



City of

**PORTLAND, OREGON**

Development Review Advisory Committee

1900 SW 4th Avenue, Suite 5000  
Portland, Oregon 97201  
503-823-7308  
FAX: 503-823-7250  
TTY 503-823-6868  
www.portlandonline.com/bds

**DRAC DEMOLITION SUBCOMMITTEE – POST ORDINANCE IMPLEMENTATION**

**AGENDA**

**June 19, 2017**

**2:30 – 4:00 p.m., Room 4A**

<b>Time</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Action</b>
1. 2:30 – 2:35	Introductions	Informational
2. 2:35 – 2:50	Review of Any Open Items from Last Meeting (6/16/17)	Input and Recommendations
3. 2:50 – 3:10	Review draft clarifying language for “significance to the neighborhood”	Input and Recommendations
4. 3:10 – 3:25	Discuss property owner requirement to attend appeals	Input and Recommendations
5. 3:25 – 3:55	Discuss MRAA Exterior Wall Requirement	Input and Recommendations
6. 3:55 – 4:00	Next Follow-Up Meeting	Informational

- I. **INTRODUCTIONS** [Informational]
- II. **REVIEW ANY OPEN ITEMS FROM LAST MEETING (6/16/17)** [Input and Recommendations]
- III. **REVIEW DRAFT CLARIFYING LANGUAGE FOR “SIGNIFICANCE TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD”** [Input and Recommendations]
- IV. **DISCUSS PROPERTY OWNER REQUIREMENT TO ATTEND APPEALS** [Input and Recommendations]
- V. **DISCUSS MRAA EXTERIOR WALL REQUIREMENT** [Input and Recommendations]
  - MRAA trigger “if 50% or more of an exterior wall is increased or replaced”; recommendation to remove this trigger and replace with 500 square-foot addition
- VI. **NEXT FOLLOW-UP MEETING** [Informational]
  - Any items not completed from 6/19/17 meeting



City of

## PORTLAND, OREGON

### Development Review Advisory Committee

1900 SW 4th Avenue, Suite 5000  
Portland, Oregon 97201  
503-823-7308  
FAX: 503-823-7250  
TTY 503-823-6868  
[www.portlandonline.com/bds](http://www.portlandonline.com/bds)

#### DRAC DEMOLITION SUBCOMMITTEE – POST ORDINANCE IMPLEMENTATION

#### MEETING NOTES

June 19, 2017

2:30 – 4:00 p.m., Room 4A

Time	Topic	Action
1. 2:30 – 2:35	Introductions	Informational
2. 2:35 – 2:50	Review of Any Open Items from Last Meeting (6/16/17)	Input and Recommendations
3. 2:50 – 3:10	Review draft clarifying language for “significance to the neighborhood”	Input and Recommendations
4. 3:10 – 3:25	Discuss property owner requirement to attend appeals	Input and Recommendations
5. 3:25 – 3:55	Discuss MRAA Exterior Wall Requirement	Input and Recommendations
6. 3:55 – 4:00	Next Follow-Up Meeting	Informational

#### I. **INTRODUCTIONS** [Informational]

##### In Attendance:

Nancy Thorington, BDS  
Maryhelen Kincaid, DRAC  
John Hasenberg, Oregon Remodelers Association (ORA)  
Jeff Fish, Fish Construction  
Al Ellis, UNR  
Constance Beaumont, Laurelhurst Neighborhood Association  
Lydia Ness, Restore Oregon  
Mitch Nickolds, BDS  
Joshua Rice  
Brandon Spencer-Hartle, BPS  
Kareen Perkins, BDS  
Emily Sandy, BDS  
Terry Whitehill, BDS  
Catherine Heeb, BDS  
Marshall Runkel, Commissioner Eudaly’s office (Chief of Staff)

Nancy began by stating that she would like to change the agenda for today. She suggested that it would be good to discuss the MRAA section today.

Also, Maryhelen did some soul-searching over the weekend and came up with some thoughts about the Demo Delay Ordinance. Nancy distributed the handouts with those thoughts.

#### II. **REVIEW ANY OPEN ITEMS FROM LAST MEETING (6/16/17)** [Input and Recommendations]

Nancy brought up two subjects from the discussion at the last meeting: Should door hangers be posted on more properties, and in a narrower time frame, for demolitions? The general feedback has been that it would be helpful to have some kind of notification closer, within 5 days, and to a larger group of people.

Discussion: Al clarified that there is the 35-day notification for major remodels, five days for demolitions (door hangers), and on demolitions, mail notification is sent out after the permit has been applied for. Nancy explained that the 35 days was related to the neighborhood associations. Jeff said that in relation to the five-day regulation, he would prefer it be closer to the time the demolition would actually happen, but that it could be expanded to include more neighbors. Brandon reminded the group that the purpose of the 35-day notice is an opportunity to take action. Last-minute notice is just notification. John said he likes to see door hangers as a face-to-face notification. Kareen said that the more effective we are in providing notifications, the better/easier it is to get to yes. If we're not doing notifications, we need to change and address that situation.

Nancy wondered if the notification piece is something we want to talk about at this meeting. She has heard a lot of complaints from the neighborhood associations. Some of them are stating that it is too much email notification, that there are so many emails that it gets confusing. Maryhelen wondered if maybe expending the doorhangers and eliminating the emails would be the way to go. John's opinion was that the doorhangers are really helpful.

Decision: Nancy requested that the discussion be postponed until the group can get some feedback from the neighborhood associations. Maryhelen volunteered to talk to neighborhood associations at their next meeting and report back to the group. Al will talk to UNR. Nancy will put the subject on the agenda for July or August, whenever the next series of meetings will be held.

The group segued into some preparations for tomorrow's meeting:

Nancy asked that the group read Maryhelen's "Thoughts on the Demo Delay Ordinance" and be prepared to discuss it tomorrow. Maryhelen and Nancy both agreed that the goal of the ordinance was to find a way to save houses. Maryhelen suggested getting rid of appeal hearings, but focus instead on how to actually save houses. Perhaps there would be another fix, something like a demo review board. John said he was interested in knowing how many demo permits have been issued, and in what areas. Nancy and Kareen said that information is available on the BDS website. John then wondered what the actual fee was for demolitions, and Kareen said it depends on square footage, but the cost is approximately \$600-1200 per demolition. Kareen volunteered to collect information on the number of houses to be replaced and the cost of those permits.

III. **DISCUSS MRAA EXTERIOR WALL REQUIREMENT** [Input and Recommendations]

- MRAA trigger "if 50% or more of an exterior wall is increased or replaced";  
recommendation to remove this trigger and replace with 500 square-foot addition

Nancy distributed a handout prepared by John Hasenberg defining a major single family residential remodel.

Discussion: John Hasenberg brought up the difficulty in applying the trigger ("50% or more of an exterior wall is increased or replaced"). Catherine Heeb said she has some concerns about deleting/changing that requirement. John gave a little background regarding the demolition/remodel discussion: when the demolition ordinance was originally being formulated, there was discussion regarding the distinction between full-on demolitions and large-scale remodels, especially as it pertains to the notification piece of the ordinance. The group agreed that notification is essential for demolitions, but the need for notification is not as clear for remodels. John is suggesting the change in language partially because some houses are very difficult, and it is cumbersome to try and figure out percentages. He felt that addition of habitable square footage would be easier.

Catherine stated that as a person who gets called to the Permit Center to help customers, her experience is that customers are not as worried about whether a project is a major or minor remodel. It's more of a demo discussion. Mitch agreed that it's difficult to make the distinction between a major and minor remodel. Maryhelen said that from a neighborhood standpoint, the neighbors want to know aesthetic impact. Remodels take much longer than mechanical demolitions and have a great impact on the neighborhood. Al said there are also environmental factors to consider. John agreed; even a reroof has an environment impact. Nancy reminded the group that

one of the other pieces is a virtual demolition. Virtual demolition should be captured in the definition and regulations. John stated that the vast majority of remodels are attics or basements; it is an inexpensive way for people to get more habitable space in their current house.

Nancy asked—what about those who are trying to circumvent the demo process? They will sometimes put up new walls just inside or outside existing walls. John knew of one contractor who tried to get around the system. They went through FIR because they could get a permit faster and less expensively. Maryhellen agreed that there will always be some bad actors, and that the decision regarding remodel and demolition should be made easier for staff, remodelers, and builders. The simpler the better. Terry said he felt they are two separate issues, major/minor remodel and demolitions. Connected issues, but still separate.

Decision: Nancy will take John's proposed wording, setup up a meeting with staff, perhaps come up with some refined language and will bring the new proposed language back to the group.

- IV. **NEXT FOLLOW-UP MEETING** [Informational]
- 6/20/17 - Any items not completed from 6/19/17 meeting