns area and regional destinations. The recommended transit enhancements for Lombard Street and the St. Johns town center are described in the following sections and shown in the figures below.

**Frequent Service** – Tri-Met has implemented a Frequent Service program for selected bus routes. Frequent service transit lines provide 15-minute headways or better during the day every day. Currently 14 Frequent Service bus routes operate in the Metro area. Within the next five years Tri-Met plans to expand the Frequent Service program to most popular bus routes. Bus route #75 – 39th Ave/Lombard and bus route #4 – Fessenden are planned for frequent service by 2004.

**Transit Signal Priority** – This project extends the green time at traffic signals for buses that are behind schedule. Tri-Met plans to install this feature at all traffic signals located on an identified Frequent Service route resulting in approximately 250 locations in Portland and the Metro region. Within the study area, transit signal priority is recommended at all traffic signals on Lombard Street east of Oswego Avenue. This would benefit bus routes #75 – 39th Ave/Lombard and #16 – Front Ave/St. Johns. The traffic signal system within the town center would have limited benefit from transit signal priority due to the frequency of bus stops, close signal spacing, short signal cycle lengths and low travel speeds.

**Priority Transit Service** – The use of priority (limited stop) bus service during peak hours is recommended on bus route #75 – 39th Ave/Lombard to significantly reduce travel times for commuting passengers. The use of priority bus service results in less travel time delay from frequent bus decelerating/accelerating and loading/unloading passengers. The recommended priority bus service locations are supported by future land use needs.

**Bus Stop Consolidation or Relocation** – Consolidating the existing bus stops on Lombard Street and within the town center is recommended. This would benefit bus routes #75 – 39th Ave/Lombard and #16 – Front Ave/St. Johns. Transit stops should be spaced appropriately to provide adequate accessibility to riders while limiting bus delays from frequent stops. The current spacing of bus stops on the Lombard Street corridor range from 350 to 1,000-feet. The recommended transit stop spacing on Lombard Street is approximately 500 feet minimum. Transit stop relocations should be coordinated with pedestrian improvements, such as curb extensions, as they are construction.
Transit Amenity Improvements

Transit amenities should be provided throughout the study area to improve the convenience and attractiveness of using the transit system, which potentially lowers vehicle trips. The various amenities recommended for Lombard Street and the St. Johns town center are described in the following sections and shown in the figures below.

**Bus Shelters** – The use of bus shelters is recommended to encourage transit ridership. Bus shelters are recommended at all bus stops within the Lombard full main street, at community corners and at all priority transit stops. Bus shelters are also recommended at stops with more than 35 boardings per day or located adjacent to special trip generators such as schools or senior housing. The cost for a bus shelter ranges from $3,000 to $8,000 depending on location.

**Information Kiosks** - This enhancement is recommended at all bus shelter locations to improve transit rider convenience. At a minimum, an information kiosk would include bus route schedule information displayed either on paper or an electronic reader board and bus route maps. The cost for an information kiosk ranges from $2,000 to $10,000 depending on location and the complexity of installation.

**Transit Tracker** – This system uses satellite technology to pinpoint the location of each bus along its route and provide real-time countdowns to riders on the street. The electronic display shows the number of minutes until each bus will arrive at that stop, as well as current time and date. The estimated arrival times are based on the location of the bus and the scheduled speed along its route. Tri-Met has identified priority locations for Transit Tracker systems at busy bus stops and transfer locations. The estimated cost for Transit Tracker is approximately $5,000 per location assuming a bus shelter with access to electricity is already provided.
Street Lighting – The use of street lighting results in highly visible bus stops so pedestrians can easily identify the locations and good security can be provided. Street lighting should be provided at all bus stops within the Lombard full main street and at community corners and at locations adjacent to special trip generators such as schools or senior housing. Additional street lighting was recommended at bus stops located more than 100-feet from existing street lighting. The estimated cost for street lighting is approximately $25,000 per location.

Tri-Met has identified several bus stops on Lombard Street within the study area for specific enhancements as part of the Frequent Service program. The following figure shows the priority locations for Frequent Service amenities planned for installation by 2004. In general, Frequent Service bus stops are planned to feature:

- schedule and route maps at every stop
- Transit Tracker
- shelters and/or benches
- curb ramp
- distinctive new buses and signs
- bike rack
- low-floor buses for easier boarding with air conditioning and reduced pollution
- easier pedestrian access
- traffic signal priority
- optional: ticket vending, public phone and artwork element
Transit Routing Improvements

The existing bus route configuration through the St. Johns downtown area can be confusing to transit users. Bus routes should focus on Lombard Street, Ivanhoe Street, St. Louis Avenue and Richmond Avenue as the main transit facilities to increase rider convenience. The existing routes located on Chicago Street, Leavitt Street, Charleston Street and Syracuse Street should be rerouted to the preferred main transit facilities. Burlington Avenue and Central Street should continue to provide service north of the town center. Bus routes #16 and #75 would continue to operate as they do today on Lombard Street and Ivanhoe Street. Bus route #6 would relocate from Chicago Avenue to St. Louis Avenue north of Lombard Street to increase coverage. Bus route #4 would relocate from Syracuse Street to Lombard Street between St. Louis Avenue and Baltimore Avenue. Bus route #17 would relocate service from Chicago Avenue to St. Louis Avenue and remove the one-way service on Syracuse Street and Charleston Street to simplify the route. Bus route #40 would remove the inbound service on Charleston Avenue to two-way service on Richmond Avenue.

A transit center that provides a connection to all bus routes serving the St. Johns area is recommended. The plaza on Philadelphia Avenue between Lombard Street and Ivanhoe Street would be an appropriate location to consider for a transit center with frontage on both main transit facilities. This would allow for bus service to be divided between Ivanhoe Street and Lombard Street reducing the impacts of bus service to motor vehicles and providing a greater area of coverage. Loading all of the bus service onto one roadway may impact both motor vehicle capacity and transit travel times. The preferred transit routing plan for the town center is shown in the figure below.
Summary

The existing transit service coverage within the study area is generally good. No new transit routes are recommended. Enhancements to reduce transit travel times and to improve the overall convenience of using transit services are recommended along Lombard Street and within the town center. Enhancements are focused within the town center and at planned community corners where future transit ridership demand is expected to be significant. The recommended improvements are consistent with plan goals to provide for a balanced multi-modal transportation system and regional goals to support development opportunities without increasing traffic congestion. The enhancements within this plan are expected to create an efficient and convenient transit system.
Bicycle System Improvements

Lombard Street is designated as a City Bikeway, however, the existing restrictive right-of-way west of Alma Avenue suggests that several alternatives for bicycles may be appropriate. To accommodate safe and convenient bicycle travel on or near the Lombard Main Street, four potential alternatives were developed for evaluation.

Shared Roadway

The current conditions on Lombard Street require bicycles to share the travel lane with motor vehicles. Roadway characteristics such as lane width, peak hour traffic volumes, active on-street parking and vehicle speeds create an undesirable environment for some bicyclists. The City’s Bicycle Master Plan does not recommend a shared roadway with average daily traffic volumes greater than 10,000 vehicles. Lombard Street currently carries approximately 17,000 vehicles per day. Bicycles sharing the travel lane with vehicles can impact capacity if vehicles are blocks by slower moving bicycles. This alternative does not impact right-of-way or on-street parking. Lombard Street operates as a shared roadway today, therefore no costs are associated with this alternative.

Bike Lanes

Designated bike lanes could be accommodated on Lombard Street east of Ida Avenue in both directions within the existing roadway cross-section with no impacts to on-street parking. However, the midblock center turn lane east of Portsmouth Avenue and separate left-turn lanes at signalized intersections would have to be removed. The operating conditions at signalized intersections would be significantly degraded with the removal of the separate left turn lanes on Lombard Street. Left turning vehicles would block through traffic and cause delays.

To accommodate bike lanes on Lombard Street in both directions west of Ida Avenue, the existing on-street parking would have to be removed on both sides of the street. Separate left-turn lanes at signalized intersections would also have to be removed. The operating conditions at signalized intersections would be significantly degraded with the removal of the separate left turn lanes on Lombard Street. Left turning vehicles would block through traffic and cause delays.

Designated bike lanes on Lombard Street from Woolsey Avenue to Oswego Avenue would cost approximately $200,000 for striping, signage and required signal modifications. The recommended bike lanes on Lombard Street are shown in the following figure.

---

15 Bicycle Master Plan, City of Portland, Office of Transportation, May 1, 1996, Table 3.2.
Alternative Bike Routes

Parallel alternative bike routes were developed to avoid impacts to on-street parking and center left turn lanes on Lombard Street. Oberlin Street, Jersey Street and Central Street are ideal locations for alternative bike routes because they are parallel local roadways within a few blocks of Lombard Street. The potential bike routes are located on Oberlin Street from Olin Avenue to Macrum, on Jersey Street from Ida Avenue to Richmond Avenue and on Central Street from Ida Avenue to St. Louis Avenue. A bike route on Willamette Boulevard west of Ida Avenue is also an option to extend the existing bike lanes on Willamette Boulevard and provide an additional connection to the town center. The connection between Oberlin Street and Jersey Street or Central Street is not continuous due to limited crossing locations at the railroad tracks. The short-term option is for cyclists to relocate to Lombard Street as a shared on-street facility between Ida Avenue and Macrum Avenue to ride continuously from east to west. A long-term option would be to construct a multi-use bridge providing a direct connection between Oberlin Street and Jersey Street from Macrum Ave to Ida Avenue. The preliminary cost estimate for the alternative bike routes with the short-term railroad crossing option is approximately $10,000 primarily for route signage. The long-term multi-use bridge option would increase costs approximately $750,000.

The Oberlin Street bike route crossing at Portsmouth Avenue may require enhancements to improve bicycle safety and convenience. A marked crosswalk either alone or in combination with a crossing signal, in-road lighting, curb extensions and/or median refuge islands may be appropriate crossing enhancements. Preliminary cost estimates for these enhancements range from $10,000 for curb extensions to $100,000 for a combination.

Capacity impacts on Oberlin Street, Jersey Street, Central Street and Willamette Boulevard would be limited due to low vehicle volumes. The alternative bike routes would have no impact
to right-of-way or on-street parking because the roadway would be shared between motor vehicles and bicycles. The alternative bike routes are shown in the following figure.

Bike Lane and Bike Route Combination

Portions of the potential bike lanes on Lombard Street and the alternative bike routes were combined as an additional option to improve bicycle connectivity. Designated bike lanes would be provided on the section of Lombard Street where impacts could be limited. Specifically from Portsmouth Avenue to Ida Avenue with a 50-foot cross-section and a center turn lane, but not at the signalized intersections to retain the separate left turn lanes at Portsmouth Avenue, Wall Avenue and Ida Avenue. The location of the bike lanes and bike routes are shown in the following figure.
The bike lane configuration would take the mid-block 12-foot wide center left turn lane and convert it to two six-foot wide bike lanes. Bike lanes could be provided on both sides of the street for 1,200-feet from Portsmouth Avenue to Wall Avenue and 1,900-feet from Wall Avenue to Ida Avenue. The removal of the center left turn lane from Portsmouth Avenue to Ida Avenue would allow a mid-block left turning vehicle to block the through movement, however the impacts to capacity are expected to be minor based on the low mid-block left turn volumes. A detail of the Lombard Street cross-section with bike lanes is shown in the figure below.
The alternative bike routes on Oberlin Street from Olin Avenue to Portsmouth Avenue, Jersey Street from Ida Avenue to Richmond Avenue and Central Street from Ida Avenue to St. Louis Avenue would also be provided with the partial bike lanes on Lombard Street to provide a improved bike network. The preliminary cost estimate for the bike lane and bike route combination option is approximately $60,000.

Several roadways within the town center are designated as a City Bikeway, however, the existing restrictive right-of-way and high traffic volumes at some locations suggests that alternative routes for bicycles may be appropriate. To accommodate safe and convenient bicycle travel within or near the town center, a bike route network was developed for evaluation.

Summary

The bike lane and bike route combination alternative is recommended to limit the impacts to Lombard Street and optimize benefits to the local bike network. The bike lanes on Lombard Street provide direct bike access to commercial destinations and alternative bike routes help provide a continuous system.

---

Policy Evaluation

The adopted state, regional and local transportation policies applicable to the study area were identified to assess possible conflicts with the recommended improvements of this plan. The policy compliance review is summarized in the following sections.

Mode Split Targets

Alternative mode share targets for 2040 have been established by Metro\textsuperscript{17} as goals for cities to work towards. Urban areas in the region should achieve higher non-single occupancy vehicle (SOV) mode shares than less developed areas. The 2040 Regional non-SOV modal target for a town center is 45-55%. The north Portland peninsula operates with non-SOV mode share of 45% or better based on forecasted 2020 conditions. This meets and exceeds the 2040 target.

\textsuperscript{17} 2000 Regional Transportation Plan, Metro, August 10, 2000, Table 1.3, page 1-62.
**Congestion Management**

Management strategies can be implemented both locally and regionally to achieve operating standards. The Metro Regional Transportation Plan\(^1\) has identified 2020 Preferred System improvements for the St. Johns town center to help relieve congestion. These improvements have been incorporated in the St. Johns/Lombard Plan. The review found no roadway system improvements impacting motor vehicle capacity at study intersections were identified in the RTP. The projects identified for other modes include:

- St. Johns Bridge Restoration (RTP 1139)
- N/NE Lombard/Killingsworth Traffic Management Improvements (RTP 4012)
- MLK/Lombard Frequent Bus (RTP 1135)
- Freight Mobility Study (RTP 1152)
- North Willamette Crossing Study (RTP 4016)

An analysis of the 2020 Base alternative model for the p.m. peak hour was conducted to assess the forecasted congestion within the study area. The volume to capacity plot shown below indicates the local street network is not expected to operate overcapacity (v/c greater than 1.0) on a link level analysis. However, the operating conditions at specific intersections on the network link may experience volumes greater than the available capacity.

\(^1\) 2000 Regional Transportation Plan, Metro, August 10, 2000, page 3-33.
Street Connectivity

The Metro Regional Transportation Plan\(^9\) has adopted Design Standards for Street Connectivity to “improve local circulation in a manner that protects the integrity of the regional transportation system.” Based on the adopted standards, new streets require a spacing of no more than 530 feet between connections except where prevented by barriers (topography, railroads, pre-existing development, etc.).

The City of Portland TSP\(^{20}\) has identified street connectivity goals to “support development of an interconnected, multi-modal transportation system to serve mixed-use areas, residential neighborhoods, and other activity centers.” The three established objectives include:

- “Provide interconnected local and collector streets to serve new and redeveloping areas and to ensure safe, efficient, and convenient pedestrian, bicycle and vehicle access with preference for public streets over private.
- Create short blocks through development of frequent street connections in mixed-use areas of planned high-density development.
- Provide convenient and safe bicycle and pedestrian connection to transit routes, schools, and parks, as well as within and between new and existing residential developments, employment areas, and other activity centers where street connections are not feasible.”

The recommended roadway system for the hillside and riverfront areas in this plan are consistent with the Metro standards and City of Portland goals for street connectivity.

Street Classifications

The street classifications recommended in the St. Johns/Lombard Plan are not consistent with roadway designations in the City of Portland TSP.\(^{21}\) Within the hillside and riverfront area, Richmond Avenue (Willamette Boulevard to Crawford Street), Crawford Street (Richmond Avenue to Baltimore Avenue) and Baltimore Avenue (Crawford Street to Ivanhoe Street) have been identified for upgrade from Local Service Traffic Street to Neighborhood Collector classification. These same identified roadways with the addition of Richmond Avenue from Willamette Boulevard to Ivanhoe Street have been identified for upgrade from Local Service Bikeway to City Bikeway classification. The transit routes recommended in the St. Johns/Lombard Plan are also not consistent with transit classifications in the Portland TSP. No new Transit Access Streets are recommended, rather several transit designations have been identified for removal. These recommendations would require modifications to the current Portland TSP.

\(^{21}\) Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan, City of Portland, adopted by City Council October 2002, page 2-89 through 2-95.
Parking Ratios

The City of Portland Code\textsuperscript{22} has established motor vehicle parking regulations for new and redeveloped properties. The parking ratios assumed for the future land use alternatives in the St. Johns/Lombard Plan follow the current code regulations.

\textsuperscript{22} Code of the City of Portland, Title 33, Planning and Zoning, Chapter 33.266.
Summary of Preferred Improvements

Lombard Street Traffic Signal Coordination
A coordinated traffic signal system is recommended for the east-west approaches on Lombard Street from Oswego Avenue to Woolsey Avenue. The coordinated system may include traffic signal controller, detection and communication updates. The Lombard Street coordinated traffic signal system could be extending east of the study area to Interstate Avenue to increase the benefits of the improvement. The appropriate peak hour cycle length should be determined based on current operating conditions at the time of the improvement.

St. John’s Town Center Traffic Signal Coordination
A coordinated traffic signal system is recommended on the Ivanhoe Street corridor from St. Louis Avenue at Lombard Street to Richmond Avenue at Lombard Street. The coordinated system may include traffic signal controller, detection and communication updates. The appropriate peak hour cycle length should be determined based on current operating conditions at the time of the improvement.

St. Johns Town Center Study Intersections

Richmond Avenue/Ivanhoe Street
- New traffic signal with crosswalks on each approach
- Coordinated traffic signal system on Ivanhoe Street from Philadelphia Avenue to Richmond Avenue/Lombard Street
- Curb extension on Ivanhoe Street at the northwest corner

Baltimore Avenue/Ivanhoe Street
- Coordinated traffic signal system on Ivanhoe Street from Philadelphia Avenue to St. Louis Avenue at Lombard Street
- Curb extensions at both crosswalks across Ivanhoe Street

Philadelphia Avenue/Ivanhoe Street
- Coordinated traffic signal system on Ivanhoe Street from Philadelphia Avenue west to St. Louis Avenue/Lombard Street and east to Richmond Avenue/Lombard Street
- Increase traffic signal green time for pedestrian crossing phase on Ivanhoe Street west approach.

St. Louis Avenue/Lombard Street
- Coordinated traffic signal system on Ivanhoe Street from Philadelphia Avenue to St. Louis Avenue at Lombard Street
- Remove unnecessary signage and utility poles
St. Louis Avenue/Ivanhoe Street
- Signage indicating “No Pedestrian Crossing” and additional signs to direct pedestrians to the existing signalized crossing at Lombard Street.

Richmond Avenue/Lombard Street
- Coordinated traffic signal system on Ivanhoe Street from Philadelphia Avenue to Richmond Avenue/Lombard Street
- Redesign intersection with a ninety-degree westbound free-right turn movement on Lombard Street, a realigned intersection with perpendicular approaches and a large pedestrian/sidewalk area on the northwest corner.
- An additional northbound travel lane on Richmond Avenue is recommended. The lane would begin just north of Ivanhoe Street, continue through the Richmond Avenue/Lombard Street intersection onto Lombard Street and drop approximately 200-feet east of the intersection.

Ivanhoe Street at Charleston, John, Leavitt, Chicago and New York Avenue
- Curb extensions across Ivanhoe Street on either side of the unsignalized intersection if a marked crosswalk is determined to be appropriate

Lombard Street at Chicago, Baltimore, Leavitt and Charleston Avenue
- Curb extensions across Lombard Street on either side of the unsignalized intersection if a marked crosswalk is determined to be appropriate
- Located on preferred transit route

Burlington Avenue/Lombard Street
- Curb extensions at both crosswalks of the signalized intersection across Lombard Street
- Located on preferred transit route

John Avenue/Lombard Street
- Curb extensions at the existing pedestrian signal across Lombard Street
- Located on preferred transit route

Charleston at John Elementary School/St. Johns Library
- Enhanced pedestrian treatment

Lombard Main Street Study Intersections

Oswego Avenue/Lombard Street
- Curb extensions at both crosswalks of the signalized intersection across Lombard Street
- Priority transit service
- Bus shelter at the eastbound and westbound stops

Buchanan Avenue/Lombard Street
- Curb extensions at both crosswalks of the signalized intersection across Lombard Street
- Priority transit service
- Improved transit street lighting
Ida Avenue/Lombard Street
- Separate southbound left-turn lane
- Curb extensions at both crosswalks of the signalized intersection across Lombard Street
- Priority transit service
- Bus shelter at the westbound transit stop
- Improved transit street lighting

Wall Avenue/Lombard Street
- Curb extensions at both crosswalks of the signalized intersection across Lombard Street
- Priority transit service
- Bus shelter at the eastbound and westbound transit stops

Portsmouth Avenue/Lombard Street
- Curb extensions at both crosswalks of the signalized intersection across Lombard Street
- Priority transit service
- Bus shelter at the westbound transit stop

Hodge Avenue/Lombard Street
- Curb extensions at the existing pedestrian signal across Lombard Street
- Bus shelter at the eastbound and westbound transit stops

Fiske Avenue/Lombard Street
- Curb extensions at both crosswalks of the signalized intersection across Lombard Street
- Priority transit service
- Bus shelter at the westbound transit stop

Woolsey Avenue/Lombard Street
- Curb extensions at both crosswalks of the signalized intersection across Lombard Street

Lombard at Westanna, Berkeley, Haven and Huron Avenue
- Median refuge island combined with curb extensions across Lombard Street on either side of the unsignalized intersection if a marked crosswalk is determined to be appropriate

Lombard Street at Tyler, Burr, Gilbert, Van Houten and Stanford Avenue
- Curb extensions across Lombard Street on either side of the unsignalized intersection if a marked crosswalk is determined to be appropriate

Study Area Roadways

Richmond Avenue – Ivanhoe Street to Crawford Street
- Collector roadway with minimum 36-foot cross-section

Baltimore Avenue – Ivanhoe Street to Crawford Street
- Collector roadway with minimum 36-foot cross-section

Crawford Street – Tyler Avenue to Baltimore Avenue
- Collector roadway with minimum 36-foot cross-section

**John Avenue – Ivanhoe Street to Crawford Street**
- Primary local street with minimum 28-foot cross-section

**Edison Street – Burlington Avenue to Richmond Avenue**
- Primary local street with minimum 28-foot cross-section

**Decatur Street – Burlington Avenue to Richmond Avenue**
- Primary local street with minimum 28-foot cross-section

**Syracuse Street – Leavitt Avenue to Mohawk Avenue**
- Primary local street with minimum 28-foot cross-section

**Leavitt Avenue – Princeton Street to Crawford Street**
- Secondary local street with minimum 28-foot cross-section and pedestrian/bicycle emphasis

**Charleston Avenue – Ivanhoe Street to Crawford Street**
- Secondary local street with minimum 28-foot cross-section and pedestrian/bicycle emphasis

**Richmond Avenue – Crawford Street to riverfront multi-use trail**
- Secondary local street with minimum 28-foot cross-section and pedestrian/bicycle emphasis

**John Avenue – Crawford Street to riverfront multi-use trail**
- Secondary local street with minimum 28-foot cross-section and pedestrian/bicycle emphasis

**Oberlin Street/Jersey Street**
- Designated bike route from Olin Avenue to Macrum Avenue and Ida Avenue to Richmond Avenue

**Central Street**
- Designated bike route from Ida Avenue to St. Louis Avenue
- Curb extensions across Lombard Street on either side of the unsignalized intersection if a marked crosswalk is determined to be appropriate