



Bureau of Planning and Sustainability
Innovation. Collaboration. Practical Solutions.

Residential Infill Project – Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC)

Meeting #2 Summary APPROVED BY SAC

Date: Tuesday, October 6, 2015

Time: 6:00 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.

Location: 1900 SW 4th Avenue, Portland, 2nd Floor – Room 2500A

SAC Members in Attendance: Linda Bauer, Alan DeLaTorre, Jim Gorter, John Hasenberg, Marshall Johnson, Emily Kemper, Douglas MacLeod, Maggie McGann, Rod Merrick, Rick Michaelson, Mike Mitchoff, Michael Molinaro, Danell Norby, Douglas Reed, Vic Remmers, Young Sun Song, Brandon Spencer-Hartle, Eli Spevak, Barbara Strunk, Teresa St. Martin, David Sweet, Eric Thompson, Garlynn Woodsong, Tatiana Xenelis-Mendoza

SAC Members NOT in Attendance: Sarah Cantine, Mary Kyle McCurdy

Staff/Consultants in Attendance: Kathryn Beaumont (City Attorney), Joe Zender (BPS), Sandra Wood (BPS), Morgan Tracy (BPS), Julia Gisler (BPS), Todd Borkowitz (BPS), Kristin Cooper (BDS), Camille Trummer (Office of Mayor Charlie Hales), Anne Pressentin (EnvirolIssues)

Others in Attendance: Robin Harman, Karen Andrews, Hillary Dames, Patty Nelson, Val Wegner, Robert Wegner, Elisabeth Heinberg, Allan Owens, Nan Gorder, Neil Shargel, Terry Parker, Midge Pierce, Janet Baker, Merrilee Spence, Terry Griffiths, Murphy Terrell, Margaret Davis, Ken Ray, Lara Zingmark

Meeting Objectives: Introduce and discuss administrative items, discuss ‘scale of houses’ and develop a list of questions regarding residential scale and building form.

Abbreviations: Q = Question; C = Comment; R = Response (staff)



City of Portland, Oregon | Bureau of Planning and Sustainability | www.portlandonline.com/bps
1900 SW 4th Avenue, Suite 7100, Portland, OR 97201 | phone: 503-823-7700 | fax: 503-823-7800 | tty: 503-823-6868

Printed on 100% post-consumer waste recycled paper.

WELCOME AND MEETING INTRODUCTION

Facilitator Anne Pressentin identified the meetings objectives (see above), including review and discussion of the 9/15 Meeting #1 summary, member biographies, member interview results, project parameters, work plan, public meeting law, disclosures and charter. She then asked members, staff and consultants to share with the group one thing from the past weekend that brought each member joy (responses are not listed in this summary).

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

9/15 Meeting #1 Summary:

In the 9/15 Meeting #1, Mayor Hales gave a project introduction and described the project scope. BPS staff emailed a summary of the meeting to SAC members. Anne asked if SAC members had questions or suggested edits.

C: The summary was complete and well done.

C: Form-based code was discussed more than the summary suggests, although this may have been conversation that largely happened after the meeting adjourned.

C: In the first paragraph, the number of projected households was incorrect. It should read "123,000."

R: BPS staff will revise the 9/15 Meeting #1 summary. They will also continue with this process for communicating future meeting summaries.

SAC Biographies:

Thank you to SAC members for submitting member biographies. BPS staff emailed a draft version to SAC members and is making revisions per requested edits. Biographies have been posted on the project website: <https://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/544829>

Interview Results:

Thank you to SAC members for taking the time to be interviewed by Anne Pressentin. Each interview took about 30 minutes. The interview process is now complete. Some key themes that emerged include:

- Concern about project scope, schedule and size
- Concern of the City's commitment to effectively address project goals
- 'Affordability' is a common sentiment
- Neighborhood interests go beyond ones just identified by neighborhood associations
- Desire to be involved with creating meaningful change on residential infill issues

Project Parameters

Planning Manager Sandra Wood presented a draft of the project parameters that included eight topics and specific items to be included or not included within the project scope. She highlighted available BPS staff resources and potential evaluation criteria (a starting point for the SAC's January 2017 meeting). The work is being performed in BPS's Code Development group, but is being coordinated with other BPS staff. The code is projected to be effective by July 2017, and will need to go before the Planning and Sustainability Commission in early 2017.

Some highlighted items include:

- Multi-dwelling zones (Item 1) will not be addressed.
- Detached accessory dwelling units (ADUs – Item 5) will not be addressed as a draft plan regarding them is currently being considered by City Council.
- Tiny houses on wheels (Item 6) will not be addressed as they are more affected by building code (not zoning code) rules.
- Land division rules (Item 7) will not be addressed given the significant extent and complexities associated with them (the City's previous project to address them took seven years to complete). The project will be examining lot sizes for lot confirmations as well as providing greater clarity when narrow lots in land divisions are allowed.
- Pattern areas (Item 8) are defined in the draft Comprehensive Plan; the SAC may seek to develop unique zoning code applications that address each area's unique attributes.

Link to draft project parameters (as presented at the 10/6 Meeting #2):

www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/548060

Q: Does the Residential Infill Project address development in new land divisions?

R: Yes, for narrow lots and the subsequent development on land division lots, but not the land division process itself.

Q: Should micro apartments (Item 6) be moved inside the project scope?

R: BPS staff will look into.

Note: The project is looking at conversion of larger homes into multiple smaller units (internal conversions), and multiple smaller units on a single lot (cottage clusters). However, other group living uses (such as dormitories, communes; fraternities and sororities; monasteries and convents; nursing and convalescent homes; some group homes and post incarceration facilities) are currently allowed through a conditional use process. This project will not be addressing review processes for these uses.

Q: Where and when is the place to discuss R-5 lot size?

R: The City addressed this issue in 2002.

C: The lot size requirements has since been changed.

R: New houses on new narrow lots will be part of future SAC discussion.

C: Lot size cannot be taken off the table.

R: We will be looking at lot width in the context of narrow lot land divisions, and lot size and width in the context of lot segregations.

Facilitator Anne Pressentin indicated that many potential SAC concerns will be addressed in the SAC charter discussion.

C: The SAC (not City staff) should be responsible for identifying what will be and will not be included in the SAC's project scope.

R: Staff will look into

NOTE: Staff confirmed that the Mayor's office is responsible for what is and what is not part of the project scope. Staff discussed the project parameters with the Mayor to confirm his understanding of issues under consideration for this project.

C: Single- and multi-dwelling zoning codes (Item 1) have common issues and should be addressed at the same time so they can mutually inform one another.

R: This project will be ahead of the multi-dwelling zones project timeline and can help inform the related topics as they apply to single dwelling development in those zones. However, this project will not be expanding its scope to include development outside of single dwelling zones.

Q: What is the definition of multi-dwelling (Item 1)?

R: Multi-dwelling development is where more than one dwelling is built on a single lot (such as an apartment building). Single-dwelling development (one dwelling on one lot) can also be built on lots in multi-dwelling zones.

C: Clarification: In multi-dwelling zones, more than one house is allowed to be built on one lot, allowing for more variety of housing types.

Q: How is 'consistency' defined (Potential Evaluation Criteria)?

R: The code should treat like situations similarly throughout the city.

C: Protection of neighborhood character should be an evaluation criteria.

R: The SAC can inform the evaluation criteria; what was identified by BPS staff is just a place to start.

C: The SAC should be free to move land division rules (Item 4) inside the project scope if it chooses to do so (a motion was made and seconded to do so).

Facilitator Anne Pressentin indicated that SAC members must abide by the charter and suggested that the SAC move onto the work plan.

C: Many items that are proposed as outside of the project scope are ones that some SAC members actually joined the SAC to help specifically address.

C: Preserving neighborhood character and addressing architectural style (Item 5) is synonymous.

C: Land division rules (Item 7) should be inside of the project scope as the allowed size and density of in the R5 zone is a primary concern of many residents.

C: Micro apartments (Item 6) should be moved inside the project scope.

C: More SAC meetings (than what BPS staff proposes) is needed to ensure the SAC has sufficient time to make the right recommendations.

C: The most recent Comprehensive Plan goals are not being used to guide the Residential Infill Project. Portland's zoning code has a 'one size fits all approach' when a customized code that addresses unique neighborhood (or group of neighborhoods) attributes is needed. Technology allows for code to be applied for individual properties. This should be done to more effectively advance the most recent Comprehensive Plan goals.

R: BPS staff acknowledges the need to align this project with the proposed Comprehensive Plan goals; this will be addressed in the January 2016 SAC meeting.

C: Architectural style (Item 5) should be moved inside the project scope.

Work Plan

Project Manager Morgan Tracy reviewed the SAC's draft work plan. It has four phases (1. Research/ Analysis/Issue Identification; 2. Option Development; 3. Option Evaluation; and 4. Draft Code). The SAC is scheduled for completion upon completion and presentation of a discussion draft in November 2016. Afterward, the project moves into the legislative process,

which will be informed by public hearings at the Planning and Sustainability Commission and City Council.

Link to draft work plan (as presented at the 10/6 Meeting #2):

www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/548061

Q: What will BPS staff be working on between SAC meetings?

R: BPS staff will be developing curriculum, neighborhood walks and materials for public meetings.

C: Meeting once per month is too infrequent. The SAC should, at minimum, be able to communicate online between meetings.

R: This is a good suggestion; BPS staff is looking at ways to effectively address. There are legal limitations to collaborating online and without public oversight. As a result, this communication will need to be developed and managed by BPS staff.

Q: The previous work plan draft identified two SAC meetings per month thru 2015. Why has this been changed?

R: BPS staff realized that the previous work plan draft had too aggressive of a schedule with limited staff resources available to successfully complete tasks.

C: This creates some concern for the SAC getting needed tasks completed.

R: BPS staff agrees, but is also trying to proceed in as deliberate and thoughtful manner as possible.

Q: Is it possible to do a 'save the date' for optional SAC meetings?

R: Yes, that is a possibility.

Q: If BPS resources are limited, can the SAC hold SAC-led meetings?

R: As 2015 meetings serve as a primer for the SAC on all-day workshop/charrette in January 2016 (date to be determined), BPS staff will need to lead 2015 meetings.

C: There is a lot of work for the SAC to complete. "Getting something on the books" is important.

R: The first project phase is necessary as it will ground the SAC in City code and practices regarding single-dwelling residential infill. The SAC will develop and evaluate specific

proposals in the January workshop/charrette, where the focus will evolve into creating 'concrete' ideas. This event will be where the "pieces start coming together."

Public Meeting Law

City Attorney Kathryn Beaumont thanked the SAC for their participation, then discussed its responsibilities to maintain transparency and ethics. Public meeting laws require that BPS staff create and maintain SAC meeting agendas and minutes/summaries for the public record. SAC meetings are considered public meetings subject to these laws.

Outside communication between SAC members and interests they represent is allowed, provided that Residential Infill Project-related discussions are reported back in SAC meetings. SAC members communicating with one another (in any form) outside of BPS staff-led project meetings creates potential for violating public meeting laws. Quorums (typically any majority of SAC members communicating in any type of forum - including online) outside of a public meeting are prohibited without proper notice to the public. BPS-staff coordinated SAC subcommittees may be an acceptable solution for small-group SAC member discussions. Still, it is expected that the majority of the SAC's work will be done in the SAC meetings identified in the work plan.

Q: Are meetings between one or two SAC members acceptable?

R: Yes.

In addition, the State of Oregon and the City of Portland have laws regarding the acceptance of gifts by SAC members. The State of Oregon limits gifts to \$50 (value) per calendar year. However, the City of Portland has a 'no gifts' policy. City Attorney Kathryn Beaumont advises to just say no.

In addition, it is advised that SAC members refrain from discussion and/or promotion/demotion of any candidate or ballot measure in all SAC meetings. Political expression through the wearing buttons or clothing is allowed.

SAC members were advised that if they had specific questions about ethics/conflict of interest rules, they can discuss with project staff who would then research and share answers with the larger group.

Disclosures

City Attorney Kathryn Beaumont discussed the need for SAC member disclosure of conflicts of interests (actual and potential). A conflict of interest is any action leading to a financial benefit or detriment resulting from one's role as an SAC member. While the risk of *actual* conflicts of interest for SAC members on the Residential Infill Project is deemed low, *potential* conflicts of

interest may exist. Potential conflicts of interest are acceptable, so long as they are disclosed in advance. Each SAC member is asked to complete and submit a City of Portland Conflict of Interest Form to Morgan Tracy by November 3rd only if any disclosures need to be made.

The City requests submittal of Conflict of Interest Forms for both the protection of individual SAC members and the overall SAC. Submitted forms will not be publicly posted but, as they are public records and subject to law, must be made accessible upon public request.

Q: As many SAC members are developers and have a variety of conflicts of interest through their personal investments, how should these be disclosed while also protecting private information?

R: The conflicts of interest pertain to only current business practices, relationships and holdings. The remedy to conflicts of interest is to disclose them all; “fill out the form in a common sense way and leave it at that.”

Facilitator Anne Pressentin reiterated that it is important for SAC members to fully understand that the best remedy to conflicts of interest is to disclose.

Q: Is the form asking only about properties currently owned?

R: Yes.

Q: Who is the Conflict of Interest Form information shared with?

R: It remains on file with BPS but will be made available, in accordance with law, if specifically requested by a member of the public.

C: SAC discussion will be very specific regarding individual lots.

R: Nothing will prevent SAC members from sharing their views.

Facilitator Anne Pressentin indicated that BPS has no ability to not comply with public record requests. SAC members should be fully aware of this and inform Morgan Tracy if unable to submit a Conflict of Interest Form.

C: SAC members are participating in the Residential Infill Project because they do have a vested interest.

R: BPS staff agrees. It would make little sense to have a conversation on this topic with people who do not have a vested interest.

Charter

Facilitator Anne Pressentin asked SAC members if the meeting summary of the charter accurately reflects what was discussed in the 10/15 Meeting #1. She indicated that the Residential Infill Project scope is implicit in the charter, and also that while reaching SAC consensus on issues may be at times challenging, it is important that key discussions remain active.

While the agenda limited time for discussion on charter questions and concerns, Anne asked SAC members to please read over and identify any items that are unclear or potentially problematic to Morgan Tracy.

Link to draft charter (as presented at the 10/6 Meeting #2):

www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/548059

C: Please revise the first sentence in paragraph four, I.A., removing “to improve controls” and many people believe that the existing controls for form and scale of infill housing are sufficient.

R: The charter will be revised to reflect this.

C: There is a spelling error in the first paragraph of the charter.

R: The first paragraph of the charter has been revised, replacing “has” (for the incorrect “had”).

C: Please recognize that addressing administrative items in SAC meetings takes away from valuable discussion in Residential Infill Project issues.

C: Many SAC members agree that meeting materials should be read by all SAC members in advance of meetings.

C: Regarding III.D.3, “Speaking... non-repetitively” is problematic as it adds undue constraints to discussion.

R: Is there a way to make better? (SAC members gave no response).

NOTE: The charter is not intended to prevent members from reiterating a similar and relevant point in another discussion, but rather to acknowledge when a point has been made in a discussion and not re-cycle it into the same conversation. Staff has proposed changing the sentence to read: 3) Speaking respectfully, briefly and ~~non-repetitively~~ not repeating points already made during a particular discussion.

C: The project summary and scope should better related to one another. SAC discussions will likely get into detail on key issues.

PRESENTATION OF SCALE HOUSES

Given time constraints, Project Manager Morgan Tracy suggested that the SAC consider a 'buffer' meeting to provide SAC members sufficient time to participate in the small group exercise on scale (originally proposed for the 10/6 Meeting #2), perhaps on Tuesday, 10/20 or Tuesday, 10/27.

Q: How many SAC members need to attend?

R: As many as possible.

C: Tuesday 10/20 works best.

Q How can the SAC be confident that creating 'buffer' meetings resulting from getting behind on SAC meeting agenda will not become a regular occurrence?

R: City Staff apologizes; the agenda for the 10/6 Meeting #2 was tight to begin with and should have been revised in advance in response.

C: Meeting more often is preferred over longer meetings.

C: City Staff should show more respect for SAC member's time.

C: More meetings makes it challenging for those needing to attend to family needs.

Facilitator Anne Presentin indicated that BPS staff will send out a Doodle poll with options.

C: Extending the SAC's November meeting should be considered an option.

Link to Morgan's presentation (as presented at the 10/6 Meeting #2):

www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/548058

Q: Must the required outdoor area be contiguous?

R: Yes, and must be able to contain a 12-foot by 12-foot square within it.

C: The required outdoor area could be at the front of the property.

R: Yes, but not within the front setback.

Facilitator Anne Pressentin asked the SAC if a summary handout of the scale of houses presentation would be helpful.

R: Yes, but there is no simple way of communicating this complex information.

C: There are some good codes elsewhere that communicate scale of house issues well. These will be covered at a subsequent SAC meeting.

C: Regarding building coverage requirements based on lot size percentage is not being communicated correctly. It is not dependent on zone, but instead on lot size.

R: Correct.

Q: Was the example used in the presentation specifically for the R5 zone?

R: Yes.

C: It would be helpful for SAC members to have a copy of the presentation in advance so that they could follow along.

C: A discussion of building relationships in the rear of lots is missing. Illustrating some of the subtle variations of how Portland's zoning code is applied would also be helpful to SAC members.

Q: How long have current R5 zoning setback regulations been in existence?

C: Portland's zoning code was rewritten in the late 1980s.

Q: Can historical data on Portland's zoning code be made available to the SAC?

R: City staff will look into.

C: Having a better understanding of what zoning code regulations are objective and which ones are discretionary would be helpful for the SAC.

C: Data on what zoning adjustments are being approved by pattern area would be helpful for the SAC.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

(Additional written public comments are appended to this meeting summary)

Robin Harman: Robin is a South Burlingame resident. She is involved in a door-to-door campaign to gauge resident opinion on new residential development. Robin identified three

primary areas of focus: increasing building setbacks, decreasing building heights and restoring R5 zoning regulations. She stated that existing setbacks are inappropriate and that many of her neighbors do not want to create “the feel of Northeast or Southeast” and believe that nobody at the City of Portland is championing these concerns. Robin shared that Portland’s current zoning code was revised in the early 2000s so that building heights are measured differently to allow for taller height allowances. To advance these concerns, her group will be present at all future SAC meetings.

Murphy Terrell: Murphy is a resident of Multnomah Village and shares the same concerns (“ditto”) that Robin Harman shared.

Hillary Dames: Hilary is a South Burlingame resident. She agrees with everything that Robin Harman shared. Hilary believes that infill is an option for increasing sustainability, but needs to be done in a manner that is sustainable. Larger buildings are much more expansive to heat and cool; demolition of homes is not a sustainable practice.

Allan Owens: Allan states that while he does not “have a horse in the race,” he does have a “greyhound in race.” He believes there is a “nasty problem with housing” in Portland and hopes that the City of Portland can find a way to shelter all of its residents in a manner that is reasonable, safe and attractive.

Terry Parker: Terry is a 60-year resident of Rose City Park. He objects to houses that take the form of a “skinny box” or “2-1/2-story box,” and that as “one size does not fit all,” compatibility of new development must be more sufficiently considered.

WRAP UP

SAC will:

- Inform City staff of good examples of other city codes to explore.
- Inform City staff of edits to member biographies.
- Complete the City’s Conflict of Interest Form.
- Inform City staff of edits to the charter.
- Respond to Doodle poll (BPS staff will send email) in ‘buffer’ meetings.

END OF SUMMARY MINUTES

(Additional written public comments - received by BPS staff via email - follow).

ADDITIONAL WRITTEN PUBLIC COMMENTS (RECEIVED BY BPS STAFF VIA EMAIL):

Nancy Hedrick (Arbor Lodge resident), received via email on October 4, 2015, 2:09pm

I hope this is an appropriate way to forward comments for the residential in-fill topic of your October 6th meeting (when I'll be out of town), about housing scale. I am concerned about the rapid proliferation of mini-mansions in regular city plats, for 2 reasons: (a) the cost and (b) the sun exposure issue.

Firstly, the current large scale houses are much above the neighborhood costs of recent years in many city areas, including my N. Ptld Arbor Lodge area. For example, there are two of the new mini-mansions within a two-block area that are being sold or were sold recently for around \$700 thousand, while three houses in the same two-block area of existing housing (being also smaller & shorter) have been marketed at \$280-\$295 thousand. Within the not rapidly changing Portland median income (income which is stagnant in my own professional class of social workers), this newer big house trend means more families seeking homes are priced out. As the Tribune has pointed out, a relatively small number of developers dominate the market in constructing these large homes.

Secondly, regarding sun exposure, these new houses, with their exploitation of current regulations by developers, can build homes so near to each of the property lines and with such tall roofs and ceilings reaching the height limit (and often with the roof coverage extending more of the full area of the house than other older homes with small dormer-style top floors).

This impacts neighbors in two ways. The option of growing fruits and vegetables I reduced, an issue of further importance as we try to reduce our carbon footprint. Also, the northern latitudes (& particularly NW Oregon) are notorious for bringing gray, dark days leading to seasonal affective disorder for some. My neighborhood is full of homes with roof skylights. Houses surrounded by mini-mansions may resultantly only have decent sun exposures through the roof or from street-facing windows.

In conclusion, I would argue that Portland consider pushing back how close to the property line houses can be built, and also some form of design disincentive or review for full-area roofs reaching the maximum height level. (This roof policy might in part be based on the neighborhood character considerations.) Additionally, it is fatal for the vibrant, economically diverse nature of our city to continue to demolish sound homes. Portland needs to strengthen either the incentives or disincentives to prevent this trend from happening at such a rapid pace. Thank you for the thoughtful work of yourselves and the committee on this key issue.

Neil Shargel, received via email on October 6, 2015, 10:40pm

I didn't get a chance to air my grievances, so to speak, so I thought an email might allow me a voice.

The last person to speak, I believe Terry was his name, from Rose City, said a lot of what I feel as well, especially my first point below, but here are some notes I took while listening to your meeting occur.

1) Regarding standards...having a set of generic standards don't necessarily fit every situation. For example, if a new house is built with a 30 ft height limit, and the houses on either side of the new structure are 15 ft, the neighborhood character has now changed. And my guess is that a developer will build to the maximum allowable limit, regardless of the neighboring houses - they won't be living there and their goal is to maximize profit for their investors. It would be nice to see something a little more flexible than a one-size-fits-all standard. Think outside the box - how about some committee, or an office that reviews the proposed structure. Have someone go out and look at the site. Maybe include the neighbors in the discussion. The folks who live next to the new structures are the ones that are impacted by the abominations (visit ne 16th and Failing or look at this:

<http://www.kqw.com/story/news/investigations/2015/09/24/home-demolitions-rising-along-tension-portland-neighborhoods/72749470/>

2) Neighborhood character... What happens to the value of the properties next to a newly built monstrously large house? I suspect when those neighboring property owners try to sell, they'll have a hard time. Who wants to live next to a house that blocks their sunlight!? What'll happen is that those owners will sell to a developer who will build more monstrosities. And like dominoes, there goes the neighborhood. So not only has the look of neighborhood changed, but because the value of these newly built homes are more, eventually, only rich people will live in Portland.

3) The slide show was nice...I particularly liked the slide that showed four houses, small graduating to Max. Unfortunately, in this city, there is no graduation - it is [maxed] out house smack dab next to small. How will you feel when your turn comes and your neighbor sells and you're now living next to some monstrous house that blocks your sunlight? Remember, we're talking about where people live, not "product".



Feel free to visit my neighborhood and look at the behemoth built next to my house at 3930 NE 20th [A]ve.

Marianne Terrell-Lavine, received via email on October 13, 2015, 1:56pm

Thanks again for the informative meeting October 6, 2015. I volunteered not to speak at the end of the meeting, but I'd still like to summarize my points/issues, for the committee to consider, and if possible be put into the record.

Point 1: The house south and uphill from me might someday be sold for tear-down and a larger house built in [its] place, blocking my solar panels and my sun changing my 'partly sunny house' to a 'cave.' What can be done to save my lovely one story ranch from such a dismal fate? BES told me I could talk with the current home owner and ask him not to do it, [o]therwise, too bad for me. Last night one of the staff mentioned an 'easement.' What might that involve? I want to make changes as needed BEFORE destruction is considered and it's too late to save my home. Other homeowners must be considered when giving permits.

Point 2: I live near Spring Garden Creek (at SW 37th Ave). Recently (2013 to present) upstream from my home the property owner of a large piece of dividable land sold for 9 build-able lots. In construction the old creek bed was torn out and the creek flooded three homes in spring of 2014. When we complained BES said there was nothing they could do as the Army Corps and the State had signed off on the destruction. When I describe the issue to Morgan last night he suggested creek restoration like Johnson Creek. I submit: Why allow the destruction for a functioning creek/swamp then suggest restoration? Not destroying the creek would be a more elegant, cost effective, water mitigation effective solution. It's too late for my immediate area, but perhaps a change of regulations could save another small, but necessary creek from destruction and downstream homes from flooding. I suggest: Disallow from destruction five to 15 feet on each side of the creek run. The new construction would still be required to mitigate, but in the immediate are (not mitigation work elsewhere), the mature creek area would remain less-disturbed and still doing it's natural and needed job~ slowing water flow, reducing erosion, containing water, allowing water fowl (ducks, red-wings, etc.) and other water dependent animals (bats, amphibians/salamanders, song birds, etc) to rest or breed. And affording a bit a nature to remain without further habitat loss. In this our case the lots are large enough to sacrifice a few feet to save the creek and it's ways, keep sound deadening trees, and natural neighbor separator & view enhancing trees, and keep much needed and much appreciated habitat.

Point 3: Who or what body determines 'Neighborhood's Character', as described to maintain in future development? In Multnomah Village a builder wants to build a four story apartment building with 70 or so units and few parking spaces. Why? Because he can. He said the facade would keep with the Multnomah character. That part of Capitol Highway is one and two story, single store fronts. Nothing in the Village's character says 'four story monolith cube on the corner'. The Village is small, quaint, [and] individual. Even the recently built [Umpqua] Bank is three stories and set back. It is still small, quaint, [and] individual. Not a four story block house. The builder says he wants to build here because of the quaint Village character. This would ruin the Village's character and forever point to the City's arrogance as the City That Doesn't Care. I don't want to live in a place that looks like Seattle. But even Seattle learned the lesson and

changed their building codes.

I liked Morgan's graphics & explanations of house height, street view, etc. I would suggest a flaw when showing a new large house with a large tree next to middle sized house with middle sized tree and a small house with a small tree. Please remember new houses are commonly planted with saplings (which often are not cared for and die) and it's 20 years before the tree is the size in the graphic. And that tall houses south of smaller houses make small houses unhappy houses and difficult to sell~ except for tear-down. Then soon enough Portland will be a city of big box houses with nods to Craftsman Style and dead sapling trees and the MAX lines.

Last, I'd like to know when and where the October 24th Neighborhood Walk of the west side will be and if I may tag along to listen.

END OF ADDITIONAL WRITTEN PUBLIC COMMENTS