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Why We’re Here

• To present what is being considered through the Oakland Plan and associated Zoning Code proposals.
• To hear from you as stakeholders in the Oakland Plan process.
• We’re not here to discuss the proposed OPR-E rezoning. There have been three recent community meetings in the last week focused on that including last week’s OBID meeting and one last night, as well as an active comment period using EngagePGH: https://engage.pittsburghpa.gov/opr-e
Background Materials

The Oakland Plan process is based on work with the Oakland community, local and national data, as well as best practices and lessons learned from other similar innovation neighborhoods.

Learn more:

Existing Conditions Report: https://pittsburghpa.gov/dcp/oakland-resources

Work and public input from throughout the 2.5 year planning process: https://engage.pittsburghpa.gov/oakland

Specific research and analyses conducted as part of site-based tours and workshops for Forbes Avenue and Boulevard of the Allies: https://engage.pittsburghpa.gov/oakland/workshops
Oakland Plan Plan Process

**Past Event**
- **2019**: URBAN DESIGN WORKSHOP & PLANNING EDUCATION SERIES

**Summer/Fall 2020**
- Online open house

**Fall 2021**
- In-person events, online engagement

**2020**
- ONLINE ENGAGEMENT Challenges, Vision, and Goals
- ONLINE ENGAGEMENT Review Draft Proposals
- PUBLIC HEARING Planning Commission

**2021**
- Past Event

**2022**
- Past Event

**STEERING COMMITTEE**
- Create Public Engagement Plan
- Develop Knowledge, Identify Challenges & Opportunities

**ACTION TEAMS**
- Issue Identification
- Research
- Draft Proposals
- Refine Proposals
- Integrate Proposals into Draft Plan

**ROLE OF PUBLIC**
- Co-creation through regular work sessions, activities.
- Participate in periodic equity workshops.

+ Technical Advisory Groups, Focus Groups
### Who's Who and What They Do: The People Behind the Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Steering Committee</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Action Teams</th>
<th>Technical Advisory Group</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advisory body with up to 30 member organizations that represent most stakeholder groups.</td>
<td>A person with an interest or concern in the neighborhood.</td>
<td>Team comprised of Steering Committee members, residents, other stakeholders, and public agency staff.</td>
<td>Group composed of experts that focus on complex topic(s).</td>
<td>Professional staff from public, non-profit, and private sector organizations that manage the planning process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| What | They engage the stakeholder group representatives, produce elements of the plan, and integrate the work of the Action Teams. | They provide input and feedback throughout the planning process. | They identify issues and conduct research to fully understand topics, and develop actions and identify resources to address them. | They support work of Action Teams by providing clarity and detail for complex topics. | They work to achieve full community and stakeholder participation in the planning process. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When</th>
<th>Organize</th>
<th>Organize</th>
<th>Organize</th>
<th>Organize</th>
<th>Organize</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visualize</td>
<td>Visualize</td>
<td>Visualize</td>
<td>Visualize</td>
<td>Visualize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategize</td>
<td>Strategize</td>
<td>Strategize</td>
<td>Strategize</td>
<td>Strategize</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Draft Public Engagement Plan</th>
<th>Input on All Vision and Goals</th>
<th>Draft Policies, Projects, Programs, Partnerships, and Targets</th>
<th>Draft Strategies for Complex Topics</th>
<th>Coordinate and Facilitate Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>Review Work From Action Teams</td>
<td>Review Work From Action Teams</td>
<td>Review Plan Drafts</td>
<td>Conduct Research and Engagement</td>
<td>Create Drafts of Deliverables</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Engagement Summary

Online engagement – EngagePGH, Zoom, etc.

• Summer 2020 online open house: 2,500 visits and 800 comments
• Fall 2021 online open house: 2,400 visits and 550 comments.
• Vision, goals, and all strategies posted online with various ways to engage throughout planning process.
• Monthly Action Team meetings of 20-30 members of the Oakland community for the four chapters: Community, Development, Mobility, and Infrastructure.
• Monthly Steering Committee meetings.
• May 2021 virtual workshops for Forbes/Meyran and Boulevard of the Allies sites.

In-person engagement – nearly a dozen outdoor events in 2021

• Spring through Fall 2021 walking tours, block parties, and small-scale neighborhood meetings with approximately 1,600 people in attendance.
• Online equivalents were provided for all in-person events.
Plan Relationships

• Community organizations have created important plans that are guideposts for this work: Oakland 2025 (2012), OBID Strategic Plan (2020), the Innovation Oakland Master Master Plan (2010).

• This project has also incorporated past and influenced ongoing institutional master plans at the University of Pittsburgh, Carnegie Mellon University, Carlow University, and UPMC.
Major Themes of the Oakland Plan

• **Grow housing and job opportunities** in Oakland. New housing is needed to meet a variety of long-term and undergraduate student resident demands. The employment base needs to grow to provide jobs that are available to everyone and coupled with workforce development efforts to create a ladder of opportunity.

• **Increase livability** through public and private investments in Oakland such as new and improved open spaces, expanded tree canopy, stormwater management systems, and supportive services.

• **Reimagine mobility systems** in Oakland to prioritize the comfort and safety of pedestrians, transit riders, and cyclists.

• **Acknowledge and address inequities** for Black residents and students of all backgrounds in Oakland and create a welcoming environment for the neighborhood’s growing immigrant and newcomer populations.
Reminder: Land Use vs. Zoning

Land use
• Reflects the desired future development pattern for an area.
• Consider land use maps are a geographic expression of goals for an area.
• Neighborhood Plans are adopted into the City’s Comprehensive Plan.

Zoning
• One tool for implementing the land use map / goals.
• Regulates what uses are allowed on publicly and privately owned parcels.
• Sets design and development requirements (standards).
• Future Zoning amendments should implement the land use plan.
What is Zoning?

• The Zoning code creates the set of standards that future development will have to follow. Nearly every US city has these kinds of rules.

• Zoning is also a tool to achieve land use policy goals and to harness private development investments to implement community goals.

• There are limits and constraints based on State and Federal property rights laws, so Zoning needs to balance private property rights and public/community goals.

• Zoning can allow something to happen or prohibit it, but it can’t make something happen.
Recent Zoning Code Projects

- Accessory Dwelling Unit Overlay (pilot, has since expired)
- Uptown Public Realm District (implements the EcoInnovation District Plan)
- Performance Points System (development incentive system)
- Riverfront Zoning (35 miles of riverfront lands)
- Inclusionary Zoning Overlay (currently undergoing expansion)
- Stormwater Code and Ordinance Review and Update
Performance Points System

Zoning Code menu of 11 ways that buildings can earn more building height* by meeting established goals.

- More height means more income for the developer, which can often offset potentially more expensive parts of the project.
- The more you do of one thing, the more points you get.
- The points are objective and can be predictably integrated into development projects saving time and money.
- Development projects can mix and match points to make the project work.

* In the Riverfront Zoning, buildings can earn the ability to be sited closer to the riverfront.
Packages of Zoning Amendments

Initial Package as Part of Plan Adoption
• Mandatory Inclusionary Zoning – Applies to multi-family residential
• Employment District – Innovation District Area (Fifth and Forbes Aves)
• Residential District – Central Oakland
• Mixed Use District – Boulevard of the Allies

Future Zoning Code Projects After Plan Adoption
• Missing Middle Housing (including Accessory Dwelling Units)
• North Oakland Mixed-Use Zone(s)
• Employment District – Melwood Area
Proposed Land Use Map

This land use map and those on following pages are adapted from the October 2021 Steering Committee meeting and provided as a reminder of the land use concepts the Zoning Proposal is trying to address for the relevant areas.
Land use proposal: Innovation District

**High Density Employment**

**Goal:** Support life sciences, healthcare, and other sectors that provide jobs available to a greater variety of workers and educational levels and also benefit from locating in Oakland.

**Character:** New research and development buildings that add publicly accessible open space, active ground floor spaces, varied community services and amenities.

**Height:** 5 stories without bonus. Workforce development bonus up to 15 stories.

**Urban design considerations:** Require 20 ft sidewalk on Fifth and Forbes Avenues, publicly accessible and functional open spaces (e.g., playgrounds, community gardens, exercise areas), upper floor setbacks above 5 stories. No skybridges over Fifth and Forbes Avenues.

**Mixed uses:** Prohibit or limit residential to affordable housing. All other uses are allowed. Student housing allowed on campuses.

**Programming:** Workforce development, cultural programs (arts, museums, etc.), community services.
Supporting the Innovation District

The future of the Forbes Ave Corridor is significant citywide.

Life Sciences are Location Sensitive and Talent Driven

- Significant investments are occurring in life sciences at the institutions taking an already strong research enterprise and adding substantial new capabilities
- This investment leads to a higher probability of more start up companies or existing companies wanting to locate research teams in Pittsburgh
- Biotech in particular wants to be near academic research and patients during the development phase making Oakland a critical location

Variety of Jobs with Range of Educational Requirements

- As companies move from start ups to clinical applications a range of jobs are created requiring different levels of education
- Educational Levels of Posted Life Science Jobs
  - High School: 33%
  - Assoc Degree: 10%
  - Bachelors Degree: 34%
  - Grad / Prof: 1%

Source: https://engage.pittsburghpa.gov/oakland/forbes-and-meyran-workshop
Supporting the Innovation District

Considerations: Lab Building Height

• Lab floor-to-floor heights are taller, generally 14–15 feet versus 12–13 feet for traditional office and 10 feet for residential or parking levels.

• Assuming an active ground floor use, a 120’ height limit roughly allows:
  ▪ 11 Stories of Residential
  ▪ 9 Stories of Office
  ▪ 7-8 Stories of Lab
  ▪ Ground floor with active uses (15-20’)
  ▪ Any above-grade parking reduces number of stories indicated

Source: https://engage.pittsburghpa.gov/oakland/forbes-and-meyran-workshop
Supporting the Innovation District

Considerations: Floorplate

• Lab development requires larger floorplates for efficient and safe layouts.

• Because many parcels for redevelopment in Oakland are relatively small, supporting life science redevelopment may mean using strategies like skybridges and linked building footprints.

• It also means remaining large parcels may be particularly important to target life science development.

Source: https://engage.pittsburghpa.gov/oakland/forbes-and-meyran-workshop
Example showing aerial view of potential life sciences type buildings in the Fifth and Forbes Avenue corridor.
Example of development on Forbes Ave with 20 ft sidewalks and required open spaces.
Example of development on Forbes Ave with 20 ft sidewalks and required open spaces.
# Redevelopment Scenarios Analyzed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario Comparison</th>
<th>Plaza on parking garage site Parkvale Building connection</th>
<th>Plaza on parking garage site Building across Fresco Way</th>
<th>Plaza on Forbes Hall site Building across Euler</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scenario A Up to 120’ height</td>
<td>Scenario B Up to 85’/120’ height</td>
<td>Scenario C Up to 120’ height</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scenario A Up to 150’ height</td>
<td>Scenario B Up to 120’ height</td>
<td>Scenario C Up to 150’ height</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited Public Realm Shadow Impacts</td>
<td>⬤ ⬤ ⬤ ⬤</td>
<td>⬤ ⬤ ⬤ ⬤</td>
<td>⬤ ⬤ ⬤ ⬤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Benefit Funding Potential</td>
<td>⬤ ⬤ ⬤ ⬤</td>
<td>⬤ ⬤ ⬤ ⬤</td>
<td>⬤ ⬤ ⬤ ⬤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Innovation Space and Number of Jobs (1.5/1,000sf)</td>
<td>360,000SF 540 jobs</td>
<td>440,000SF 660 jobs</td>
<td>380,000SF 570 jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>400,000SF 600 jobs</td>
<td>440,000SF 660 jobs</td>
<td>475,000SF 710 jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Parking Provided (449 existing spaces)</td>
<td>⬤ ⬤ ⬤ ⬤</td>
<td>⬤ ⬤ ⬤ ⬤</td>
<td>⬤ ⬤ ⬤ ⬤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76% existing</td>
<td>67% existing</td>
<td>84% existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for careful design of height transitions and/or bridges</td>
<td>⬤ ⬤ ⬤ ⬤</td>
<td>⬤ ⬤ ⬤ ⬤</td>
<td>⬤ ⬤ ⬤ ⬤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74% existing</td>
<td>67% existing</td>
<td>84% existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67% existing</td>
<td>96% existing</td>
<td>73% existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>96% existing</td>
<td>84% existing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing Zoning

Full Oakland area shown. Maps on remaining slides focus on area where initial package of amendments is being proposed.
Existing Zoning
Potential Height Bonuses

Priorities from the planning process and possible locations for bonuses:

EMP
Workforce Development – Top priority
Energy Efficiency
Energy Generation (Renewables/DES)
Public Art

RES
Affordable Housing – Top priority
Building Reuse
Rainwater
Public Art

MU
Combine the above

Note: Inclusionary Zoning applied for all areas where multi-family residential is allowed.
Existing Height Limits

Map Notes:
Height is shown as the limit in feet (ft) with the possible maximum height through Special Exception shown in parentheses.

Note: Special Exception heights are not bonuses that must be earned, but instead allow additional height if applicants can make a case to the Zoning Board of Adjustment that impacts on adjacent properties are mitigated.
Proposed Height Limits

Map Notes:

Height is shown as the limit in feet (ft) with the possible maximum height earned through the Performance Points System (height bonus) shown in parentheses.

White lines represent proposed mapping of the Height Reduction Areas.
### Proposed Innovation District Zoning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Height without bonus</th>
<th>Proposed Oakland Plan Zoning</th>
<th>Why?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                      | 85 ft<br>
*FAR limited to 6:1* | 85 ft<br>
*No limit on FAR* | Fifth and Forbes Avenue corridor is a regionally significant employment zone. |
| Height with bonus    |                            |      |
| LEED Bonus possible up to 102 ft<br>
Special Exception on Fifth Avenue possible through Zoning Board of Adjustment up to 120 ft. | 210 ft<br>
*Height possible through existing bonus system used in riverfront and Uptown.* | Need to ensure there is space to grow these and other commercial uses. Proposal aims to achieve this by increasing height, expanding Innovation District to Louisa Street, and prohibiting new residential uses. This will not affect existing buildings and uses. |

### Use summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing OPR-C</th>
<th>Proposed OPR-D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wide range of employment and commercial uses. Includes multi-family residential.</td>
<td>Similar to existing OPR-D uses, but prohibit new residential uses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Special Exception Process

- Applicants pay a fee to be reviewed by the Zoning Board of Adjustment.
- Applicants prepare a legal argument making the case for why the project complies with the Special Exception criteria.
- ZBA holds a public hearing on the project which allows testimony for and against the proposal.
- A Development Activities Meeting is required prior to the hearing and typically the Registered Community Organization will testify at the hearing or provide a written letter in support or opposition of the project.
- ZBA then has 45 days to make a decision, often longer for large projects. This decision can then be appealed to the Court of Common Pleas.
Special Exception for Height Conditions

(f) Special Exception for Height in the OPR-C Subdistrict

Additional height above eighty-five (85) feet in the Oakland Public Realm Subdistrict C shall be allowed in accordance with the Special Exception procedures of Section 922.07 with the following standards:

• The building shall have frontage along Fifth Avenue;

• The maximum height shall be one hundred twenty (120) feet, measured from Fifth Avenue;

• The additional height will not create detrimental impacts on nearby residential properties through consideration of the additional traffic impacts caused by the additional height, the impacts on views from such residential properties, and the impacts of the bulk of the buildings on such residential properties.
Special Exception Conditions for FAR

(g) Special Exception for FAR in the OPR-C Subdistrict

Additional FAR allowance in the Oakland Public Realm Subdistrict C shall be allowed in accordance with the Special Exception procedures of Section 922.07 with the following standards:

• The maximum FAR for structures that contain residential dwelling units shall be 7.5, provided that the total amount of residential floor area equals or exceeds twice the amount of bonus floor area;

• The additional density will not create detrimental impacts through consideration of the additional traffic impacts caused by the additional density and the impacts of the bulk of the buildings on such residential properties.
Comparison to Recent Projects

• Two employment-oriented projects were proposed in the last five years on Fifth and Forbes Avenue. Both sought variances for height and FAR. One needed additional variances to reduce their parking requirements and another needed variances due to residential compatibility.

• The Oakland Plan zoning proposals already seek to address these issues by bringing zoning code elements from Uptown and the Riverfront areas into Oakland to allow bonus height, eliminate FAR limits, reduce parking requirements and allow reductions through contributions to the Mobility Trust Fund, and rethink how residential compatibility works.
Sample of cities with density/height bonuses

- Pittsburgh’s Uptown and Riverfront Areas
- Charlotte
- Atlanta
- Boston
- Seattle
- Portland
- San Francisco
- Philadelphia
- Cincinnati
- Los Angeles
- San Diego
- Denver
- Many, many more

Highlighted cities have BIDs and height bonuses in the same area.
Proposal - Open space requirements

• Following a Downtown model for requiring open space as part of larger scale developments, we are considering projects with a site area of 20,000 sf or larger to incorporate publicly accessible open space on 10% of the site. Spaces would be 2,000 sf or greater. This would apply to the Employment (EMP), Mixed Use (MU), and Residential (RES) districts.

• For reference, this would have meant a 6,000 sf open space for SkyVue. Oakcliffe Community Playground is approximately 9,000 sf and many of Oakland’s single-family parcels are 1,500 sf.

• We've heard in the planning process that these should be integrated into the neighborhood where open space is currently very limited.

• Desirable functions were identified as playgrounds, community gardens, dog walk areas, places for rest and being together.
Open space examples

- Mellin Park, Chicago (Site Design Group)
- Greenacre Park, NYC (Sasaki)
- John F Collins Park, Philadelphia (CCD Parks)
- CCH, Chicago (Site Design Group)
- Chelsea Street Playground, Sydney (City of Sydney)
- Los Amigos Community Garden, Harlem (NYRP)
Public art

• The Arts, Culture, and Design Technical Advisory Group recommended that art and artists be thoughtfully embedded in the development of buildings and open spaces. Inclusion, fair pay, and treatment are key considerations.

• Making the Public Art Performance Point an available bonus in the EMP, RES, and MU areas should create an incentive for public art throughout these parts of the neighborhood.

• The Public Art and Civic Design Division of DCP and the Office of Public Art are working to create new resources to reduce barriers to developers finding and working with artists.

• The Oakland Plan also proposes the creation of Design Guidelines that would further enhance new development.
Public art (continued)

• Staff are currently looking at areas where policies and potentially changes to standards can lead developers to engage artists early in the development process and consider the role that art and design can play in low or no cost alternatives to existing needs such as fencing, railing, parking screening, lighting, pavement treatments, furnishings in the public realm, signage and wayfinding.

• New required open spaces are also places artists, art, and design can play a meaningful role to enrich the community.
Public art examples

Artist Carin Mincemoyer, photo credit Heather Mull
Artist Rob Ley, photo credit Serge Hoeltschi
Artist Jenny Heishman, photo credit Spike Mafford
Artist Francois Fouilhe, photo credit Katya Horner
Artist Kyuseok Oh, photo credit Rose Kennedy Conservancy
Artist Janet Zweig
Managing height impacts

The planning process identified strong feelings among Oakland stakeholders about the need to have a more predictable and beneficial system for managing the impacts of taller structures.

The following conditions were noted as needing to be addressed:

• Street frontages where new taller buildings will be constructed alongside smaller structures. Proposal – Upper floor step backs.

• New taller development adjacent to smaller structures. Proposal – Green buffers. Not currently considering for Innovation District area.

• Areas between Zoning Districts with significantly different height limits. Proposal – Height reduction areas.
Proposal – Upper floor step backs

A Buildings over 65 feet in height are limited to a maximum building footprint of 40,000 square feet.

B Structures measuring taller than 65 feet in height are required to provide a minimum front and street-side step back of ten feet at the portion of the building exceeding 65 feet or six stories, whichever occurs first.

C Structures measuring taller than 85 feet in height are required to provide either of the following:

   - An additional minimum front and street-side step back of ten feet at the portion of the building exceeding 85 feet; or
   - The footprint of the portion of the structure exceeding 85 feet in height may be no greater than 80% of the total building footprint.
Proposal – Height reduction areas

• Height reduction zone is proposed to be mapped in the Zoning Code to create clear provisions that are easily understood and enforced.

• Adjacent to lower scale structures, structures in this zone cannot exceed 20 ft above what the maximum height is in the adjacent zoning district.

• The height reduction zone is 20 ft deep from the edge of the parcel adjacent to the smaller structure. It would not reduce the height across the entire new development.

• Upper story stepbacks required, based on maximum height of proposed districts.

• Stepbacks are only required on Street frontages.
Proposal - Parking

• Parking minimums reduced to half of base requirements, existing parking minimums now the maximum.

• To reduce parking provided further, must contribute to Mobility Trust Fund.

• Surface parking prohibited, including commercial surface parking.

• All structured and integral parking, whether a primary or accessory use, must have at least 10% of spaces EV Ready (conduit, wiring, and expanded electrical panels) or 20% of spaces EV Capable (conduit only).

• Curb cuts must be on Way if possible (not Street), unless documented that this is infeasible.

• Ground floor parking prohibited except where wrapped by an active use on the primary frontage (Street).
Other standards being developed

• Projects in the Employment (EMP), Residential (RES), and Mixed Use (MU) Districts will be required to submit a Whole-Building Life Cycle Assessment from LEED and includes embodied carbon and operational carbon calculations and has an ANSI/ISO standard. Partnering with GBA.

• Bird safe glass requirements. Consulting with Bird Safe PGH.

• Updating Planning Commission thresholds to match other zoning districts.
Feedback from 2/3/2022 Meeting Attendees

• Multiple comments supporting the use of height bonuses through the Performance Points System as a way to support Innovation District growth.

• Multiple comments about rethinking the proposal around Halket Street to allow bonus height there. Discussion of potential Steering Committee tour of the area.

• Agree that Fifth and Forbes corridor should be employment-focused, but recommend allowing small amounts of new residential as part of primarily commercial/employment buildings.

• Support for the new open space requirement, but recommend creating a flexible system to get the best quality open spaces and supports larger open spaces if a project wants to build them.

• Desire to see West Oakland gateway area of Fifth and Forbes Avenue corridor have the same base height without bonuses as the rest of the corridor (i.e., 85 ft instead of 65 ft).
Where can you find us?

Pittsburgh City Planning
@PLANPGH
@resilientPGH
@planpgh

Online at pittsburghpa.gov/dcp/oakland
and engage.pittsburghpa.gov/oakland