

Appendix D: Comments from individuals submitted via email, letters, comments cards and flip chart notes (323)

Ordered by date received and type		
06/28	With Stop Demolishing Portland: burdening infrastructure, massive burden, ~10k housing units, water, sewer, roads	Flip chart note
06/28	Infrastructure includes firehouses, police stations – staff up to support current	Flip chart note
06/28	Don't have adequate public transportation of no off street parking	Flip chart note
06/28	Not being called “rezoning;” city supporting county decision – ADUs add just as many folks, cost rest of us; need more tax	Flip chart note
06/28	City is growing – can't stop it – need more housing, becoming more inclusive	Flip chart note
06/28	Situation getting desperate	Flip chart note
06/28	Across street from condos, townhouses proposal; cars; have to move response from City Hall – “embrace what's happening or sell house”	Flip chart note
06/28	A little nervous, can't stop growth, would be nice to have homeownership opportunities	Flip chart note
06/28	Son can't afford to buy home – no middle ground for affordability – what is the answer?	Flip chart note
06/28	This is a good plan to get that 20% of new households that are planned for the neighborhood, along with the 50% that will be going in centers and corridors – we need to ensure that we'll get density on those corridors as well, or the plan won't reach its objectives.	Flip chart note
06/28	Incentives to NOT demolish!	Flip chart note
06/28	Visit but don't move here – Tom McCall was right	Flip chart note
06/28	Slow the growth (someone crossed out “slow the” and wrote “stop the insane”)	Flip chart note
06/28	Limit size of new houses to 1600 sq. ft. above ground	Flip chart note
06/28	It should be very very hard to demolish a good house	Flip chart note
06/28	Keeping existing houses is the greatest thing we can do	Flip chart note
06/28	Requiring minimum open spaces and/or more areas where no building can occur to preserve green space	Flip chart note
06/28	Increase side setbacks to 7' to allow more green space, light and allow space for larger eaves. Bigger houses do not increase density	Flip chart note
06/28	You have a graph showing the need. What is the impact of these measures on meeting that need?	Flip chart note
06/28	Required parking à for internal conversions – do not require	Flip chart note
06/28	More flexibility for 0' side setbacks – neighbor agreements	Flip chart note
06/28	Orientation of house should determine placement of ADU	Flip chart note
06/28	Leave minimum 10' setbacks. This leaves space for larger backyards, with large trees, and/or an ADU in back.	Flip chart note
06/28	Call it rezoning – I dare you!	Flip chart note
06/28	Allowing duplexes on all lots and triplex on corner lots in R5 traditional single family neighborhoods will KILL the neighborhood.	Flip chart note
06/28	Those who build duplex and triplex do not live in them	Flip chart note
06/28	Increasing density through these overlays will add to parking congestion because often housing units will have more than one car. At the minimum one parking space per unit must be required even in areas within 500 feet of peak transit service frequency. No units should be built with no parking required.	Flip chart note
06/28	Do not make it easier to destroy what we already have.	Flip chart note
06/28	Sellwood has density and Eastmoreland will not. Not fair!	Flip chart note
06/28	New housing types, ADUs, duplex, triplex, houses need to fit the look, style, and feel of the neighborhood.	Flip chart note
06/28	We need a mix of housing options across the city – allow duplexes and triplexes on all lots	Flip chart note
06/28	What is everyone so afraid of? I'm not a developer I want to build a home in the neighborhood my son grew up in on my lot that he can afford to buy.	Flip chart note

Appendix D: Comments from individuals

06/28	If on site parking is required for internal divisions more houses will be torn down and less housing will be built. Permit the streets don't require parking.	Flip chart note
06/28	I like the plan – our neighborhoods will be great with more diversity of housing types, within ¼ mile of centers and corridors	Flip chart note
06/28	We need more housing types across all neighborhoods. Large SF lots are exclusionary.	Flip chart note
06/28	Across all city limits, require to have parks/green space in every neighborhood or requirement for more carbon sequestration from trees and shrubs	Flip chart note
06/28	¼ mile from centers and corridors is a good start. It's the first step in creating a city where enough people live near transit and within walking or biking distance of shopping and services.	Flip chart note
06/28	Keep existing houses which are most affordable and save resources. Demolition is toxic and wasteful	Flip chart note
06/28	This much density ruins the livability we all love. People who have their own businesses (service) sometimes need to drive to clients' homes. Mass transit and bikes are great but don't always work or make sense for everyone	Flip chart note
06/28	I think the ¼ mile radius is arbitrary and disconnected to the reality of transit as a whole. Not all journeys are to "centers." I think more housing types/sizes are important to affordability. I also think increased density should come with city or required improvements to the neighborhood such as parks, new sidewalks, and more trees.	Flip chart note
06/28	These lots were never intended to be built on – they were a way to sell lots – do you want 2 or 3 was how it was historically framed. Close the lot line loophole now.	Flip chart note
06/28	No demolition of existing houses – not green not affordable	Flip chart note
06/28	These lots provide a good opportunity to provide more smaller houses	Flip chart note
06/28	Narrow lots don't support big trees we need – no space for growing food or urban wildlife	Flip chart note
06/28	Off street parking must be required, garages optional, to fit the context of the neighborhood houses that have driveways and garages – it is an equity issue!	Flip chart note
06/28	I live in a house on a narrow lot. It was much more affordable compared to a bigger more traditional sized house. I support the proposal to increase narrow house and remove driveways to increase green space and more closely match older homes without driveways or garages	Flip chart note
06/28	I support removing off street parking	Flip chart note
07/06	2,500 s.f. seems fine. Perhaps a little small, compared to some historic houses. If we want to encourage triplexes on corner lots e.g., perhaps the "house" envelope on corner lots could be 3,300 s.f.	Flip chart note
07/06	Good idea! Smaller is the future. Leave some green space	Flip chart note
07/06	Keep the 35' height max. in R2.5, as a step-down from the CM-2 commercial which will be 45'. The 2.5 will then step down to 30' in R5.	Flip chart note
07/06	Flat roofs don't make sense in our climate. Warranties are limited and more expensive to build. Also, eaves do serve a purpose in protecting windows, doors and the house itself. 20% into setback helps but could be a little large.	Flip chart note
07/06	Yes, please keep the limit at 2,500 sq. ft. Thanks!	Flip chart note
07/06	I really like and support the proposals on scale to fit in the existing neighborhood – sq. ft. limit, lower roofline and consistent front setbacks are common sense approaches to helping new construction both increase density and maintain integrity of neighborhood.	Flip chart note
07/06	The Near Centers can provide more small housing (say lower cost affordable) but we can't – don't limit – citywide	Flip chart note
07/06	Single family lots should remain as single family dwellings – free of ADUs. Please concentrate development in the inner urban core as opposed to building multiple family units in/near family neighborhoods.	Flip chart note

Appendix D: Comments from individuals

07/06	New construction, no matter what type, cannot be affordable. Just like the only sustainable (green house) is the existing house, the only affordable houses are the existing houses. Build new construction where you don't have to tear down. We have space.	Flip chart note
07/06	More community housing ideas around green space like the cottages but at different affordability levels	Flip chart note
07/06	I like the ideas of changing zoning to allow more options. Should consider more areas of Portland.	Flip chart note
07/06	I do not like "near Centers and Corridors." Make changes in all of Portland to increase affordability	Flip chart note
07/06	EXPAND Centers and Corridors to citywide. Neighborhoods with mixed housing types are vibrant and more equitable.	Flip chart note
07/06	I like the varied types. I would like shorter front setbacks in R2.5 – keep the current 10', or lower it to 5'	Flip chart note
07/06	Why take task force dedicated to improving construction guidelines, and hijack it for a substantial rezoning? Keep scope to intent.	Flip chart note
07/06	I support varied housing types and sizes throughout the city. This will increase the vibrancy of our neighborhoods. And it helps address climate change.	Flip chart note
07/06	Your proposal would mandate that 2 homes be built on R2.5 lot with a recent demo of a single family home. Please remove this mandate from the proposal!	Flip chart note
07/06	I don't agree with this proposed massive "rezoning" of huge areas of the city which will dramatically increase demolitions and reduce affordability. Instead, the city should propose selective actual rezonings, with full public input on specific locations. But I support allowing internal division of existing units, and extra ADUs for existing homeowners.	Flip chart note
07/06	If garages are not allow, and there are no off street parking pads (driveways) where are people going to plug in their electric cars? With a 4 block long extension cord when the street is full of cars?	Flip chart note
07/06	Most were never meant to be used as 25 x 100 so calling them historic is misleading. Allowing 50 x 100 to be divided into 2 25 x 100 lots incentivizes demolition. Therefore they destroy affordable housing, not create it. Just encourage ADUs and sharing existing housing (not new construction) instead. Put the effort and zoning into creating/enhancing new neighborhoods not destroying existing, successful ones.	Flip chart note
07/06	In a 25' lot, put it to qualitative use by taking it from housing and using it for a tot lot, a neighborhood center, a childcare facility, etc.	Flip chart note
07/06	New houses should be allowed on these historic narrow lots. There should be incentives, if not requirements, to build them attached.	Flip chart note
07/06	Eliminate lot splitting	Flip chart note
07/06	No garages on front st.	Flip chart note
07/06	Where are narrow houses/lots – racial breakdown	Flip chart note
07/13	Specify size of "large lots"	Flip chart note
07/13	If the city is really serious about public input they would mail letters to all residents labeled "Crisis – Important Mail – Your property value and character of your neighborhood may be changing! Zoning rules are about to change!" BPS has used the word "crisis" liberally so why not in this context?	Flip chart note
07/13	Parking allowances need to correlate with width of street. Some streets are too narrow for parking on both sides.	Flip chart note
07/13	Scale changes moving in right direction; however, setbacks need to adhere to surrounding structures.	Flip chart note
07/13	Design standards, building material requirements, architect requires for house design (exterior)	Flip chart note
07/13	City should have blanket rule requiring special variance before demolishing any building over 90 years old, listed or not	Flip chart note

Appendix D: Comments from individuals

07/13	Why “rezone” entire (almost) residential zones; seems like overkill – reduce this area until consequences are known.	Flip chart note
07/13	Would prefer duplex and triplex to narrow houses.	Flip chart note
07/13	This isn’t the topic above BUT why so many proposals – wouldn’t less be more? More oversight, more review of how well a few proposals work, etc.?	Flip chart note
07/13	There should be a minimum lot size in order to build a duplex – larger than the 5,000 square foot lot – otherwise there could be too much demolition of existing homes to put in a duplex and ADU on one lot. We don’t want to incentivize runaway demolitions, which can take over whole neighborhoods. Without any limits on how much can be squeezed into these lots, developers will just keep demolishing homes to put up three.	Flip chart note
07/13	How does encouraging use of ADUs (short-term renters) solve Portland’s long-term housing crisis?	Flip chart note
07/13	Why doesn’t R5 mean R5! If you want R2.5 – go through process of rezoning!	Flip chart note
07/13	Please specify on the pie chart on your handout that a 50x100’ lot is considered a “large lot” – that info is missing and easily misunderstood	Flip chart note
07/13	Removing parking requirements isn’t practical. There is not enough street parking	Flip chart note
07/13	What exactly is a historical narrow lot?	Flip chart note
07/13	Truth in zoning – please!	Flip chart note
07/14	I SUPPORT reduction in FAR to 2500 to 5000 sq. ft. lot. Add front setback considerations for existing houses if greater than the 15’ proposal (i.e. no more than 5’ closer than adjacent houses).	Flip chart note
07/14	Keep the 35’ height limit in R2.5, please!	Flip chart note
07/14	OK with scale reduction so long as there’s more flexibility on what happens inside	Flip chart note
07/14	I like max. 2500 finished area for SF dwelling	Flip chart note
07/14	I agree. The problem is all the completely out-of-scale houses being introduced into older neighborhoods	Flip chart note
07/14	Provide incentives for homeowners to build multiple small houses on standard lots instead of giant houses i.e. 3-4 750-800 sq. ft. houses on 7500 sq. ft. lot. More density, but smaller interesting homes. Shared green spaces...etc.	Flip chart note
07/14	Where are the parks?	Flip chart note
07/14	2500 sq. ft. seems fine for a single house. If it’s a duplex, maybe ok. If it’s a triplex (proposed on corner lots), I would bump the max up to 3000 sq. ft. for the main structure.	Flip chart note
07/14	While I generally support alternative housing styles – I do not agree to “rezoning” so much of the city (smaller area)	Flip chart note
07/14	I agree with all the alternatives presented. These will not destroy neighborhoods, but will allow them to gracefully, gradually, transition into the higher density residential areas that they are, in many cases, trying to be. This proposal will respond to the high demand for housing, rather than trying to deny that it’s happening.	Flip chart note
07/14	“Center” too broadly used. Needs to be limited	Flip chart note
07/14	Sunnyside neighbor – great examples of infill middle: 1888 Proud Past – Bright Future “as is” present; 4/5 story condos limited on-site parking. SB5133 “by right” troublesome!!!	Flip chart note
07/14	I oppose the currently used definition of “center” as this should apply ONLY to regional centers and town centers	Flip chart note
07/14	Create opportunities for greater population density (2 ADUs) within reduced massing from what’s allowed today	Flip chart note
07/14	Make it a requirement for existing houses to be preserved and current renters protected against eviction if ADUs are built. If you can replace an existing house with a duplex or triplex you are creating a developer’s buffet that will destroy Portland’s neighborhoods and lead to displacement, not affordability - Please innovate! Not liquidate Portland!	Flip chart note
07/14	Portland Heights neighborhood – large lots, walking distance to downtown – so what is proposed for there?	Flip chart note

Appendix D: Comments from individuals

07/14	Middle housing is a good opportunity to increase density and affordability at a human scale. It must be implemented in every ZIP code to drive equity. Equal housing opportunities will drive racially and economically diverse neighborhoods. Diverse neighborhoods will drive diverse/equitable schools.	Flip chart note
07/14	The proposed area of application is a good start – ¼ mile from the outside boundaries of “neighborhood centers” as well as “town centers,” as well as a ¼ mile from corridors. I like the equality inherent in including ¼ mi. from transit stations, like Hollywood TC, where the ¼ mile radius includes parts of Laurelhurst.	Flip chart note
07/14	Aging in community is not the same as aging in place	Flip chart note
07/14	Anyone can fill out the online questionnaire as many times as they want. I can assure you that there are motivated people that will fill it out 100x. Your data will have very little integrity	Flip chart note
07/14	Please do not consider duplexes and triplexes as rentals only. They can also be owned “attached housing”	Flip chart note
07/14	If RIP Neighborhood’s single dwelling lots all became 3 unit (Duplex + ADU) then we alone would provide more than 1/3 the housing need stated by the comp plan (20% of new units) – this idea of more units per lot is a no go. Instead, offer differing housing type as ADUs (now regulated citywide)	Flip chart note
07/14	Keep garage requirement!!!	Flip chart note
07/14	All residences should have off street parking	Flip chart note
07/14	If multiple residences on a lot, leave room for 2 cars off street	Flip chart note
07/14	Stop acting as if corridors do not have residential streets coming off them	Flip chart note
07/14	Consider the garage as a bonus – front loading or otherwise – have a weather proof insulated garage door with windows so the space can either be used as a garage or a multi-purpose room.	Flip chart note
07/14	An off street parking pad is necessary especially if a mega-unit apt bldg. goes up nearby without parking or not adequate parking for all tenants with cars	Flip chart note
07/14	No parking is required now for any small development within 500’ of frequent transit. This rule should remain in place. Parking requirements on skinny lots are a bad idea, make ugly houses and, ironically, lead to a loss of on-street spaces because the frontages are almost entirely driveways!	Flip chart note
07/14	Only allow common lot line development that way they can create a structure that looks like the typically size structure	Flip chart note
07/14	If you were required to keep the existing house have all kinds of creative housing options pop up and become available. If a house straddling two narrow lots is allowed to be torn down this will not lead to innovation...but degradation of Portland’s charm and will not lead to affordability – Allow for small flag lots to be created for micro home lots.	Flip chart note
07/14	Forget skinny houses; build duplexes/triplexes instead. Maintain parking requirement.	Flip chart note
07/14	Encourage attached housing in these situations – without garages out front (and curb cuts that remove street parking)	Flip chart note
07/14	Stop demolishing existing houses	Flip chart note
07/14	Ugly is a subjective opinion!	Flip chart note
07/14	Encourage shared driveways	Flip chart note
07/20	Please specify that “large lots” includes lots as small as 5,000 square feet. You said you’d fix this! Most people living on standard R5 lot don’t think of it as a “large lot” and these are what would be opened nearly citywide to intense development. At least ensure a level playing field and compliance with codes if advocating such a radical increase in demotion and development.	Flip chart note
07/20	Portland for Everyone Who Wants to Be a Renter: Metro study showed 80% of Portlanders want to live in a detached house. Who exactly wants all these housing choices – A: Developers. I don’t know of one house destroyed that resulted in less expensive housing.	Flip chart note

Appendix D: Comments from individuals

07/30	If we want to move toward a city with more transportation options (other than cars) we need to consider how the built environment communicates our priorities - Take the parking requirement away and reward families who choose a car-free life with ALL the space on their property.	Flip chart note
07/30	Agreed. We cannot accommodate this density if every new unit brings another car onto our roads.	Flip chart note
07/30	Cars aren't going away. Some of us need them to get jobs done	Flip chart note
07/30	Stop building housing and apartments without parking, and begin building new neighborhoods for the transplants rather than over-stressing historical neighborhoods.	Flip chart note
07/30	Encourage a diversity of housing types and remove current barriers to promoting development of duplexes, triplexes, garden apartments, ADUs, etc. High-rise apartments and McMansions don't serve the needs of everyone, and more importantly discourage strong communities.	Flip chart note
07/30	How do we incentivize car-free living if we don't require parking? Currently people typically have cars in most "car-free" zones.	Flip chart note
07/30	Stop building density where you have no infrastructure (quality paved roads with sidewalks). Limit infill in areas that have intersections that "fail" - if you can't move traffic through a neighborhood at a reasonable rate during peak times then you have no business developing in that area or adjacent to it.	Flip chart note
07/30	Sellwood already has a huge concentration of high density and commercial zoning. Currently 21 apartments are being built. There is still plenty of capacity for high density in Sellwood that the community is struggling to accommodate. Why would we rezone nearly every home in Sellwood to be more dense when we have already agreed to a very generous zoning plan? Some less complete neighborhoods may benefit from increased density but applying this one size solution will change balanced neighborhoods like Sellwood to be less desirable in the name of equity.	Flip chart note
07/30	Do an environmental impact statement on infill impact on the SW Portland ecosystem!!	Flip chart note
07/30	Keep neighborhood feel of mixed use and community building	Flip chart note
07/30	Keep design to retain old Sellwood feel	Flip chart note
07/30	We have to think about water/climate stability - the SW USA will be uninhabitable at some point. Emptying it out slowly is much more desirable	Flip chart note
07/30	Change is hard, but it cannot be stopped	Flip chart note
07/30	We need to build for PEOPLE, not cars. Let's get beyond thinking about parking. Fewer cars means BETTER livability.	Flip chart note
07/30	Our SAC representative for CNN did NOT represent us - did not survey and went against what people wanted. Also, this is a done deal - you say you want input but you already have an end point and that will not change.	Flip chart note
07/30	The hypothesis that increase in population density will lower housing costs is not proven. Do not impose this unproven hypothesis on current livability. This should not drive proposals for increase in population density. Why not include all of Portland in these proposals. Note that NO city commissioner lives in East Portland.	Flip chart note
07/30	Thank you for attempting to increase density. Duplexes, triplexes, and small-scale apartments are an important part of Portland's architectural history AND its future!	Flip chart note
07/30	I was pleased to see suggestions around parking and trees at this session. I agree with these comments. Fee and incentive both adding parking and giving variances to save tree canopy. With rising heat indexes we will need tree cover.	Flip chart note
07/30	Permeable parking lots seem like a good compromise.	Flip chart note
07/30	Proposal will convert a lot of the city from homeowners to renters with negative impacts on property maintenance and stability - we are sacrificing a bigger up-front cost for long-term investments. We will become a city owned by landlords. This made NE Portland more vulnerable to gentrification - because it was easy to evict lots of residents quickly.	Flip chart note

Appendix D: Comments from individuals

07/30	Parking is infrastructure. If there is not enough a building moratorium should exist. If the reason for restricting off street parking and garages is to reduce the number of cars then equity must be applied by taxing biking and transit fares to pay for infrastructure.	Flip chart note
07/30	Please consider green corridors (bike lanes) that are near boundary areas (Duke St. in Mt. Scott for example). Quarter mile as the crow flies is not representative of how people actually travel to reach metro transit centers. Thanx.	Flip chart note
07/30	What's the deal: 1. Rezoning most of the east side with no comprehensive process - data - or studies to back the "promise" 2. Why are not the large house-lots of the SW and NW hills included - even though they hav access to best schools and are predominantly white and upper-middle class?? 3. Shouldn't equity be a huge concern with this rezoning idea? Shouldn't everyone have an opportunity to benefit from increased density/diversity and shared public schools? Healy Heights should be rezoned too!! In other words, if you intend to rezone the city w/o process, rezone the entire city for equity, diversity, and opportunity. :)	Flip chart note
08/15	The additional units proposed near Centers and Corridors will incentivize demolitions. Also will likely be ugly.	Flip chart note
08/15	Density is good. Living like rats in tiny stacked cages is not.	Flip chart note
08/15	Disagree (with above comment). Apartments/dense housing is great!	Flip chart note
08/15	Limiting size of new houses to avoid McMansions is good.	Flip chart note
08/15	Tell everyone in the permit office they are doing a great job!	Flip chart note
08/15	Homelessness/houseless matter more than neighborhood "character." Look at all these beautiful historic neighborhoods I can't afford to live in!	Flip chart note
08/15	Stop destroying roundabouts. Preserve legacy neighborhood aesthetics. Replace the guts beneath the street if we must. Leave the trees if they're healthy.	Flip chart note
08/15	No developer "incentives." *angry face*	Flip chart note
08/15	What about for affordable housing? (in response to "No developer 'incentives.'")	Flip chart note
08/15	We need to increase supply to meet the demand and make housing more affordable.	Flip chart note
08/15	Many beautiful houses in Ladd's Addition would be illegal to build under these regulations - that's a clue they've got problems (size limit is way too low).	Flip chart note
08/15	Permit/development PROCESSING is by far the no. 1 factor in house pricing. Half the time double housing supply. Fees/taxes/jobs/SDCs.	Flip chart note
08/15	I like the plan. Biggest concerns are how transportation plan relates. If we add density to SF areas there needs to be a corresponding investment in transit, biking, and walking and NO MORE PARKING MINIMUMS.	Flip chart note
08/15	Like the approach. Please coordinate with PHB on incentives to promote affordability of at least some of the units. Even if value capture may not pencil out now, what about 3-5 years from now? (another noted: "+1 for value capture!")	Flip chart note
08/15	Please allow RF antennas on poles and rooftops to keep us connected!	Flip chart note
08/15	This plan will NOT open neighborhoods to all, it will DESTROY them. There are many other solutions and voting against this is NOT an indicator that homelessness isn't important. I can't remember the last time anyone takled about new parks, community centers, or transit options, while they're stuffing in all of these ugly buildings that narrow the sidewalk and exclude parking. Is this Portland or what? We can do better.	Flip chart note
08/15	Imagine: Portland Shopping Zone. A zone designed to allow single local businesses, pedestrian/bikes, and nearby parking/handicapped access. Individually owned smaller units.	Flip chart note
08/15	For 1500 homeless you better count on a huge ratio of mental health counselors, cops, fire, etc. This will be a ghetto	Flip chart note
08/15	*someone drew a picture of a 2-story house labeled "skinny" next to a 5-story mixed-use building with a line representing the R2.5 zone between them, with the title "proposed zoning."	Flip chart note
08/15	Faith is being sure of what you hope for and certain of what you cannot see!	Flip chart note
08/15	Reduce complexity - complexity reduces affordability	Flip chart note

Appendix D: Comments from individuals

08/15	Q - of the new waterfront development: # new units, # new units occupied, # new units held as investment/AirBnb, # new units affordable housing	Flip chart note
07/07	:) Thank you for proposing to limit housing size, increasing front setbacks and changing how maximum height is measured. This is where I think your proposal is heading in the right direction. :(Where I feel your proposal is heading in the wrong direction includes: concentrating development near but not actually on a main corridor (e.g. allowing a million dollar duplex one block off N. Interstate Ave.) Historically single family homes should remain as single family homes and not build duplex/triplex infills, especially outside the urban core. Multi-family developments look out of place and diminish the character and environment of single family neighborhoods. There are too many demolitions and I don't see how this proposal will reduce this. I would like to see the following changes to your proposal: 1. Focus density in the urban core as opposed to neighborhoods 2. Some density along MAX lines (e.g. Interstate Ave.) seems appropriate; however, development is getting out of hand. Too many 4-6 story apartments are being built adjacent to small homes and businesses. These developments exacerbate parking and add little community benefit. Continuing to focus new developments along these corridors, I believe, is a mistake. 3. Limit ADUs on single family lots. I am ok with having an occasional internal ADU because it doesn't add to the overall size of the house. However, external ADUs decrease available space for greenery and trees. Because external ADUs increase the overall area of development I don't see how this is consistent with city goals. Note: Allowing 2500 sq. ft. houses means most new houses will be 2500 sq. ft. Although likely outside the scope of the RIP, the following are VERY important: 1) Decrease demolitions!!! 2) Increase availability of affordable housing to low and lower-middle classes. Most houses being built are for wealthy residents. 3. The architectural style of the current homes being built is horrendous. Please regulate design. These modern box homes are destroying Portland's character	Comment card
07/07	Why is it a basic assumption that we have to accommodate 125,000 people? We DON'T have to grow. The city seems to have these goals, not the population of Portland. The beauty of our city is in the solid, historic housing stock. You will destroy the character of the city. I feel like business interests and capitalism will destroy the city. This proposal is way to liberal in changing to R2.5 zones. Don't allow so much of it. OR Limit the total size of duplexes in an R2.5 zone to 2500 (including all ADUs) to dis-incentivize demolition. It is not clear what the total size of a duplex is in this proposal.	Comment card
07/07	Morgan spoke of reducing transportation costs by using transit. However, transit is subsidized over 60 cents per passenger mile, and fares only cover approximately 25% of the operating costs. So who pays for this? Additionally, transit on average uses more energy per passenger mile as measured in BTUs, and create more emissions per passenger mile as measured in CO2 than driving an average car. (Per a federal govt report) If the context of the neighborhood has driveways and garages facing the street, then equity requires that any infill must require garages and driveways. Saying a front loading garage on a skinny house is ugly is STRICTLY an opinion! Long term parking on the street is illegal. Replacing aging in place with aging in community is still displacement.	Comment card
07/07	What assurances do we have that the "middle housing" won't just result in very expensive (though smaller) housing. In my neighborhood, they are tearing down affordable homes and putting up expensive housing on small narrow lots. Density DOES NOT equal affordability, in spite of what we've been told. Related to this: just how many new units do we have to build to put even a dent in affordability. It would probably be 10,000+ units. If that is the case be honest about it. That should be part of the presentation.	Comment card
07/07	These proposals seem like mostly incentives for developers and anyone who wants to make a buck developing their own property without regard for neighbors, traffic or liveability	Comment card
07/07	1) This proposal encourages demolitions on multi-family lots. Demolitions are a huge concern which will be made worse with this plan. 2) This plan should contribute more to address Portland's housing affordability crisis. We can't rely on developers to build our way	Comment card

Appendix D: Comments from individuals

	<p>out of this! Developers are driven by profits alone and shouldn't be considered a community partner. 3) I don't like the idea that triplexes are going in in historic, single family zones. This plan will promote the construction of duplexes and triplexes in all areas where they're allowed. Most of these are market rate houses. I'm only ok with more multi-family housing if they are affordable. 4) Don't require developers/homeowners to build two homes on R2.5 lots when a single family home gets demolished. 5) Incorporate design standards! I'm fine allowing more and bigger homes if they have historic character and quality craftsmanship. Most new houses lack character and are built cheaply. 6) Stop encouraging people to move to Portland. If we didn't have 123,000 new people moving here, we wouldn't have to sacrifice our integrity and historic character to appease transplants. 7) Discourage demos at all costs!!</p>	
07/07	<p>I support allowing internal conversions of existing houses, but not the proposal to allow duplexes and triplexes in single-family zones. This will increase demolitions and not increase affordability.</p>	Comment card
07/07	<p>1) 25x100 lots in particular, but any "wasted" space too, use the lot for a useful use by having it made into a tot-lot, a gathering place for yourmothes, or for a childcare center. 2) Broadening that idea out, have the original community about to be evicted by gentrification decide what they would like to have there and have it installed before the residences are started. Give the original occupants a sense of hope that their real needs and desires be respected. The new [illegible] could be rented out to some facet of the original community. It could be a laundry or laundromat, a flower shop, or a "reading" room - a quiet space used by old age groups where the density of their home is intolerable. I'd be happy to pursue these thoughts with you.</p>	Comment card
07/07	<p>I was most interested in ADUs. I would like to see this housing alternative offer more options for people to move into existing neighborhoods. Also, the city should encourage and support this mode of development. What about a property tax break for property owners?</p>	Comment card
07/07	<p>Thank you! The information presented was very clear. Please consider allowing more units citywide, rather than in centers and corridors. These changes present opportunities that should be available to all, especially low income communities in East Portland. Consider basic design standards if allowing new homes larger than 2500 sf. Think about allowing 3000 sf for triplexes. Design standards could include projection/recessions so the front facade is not one flat plane. I basically agree with the framework for height, setbacks, and units, but would encourage</p>	Comment card
07/07	<p>To increase affordability perhaps smaller square footage on smaller lots (i.e. single level cottages but maybe 2 allowed). Decrease square footage allowances. Keep high density near the MAX line to reduce traffic. I love the cottage idea or create smaller lots with smaller homes (ideal for elderly). I'm not a fan of ADUs all over, I think condos/apartments are a better use of land. Request developers contribute to low income housing, parks, streets, etc. How about income tax incentives to remodel existing homes if ADUs are added? Some homes should be torn down but as I've noticed some of the large older ones need expensive fixes. In older neighborhoods heights were more uniform. Don't lose your trees/green space. Developers are greedy. Make them save this valuable space. I moved down from Seattle. The haves are rapidly replacing the have nots. Some is inevitable but huge mansions replacing affordable housing doesn't seem right. New houses on narrow lots is fine but why do they have to be tall and skinny? Why not single level on basements? Design is also important overall - of houses, of neighborhoods. Thanks for asking.</p>	Comment card
07/07	<p>I think there are some good ideas that are being proposed. I'm not a fan of enacting more rules dictating what, how, cost etc. Let the market provide.</p>	Comment card
07/13	<p>1) Please check Metro survey that showed 80% of Portlanders want to live in SF detached house. 2) ADUs already allowed but seem to have exacerbated housing costs... 3) Issue is solar access, ability to grow/retain mature tree canopy 4) Re: lowering roof heights -- Protecting against "manufactured tree canopy grade" - already a problem? 5) Re: increased</p>	Comment card

Appendix D: Comments from individuals

	setbacks -- Blocks already denigrated by aggressive infill will suffer further 6) Re: less expensive housing types -- Such as already existing modest homes that are now being demo'd by the hundreds? 7) Re: question about where development should be focused -- Where is the "no" blank? We haven't even built out fully per comp plan provisions - why open up neighborhoods to even more destruction? 8) Re: allowing triplexes on corner lots -- maybe only if oversized lot 9) Re: bonus unit for internal conversion -- Just allow but no "bonus" - bonuses seem like a developer gimme when we already have such a bunch of lawless/noncompliant players and projects. w/o enforcement as faith in integrity of future process 10) Re: not requiring off-street parking for narrow lots -- Require parking - irresponsible to offload residents' belongings to community space 11) Re: allowing flag lots when keeping existing house -- What about open space and ability to maintain/grow mature trees? Just because we have space doesn't mean we have to fill it.	
07/14	If we're concerned about narrow houses being built on platted narrow lots underlying existing single structures, can we please just re-plat those underlying lots. There must be a way to either erase the plat lines and make that one lot or replat for three lots that would cause squarer houses to be built when subdivided.	Comment card
07/14	Why isn't the BPS proposing to build more housing in areas like the Lloyd District - high rises - where affordable units can be required as well? Just because a wealthy person wants to live in Sabin, doesn't mean we should demolish a small affordable house to accommodate the wealthy. Let them buy in another neighborhood such as Lloyd District.	Comment card
07/14	If the garage door on a skinny house is ugly, maybe the whole idea to do skinny houses on narrow lots is ugly. Ugly is strictly an opinion! Parking is a necessity not an opinion.	Comment card
07/14	Thank you for a thoughtful proposal. I support allowing 2-3 additional units on R5 lots. I would also support stronger incentives, or a requirement, to retain the existing home in order to get the additional units.	Comment card
07/14	Developers, development "on spec," and design choices that align with the character of the historic/existing neighborhood: Owner-occupied development tends to acknowledge the character of the neighborhood better than "as much as code allows" development built on speculation. What if we had a program where new or re-development must be guided by owners who were committed to occupying the new development for at least 5 years? The people moving into a neighborhood would want their developer to build a house that their new neighbors would be comfortable with.	Comment card
07/14	We should invert the property tax structure. This would incent people with empty lots, flat on the ground, to build. There is, presumably enough space in Portland to house people, but much of it underdeveloped. Thanks for the presentation.	Comment card
07/14	When flag-lot infill is developed it is important that new structures orient the same direction (or 180 degrees) as existing structures, not perpendicularly (90 degrees). When we moved into our flag-lot home, adjacent to a single house on its original long lot, we anticipated that our neighbors might eventually split off their back yard - we expected we'd get new "flag lot" neighbors, in a single family home that faced the backyard of the house in front of it, like ours was built. Instead when the lot was split the new construction faced our back yard. Not only did 4 times the density we expected get built, it was oriented perpendicularly to all the existing structures around it. Not ok.	Comment card
07/20	Will the permit process for plans be a lot easier to get through in order to get projects off the ground? Policy through City Hall to change the policy to have designate policy on set aside of accessibility units for rental/housing	Comment card
07/20	What will you "the city" do to educate the public and property owners about the opportunities to add ADUs or infill projects? Industry standards that when building new property or codes include a set aside.	Comment card
07/20	Are there basic guidelines for ADA compliances that all have to follow?	Comment card
07/20	With the aging population are these infills going to be something that will work for that population? The market is being driven by newcomer incomes.	Comment card

Appendix D: Comments from individuals

07/20	There are many big houses that are near the things that people with disabilities need, like transit stops and services, and the people in those houses have cars and don't use the things that are near them that we need. We need to be able to live near those things.	Comment card
07/20	Develop visitable units as often as possible. Build homes with off street parking! Parking homes do not work for people with disabilities and add to our traffic issues. Utilize universal design principles - they work for everyone.	Comment card
07/20	I generally support the proposals from the Residential Infill Project, especially the provisions relating to allowing more "middle housing types", which will help provide more affordable housing options for older adults, and will provide more options for aging in place – either in the same house or in the same neighborhood. I have one thought relating to the proposed increase in front yard setbacks: as we age, it becomes important to have all essential living spaces at ground floor level without any steps (i.e. living room, kitchen, bedroom, bathroom, laundry). Increased front yard setbacks may conflict with the need to accommodate more ground level spaces. Please pass this on if you have opportunity to do so. Thanks!	Comment card
07/20	"There is a lot of intersectionality of issues around housing." To make a statement by Todd Borkowitz BPS - that to try to not get off topic is not appropriate. When you have people with special needs	Comment card
07/30	Why is the City of Portland suggesting that there be spot up zoning in R5, R7, and R10 zones? Based on residential capacity summary in the newly adopted Comp Plan, "enough land in Portland is currently zoned to accommodate the projected numbers of new households" in the next 20 years. But just at the last year of a 10+ year plan development process, the city "just somehow discovered" that more housing capacity is needed. It is stated in the City Infill Summary that 1/2 of it's housing stock are single family dwellings on individual lots which it is claimed on pg 12 "presents a barrier to greater diversity". It also states "code changes to allow more housing types in Portland's single family dwelling zones and other areas are KEY to increasing a housing supply that is affordable to a broader spectrum of households". This logic is faulty. If the City wants to allow duplexes and triplexes in R5 and R7 and R10 zones, it can do that without incrementally allowing spot up zoning in these low density residential zones. I have no problem with some duplex and triplex structures being built (under infill housing scale standards) in my neighborhood that is designated R7. But, I do object to up zoning my neighborhood. If the City wants "diverse and possibly lower cost units" in single family residential zones, but only if the diversity is adhered to. For example, a duplex in an R7 zone only be allowed on a 14,000 square foot lot. A triplex only be allowed on a lot at least 21,000 sq ft. The City can allow more "affordable and diverse housing" in low density zones, but it should conform to its own contract with existing residents in those zones by recognizing that density not be increased. According to the comp plan, additional incremental up zoning in low density zones is not needed to accomodate projected growth.	Comment card
07/30	Priority should be affordability, which means increasing density. I love proposals for limiting single family house sizes, height.	Comment card
07/30	Equity is important - increasing density throughout PDX (not just in certain areas) is an issue! The scale of houses was a wonderful idea. Changing the zones instead of the regulations within existing zones was an idea I preferred (with regard to infill, not scale).	Comment card
08/04	Issue - narrow lots within 1/4 mile of centers and corridors. Comment: When I look at the map I see tha a significant majority of the existing narrow lots are within 1/4 mile buffer bubbles (80-90%? Do you have a figure?). Why not just allow development on all of them? The few outside the 1/4 mile buffer are still close to transit service. The argument that this denser development type [narrow houses] needs to be closer to transit is not compelling when you consider that other proposals in the package (allowing duplexes with ADU - 4 units total - for example) are a denser form of development, but would be allowed outright with no tie in to distance from transit. The proposal seems arbitrary and intended more to	Comment card

Appendix D: Comments from individuals

	show that something is being done to punish an unliked development (houses on narrow lots) than addressing a real problem.	
08/04	Infill is great! Heights should NOT be lowered it's hard to CONVERT attics and garages to MEET code as it is. Setbacks SHOULD BE reduced where possible.	Comment card
08/04	This is so great! I love the proposal for additional ADU allowances on R5 lots.	Comment card
08/05	Provide requirements for a tiny house (on trailer) to meet ADU specifications	Comment card
08/05	More density. Allow developers to build more, but require more of them in the process e.g. excise tax-like policy	Comment card
08/08	Please don't limit the size of the ADU to a proportion of the primary residence. In neighborhoods, like Montavilla East, with small homes (750 sf) this essentially eliminates ADUs even though lots are big enough to accommodate them (5,000 to 6,000 sf).	Comment card
08/08	Think about dispersing/limiting density to x number of units per block face. # lots x ____ = max. units allowed. I live next to a duplex, 3 lots from 3 plex and 4 lots from a small apt. bldg. Tolerable but would be issue if all extra units were grouped together. The duplex next door has 4 adults, 4 cars, and 3 dogs. Time to merge single-dwelling and multi-dwelling residential zones in interest of "truth in zoning?" Can you give examples of how you will fit in higher density, more cars, and on-site parking and space for trees?	Comment card
06/03	<p>I live on and own property on SE Insley St in Westmoreland. I wanted to let you know that I oppose the reduction of building height maximum from 35' to 30' in R2.5 that is being proposed by BPS staff as part of the Residential Infill project.</p> <p>I've been looking into a number of redevelopment concepts for my property that will allow us to stay on the property while providing some additional housing units. These concepts rely on having a 35' building height to provide design flexibility in constructing attractive, functional, 3-story homes. In addition, reducing the building height maximum would be the second time my property has had development potential reduced by zoning changes - the first being the downzoning from RHd to R2.5a that is part of the recommended Comp Plan.</p> <p>Please keep the 35' foot maximum. Alternatively, as one SAC work group proposed last month, allow 35' if the development will result in more than one home on the property.</p> <p>Thank you for your work,</p>	Email
06/07	<p>*****</p> <p>"Outside of a few lots, no Comprehensive Plan map changes are proposed within Sunnyside's single-family neighborhoods." - Dan Rutzick, Chair Land Use, Sunnyside Neighborhood Association News, January 2015</p> <p>*****</p> <p>I am the current co-chair of the Sunnyside Neighborhood Association Land Use and Transportation Advisory committee. This letter is my own opinion. Like many I am looking forward to the draft report and upcoming open houses by the Residential Infill Project Stakeholder Advisory Committee (RIPSAC)</p> <p>From various sources I have heard of proposals that would introduce some fairly aggressive rezoning in the spirit of "Missing Middle Housing." In terms of some of the overlays or rule changes involved, the reach of this project could well be construed as Comprehensive Plan level in scope.</p> <p>A slow and steady approach is needed: Concepts for applying Missing Middle will require an extensive vetting to explore collateral impacts. As the RIPSAC Project Summary and Timeline states:</p>	Email

"What's not included? This project won't be addressing a number of related issues, including rules for demolition/deconstruction, historic preservation, systems development charges and fee structures, moveable homes (e.g., tiny houses on wheels) or changes to community design standards."

These "related issues" are of paramount importance if we acknowledge that some Missing Middle zoning models are in fact designed to have a huge impact on Portland's single family neighborhoods, most of which work and thrive today as "20 minute" real life models. The historic value of these neighborhoods, which trace all the back to Portland's core formative roots, has not been given adequate due. The annual pace of demolitions is approaching half of the structures that would have been lost with the Mt. Hood Freeway. Many corridors have limited capacity to improve transit times, as witnessed by the clawback of the Powell high-speed transit initiative.

To the extent that new models are proposed that in effect overturn single family housing as we know it, extensive economic modeling is required to ensure what's proposed does not have unintended impacts in the market.

It will take time to achieve a consensus on what exactly constitutes "Missing Middle" and more importantly, how it functions. Is it a transition tool? A density tool? An affordability tool?

I believe much early support for "Missing Middle Housing" is expressed and motivated as an alternative or substitute to "big box" apartments appearing on corridors, not in addition to them.

Finally, the quotation from the Sunnyside Newsletter above underscores a major point - as part of the Comprehensive Plan process - the Map App and BPS representatives communicated that many single family neighborhoods - like Sunnyside - would not be rezoned. Instead the emphasis expressed clearly communicated change would come to the corridors through the Mixed Use Zones Project. BPS risks considerable erosion of trust following such declarations if major new middle housing initiatives are unleashed on an accelerated timeline.

My recommendation is to apply the best ideas of RIPSAC in a conservative fashion. Primarily that means applying FAR limits to single family zones (Ideally .5 FAR for R2.5,R5, R7, excluding basements) with a .65 FAR for an attached duplexes in the R2.5 zone only.

I support contextual setbacks.

I continue to support Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) in zones R5, R7. These should be limited to one per lot (whether attached or detached) and setbacks from the front lot line should be more stringent than those applied to primary structures. Both lot lines on a corner need to be considered front lot lines.

I support planned Cottage Style housing. It should be noted that Metro proposes a model .35 FAR on such projects.

I oppose applying multi-dwelling approaches (condosizing) ADUs on single family lots.

	<p>It is outside of the scope of RIPSAC yet I wanted to state that Community Land Trusts represent the best, long term approach to purchasing existing housing stock and preserving its affordability for future generations. It is in this area that the greatest effort will be required.</p>	
<p>06/11</p>	<p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>I have a novel idea, apparently. If developers remove a house on a lot, they must build a house of the SAME NUMBER OF SQUARE FEET. Period. All over Portland and throughout Portland neighborhoods, multiple unit building are being constructed (and have been constructed), that HAVE NO RIGHT TO BE THERE. These buildings are destroying the quality of our neighborhoods.</p> <p>Further, in their small number of square feet, they discriminate against families. Not everyone moving to Portland is young, white and rides a bicycle.....often times with their car parked/ left out on the street for long periods of time. The so-called “planning” that is going on is short-sighted. It’s accommodating only one segment of our population.....and guess what, these folks are actually going to grow older, have families and there’s not going to be any place for them to live, since too many of these (often times) poorly constructed buildings squeezed into neighborhoods have apartments that are too SMALL.</p> <p>May I suggest, having lived as an adult in Chicago, Boston, and DC, that “Portland” powers that be, pull their heads out of the sand, and cease destroying this city by squeezing more and more into spaces, replete with no parking, while eliminating car travel.</p> <p>Further, on your Advisory committee, I see only younger people. Hello! Not everyone is young and rides a bike, especially in a climate such as this one. Please have some consideration for older people, who are often the most impacted by such changes “you” are proposing.</p>	<p>Email</p>
<p>06/15</p>	<p>I am appalled at the wild, unceasingly irresponsible development by greedy developers</p> <p>yes we need more housing but we need prices to come down as salaries have - salaries for middle to low level workers have stagnated for 30 years housing has gone ballistic - people who (like me) were priced out of home ownership due to maintenance and mortgage combination being not doable, are now priced out of renting as well.</p> <p>these monster multiple rabbit hutch nightmares springing up everywhere are NOT affordable, not livable, and MOST OF ALL THEY ARE TRASHING THE NEIGHBORHOODS AS THEY HAVE NO PROVISION FOR PARKING.</p> <p>People who invested in homes in nice single family neighborhoods where visitors could park to visit them, now are squeezed on all sides by this irrational, dense type of building, and their friends can't even park to visit. and in some cases where homes originally built with no garages, no parking is available for even the homeowner, while these transplants from other states are moving in and occupying land that was rightfully owned by someone else.</p> <p>I implore to stop this madness. Before you overrun the streets, the air we breathe and the sewers as well. There is no quality of life with this abominable trend. Just look at the freeways - no longer a rush hour challenge, they are a slow to non moving nightmare all day</p>	<p>Email</p>

	<p>long.</p> <p>commutes to jobs that used to take 20 minutes now take 45 min to an hour.</p> <p>stop this deluge - please - as a life long resident, born in Portland Oregon - I beg you to stop this ruination of our once lovely city with many lovely close in single family neighborhoods being destroyed all over by this irresponsible greedy developing and over-use of land.</p> <p>I don't have any clout; I am a modest resourced person who has had to rent most of my life, and even that is endangered as I am now a sr. citizen less able to earn a decent wage.</p> <p>I ask you to think about life in Portland and work to correct this horrendous situation.</p>	
<p>06/15</p>	<p>Dear Elected Official, We now hear the latest news from the City of Portland about rezoning so that duplex, multifamily dwellings and apartments could be placed in residential, single family home neighborhoods, all in the name of residential infill. Let me just say this, I have lived in southwest Portland for 42 years and our area (Multnomah Village) is well known for its charm and historical significance. My property taxes are HIGH and more taxes just keep piling on top of others. The city of Portland has had one scheme after another, all of which will cost me even more money. My family and friends who live in Washington and Clackamas counties can't figure out why I stay here. This scheme to ruin our neighborhoods and decrease our property values will drive homeowners out fast. What you are proposing will be just another slum in no time because there will be no reason for families to stay. These proposed zone changes should not only have citizen input but the people who pay horrible taxes to live here should have a vote.</p> <p>Last comment- when will you all realize that while people may ride mass transit to and from work and into the city etc. , they still need cars for vacations, weekend outings, driving a baseball team etc. Mass transit does not go everywhere people want to go. They will still need and want cars and they need someplace to park them. Every time some planner gets it in his/her head that structures can be built with no parking, they think they just won't have cars. Not so, they will just park them along narrow side streets where residents have to vie for the same space. We have seen this over and over again and someone needs to wake up and realize that parking is a HUGE ISSUE! Planners can't just plan cars away so why don't you all take a serious look at reality and figure out a reasonable plan instead of foisting apartment dwellers with cars onto neighborhoods that are already over parked.</p> <p>We do NOT approve of rezoning to allow residential infill and object strongly to even attempting to shove it off on the property owners across the city. When will someone realize there has to be a better way than planners are trying to shove down our throats.</p>	<p>Email</p>
<p>06/16</p>	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I'm reading online about the residential in-fill project and the upcoming community meetings. My questions are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To what extent, if at all, do these proposals address large scale development like apartments and condos in historically single family dwelling neighborhoods? 2. To what extent, if at all, do the draft proposals deal with concerns about over-saturated 	<p>Email</p>

	street parking and how that has impacted quality of life in historically single family dwelling neighborhoods?	
06/20	<p>Hello RIP team,</p> <p>I am unclear how the draft RIP proposal will affect my property, which is 5,000 sf, not on a corner, and slated to be zoned R2.5a as a result of the Comp Plan.</p> <p>Two questions:</p> <p>1) What will be the dimensional requirements in R2.5 with an 'a' overlay?</p> <p>[Name] sold me on the downzoning from RHD to R2.5a on the premise that I would still have significant development potential for my investment - I could build 3 homes. Sellwood-Moreland is immensely popular with families with children and in order to implement my intention to build 3 quality homes for families, they need to be of a certain size. The proposed setback, height and FAR limits have me very concerned. What will I be able to build under the proposed rules?</p> <p>2) If privacy and sunlight were big issues for some people, why was the front setback changed instead of the side and rear setbacks?</p> <p>I think 10' front and rear setbacks would have made more sense than 15' front and 5' rear. Under the proposal, people will be shoving homes as far back as they can because of the increased front setback, while mandating larger (though not useful) front lawns and wider-looking street corridors.</p> <p>Please understand the situation that is being created in Comp Plan downzone areas in north Westmoreland, east Portland and elsewhere. We're now living in the shadows of numerous new apartment buildings while having the ability to create our own wealth taken away - first through downzoning, second through downsizing.</p> <p>Thank you for addressing these questions and please reply all for the benefit of those cc-ed.</p>	Email
06/20	<p>I attended the first public presentation of the Residential Infill Project in Multnomah. There was a comment from a woman in the audience that the 2500 square foot limit was too small for a large family. Several others chimed in agreeing with her.</p> <p>In your response to her comment, you did not mention that houses over 2500 would be allowed on larger lots (many of which are found in the southwest neighborhoods). I think this is an important thing for you and other city staff to point out to the audience. I know the proposal itself says this but you can't necessarily count on people reading the proposal that carefully.</p> <p>I have some other comments but they are more about the actual proposal and not about the presentation so I will address those separately.</p>	Email
06/21	<p>Morgan and Julia:</p> <p>Why is the email for each of you the same?</p> <p>I tried to get on this panel last year and was told that it was an informal panel but was full. I</p>	Email

	<p>was worried that it was being stuffed with developers, real estate people that would push for more of a certain kind of development and less choice. I was told that it was a citizen advisory panel and not as official as you are now making it.</p> <p>I think that it has gone in the wrong direction. I live in the Cully neighborhood and have seen what living cully, orange spot and some other development people are sucking on the teat if the city in the name of displacement, homelessness and people of color. All of which are issues but they are using these issues mostly to further their ends not for the people they are saying they are doing this for.</p> <p>Living Cully has already gotten Portland to pay for the cully plaza which will benefit living cully, they are trying to get \$1.5 million for a trailer park that will generate \$15,0000 a month living cully, They are only paying \$1.5 million for the place. What will they do with the \$15,000 a month?</p> <p>Orange Spot is building 14 houses on property that had two houses on it and cost them \$500,000 together. They want money \$120,000 from the city if they are to build 2 of the houses "Affordable". Then sell those two for \$180,000 each. The other 12 houses will sell for 350,000 each or more. Is this affordable infill? They are taking two houses that sold for \$250,000 each with 12,000 sq ft lots with trees and building 14 houses that will average over \$325,000 each with no yards. Is this how we want to grow up our children?</p>	
<p>06/21</p>	<p>Morgan:</p> <p>Thank you for discussing the proposed compatibility regulations today with me at the NW Library. That was idea to be able to talk in person. I'll submit comments in writing later on.</p> <p>Main reason for this email--as you know, the project pamphlet has a photo of a blue house on p. 8, and a dormer diagram on p. 9 showing "dormers" covering the entire halves of gable roofs, and the house's caption says,</p> <p>Without limits, dormers (currently not measured for height) may begin to look and function like an entire additional story, resulting in a height that is taller than the maximum allowed.</p> <p>http://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/580581</p> <p>That is the reason for the proposed "50% limit" for dormers.</p> <p>My view, as you know, is that when a "dormer" covers the entire half of a gable roof, it's not a dormer, it's just a higher roof, so those two examples are incorrect, because their heights would have to be measured to the midpoint of their own roofs, not the midpoint of the hypothetical roof implied by the fake eaves stuck onto the wall below them.</p> <p>But even if those "whole-roof dormers" aren't dormers, the caption still states that dormers don't count in height measurements.</p> <p>However, I'd asked the zoning hotline yesterday how to measure height of a house with a gable roof and a dormer. The reply (in a message I got right after we met) was that dormers DO count, and that you have to measure to the midpoint of the "highest roof" (which would be the dormer roof) to get the height of a house.</p> <p>If that's true, that would make the 50% dormer limitation of your project irrelevant, because</p>	<p>Email</p>

	<p>the hotline answer is that you have to measure to the top of the dormer roof, no matter how small the dormer is.</p> <p>I hope it's NOT true, because it would mean one small dormer would increase a house's height measurement by several feet, which would be a huge penalty for adding a dormer.</p> <p>In any event, the pamphlet info says dormers don't count, and the hotline answer says they do, and both answers can't be correct.</p> <p>I'd think a reasonable thing would be dormers over some certain measurement (such as your proposed 50% idea) should count in the height measurement.</p>	
<p>06/23</p>	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>Can you direct me to where I can find the slide presentation that was presented at the Multnomah arts center. Also where could I find the minutes from the meeting please? I needed to get some clarification on some things.</p> <p>Also does the city plan to video tape any or all of these presentations so people that aren't able to attend can watch them from the city website.?</p> <p>I'm out of town on business and can't attend the next open house and would really like to watch it or have it taped so I can watch it later. Please let me know if this is even possible. Just wondering why these aren't taped presentations? It would be very helpful if the city considered taping these informational sessions. I had asked this about the new tree code policy as well. Still wondering why these are not more widely distributed and made available to those that can't attend in person.</p> <p>This is a city wide issue and it would be helpful to see what the issues are for each Neighborhood.</p> <p>Also the open forum question and answer period was extremely helpful and useful and would like to recommend it be allowed at each open because many people don't know what questions to ask.</p> <p>Will this be an options for the rest of the open houses coming up?</p>	<p>Email</p>
<p>06/23</p>	<p>Morgan/Project Team:</p> <p>Can you tell me if this project has considered if the size limits (the 2500 sf proposed limit for new houses on standard R5 lots, or similar restrictions) would apply to enlarging existing homes?</p> <p>With the theory for the size limit being that houses over a certain size will not be compatible, then the limit does need to apply to enlarging existing houses, since size is the issue, not date of construction. That means the owner of a house already 2500 sf (or whatever the limit is) will need a zoning adjustment to enlarge, or for that matter, even to convert unfinished interior space to living space. The same is true for an owner of a house under 2500 sf who wants to enlarge to greater than that.</p> <p>This means thousands of existing houses will be made nonconforming, and will need a land</p>	<p>Email</p>

	<p>use approval in order to expand. That will be an expensive mess for owners and BDS, even if adjustments are readily granted (and there's no guarantee or particular likelihood they would be).</p> <p>People who own existing houses--especially those over or near whatever size limit is approved--will assume these compatibility rules won't affect their own existing houses. They will need to be informed that is wrong, and that the size limitations could have potentially huge negative impacts on their existing houses' potential and value.</p> <p>But if the answer is that these limits would not apply to expansions of existing houses, then the City would have to justify telling a property owner he or she will not be allowed to build a new house greater than 2500 sf (or whatever the limit is) because that is too large to be compatible, while meanwhile defending giving that owner's next door neighbor a permit to enlarge his existing 3000 sf house, or to enlarge his 2000 sf house to something over 2500 sf. That would be illogical and unfair.</p> <p>And thinking of the size limits applying to existing houses also points out more problems associated with another part of the proposed size limit--allowing extra floor area only if it's in the form of a detached structure. Imagine telling someone who wants to add a bedroom or enlarge their kitchen that they can only do that (without a land use approval) if they put it in the backyard in a separate structure!</p> <p>All these problems would be solved by increasing the size limit to something much higher than what's being proposed, and eliminating the incentive/requirement that allows floor area over that limit only if it's in a detached structure.</p>	
<p>06/27</p>	<p>The online survey offered to facilitate feedback on the Residential Infill portion of the new Comprehensive Plan does not have enough room for the things I would like to say.</p> <p>So, herewith are the notes I took while reacting to the Infill Project materials online. If there is someone else who should be reading this, please forward appropriately.</p> <p>Where does the magic 123,000 number for new residents in the next 20 years come from? Why must Portland turn into Los Angeles for these hypothetical newcomers? Why do Portland planners seem simply to rubber stamp developer proposals? Why has no apparent consideration been given to the traffic congestion that comes with increased density, especially if parking requirements are reduced? How about the congestion caused by on-going construction? How fair is it for the city flip zoning from R5 to R2.5 or to dig up ancient plats to OK transforming neighborhoods? Why do old neighborhoods with some charm have to turn into canyons of cookie-cutter apartment blocks or rows of skinny houses or "traditionals" perched on super steep front stairways?</p> <p>Where does affordability come into the picture? And earthquake hazard -- should people be packed into hazardous areas? How about addressing issues of air quality and noise levels when permitting construction? Here I am thinking about the infill going on right by I5 where N. Michigan meets N. Prescott: can this be a healthy place to live?</p> <p>I would like to see a snapshot set of statistics showing dwelling units under construction now in Portland, and ranges of rents or sales prices being asked.</p> <p>The UGB includes other places besides Portland; if we must have infill, why can't it happen in Gresham or Hillsboro or Milwaukie? Or even Dunthorpe and Lake Oswego? Why</p>	<p>Email</p>

	<p>remove the charm from "Inner Ring" neighborhoods? TriMet and light rail serve more than the Inner Ring and Central City.</p> <p>What about trees and open spaces -- how can the city rubber stamp rampant development and still protect air and water quality? Can the city mandate deconstruction, if there must be removal of good old housing stock, vs. to-the-landfill demolition? Can the city insist on tree and open space preservation?</p> <p>Is the city leaning on the legislature to quit letting property owners remove their buildings from local historic building inventories?</p> <p>Vic Remmers on the SAC??? The guy who would have cut down the Eastmoreland sequoias? One of the most egregious old house demolishers? Any thought that this guy might be exploiting the city's perceived need for more housing for his own gain?</p> <p>ADUs ... has any one in the planning department done a survey of the extra vehicles ADUs might bring into a neighborhood? Any parking requirements for ADUs?</p> <p>Ever tried driving through a little local feeder street near one of those doesn't-need-to-provide-parking apartment blocks, where drivers must thread their way single file on two way streets? Does not look like folks are giving up cars for public transportation,</p> <p>Re minimum number of units in R2.5 Sounds like if there's "underlying lot lines" people would be forced to build ADU's to conform to new regulations. Am I misconstruing? Would something like this kick in for people as they buy vs. whamming the current residents?</p> <p>I truly wish someone reading this could provide answers to the questions I have, but for now I only hope you will take my questions and doubts seriously. Thank you.</p>	
<p>06/27</p>	<p>Hi, I see references to the questionnaire in the email and on the long presentation on the various infill options, but the link on the latter page then leads to a second page that does not appear to have any obvious link to the questionnaire (it simply mentions that it is available).</p> <p>Can you please help me out by sending me a direct link to the questionnaire? Thank you,</p>	<p>Email</p>
<p>06/28</p>	<p>Morgan:</p> <p>Thanks for the dormer measurement info. It makes it clear how gabled dormers are measured. What about shed dormers on a gabled-roof house? Are those also ignored if the top of the shed dormer's roof is below the ridge of the main roof? And also NOT ignored if the shed dormer's roof is joined up at the house's main ridge? And if they're not ignored in that case, then is the height of the dormer (and the height of the house) the topmost part of its roof, since shed roofs are measured at their highest point?</p> <p>Note that the BDS article I mentioned shows shed dormers that attach at the ridge of the house's main gable (on p. 8 and 9) but the text states that dormers are not measured for height. Is that true with shed dormers? If it is true, then gable dormers whose ridge aligns with the house's main ridge are horribly penalized by the code, because they'd count in the height calculations, while the shed dormers would not.</p>	<p>Email</p>

	<p>The reason I'm asking for clarification is that this all goes back to my opinion that flat roofs will be penalized unduly by the proposed regulations, and part of the reason for that is that dormers can increase the wall area of gabled-roof houses to the point that those walls are close or even equal to the wall area of flat-roofed houses. But I don't want to be wrong in my comments about that, so want to be sure I'm understanding how shed dormer heights are measured.</p> <p>PS In regard to the size limits applying to existing houses (as I'd assumed they would), that's one more reason to consider increasing the proposed area limitations. The tighter the limit, the more existing houses will become non-conforming, and the more difficult it will be to do even simple, small additions on hundreds or thousands of homes. It's also important that people be made aware that existing houses will be impacted by the size limitations.</p>	
06/28	<p>Julia</p> <p>Thank you Julia do you have a list of the Q&A questions and the responses that Sandra wood and Morgan gave from Multnomah meeting?</p> <p>Also we have been asking for the maps of each Neighborhood that show the 1/4 mile areas that would be affected. The map in the Ripsac web site currently doesn't give enough details with streets and pin point location. We want one that you could put your address into and then see how far our the 1/4 mile radius went. A map like what Multnomah got from Joan show be available to each Neighborhood. Is that possible?</p> <p>We really could use these before tonight's meetings.</p>	Email
06/28	<p>I would like to request all economic analysis done for the RIPSAC Project and copies of any contracts in issued in producing any economic analysis for the RIPSAC Project. The request is being under provisions of Goal 1, Metro's citizen involvement policies and ORS 192. Please note ORS 192 has time limits or formal processing will proceed.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this matter</p> <p>Here is a link on housing affordability that is inconsistent with staff presentations http://portlandtribune.com/pt/9-news/312877-190544-new-poll-numbers-help-city-rethink-roots-of-homelessness</p>	Email
06/28	<p>At least two parts of the slide show are deceptive.</p> <p>1) The pie chart showing 46% of the lots in Portland are large lots. That 46% includes 5000 square foot lots which most people consider standard lots and are described as standard lots in some of the published info.</p> <p>2) The two slides showing skinny houses the first with garages and driveways with cars parked in them, and second slide without garages and driveways with no cars parked on the street. Maybe it is because the people with driveways and garages commute to work using another mode of tansit and those without off-street parking commute by driving.</p> <p>These deceptions and any others need to be questioned at the up coming public meetings</p>	Email
06/28	<p>How will house size limits apply to duplexes and triplexes?</p>	Email

Appendix D: Comments from individuals

	<p>Will a duplex in a 5,000 square foot lot be limited to 2,500 square feet for both units (i.e. 1,250 per unit), or will it be 2,500 square feet per unit (i.e. 2,500 per unit).</p> <p>Thanks,</p>	
06/28	<p>Hi Julia, Is there a better map, or one that can be enlarged to accurately identify the specific streets that could be impacted by the proposed new housing development types and also those near centers and corridors? Or maybe I should ask to see a map of what streets on the eastside NOT impacted by this proposal! It is impossible to tell from the map on the website but important to know as the scope of this proposal as the public input meetings begin.</p>	Email
06/28	<p>Dear Julia:</p> <p>I have been on this mailing list and I am planning to attend one of the public open houses. I have a couple of questions about the process and the proposals:</p> <p>—I'm unclear about proposal #1, re: limiting house size to 2,500 square feet: Does this refer to the total floor area of the house on all floors (the normal way people talk about a house's square footage), or only its ground footprint? The language on the PDF document leaves that vague. (e.g., a 3-story house with a ground footprint of 2,500 sq ft. could have a floor area of 7,500 sq ft.)</p> <p>—Will the open houses have opportunity for residents to speak and make comments about the proposals? If so, how much time will be allowed for public comment?</p> <p>Thanks very much,</p>	Email
06/29	<p>Julia and Morgan,</p> <p>I attended what I assumed would be an open house last night at TaborSpace, but what I really attended was an unmoderated rally for wealthy homeowners who want to pull up the drawbridge to Portland.</p> <p>I am a busy father of two who is chair of my neighborhood association (Sunnyside) volunteers on stakeholder advisory committees (Centers + Corridors & Central City Parking Policy Update) and runs a newly formed advocacy group (Portlanders for Parking Reform) and my time is limited. I had planned to come to the "open house" learn about the RIP proposal, give my comments, and leave.</p> <p>Instead the staff were bullied into allowing the open house format to be changed to a town hall where dissenting voices were made very uncomfortable and angry neighbors were applauded for promoting ill-informed conspiracy theories.</p> <p>This is not how public involvement should look. This is not how the city should take the temperature of its constituents. The feedback from these open houses is tainted by a format like this. You can ask the staff, I was in several groups speaking to staff where people who were supportive of the proposal stated that they were afraid to speak up in the mob.</p> <p>Please retain the OPEN HOUSE format. If you have a presentation or Q&A, please bring a moderator who can keep people on topic and on time. Please reschedule events in inner SE and in SW Portland that can be a more informative and less intimidating format.</p>	Email

	<p>I would like a response about this topic.</p>	
<p>06/29</p>	<p>Dear Staff (sorry, I don't remember the names of the people who presented last night),</p> <p>Thank you for an informative session and for all your hard work on this very complex, contentious, and high-impact project. I appreciated your handouts and displays and also your systematic organization of the time. I especially appreciated your diplomatic handling of some very rude people, including the "professional speech coach" who kept yelling instructions to the presenter. (They were good suggestions, but she was very rude.)</p> <p>I completely the online questionnaire as best I could, but I realize my understanding is far from complete, so I may attend another session to fill in some gaps.</p> <p>If you will permit me, I'd like to make a couple of purely process, rather than content, suggestions for the remaining public input sessions. My guess is that after last night and your first session, you've already thought of some of these. But I'll toss them out anyway - and you can toss them out if you don't agree! TaborSpace was crowded, to be sure, but I think the flow could be smoothed out a bit even in tight quarters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Place the registration table so that people can get in the door and line up in an obvious way as they approach the table, rather than having to double back to the other side. When those two steps of the process compete, it starts the whole experience out on the wrong foot by causing a crowd clog right at the beginning. *Have staff wear very visible badges and line up to one side of the room so that as we enter we can see right away who they are. That way, if we want to seek someone out with questions, we know where to go. *During the first "circulation period" allow people to walk through and read for themselves, on their own, unimpeded *If participants have a question at a station, they can seek out a staff person. Or, if you want to have a staff at each station, have them position themselves to one side so that others trying to cruise the displays can get in to look and then move on. Also, have them limit individual discussions to two or three minutes and then politely disengage. The first station last night was completely blocked for most of the pre-presentation half hour by one staff talking with just two people, all three standing directly in front of the poster. It was frustrating. *People with a lot of questions should be asked to first listen to the presentation and then stay after the presentation if they want more individual attention. *Allow staff more time to make the presentation itself. Even for those of us who've tried to familiarize ourselves with the basics beforehand, there are fine points, implications, and ramifications that need to be explained. **Continue to stop a person who's trying to hijack the presentation process - just as ordinary citizens are trying to prevent developers from hijacking land ownership and development. *After the post-presentation open discussion, strongly encourage people - whether they have spoken up or not - to write their comments on the flip charts and also complete the online questionnaire when they get home. People often think their spoken points are captured, and in a large and diverse group, it's hard to keep up. Also, this would give staff more info. re: how many people feel which way about issues. So often, one person speaks and many 	<p>Email</p>

	<p>others agree but don't speak. This would better capture all of them.</p> <p>Thanks for considering these thoughts. I did large employee training sessions for year, and I just can't help but notice the "flow" in situations like these.</p> <p>All the best to each of you,</p>	
<p>06/29</p>	<p>Julia and Morgan:</p> <p>I would like to second what I heard others expressing:</p> <p>The Residential Infill Open Houses, both in Multnomah Village on June 15, and last night at Tabor Space on SE Belmont, quickly became a sort of "town hall", except with the audience members shouting at the presenters about how they hated the proposal. Folks who tried to express support for the proposal, or had an innovative suggestion, were intimidated from speaking up, or in one case, shouted at by other attendees.</p> <p>At last night's 2 hour meeting, there was only 15 minutes at the end where attendees could actually walk around and look at the display boards, and be able to talk one-on-one with staff. Even attendees who were writing on comment sheets found others standing there debating their points as they wrote them down.</p> <p>Neither of these meetings were conducive to gathering public input from the cross-section of those attending. The time for folks to talk one-on-one with staff should be kept free of intrusion of the "presentation", and the presenters need to have a strong moderator (and security guards?) to keep the unreasonable, angry crowd of detractors in check, and quiet while others talk.</p> <p>I hope you will be able to devise a format for future meetings that keeps some of these members of the public from intimidating others who came to be informed.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	<p>Email</p>
<p>06/29</p>	<p>Hi Julie and Morgan,</p> <p>I attended the "open house" on the residential infill project last night at Tabor Space. I want to thank you both and the staff from BPS for your hard work on this project. It was a pretty tough audience and I applaud you for standing in front of the room and answering difficult questions.</p> <p>I would like to provide some feedback on the format of the meeting. I was expecting it to be a real open house where people could visit different boards/stations, learn about the infill project and talk to BPS staff one on one and provide input. I was not expecting a town hall type of meeting that was dominated by angry homeowners who, quite frankly, were misinformed and aggressive to people who supported density and more housing choices. I know this is a contentious issue and you want to give both sides a chance to provide input, but what happened last night was not productive or inclusive.</p> <p>I would like to ask BPS to retain the open house format that allows people to speak with staff one-on-one for all future residential infill open house events. If you have a presentation, please bring a moderator who can keep people on topic and on time.</p>	<p>Email</p>

	<p>Thank you so much again for all your hard work to make this city more inclusive and more accessible to all people.</p>	
06/29	<p>Julia</p> <p>The meeting Monday night went very well and there was lots of light with very little heat - just as should be the case for reasonable discussion.</p> <p>The complexity of the issue, the suggestions being vetted, and the difficulty of addressing some of the other impacts of changes has made us schedule a second discussion at our July 25, 2016 meeting.</p> <p>I would like to have someone from the Residential Infill Project at our meeting. By that time most areas of the city will have had opportunities to hear the proposal but we will be discussing some questions regarding infrastructure funding mechanisms, school impacts, inadequate transit support in man neighborhoods, and other “how can we live with this” issues.</p> <p>I will be sending out weekly “white papers” regarding some of the data in back of these questions and also invite others to send me their own Neighborhood Association and Coalition issues. Fortunately the two month preparation before staff begins to digest the public comments will give us the opportunity to both identify issues but then to begin to suggest solutions that might build more acceptance for the draft proposal due next year.</p> <p>I am especially interested in anyone who has done some economic impact study of the costs of these proposals. I can - and will - get information from builders and other people familiar with the costs of this method of infill but if there is already data I would appreciate a contact person to speak with.</p> <p>Thank you, Julia. I look forward to hearing from you - hopefully to verify staff attendance for the July 25, 2016 meeting and also to identify who, if anyone, has done any economic study of the proposal.</p>	Email
06/30	<p>Attached is an information document I prepared back in April, 2015, after the United Neighborhoods for Reform Summit IV meeting where we broke up into focus groups dealing with various topics of concern to the 150 or so folks who attended. I was the "scribe" for the Land Use and Zoning group, and after the meeting I provided some background information on each of the most urgent areas of concern expressed by the folks during the break-out session. That background information is contained in the attached document, which I handed to Todd in paper form at Monday's Citywide Land Use Group Meeting. During the CWLUG meeting on Monday, I quoted a number of the statistics from this document -- hoping to stimulate a re-think of some of the basic assumptions in the RIP initial proposal, much of which I find to be extremely disappointing.</p> <p>Also attached is speaker notes from a lecture I presented at the Architectural Heritage Center in 2015 and have repeated in other venues more recently. I'd call your attention to pages 4 and 5 which make the case, contrary to view expressed in Monday's meeting, that Portland is NOT a "NEW" city, but is in fact an old city, confronted with important questions of what to preserve of a city core that is comparable in percentage of pre-WWII residences to cities like Baltimore and Philadelphia, as distinct from Phoenix, Houston, or Denver, which are much newer.</p>	Email

Appendix D: Comments from individuals

	<p>As Chairperson of the Portland Coalition for Historic Resources and a member of the Irvington Community Association's Land Use Committee, I expect to continue to speak out on this subject, marshaling the facts that have been so grievously missing from much of the RIP's discussion an position-taking.</p>	
06/30	<p>Julia and Morgan,</p> <p>I intended to attend the open house last night at Tabor Space to better understand the proposal being made by staff, but what I really attended was an organized effort by an unruly group to usurp and control what is intended to be an equitable and democratic process. Rather than Question & Answer it appeared to be more of an Inquisition & Answer.</p> <p>I was uncomfortable that angry neighbors were using the town hall format to hijack the presentation to promote their own agendas and were applauded for making accusations and promoting conspiracy theories. I can only assume others who supported the proposals by staff were likely afraid to speak up. This is not how public involvement should look.</p> <p>I suggest an alternative format.</p> <p>Thank you for your work on this project,</p>	Email
06/30	<p>I am confused about the criteria for transit corridors used in determining the 1/4 mile areas that will be subject to the Alternative House Type rules. How are you defining frequent transit service?</p> <p>Thanks</p>	Email
07/01	<p>Thank you for taking the time to talk with me this afternoon. I'd like to take you up on your offer to make an appointment to discuss this further in person. I believe that this is going to pass in some form, and I'd really like to direct energy into providing constructive comments. I think that the best way for me to do that is with some interactive feedback from BPS staff working on this project. I understand that you're going to be out next week. I'm available next week, but not July 11 -- 13</p> <p>Again, I'm grateful for any time you're prepared to spend talking with me about the draft infill proposal.</p>	Email
07/02	<p>Thanks for having an online open house. I filled out the survey and took notes along the way. Then I went to submit my notes in the comment box at the end and — there was a 150-word limit. Please expand that so you can hear thoughtful, thorough comments.</p> <p>Given that the comment box is not big enough, please accept my comments via email and consider them as part of the project.</p> <p>Thanks.</p> <p>Survey comments:</p> <p>It is not the size of the house that matters so much. I don't mind a larger house next to a</p>	Email

	<p>smaller house, for example. What matters is the design of the houses. So many of the new single-family homes have no relationship to the street. Often they have a garage and no living space or very little living space on the first floor. They have small windows or now windows on the first floor. If they have balconies or porches, they are quite high off the ground, so they do not provide an opportunity to interact with neighbors and passers-by.</p> <p>If this continues, there eventually will be a wall of garages and nearly blank walls all along the street. This means there will be no eyes on the street to promote safety and no community built through serendipitous interactions.</p> <p>So, forget about house size and focus on what is important. Require garages to be detached. Require a certain amount of the frontage to be living space with windows. Use the rules to ensure Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design and opportunities for interactions among neighbors.</p> <p>I will add that this is especially a problem in streetcar neighborhoods where things were originally designed for walking. I have not thought as carefully about how this should be applied in hilly terrain or in the more auto-oriented designs of East Portland. So be careful about citywide application of these thoughts.</p> <p>Regarding the height and setbacks. I oppose your ideas. What you can do is stop giving adjustments willy nilly for single-family homes. Do not give adjustments to setbacks. Enforce them. They are there for a reason. I live right next to the picture you have above with the blue house and the gray house. For the gray house, they requested adjustments, as I recall, on all four sides. Staff was going to hand them out without even thinking about it. I managed to object and have the houses moved back to the 10-foot front setback. But adjustments were still given with no reason. And the application for the adjustments did not even address the standards. The houses would be smaller, for example, if you didn't let them stick the eaves way out into the setbacks. They can still have the eaves, they just need to keep them within the setbacks that are within the code.</p> <p>Keep the eaves and everything else out of the setbacks!</p> <p>Regarding housing types, I support everything but the minimum unit standard for R2.5. The market will take care of that. Just allow it and they will come where it makes sense.</p>	
<p>07/05</p>	<p>Hi-</p> <p>Thank you for the additional map details. It looks like our home is located in a zone referred to as a potential "R5 tax parcels with 25x100 and 33x100 underlying plats inside Inner Ring areas and within 1/4 mile of Centers, MAX " area in hot pink.</p> <p>What does that mean exactly? How would that impact us and our neighbors? Does that mean our properties would be eligible for additional housing types if the lot size allows?</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	<p>Email</p>
<p>07/07</p>	<p>Portland is being ruined by incompatible infill and this plan is going to accelerate that. Preserve neighborhood characters by downzoning most of Portland (R2.5 to 5, R5 to R7, and so on). I do not buy pave it to save and see this whole project as an attempt to line the pockets of a few developers. I do not have time to sit and be lectured to and not listened to at any more of these meetings, but please take note that I do not agree with the direction this is going or how it is being done.</p> <p>I have a survey (with similar validity):</p>	<p>Email</p>

	<p>1: do you love puppies {circle one} (No, NO!, or HELL NO!!!!)</p> <p>2. Given that you hate puppies, would you support</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">A – killing all old dogs</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">B – giving all kids a cat</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">C – raising residential speed limits by 2.5 Kilometers per Hour within a quarter mile of a park</p>	
<p>07/07</p>	<p>Hi Julia (cc Ted Wheeler, cc BPS),</p> <p>I hope you had a nice holiday weekend.</p> <p>Thank you for this update. I am sure you are getting a lot of feedback, and, from what I have seen, not all of it necessarily very politely shared. I am sorry about that. I am sure you and everyone at BPS are doing the best they can. I have tried to remain informed on the Comprehensive Plan and infill project as best I can. I read the entire original comp plan, attended meetings, have attended multiple open houses, etc. I was happy to hear that residents of Portland would have an opportunity to give feedback. I wanted to share my reaction to the survey that was sent out and is open until August.</p> <p>In a nutshell, I was deeply disappointed and highly frustrated. I understand that a group of 30+ committed individuals from multiple "sides" of the growth issue wrestled with issues for a long time to come up with the plan. But, to be blunt- the survey is a sham. I am a professor of business who creates surveys on a regular basis. I do not believe that this particular survey is fair nor do I think it was generated to truly get a pulse of what residents think about it.</p> <p>As I went through, it was clear that my choices for feedback were very narrow. I could choose, a, b, or c that I didn't like. Too much was "assumed into evidence" in each question. There were items that had multiple points included (called double-barreled items) so that agreeing to that item was a problem if you only agreed with part of it, there was no opportunity to say what we felt or generate alternatives, and in the end, after a survey that gave me no real voice, I only got 150 words to share my thoughts.</p> <p>There is no way that a group of 30+ people who represented some extremes and with specific personal agendas could generate a plan this complex that would have no room for improvement with the hundreds of thousands of Portlanders who might have another view or ideas that meet the goals even better than this one. And, maybe not ignore the issue of affordable housing which is invoked and then discarded by the infill proposal.</p> <p>When you see all the anger and frustration, I know it can be hard to take but "managing" the citizens of Portland like this is disrespectful and disappointing. For the first time in 22 years in Portland, I feel like I have no voice and that what any of us thinks does not matter to the City of Portland.</p> <p>I truly hope that your group will reconsider the survey and ask for some real feedback rather than asking people to choose between sub-optimal choices. The phenomenon of "group think" seems to be alive and well with this group. Here is a summary of signs of groupthink below. Asking for true feedback and considering that those who disagree aren't the enemy and might have good ideas, maybe even better ideas, is key to avoiding this problem. These are taken from a draft of my textbook on Organizational Behavior.</p> <p>I remain hopeful that it is not too late and that the great civic engagement and pride of those</p>	<p>Email</p>

	<p>of us who have made Portland what it is will not be alienated and "replaced" and displaced to make room for people we have never met. Sacrificing thriving neighborhoods such as Multnomah Village and Hillsdale to cram in more houses is just wrong. We moved here from John's Landing specifically to get away from such zoning. With the corridors and centers being so dense given the new comp plan, the impact on these neighborhoods will be immediate, detrimental, and irreversible. Rather than helping with affordable housing, it will only create a few more expensive houses at the expense of everything we hold dear in Portland.</p>	
<p>07/07</p>	<p>Hi there,</p> <p>I'm wondering what this proposed requirement means.</p> <p>It says one unit is required, and an ADU counts toward the requirement.</p> <p>I own a vacant, never developed, r2.5 lot that's 33.3' x 59' in a transit corridor.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - what does it mean to build an ADU without a house? - are you somehow going to force me to build on this lot? <p>thx</p>	<p>Email</p>
<p>07/11</p>	<p>Hi Morgan,</p> <p>You really need to correct the maps or better yet change the definition of frequent service to match Trimet's definition "buses that run every 15 minutes or better most of the day, every day." That is a much better standard of frequent service. The City standard you quote of "Service provided by public transit to a site, measured on weekdays between 7:00 AM and 8:30 AM and between 4:00 PM and 6:00 PM" is biased toward professionals who work 9 to 5 jobs, which is biased toward a whiter population with higher incomes.</p> <p>What about restaurant workers and other service industry workers or people in the trades like the roofers and landscapers or other shift workers? The City's definition of 20 minute peak does nothing for them yet they are vital to this city. Where is the equity in that? And then you have to consider females who might be afraid to wait at a bus stop in the dark. I like to ride the bus but I would not feel comfortable waiting for a half hour or more at a bus stop alone in the dark. And then if the job is not downtown, or the job location changes (house cleaners, trades people), then the transit system really falls short.</p> <p>Transit service is such a flimsy criteria for basing zoning decisions and also waiving parking requirements, because routes and schedules change or may not accommodate a large part of the population. This is not just a city for young, white millennials who can ride a bike or work downtown. There are seniors, families, shift workers who still depend on cars or who have job locations that are not served well by Trimet. You are proposing a monumental change to this City when the transit system is not ready for it.</p>	<p>Email</p>
<p>07/12</p>	<p>Hi Julia, Morgan and Sandra:</p> <p>Just now getting into reading today's emails.</p> <p>Like you, I have had a busy day with two medical appointments for my husband, attending the RIPSAC open house at Tabor Space, reading the RIP materials as well as the citizen's Residential Infill - a breach of Public Trust statement. So I'm just now getting into reading today's emails.</p>	<p>Email</p>

	<p>So back to [Name] concerns.</p> <p>Surely, you are not too late to start video taping the remaining open houses for people who work during the day, or swing shifts or graveyard shifts. I'm thinking with current no cap on rents, numerous individuals are working two jobs. So within the City that Works, whose task is it to schedule video the taping of City Council, PSC, and community events on Channel 30?</p> <p>...Residential Infill Program Manager, Morgan Tracy? ...RIPSAC Chair? ... Matt Grumm in Commissioner Dan Saltzman's Office? ... Tim Crail in Commissioner Amanda Fritz's office? ...ONI Director, Amalia Alarcon-Morris?</p> <p>I attended two open houses, where individuals fielded similar concerns and issues outlined on the citizen's Residential Infill - Breach of Public Trust.</p> <p>Take for example, the gentlemen tonight, when reminding everyone how we already spent over five (5) years reviewing the Portland Plan and Comp Plan, and now we are expected to review citizen's comment on the in-fill-middle project within two months... ?</p> <p>He asked a simple question! I also, would like to know long will We-the-People will have to respond to the Staff's RIC Summary Report?</p> <p>Lastly, during the RIP open house at Multnomah Art Center, an Attorney stood up and challenged Morgan and Sandra facilitators who did not want an open-floor Q&A. He said, "These Open Houses are in fact public meetings, and as such minutes must be taken." With that in mind, I trust at the very least, those pubic's comments posted on those flip-charts will be made available one-line throughout the next six-weeks.</p> <p>Something to think about... .</p>	
<p>07/13</p>	<p>Hi Morgan,</p> <p>If I ever think I'm going to a lot of meetings, I can just remind myself that you're going to way more (and probably more contentious ones). Thanks for doing it!</p> <p>I've been thinking that it's kind of strange (and scary to neighbors) to say that the alternative development options could include 2 ADUs, duplexes and triplexes. Is there really a difference? If we just allow 2 ADUs, could we drop the duplex and triplex language entirely (except, perhaps, at corners)? Seems to me that perhaps we could.</p> <p>Attached is an attempt at a short & sweet implementation approach that rolls together a reduction in allowed home size based on FAR and allows up to 3 units (or 4 if affordable) on a single family lot that piggy-backs on existing rules for ADUs - without using the language of duplexes or triplexes that, I think, gets people thinking about bigger and bigger structures (when in fact, the FAR limit would say those additional units have to squeeze into the same volume as a single home, perhaps with a slight amount of bonus area).</p> <p>There are plenty of pieces of the RIP that this doesn't address, like cottage clusters, R2.5 lots, row houses, skinny/narrow lots, and off-street parking. But maybe this could be part of the puzzle. And it fits on less than one page, which has to be worth something.</p> <p>Cheers,</p>	<p>Email</p>

	<p>PS - I used the red text color to indicate numbers that could easily get tuned/tweaked based on policy objectives.</p>	
<p>07/14</p>	<p>Hello, ***Please take the following comments into formal consideration as part of the City's review of its Residential Infill Project (RIP).***</p> <p>Thank you for attempting to address the concerns that the community has over residential infill developments. I've attended your open houses and have been engaged with neighborhood associations, realtors, developers and City officials along the way. From what I've gathered in my research, the proposed RIP will (among other things): limit new single family homes to 2500 sq ft, address density issues where zoning allows by allowing different development types, and regulate "skinny lots". I have reservations about the City's current proposal. I believe this proposed plan has numerous shortcomings and will result in a variety of negative, unanticipated outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fails to address Portland's housing affordability crisis in a proactive manner • Incentivizes demolitions of small affordable homes, especially in multi-family zones • Lacks mandated design criteria for new developments • Contributes to gentrification • Sacrifices the character and "soul" of existing neighborhoods to accommodate out-of-town buyers. <p>To elaborate on my concerns above, I've included three case studies with photos (see attached) of actual recent developments in North Portland. The first case highlights concerns over rapid demolitions in multi-family zones, the second addresses housing affordability issues, and the third takes a look at the need for architectural design criteria. I am requesting a written response about how each of these scenarios are expected to improve/worsen under the City's proposed infill plan. I would also appreciate a response to each bolded question below. Thank you!</p> <p>Case #1) 6113/6115 N Concord</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zone: R1 • 2013: 864 sq ft single family home sold for \$190K and demolished • 2016: Rebuilt two 1990 sq ft split lot condos; each unit sold for ~\$600K • Problem: Small, affordable homes in historically single family neighborhoods are being demolished and replaced with expensive multi-family dwellings that don't match the existing character. Adjacent neighbors are concerned every time a house in this zone goes up for sale because of the likelihood it will be demolished and replaced with a very large, multiple dwelling housing unit. These types of developments look out of place, shade out small, historic single family homes and drive up property values for adjacent homes making it harder for long-term residents to stay in their homes. Your proposed plan seems to incentivize this behavior by mandating that new developments in certain zones be replaced with two units, instead of one. How can you reassure small, single family property owners in R1 zones that they won't be driven out of their neighborhoods due to accelerated demolitions and replacements with multi-family developments? <p>Case #2) 1806 N Alberta</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zone: R5 • 2015: Small single family home sold to developer for \$235K and demolished • 2016: Rebuilt one 3200 sq ft single family home; asking price \$1.4 million • Problem: Small single family homes are actively being sold to developers who are interested only in maximizing their profits. New homes being built are too large, do not fit in with existing character of neighborhoods, and are available only to wealthy buyers. <p>While I appreciate your proposed plan will cap the size of future homes to 2500 sq ft, I</p>	<p>Email</p>

	<p>think this is still too large, as it doesn't consider basements in the overall square footage. I surmise this regulation will result in a homogeneous mix of 2500 sq ft homes. How will your plan prevent small, affordable single family units in the R5 zone from being demolished and replaced with large (2500 sq ft) homes that are out of the majority of buyers' price ranges? To ignore Portland's housing affordability crisis would be a serious missed opportunity for the RIP.</p> <p>Case #3) 6226/6248 N Concord</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zone: R1 • 2014: Small single family home sold to Dozer Construction LLC for \$260K and demolished • 2016: 2200 sq ft home built on split lot with plans to build external ADU on other half • Problem: In addition to the aforementioned problems with small, affordable housing giving way to large, unaffordable housing, this development highlights the urgent need for mandated design criteria. Put mildly, this house is an eyesore (please see before and after photos). Will your proposed plan prevent short-sighted, horrendous designs from being built in historic, charming neighborhoods? If not, I strongly urge you to incorporate design standards in your RIP regulations. Without them, we will continue to witness the degradation of the character of Portland's classic neighborhoods. <p>Thank you very much for your time responding to my concerns. I am hopeful the City will land on a final proposal that will serve existing residents and will allow for long-term growth without sacrificing Portland's integrity.</p>	
<p>07/14</p>	<p>In the Residential Infill Project Update of June 2016, the Stakeholder Advisory Committee initially acknowledges the problem current residents have asked the City to address.</p> <p>At P. 4 it states:</p> <p>“The average size of houses built in 2013 was nearly 2,700 square feet, more than 1,000 square feet larger than houses built forty years ago.”</p> <p>“While older houses are generally smaller than those being built today, it is rare for new houses to be as large as what is allowed by current code. If the trend towards larger houses continues, under current rules, future infill could be much larger than the size of typical houses today. Resulting impacts are often cause for public concern, including loss of space for yard, gardens or trees; more shading on adjacent lots; greater energy and material consumption and less neighborhood compatibility.”</p> <p>I would add that present infill built in the last 3 years has resulted in the demolition of hundreds of typical houses that are smaller, affordable and habitable. This is not a future infill problem. Just look at the good condition of the homes that are being destroyed on the portlandchronicle.com website. And with the demolition of nearly every home the lots are cleared of all mature vegetation including trees. The footprint of the new infill (one or two homes) is so large that there is little room for yard, gardens or trees. There is also more shading on adjacent lots. These new structures are often not compatible in size, scale, design or quality with the houses of its neighbors. Moreover, the most energy efficient way to provide housing is to retain the existing structure.</p> <p>In addition to the problems with demolition of current homes, the SAC acknowledges at P. 6 that the design standards need to be changed to prevent even worse development allowed under the current code.</p> <p>“Per current allowances, the maximum size of a new or remodeled house on this lot is 6,750 square feet (2,250 times three stories). However, even newer houses are not being built to this maximum allowable size. The average house built on a 5,000 square foot lot in 2013 was 2,680 square feet, while the largest house was 4,461 square feet.”</p>	<p>Email</p>

Proposals 1-3 should reduce these concerns: “Limit the size of houses while maintaining flexibility in form. Lower the house roofline. Make front setbacks consistent with setbacks on existing, immediately adjacent homes.”

While the Residential Infill Proposal of June 2016 does not address the present demolition crisis, it will only make it worse. At p. 12 of the Residential Infill Project Update of June 2016, the Stakeholder Advisory Committee puts forth its proposal for “middle housing,” proposals 4-7. The SAC claims at p. 12 that the typical houses and neighborhoods of today that current residents want to protect are the problem the City needs to address.

“The city’s housing stock, more than half of which is single houses on individual lots, presents a barrier to greater diversity. Code changes to allow more housing types in Portland’s single-dwelling zones and other areas are key to increasing a housing supply that is affordable to a broader spectrum of households.”

The SAC would expand current limited exceptions to one dwelling unit per lot to units within a quarter mile of designated centers, transit corridors within the inner ring neighborhoods. The scope of the radical rezoning of the Portland’s older neighborhoods is made clear on the map on p. 13 of the June Proposal.

While this proposal may delight developers of new infill, it undermines any faith neighbors had in the Residential Infill Project. Moreover, as the SAC acknowledges, the new houses are 1000 sq ft larger than the older homes that characterize our inner city neighborhoods. And the SAC fails to point out that the prices on new infill can be two to three times the cost of the homes that are demolished. In part this is due to the size of new infill as well as the fact that two units often occupy the former single family lot. As Restore Oregon has pointed out:

“The city has begun hosting a series of public meetings to discuss the Residential Infill Proposal that the Stakeholder Advisory Committee produced. The primary concern voiced at these meetings so far and throughout the community is that the current proposals will in fact exacerbate the demolition epidemic already occurring in Portland. If this proposal is enacted, the rezoning of neighborhoods throughout the city for infill housing, particularly “middle housing,” will change the character of Portland’s neighborhoods. It will dramatically increase infill housing with an allowance of up to three housing units on an R5 zone, a 5,000 square foot lot.”

United Neighborhoods for Reform (UNR) also opposes the middle housing proposals. A central goal of UNR is to prevent the demolition of viable, relatively affordable houses in our neighborhoods. 43 neighborhood associations throughout Portland support our resolution that includes this goal.

In its April 19, 2016 Testimony Re: City Council Comprehensive Plan Amendment P45 Middle Housing its first two objections (of 7) are:

“1) This amendment regarding middle housing is a huge change that potentially affects most of the city. To bring it into the Comp Plan at this late date is irresponsible. Middle housing deserves the same consideration as mixed use, residential infill and institutional zoning.

2) Opening this change to wide areas of the city will make thousands of smaller, viable, older, relatively affordable homes vulnerable to demolition. We question whether even

	<p>smaller new houses will be as affordable, or as well built, as many currently existing houses.” The middle housing proposal should be dropped from the Residential Infill Project now.</p>	
07/15	<p>It was not easy to submit comments online so I am sending them directly.</p> <p>In general, I support the staff proposal for the Residential Infill Project. I think it is smart policy to limit the scale of new homes while proposing to allow smaller, more affordable units within a smaller building envelope. From an affordability, historic preservation, and neighborhood livability perspective these are good code reforms. I would support expanding these reforms to make all single-family zones in the City more inclusive while making it more financially feasible to reuse existing, historic structures.</p> <p>However the proposal does not address issue of preserving of large healthy trees in residential zones. I think it is a mistake to not address tree preservation while the City is making such a significant change to residential zones.</p> <p>I urge the City to incorporate the following into Residential Infill Project staff proposal:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Allow an additional bonus dwelling unit within allowed building footprint or additional square footage within the allowed building footprint in exchange for extra tree preservation - preserving one or more large healthy trees (30" or greater including root protection zones required by Title 11). The staff proposal already allows bonus units in exchange an affordable unit, a handicap accessible unit, or that preserves an existing house. The City should also allow such a bonus for tree preservation too.] 2. Instead of simply "retaining current side and rear setback minimums allow adjustment of setbacks in exchange of preservation of one or more large healthy trees (30" or greater including root protection zones required by Title 11) that would otherwise have to be removed. 3. Instead of simply "retaining current parking requirements for all houses on standard lots" allow for parking requirements to be waived in exchange for preservation of one or more large healthy trees (30" or greater including root protection zones required by Title 11) that would otherwise have to be removed. <p>A version of all these reforms were part of the Title 11 Oversight Advisory COmmittee recommendations to eliminate the barriers to tree preservation.</p> <p>Finally, the City Council needs to move swiftly to develop a site review process for large healthy trees, also proposed by the Title 11 OAC. Where we have exceptionally large or unique trees, the burden needs to be on the developer to demonstrate a large healthy tree needs to be removed in order to meet desired density. This would be entirely consistent with the stated purpose of Title 11 to preserve trees that can be preserved with new development. Ideally this would have happened or at least started before the RIP reforms go into place.</p> <p>"The real work of planet saving will be small, humble, and humbling... Its jobs will be too many to count, too many to report, too many to be publicly noticed or rewarded, too small to make anyone rich or famous."</p> <p>- Wendell Berry</p>	Email
07/16	Morgan,	Email

	<p>i haven't heard if the format worked any better at the other open houses, do you think it did?</p> <p>I did see that BPS has a specific event to reach out to older folks and people with disabilities. This is great.</p> <p>I felt that the majority of the crowd I saw at the open house was older white homeowners. I think that BPS should be doing outreach specifically to: young people, renters, people of color, and low income households. I suspect you have an idea of the demographics you are reaching and I would bet my weekly pay that older citizens are far more disproportionately represented than any of those groups.</p> <p>Thanks for your reply.</p>	
<p>07/18</p>	<p>This supplements my July 14, 2016 letter opposing Proposals 4-7 in the Residential Infill Project Update of June 2016. I attended the July 14, 2016 BPS meeting at the German American Society. BPS staff seemed more concerned with accommodating the preferences of future residents over those of present residents by referring to the future residents' rights to buy new houses in old neighborhoods.</p> <p>To accommodate future residents, BPS offers Proposals 4-7 for middle housing. At the meeting BPS admitted that these proposals would increase density in one-half of the 45% of the city area zoned for single dwelling development (see map on p. 13 of the June Update). This will encourage demolitions in these neighborhoods.</p> <p>In a January 28, 2014 article entitled "The Impact of Oregon's Increasing Demolition Trend" By: Brandon Spencer-Hartle on the restoreoregon.org website, Mr. Hartle documents the negative impact of Oregon's increasing demolition trend on our neighborhoods. "Because design review isn't required in most established neighborhoods, much of the new construction that follows the demolitions is not compatible with the character of the neighborhood around it. . . The average residential building demolished in Portland in recent years was built in 1927."</p> <p>"Retaining the integrity and continuity of traditional neighborhoods is a significant concern for Restore Oregon," says Executive Director Peggy Moretti. "We need to be careful that in the name of density, we aren't sacrificing quality, character, and our unique sense of place. Without thoughtful urban planning and community involvement, some of Oregon's most livable neighborhoods could be lost in the next ten years."</p> <p>"The current tear-down trend across Oregon should cause pause for any environmentally-conscious Oregonian because the demolition of buildings amounts to a staggering amount of embodied energy that is literally being thrown away. Every time we raze an older house and replace it with a new, more energy efficient one, it takes an average of 50 years to recover the climate change impacts related to its demolition."</p> <p>"According to a recent national study, "If the city of Portland were to retrofit and reuse the single-family homes and commercial office buildings that it is otherwise likely to demolish over the next 10 years, the potential impact reduction would total approximately 231,000 metric tons of CO2 – approximately 15% of [Multnomah County's] total CO2 reduction targets over the next decade."</p> <p>In an Oct 7, 2015, article entitled "The State of Demolition in Portland" By: Brandon</p>	<p>Email</p>

	<p>Spencer-Hartle on the restoreoregon.org website, Mr. Hartle updated his January 28, 2014 letter.</p> <p>“Using data compiled from the demolition applications, PortlandMaps, and the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability, the 172 demolitions that occurred from April 27 to October 5 had the following average characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Built in 1930 • 1,340 square feet in size • Generated 58,558 pounds of landfill waste upon demolition (not including recycled materials) <p>Assuming that 400 houses are indeed demolished in Portland this year, it will mean that 23 million pounds of waste will end up in Oregon’s landfills. That’s the equivalent of sending 2.5 billion pieces of paper to the landfill!”</p> <p>The City’s first priority should be to reduce the avoidable climate change impacts of development and preserve our existing neighborhoods, homes and vegetation. Back yard habitat certification of existing homes should be supported and encouraged. Before considering Proposals 4-7, the City should update its historic resource inventory, begin public review of demolitions, require deconstruction when a home cannot be saved (not just for pre-1917 homes), adopt Proposals 1-3 to reduce the pressure to build larger homes, tax landfill waste, remove hurdles to relocation and provide financial incentives for preserving existing homes. See Mr. Hartles January 28, 2014 article cited above.</p> <p>Only after these actions are in place should the City consider adopting only the first element of Proposal 4, allowing two ADUs per house existing in 2016, one internal and one detached, not for new construction. This should encourage the preservation of existing houses rather than their demolition. The City could also assist with fee waivers, such as the current ADU waiver, for houses existing in 2016 only. This will result in more affordable housing than continuing to demolish existing homes and building pairs of \$600-800,000 townhomes in their place.</p> <p>If the City is serious about providing low income families housing in the inner ring neighborhoods, it will do so by supporting Proud Ground and equivalent housing subsidy programs. It could also apply inclusionary zoning in current multi dwelling zones to subsidize housing in buildings of 20 or more units.</p>	
<p>07/18</p>	<p>I have lived in the Belmont/Sunnyside area for 33 years. This neighborhood has gone to hell in a hand basket. We have a 138 unit apartment building with 30 parking spaces a block away. PARKING IS NON EXISTENT. Most of us in this area have no garages or driveways because the homes were built in the early 1900's-1930. I know of one 2 bedroom apartment that has 4 tenants all with cars.</p> <p>We have glass boxes on every arterial in inner SE most with no parking. We have fine restaurants in this area but there is no parking for patrons. They are so screwed if they have a 5 year lease.</p> <p>We do not need more skinny houses. The houses that were originally built were quality built and fit the neighborhood unlike the Craftsman wanna-bes that Vic Remmers or Randy Sebastian are building. That is one of the main reasons people desire to live in our inner neighborhoods. We receive many letters to buy our houses for cash--one company told me</p>	<p>Email</p>

	<p>they send out 1000 per month. I told them as a Realtor they would have to pay me a commission of 10% and a price tag of \$1 million and I may consider it. My lot is 50 x 50 and would not be able to be developed.</p> <p>Those of us that live here are trying to maintain some semblance of quality in our inner neighborhoods and are vehemently opposed to Vic Remmers building a skinny house on Peacock Lane. Instead we have stolen cars, stolen items off porches, rampant homeless, theft of all kinds. Larceny alone is now 61% in Sunnyside. It is not a nice place to live anymore</p> <p>By the way I am a Realtor of 34 years so I know better than most what is happening in our area. Violation or skirting of codes for demolition, lead and/or asbestos abatement, destruction of our tree cover are rampant. I also have a deaf daughter whose subsidized rent is 70% of her SS. One of her deaf friends would be homeless but she lives with me. Two of her other friends live in his parents heated garage. This is too damn close and personal. This is people's lives you are dealing with and the quality of that life.</p>	
<p>07/18</p>	<p>Mary Ann, Here are a couple of thoughts. Feel free to pass them on. One of the arguments against requiring an off-street parking pad is that a curb cut takes away parking on the street, but for who? The car that belongs to the house it is sitting in front of or a car stored there from the 50, 60 or 70 unit apartment house around the corner that has no or inadequate parking? The city needs to require off-street parking not only for skinny lots but also for large multi-unit residential buildings.</p> <p>The argument for not allowing garages with skinny house on skinny lots is they are ugly. In who's eyes are they ugly? Ugly is a subjective opinion. If the garage door is insulated with windows and the opening is sealed from the outside, the garage space could either be used to park a car in or as a multi-purpose room giving the household a choice of use.</p> <p>Finally, one reason given for allowing middle housing in single family home in neighborhoods is because that is where people want to live. So instead of destroying and demolishing homes in reasonably dense neighborhoods that have taken decades to develop, why not create these same kinds of neighborhoods in areas that have flag lots and other available land. That certainly is better than destroying a village in order to save it.</p>	<p>Email</p>
<p>07/19</p>	<p>Dear Mr. Tracy and Ms. Gisler,</p> <p>When I first read about the proposed zoning changes, in the online survey, they seemed like reasonable proposals that would affect a few high-traffic areas. ADU's provide housing, and the house-size limits are a good idea, but they could be tweaked to fit different neighborhoods. However, I'm concerned after seeing the Maps section, where it's clear that an overwhelmingly-large proportion of the city would be affected, as shown below in a copy of the interactive map that results from selecting options for all four proposed changes (see note "*" at end of letter)</p> <p>he survey states that the "new Comprehensive Plan encourages relatively smaller and more affordable housing near Centers and Corridors and within Inner Ring neighborhoods." These changes could unleash a frenzy of demolition and development that would irreparably destroy the city's "livability" while preparing conditions for an epidemic of foreclosures in the next economic downturn. Neighborhoods would be changed beyond recognition without any assurance that the supply of affordable housing would increase. There has to be a better set of rules to promote affordability—the current proposals leave too many loopholes that</p>	<p>Email</p>

	<p>provide opportunities for a quick-buck at the expense of livable neighborhoods.</p> <p>I specifically oppose the expansion of “Centers and Corridors” to include all areas within a quarter-mile of them, and the proposal for “Cottage cluster development”, since those together cover almost all the city. In addition to specific concerns about “infill,” the whole project is premature, if not unfeasible, because there is no equivalent attention to the infrastructure that is needed to accommodate the large predicted increase in population. Infrastructure includes “public facility systems [that] provide water, sewer, transportation;” access to “public services [that] include ... public transportation and police, fire, and emergency response; in addition, services such as access to broadband technology, electricity and natural gas, and comprehensive waste, recycling, and composting services are essential for households and businesses.” [quotes are from page GP-1, 2035 Comprehensive Plan, June 2016].</p> <p>* People who read the maps quickly might not notice that the use of colors changes on the interactive maps. The basic map includes a KEY to the map’s colors, but some colors on the interactive maps indicate different categories than they do in the KEY. The color yellow, which is keyed as “Single-dwelling Residential” on the basic map, indicates “Centers and Corridors” on the interactive map for that potential change, and green, keyed as “Open Space” on the basic map, indicates “Cottage cluster development” on the interactive map.</p> <p>Two proposed changes, “Centers and Corridors” and “Cottage cluster development,” affect almost the entire map of the city, with most of the unaffected areas being non-residential categories such as Industrial/Employment, or Open Space (parks, etc.). What does this mean? It seems to mean that, in most areas of the city, the proposed changes could allow someone to replace a single-family house with multiple units. According to the survey, areas “near Centers and Corridors” could “allow duplexes on all lots and triplexes on corner lots” [<u>underline added</u>]. And, for any lot over 10,000 square feet, “cottage clusters” would be allowed, and the review process for them would be “reduced.” The remaining category for proposed conversion to multiple housing units is the now-invisible “narrow lots,” which were doubled or tripled in the past as one lot with one house. Again, these four categories together cover almost the entire residential area of the city, overlapping in many neighborhoods (e.g., see Sunnyside).</p>	
<p>07/21</p>	<p>Hi Julia, hope you are well.</p> <p>This isn’t about the Port, but rather about zoning and my role as co-chair of the NWDA Planning Committee. The committee is trying to understand this “housing in the middle” conversation and struggling with the lack of empirical data and analysis that would show that increasing the density in R5 zones would do anything toward alleviating the cost of housing in Portland. Can you point me to any economic studies that have been done for the infill housing project or other projects that address the housing economic conditions in a qualitative way? The City has a huge capacity for additional housing of many types given the current zoning, as born out in the EOA. What does adding more capacity in the single family R5 zone do when capacity is already beyond sufficient?</p> <p>One example that comes to mind involves the discussion of courtyard housing and the like in R1 or R2 zones. Has the City done an analysis of how much R1 zoning there is and how much of it has been built on to the density standards? My anecdotal experience is that we have plenty of R1/Courtyard housing zoning in NW and no one is utilizing the zoning. I think much of the hesitancy has to do with the structure of the lending market, the price of property, construction costs and the complexity of condo ownership vs. single family vs. apartments. The question to ask is why isn’t more being done in the zones we have? I’d</p>	<p>Email</p>

	<p>want a thorough answer to this before messing with the foundation of Portland’s very successful single family residential areas.</p> <p>I am struggling to believe that additional density allowances in the R5 zones will result in lower housing costs. It would seem that the experience of Vancouver, BC, would indicate that this tool (allowing 2-3 units on a site that previously held only one) is not useful in lowering for-sale housing costs. What data is BPS, PSC and City Council using to pursue what seems to be a wishful thinking approach to housing mix, supply, and costs?</p>	
<p>07/22</p>	<p>Hi there,</p> <p>I am a resident of the Maplewood Neighborhood. My husband and I just spent part of our evening reviewing the infill plan. We can't find info about home demolitions or anything about the environmental impact of increasing density to this level. Currently we enjoy a fairly dense tree canopy and all of the benefits trees provide. While I am a proponent of infill in order to preserve Oregon's farm and forest lands, I don't think it should be done at the expense of nature within the city - and park space isn't enough to provide for habitat to sustain birds and wildlife in the city.</p> <p>Please direct me toward this information or let me know what I can do to advocate for a balanced approach to Portland development.</p>	<p>Email</p>
<p>07/26</p>	<p>Dear Morgan Tracy and Members of the Residential Infill Project team,</p> <p>Having read the online materials regarding the Residential Infill Project, filled out the online questionnaire, and examined several public responses to the current proposals, I write to encourage the project team to give additional, serious consideration to incorporating the preservation of our urban tree canopy to all of your proposals.</p> <p>I note with dismay, the general lack of large, healthy trees in any of the graphics included in the only materials provided by the project team. While this may call attention to house size & height, or setback from the street and property lines, it also infers that suburban designs in previously cultivated fields were the models for your infill proposals.</p> <p>To make my point regarding the vital role that residential trees (and certainly not just the street trees) play in preserving and sustaining Portland's livability, I submit for your consideration two photos of a lot in southeast Portland. Until only recently, it was the environment captured by the first photo (taken in 2011). At least eight trees can be counted on the very border on the lot (which is probably a 75 x 100 lot). None of those trees reach the diameter of exceptional trees covered by recent changes to Title 11. However, take away half or all of those trees, and you dramatically change the entire environment of not one lot but the whole block.</p> <p>Maintaining the original house (in photo 1) might have been possible had the project team's new proposals been in effect. However, as you can see from photo #2, that sound and spacious house was demolished.</p> <p>Currently, the developer also plans on cutting down all of the trees, when only one of them reaches onto the property at any distance.</p> <p>I sincerely urge the project team and the City Council to bring our urban canopy back into all of your planning and proposals. A very simple thought experiment should help one understand why this is vital: Just erase 1/4 of the trees in Portland's residential neighborhoods (as developers are</p>	<p>Email</p>

	<p>currently doing in many) and note seriously how that changes not only our immediate, but the long-term economic viability and sustainability of the city of Portland. Please long beyond immediate profits for developers and plan for a Portland that is NOT "stump town."</p>	
07/28	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to learn and respond to work regarding residential infill. I did complete the survey but I want to also add a voice to concerns over Parking and our Roads.</p> <p>As we add infill housing, how do we accommodate new drivers on our already very busy roads and streets?. We apparently don't have the money to fix what is already broken and in disrepair. Potholes and inadequate safety routes are now the norm. And all those potholes lead to log jams of cars trying to navigate.</p> <p>The interstates are packed and slow. but add 200,000 more cars to that mix! Yes public transportation is available but people STILL drive. All the great transportation wont solve that.</p> <p>Parking in neighborhoods especially around business centers is almost impossible in some areas. Off street parking for infill should be a priority.</p> <p>We cant work on infill issues without addressing transportation. Thanks for all of your listening and for the opportunity to do so</p>	Email
07/28	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I live in Eliot and my large lot (9,375 s.f) has been changed from R2a zoning to R2.5 in the new comp plan.I have an existing 1910 duplex on front side portion of this lot. There is a lot of empty land that could provide housing on my property.</p> <p>With my current zoning and bonus density I would be allowed up to 6 units on this land without dividing it. I would like to see something in the infill project that will preserve the right to build on this property without dividing it. This could be as simple as allowing more than 1 external A.D.U. for duplexes on large lots depending on the square footage of their property. Another option might be reconsidering the firm 10,000 sf guideline for cottage clusters. I do believe there should also be reconsideration for height limits in R2.5.</p>	Email
07/29	<p>I recently heard about the infill changes being proposed for Portland and found that the comments I was gathering as I went through the presentation did not fit in the 150 spaces allotted. I would like to give them to you to pass on. Please let me know if you can do that, and if not, where I can go to voice my concerns.</p> <p>Thank you, Sue</p> <p>Comments on Infill Proposal July 2016</p> <p>I am wondering why there is an estimate of 25% less households with children in Portland in the next 20 years? Portland has always been known as a good place to raise kids. I'd like to do what it takes to stay that way, not plan for a childless city.</p> <p>Will all single dwelling neighborhoods be effected or just some (mostly with less income)? How is this decided and what can we do to make sure that this does not mostly allow for overcrowded development for poorer neighborhoods while wealthier ones remain untouched and unconnected to this process?</p>	Email

	<p>I understand not forcing skinny houses to have garages and parking, but in many cases, the parking helps. There is already not enough parking in this town given our current transportation system. Skip the forced, unattractive garages on skinny houses but keep the parking spots unless they really do interfere with street parking- maybe take measurements on an individual basis to make sure it makes sense instead of a one size fits all approach.</p> <p>We happen to have a 2.5 lot in a neighborhood of .5 houses. It is not on a corner, it is one in from a corner. I would hate for anyone to "force" me to put another house on what is currently my garden and back yard, where my kids play every day. That is an unfair burden to people who really want to live here long term and let their kids grow up here- but again, the fact that this plan estimates that there will be 25% less families in Portland and no one seems to think this is a problem is a problem in itself. I think the future of the human race depends on the type of kids we are raising here in portland who are part of an urban area, yet mindful of the earth. This doesn't happen on concrete slabs and infill, it happens in natural backyard spaces. I always want there to be room for kids in my neighborhood. I don't want it to be only single people or couples who move in and move out every two years and airbnb travelers coming and going constantly, which is what this kind of planning pushes our neighborhoods towards. Lets be honest, do most adus help with providing "equity" or do they just help people cash in on all the great things that Portlanders have built over the years without providing more housing? We should plan for the future we want, not what the graphs and pie charts are telling us we should swallow.</p> <p>I am concerned in general with planning for increased population growth in housing without an equally significant increased roads, highways and transportation. Big cities like NY can have so many dense residential buildings largely because they have an extensive subway system that does not take up above ground space. We have nothing like that here and keep imagining that bicycles will solve this transportation problem when in reality it still rains most of the year, making full time/no car bike commuters a rarity. Unless people can truly ditch their cars in this town, why are we clogging our already skinny roads and small highways more by creating more housing that's still hard to get to even close in? This amount of housing/development is unrealistic, mostly beneficial to developers and very damaging to the quality of life that people want to move here to experience.</p> <p>If we over develop, all we'll be left with here is another typical American city with poor planning, irritated residents and more pollution, and then people will just move somewhere else anyway. I'll be honest, if I just wanted to build up and cash out, I'd be so happy with this plan right now. Unfortunately, I don't. I've raised my kids here and want to grow old here, and I think there should be a place for that too.</p> <p>This is one of the best places on earth. Please don't ruin it.</p> <p>---</p> <p>Thanks for listening. I'd love any kind of feedback you could provide, and involvement in future events.</p>	
07/31	<p>I have read and evaluated the residential infill proposals with a perspective on the historical development of Portland, that transportation drives development. Portland downtown developed because the western bank of the Willamette River could moor deep draft ships. The east side languished until the railroads were developed, and the "complete" neighborhoods of SE Portland in highest demand today developed along streetcar lines. Post World War II neighborhoods and suburbs grew with total dependence on the automobile. I believe Portland is at a historical turning point, where population density, congestion, and the availability of other forms of transportation will make personal auto use undesirable. Other city endeavors have encouraged this transition- light rail, streetcar, bike lanes, and pedestrian improvements. I believe that the Residential Infill proposal must</p>	Email

	<p>continue this trend in order to be successful for the next generation. My sense is that it mostly does, while protecting neighborhood livability.</p> <p>I think the proposal fails when it limits its “middle housing” recommendations to areas within ¼ mile of Centers and Corridors. This is an error because density drives development of local centers and transportation options increase only in dense neighborhoods. If “middle housing” is limited to current centers and corridors, only those neighborhoods will develop the qualities of the “streetcar” neighborhoods that are so much in demand today. Portland may not lack housing as much as it lacks desirable neighborhoods to locate homes. Give areas such as far Southwest Portland and all of East County a chance to grow into desirable neighborhoods; apply the “middle housing” proposals to the entire city.</p> <p>This is also an equity issue. Restricting the location of “middle housing” will put the burdens and benefits of density onto fewer neighborhoods.</p> <p>The narrow lot proposals are focused on only a small number of neighborhoods, but they will have a large impact, particularly with parking. Nevertheless I applaud the elimination of front garages and driveways. More and more homes need only one car, and street parking is preserved by eliminating curb cuts. This proposal effectively limits each skinny house to one car. This is appropriate; more parking also means more cars on the road.</p> <p>The concept of “Floor Area Ratio” is brilliant. It solves problems of scale in an easily understandable way. However, the devil is in the details, and I want to see clear descriptions of when attic and basement space must be included in the square footage totals. Loose regulation will make Floor Area Ratios meaningless.</p> <p>I also approve of the flexibility in front setbacks. The proposal would be improved by allowing flexibility for significant tree preservation, as well as to match the appearance of adjacent homes. It should require greater setback to preserve trees at the front of properties, and allow less front setback to preserve trees in the rear.</p> <p>Overall I commend the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability and the Stakeholder Advisory Committee for developing a proposal that responds to the public’s concerns about affordability, oversized houses, and lack of housing choices. It returns the city to a growth pattern that formed our most desirable neighborhoods independent of the automobile. Not everyone will like this, but I feel it is the right direction to guide city development for the next generation.</p>	
<p>08/01</p>	<p>Greetings!</p> <p>Please regard this brief note as a statement of categorical opposition to the proposed infill plan as it pertains to neighborhoods currently zoned as single-family (with a small number of currently permitted duplexes in specific locations).</p> <p>There are many reasons why I do not support it, but in the interest of brevity, I will note only a few. These primarily pertain to the effects of increased population density and unaccounted costs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1). School enrollment: how will expansion of classrooms and hiring of additional teachers be paid for once higher-density has been achieved? 2). How will sewer-line capacity be paid for? 3). How is the city planning to deal with the increased automobile traffic on side-streets 	<p>Email</p>

	<p>currently designated as bike routes?</p> <p>4). How will cyclist safety on bike routes be assured if more vehicles are parked on both sides of the streets and traffic is therefore funneled into a smaller passageway? Anticipating a possible answer, it's not reasonable to assume that all/most/many new residents will not have cars and off-street parking is not required in most cases.</p> <p>5). What plans does the city have for dealing with increased use of parklands?</p> <p>6). If new, high-density construction is permitted along current "transportation corridors", how will these arterial traffic conduits be expanded when future needs demand it?</p> <p>7). If new and "low-cost" duplexes, triplexes, court-apartments are allowed in neighborhoods currently considered "high-value" for tax purposes are built and property values for adjacent or nearby single-family homes decrease, how will the city adjust property taxes and what steps will be taken to compensate for the lower municipal tax basis?</p> <p>Finally, and importantly, the plan fails to consider sentiments of the single-family neighborhoods primarily impacted. It seems dubious that, in the interest of potential residents of Portland, that the interests and concerns of current residents should be ignored. Certainly, before implementation, the consequences as well as the putative benefits of the proposal should be carefully considered, a cost:benefit analysis should be performed; alternatives should be considered; official city representatives should attend neighborhood association meetings; and a more concerted effort at publicizing the program in non-technical jargon should be made.</p>	
08/01	<p>One of the critical aspects to building a highly energy efficient home is through the use of super-insulation. Oftentimes designers and builders of these types of homes- homes that can use up to 90% less energy for heating and cooling than comparable code homes- run into barriers with building size restrictions when trying to add additional insulation. Adding an additional 12" of space for insulation in a roof assembly and trying to squeeze it into a height setback can result in small ceiling heights, adding extra insulation to a wall assembly can limit the amount of space for a typical floorplan- especially in smaller buildings or ADU's thus rendering it impossible or extremely hard to create a truly energy efficient home that people want to live in.</p>	Email
08/02	<p>Task 5 Comp Plan 2035 slated to change the minimum density of the single dwelling per lot zones across the 95 neighborhoods. New Residential single homes will be required to be in lots of 10 units per acre. I'm thinking great for Gateway and Cully Neighborhoods.</p> <p>While I can't speak to RNA number of units per acre, SNA has 19.2 units per acre. This is one more fast tracked agenda to finish prior to Mayor Hales leaving office. Note, BPS Project Timeline, July 2015 to January 2015. Public Participation for public feedback is between June 15 and August 15. Furthermore, many ONI 95 neighborhood associations do not meet during the summer.</p> <p>Personally, I felt blindsided attending the recent quarter-mile (5-blocks) mapping Mixe Use Zones Projects, eliminating drive-thru, a 180 flip-flop on building structures -- no step backs to allow sunlight into the immediate neighbors kitchen garden. Think about 50 years out -- knowing a four story condo/commercial building shadow preventing solar energy heating their home. When I asked the SB 5133 inclusionary housing MFI 80% bonus question -- I was told that was a State Issue.</p> <p>In Sunnyside Historic Neighborhood served by the Trolley, we wanted building heights along SE Belmont Street not to exceed 3 floors. Albeit, thanks to inclusionary housings bonus written within the SB 5133, depending on the # of subsidized housing units,</p>	Email

	<p>Developer "by right" can add up to three additional floors. ANYWHERE IN THE CITY!</p> <p>Made worse recently, when PSC voted to eliminate condo's design whereby, the roof stepped down toward immediate neighbors back yard(s). Why? Once again, Developers highly skilled Lobbyist were heard — very few citizens pay close attention to the PSC agendas.</p> <p>Take for example: Everyone for Portland, a project of 1000 Friends of Oregon have resources to hire highly skilled Attorney and Project Manager to attend RIPSAC open houses.</p> <p>VS United Neighborhoods for Reform volunteers. Most of whom work full-time therefore unable to attend day-time events.</p> <p>In my humble opinion another socioeconomic equity issue. Where the Neighborhoods get TRICKED and the Developers gets TREATED.</p> <p>In closing, rumor has it, the Grinch will sell the remanent lot for \$350,000. Peacock Lane is in process of fundraising to keep a three story cereal box from being constructed between two English Cottages. I'm sharing this article on Peacock Lane!! It's not looking good for 522 SE Peacock lane.</p> <p>Mayor Hales needs to stop this nonsense and he needs to go he has done more than enough damage to Portland. http://www.antiquehomestyle.com/primary-...”</p>	
<p>08/02</p>	<p>What I find missing in the photos below were parks, schools, and bright orange Nike Biketown Stations.</p> <p>But then BDS and PSC focus has been “in-fill-middle” Developer’s “by-right” to welcome 260,000 new comers to Portland by 2035. Let’s stop the clock, and start working to create 20-minute walk-able commercial hubs within the Cully, Gateway, and East Portland neighborhoods.</p> <p>Let’s not let BCA’s losing a full-service grocery history repeat itself. Did I fail to mention when Mr. Yann, Kienows owner died, QFC purchased 12 of his 14 stores? The two serving 0-30% households were his “community service gift" to the Buckman and NW 23rd retirees. In fact, when a Mr. Coffee pot left on over heated in the East Burnside store, — until repairs were completed, Mr. Yann provided Tri-Met bus service twice-a-week to the Buckman Store.</p> <p>Fast-forward: For some 20-years and counting, short of quick pick-up items in the Plaid Pantry — many Buckman residents continue to shop Safeway, Fred Meyers and New Seasons on Hawthorne Blvd. Yes, as evidenced by the number of shopping carts on the Tri-Met #14 Hawthorne Bus. Surely, eagerly waiting the full-service store opens on the Goat Blocks.</p> <p>Please let’s work to provide full-service grocery stores, libraries, and parks to welcome METRO’s 260,000 newcomers moving into condos, single family dwelling in the Cully, Gateway, and East Portland sooner than later.</p> <p>Worth repeating: Did you know? Although is may not be readily apparent, middle housing is not new to</p>	<p>Email</p>

	<p>SUNNYSIDE. In fact, this type of housing is prevalent in several of Portland’s historic neighborhoods. [— including “Proud Past — Bright Future” 1888 — 2016 Sunnyside]. However, in most cases, the current [post WWII Baby Boomer 1958] zoning doesn’t allow middle housing to be built in areas zoned for single dwellings today.</p> <p>Recently, City Council approved adding detached ADU’s on single dwelling lots, and approving rehabbing the garage. Parents live in the new smaller unit, and their adult children move in the main house. Yes, this concept has served many families living in the HAND neighborhood for many years.</p> <p>In closing, let’s find a grant to hire and teach visual arts students how to create beautiful murals featured in the link below. And let’s hope the Arts in the Schools Tax is able to provide mural paints to visual arts teachers in middle and high school in the near future... . Whoops, I digress ; >))</p>	
<p>08/02</p>	<p>Good Morning Commissioner Saltzman, et al:</p> <p>Yes, I understand that City Council is now considering what areas of Portland could accommodate middle housing options in the future. No [ORD] rezoning is being proposed at this time. The good news is knowing Council may direct staff to begin studying potential areas to broaden opportunities for middle house development. Meantime, the public’s input is needed by 5:00 p.m. on Monday, August 15, 2016.</p> <p>Lets bring back the MORE "Affordable" Housing topic front and center. Yes, this is what I would term social engineering when Portland's politicians on all levels of government fail to listen to those of us Voters who put them into office. For starters, take City Council, for example. Housing Commissioner Dan Saltzman screened those “volunteers” serving on the RICSAC based on their expertise. In nine months, no mention about impacts on classrooms in neighborhood schools. Granted, of the 24 RIPSAC selected 18 were Developers who will benefit financially by the "in-fill-middle policy they designed — Something BCA Chair Susan Lindsay stated during their last public hearing in the 1900 Building. Did I fail to mention including the Grinch on Peacock Lane?</p> <p>To their credit, BPS Planners did their best to invite the public to attend RIP open houses between June 15 - August 15. I might add, despite the fact most Neighborhood Associations do not meet over the summer, open houses were well attended.</p> <p>One take-away worth repeating: Did you know? Although it may not be readily apparent, middle housing is prevalent in several of Portland's historic neighborhoods. However, in most cases, the current zoning codes doesn't allow MIDDLE HOUSING to be build in areas zoned for single dwellings today.</p> <p>Now, as for today’s Missing Middle, — City Council — DID YOU KNOW that since 1958 post WWII post baby-boomers, former Planner, Lloyd L. Keefe sited many pubic school and parks throughout 95 neighborhoods — yes, centered away from traffic corridors. He also established the current areas zoned for single dwellings. Surely, you remember approving ADU on single dwelling lots several months ago... .</p> <p>Currently, Developers “BY-RIGHT” have been constructing ADUs. Planners suggest we wonder the streets around Hawthorne, Laurelhurst, or SUNNYSIDE, and you will see the reminders of earlier plans that allowed for duplexes, bungalow courtyards, and small (two-</p>	<p>Email</p>

	<p>story) apartment buildings nestled comfortable alongside single-family homes. I fully support, dwellings generally [indicates loophole for Developer] built at the same scale — SIZE, HEIGHT, SETBACKS — as single-family homes, so it feels integrated into the neighborhood.</p> <p>Did I fail to mention five (5) realtors have been fishing for the Schwab’s remanent size CORNER lot? I can’t imaging the Developer de-constructing this 1908 bungalow and replacing it with a three story triplex with no on site parking. We "Older American" are not aware that our lot is worth more than the house. The gold rush is on with Developers mining for Cheap Dirt. Nor can I image the Grinch “by-right” plans to construct a three-story cereal box between two English Cottages on Peacock Lane. Blindsiding the magic of the holidays when children walk through the story book pages of Hansel and Gretel. Nor are their young voices taken into consideration, or acknowledge that for generations Peacock Lane property owners have hosted Portlanders during the holidays between December 15 - January 1st.</p> <p>Sharing this article on Peacock Lane!! It's not looking good for 522 SE Peacock lane. http://www.antiquehomestyle.com/primary-sources/american-builder/peacock-lane.htm</p> <p>By the way the Grinch is the same Developer who held three sequoias hostage in Eastmoreland — penciled out expected profit — walked to the bank — without picking up a hammer hitting a sixteen penny nail. Rumor has it, his \$15,000 remanent lot penciled in at \$350,000. Peacock Lane property owners are now fund-raising. To quote, when Commissioner Steve Novick was voting to approve welcoming UBER taxi services on Portland Streets — “... let the market decide on fares ... !” So much for his respecting the character charm on Peacock Lane.</p> <p>Today, we are at a threshold = to when in 1970s citizens stopped the Mt. Hood Freeway while single family homes were demolished and replaced by two-block-long driveways along SE Powell Blvd. Yes, Portland is growing and our housing needs are changing — but not to the point destroying historic inner-southeast neighborhoods; e.g., Sunnyside 19.2 pre acre now. So might I suggest Mayor Hales, City Commissioners, Novick, Fritz, and Fish join MAS efforts to strongly encourage Commissioner Dan Saltzman to instruct the BPS and PSC to shift their Residential Infill Project focus toward the Cully, Gateway, and East Portland neighborhoods? Thank you.</p>	
<p>08/03</p>	<p>I think the City's proposal is very good. I'm particularly fond of any regulatory techniques that can be used to help foster more small, infill dwelling units. My general sense is that it is perverse and ultimately exclusive to have such a dominant SFD zone in the center of a growing metropolitan region. Thus, I think the most important policies related to the allowance of duplexes and triplexes. However, it would be fine to simply use additional ADUs entitlements as a proxy to achieve this.</p> <p>In light of the taxation rule that was recently published, it appears that the addition of 2 or 3 ADUs would not trigger a land value reassessment, whereas a duplex or triplex would. https://www.oregon.gov/DOR/about/Rules/PropertyTax-Permanent_filing_20160728.pdf</p> <p>The only alteration I would suggest to the current scope is to remove the 1/4 mile from transit threshold, and make the changes City-wide, which creates more equity and opportunity for less well served parts of the city, east of 82nd.</p> <p>For those who truly wish to live in SFD exclusive area, most HOAs restrict development to</p>	<p>Email</p>

	<p>SFD, so there's plenty of housing stock and neighborhoods that will remain in this category. Or, future residents who seek that type of neighborhood can opt to live in a town where the economics better support this type of low density development. Given current and future land values in Portland, the economics no longer make sense to restrict to this single use.</p>	
<p>08/05</p>	<p>Please note my complete support for the increased density goal of the project. As an active and supporting member of Passive House Northwest I am concerned that exceptions be allowed for super-insulated structures and for overhang limitations to allow for proper shading.</p>	<p>Email</p>
<p>08/06</p>	<p>The underlying premise of the debate related to infill in single family zoned neighborhoods are the homeowners whom want to protect the livability and character of the neighborhood they bought into verses the outside developers that want to come in and make a profit by tearing something down and then building something else that doesn't quite fit in. Moreover, that something else is likely to have with an over all cost that is more than twice as much than what it replaces, and a tax assessment value that reflects the new selling price market value. The most affordable homes are he ones that are already built.</p> <p>Do the planners and elected officials really care about the homeowners in the majority of Portland's single family home neighborhoods, or do they just want to collect the property taxes and only care about the neighborhoods in which they live? Similar concerns have been expressed at numerous neighborhood meetings. For seniors facing gentrification, aging in community is not the same as aging in place. Unlike the direction of the RIP process stacked with developer interests and BPS staff steering the dialogue towards adding density, the preservation of single family neighborhoods needs to be top priority. There is currently plenty of land zoned for higher density that has not reached its zoned potential. The expectation that every person in Portland will have their optimum type and location of housing is unrealistic.</p> <p>Missing from the RIP process are any proposed incentives to reduce the number of single family home demolitions. The concept of reducing the maximum new house size to match the lot size is one of the only good things to come out of the RIP process. Adopting a standard front setback of 15 feet is a good start, however the flexibility needs to be in both directions so that when the neighboring properties have setbacks that are greater than 15 feet, any new development must be required to fit in with that same context.</p> <p>Middle housing options need to be limited to a much smaller area than within a quarter mile of centers, corridors and Max stations. With an exception of some small enclaves, the current proposal encompasses almost all of inner eastside neighborhoods. Limiting new middle housing to within a block or two of centers and Max stations, and only the properties lining and facing the corridors is far more acceptable. Then analyze the concept in three to five or so years to see how well the it is working. The smaller middle housing area reflects the same the step down concept slated for mixed-use development.</p> <p>Underlying lot lines should be merged if an existing home is built on two or more of these lots. Allowing underlying R2.5 lot lines to sub-divide and trump existing R5 zoning is a defacto zoning change and must not be allowed without a going through an entire transparent zoning change process. Additionally, corner lots should not be split without a zone change. Truth in zoning is the backbone of R5 single family neighborhoods. Internal conversions that don't change the character or fabric of the neighborhood are acceptable as long as there is one off-street parking place for each unit</p> <p>The reality is that the majority of households have one or more cars even though other</p>	<p>Email</p>

	<p>transport modes may be used for commuting. The street is no place for the long term storage of cars. Additionally, the city refuses to require large multi-unit residential complexes to require adequate off-street parking that in turn fills up neighboring streets with car storage. Likewise, often times on-parking is insufficient due to city policies that create curbside bike lanes, bio-swells and curb extensions all of which can contribute to a parking shortage. There should be enough room on any given residential street for guests to park.</p> <p>Off-street parking needs to be required for all residences (3 spaces for every 4 units for large multi-unit residential complexes). Front loading garages - on narrow lots or elsewhere - should be considered as not required, but optional or as a bonus to a required off-street parking place. Ten percent of the jobs in the US are related to the auto industry. The Federal Government would not have loaned the auto industry money during the recession if cars were expected to go away any time in the near future. Instead of profiling and targeting motorists as the enemy, it is time the City of Portland wakes up and properly accommodates these primary tax paying financial stakeholders that supply the funding for city wide transportation projects. Within the framework of most Portland neighborhoods, homes have driveways and/or garages. Any infill must fit in with that context and have-off-street parking.</p> <p>Finally, demolishing a neighborhood in order to save it is irresponsible. The city needs to do more to protect not just East Moreland and historic district neighborhoods, but also the fabric and character of all of Portland's single family home neighborhoods - including those near centers, corridors and Max stations.</p>	
<p>08/08</p>	<p>BPS Staff,</p> <p>Please consider the following background on the "history" of so-called "historically narrow" lots. My concern here is for the increased density that will be permitted in areas that are not particularly close to transit or amenities and that the relatively open character of many of our neighborhoods will be sacrificed.</p> <p>The concept of "truth in zoning" is also a factor.</p> <p>An implicit question here is whether the zoning amendments proposed in the Residential Infill Draft will super-cede the five year vacancy requirement after a building on a lot with 25' x 100' plats has been demolished.</p> <p>Recent Co-Chair of the Woodstock Neighborhood Association Land Use Committee</p> <p>“Historically Narrow Lots:” A Questionable Term with Implications for Infill Development and Zoning The recent draft proposal on Residential Infill Development disregards the relatively recent history of what the Portland BPS now misleadingly refers to as “historically narrow lots.” The draft proposal explains historically narrow lots as follows:</p> <p>“Like most cities, Portland requires lots to be a certain size (in order) to be developed. Standard lot in older parts of Portland are typically 50 feet wide by 100 feet deep. Lots less than 36 feet wide are considered “narrow lots.”But in some neighborhoods, lots were historically created in 25 foot wide increments. These are called “historically narrow lots.” The land was subdivided long ago into twice as many lots as is currently allowed in the R5 zone and (these lots) do not meet current minimum lot size or width standards. In 2003, the City of Portland established a minimum lot size of 3,000 sq.ft. and a minimum lot width of 36 ft for a lot in the R5 zone to be developed. An exception was made for lots smaller or</p>	<p>Email</p>

narrower than these dimensions, which can only be developed if they have been vacant for at least 5 years.” As an active member of the Woodstock Neighborhood Association Land Use Committee since about 1985, I have followed the evolving interpretation of what is allowed on these 25’ x 100’ plats. It is only in the past 25 years that they have been treated as “buildable lots. In the early decades of the twentieth century, some subdivisions were created with parcels consisting of 25’x 100’ plats. The general consensus is that this platting was intended to provide flexibility to the purchaser of a building lot. He/she could buy a 50’ x 100’ lot, a 75’ x 100’ lot or a 100’ x 100’ lot depending on need and preference. Until about 1990, virtually all the homes built in these subdivisions were built on parcels of one of those three larger dimensions. However, beginning about 1990, as building lots became scarce, developers began to apply for permits to build on individual 25’ x 100’ plats, and the City acquiesced. The resulting infill housing tended to be tall and narrow – generally out of proportion with fabric of pre-existing neighborhood homes. Nearby home owners were perplexed as to why such development was allowed since the zoning for the areas in which most of these plats existed was R5, which required 5,000, or at least 3,000, square feet of property area per dwelling at that time.

However, developers seized the opportunity and soon perfectly good ranch houses on 100’ x 100’ lots were being demolished to be replaced by four “skinny houses“ on underlying 25’x 100’ plats. Convinced that the premise of R5 zoning was being cast aside, neighborhoods challenged the city’s allowance of construction on underlying plats.

The Portland Planning Bureau responded by proposing to amend the Zoning Code to say that in the R5 Zone, the required lot width was 36 feet. Hotly divided testimony followed this proposal, first to the Portland Planning Commission, and then to the Portland City Council – developers arguing for allowing the narrow plats as buildable lots, and residents declaring that 25’ x 100’ plats were not acceptable given the required dimensions of a building lot in the R5 Zone (and the way these lots had been built on previously). While the Planning Commission recommended in favor of the neighborhoods’ position, it was over-ruled in a 3-2 vote of the Portland City Council. When neighborhoods threatened to appeal the City Council decision to Oregon’s Land Use Board of Appeals, a compromise was reached. The compromise was that if a dwelling was demolished on a parcel with underlying 25’ x100’ plats, only one underlying plat could be built on in replacement. Any remaining plat had to stay vacant for five years before it could qualify as a building lot. Neighborhoods believed that the compromise would stave off demolitions.

It now appears that the labeling of these 25’ X 100’ plats as buildable “historically narrow lots” is both a betrayal of the premise of R5 zoning and of the compromise – the requirement of 5 years of vacancy – that was made with the neighborhoods in 2003. If all so called “historically narrow lots” are now eligible to be built on, then the City and BPS need to acknowledge the fact that they have effectively rezoned, from R5 to 2.5, a substantial amount of residential area* in the city. And they need to notify affected property owners accordingly.

*In Woodstock, the area zoned R5 but platted in 25’ x 100’ plats is shown on the accompanying attached map. That area comprises about 25% of the single family residentially zoned property in the neighborhood. A good number of other neighborhoods contain subdivisions with 25’ x 100’ plats and R5 zoning. Among them are Concordia and Eastmoreland.

08/08	BPS Staff, Please make a note of my additional protest of your misleading designation of 25-foot-wide	Email
-------	--	-------

	<p>plats as "narrow lots." These were originally defined so as to simplify the purchase of building lots by owner-builders, who I believe would combine 2 or more, depending on how large of a lot they wanted. You can see the result in studying the properties or the tax maps representing the properties in the section of the Woodstock Neighborhood east of SE 52nd Avenue, where there remain a fair number of homes built in the 1950s. Many of these are now being destroyed in the name of infill, with no regard for the natural features that true R5 lots afforded back in the day and that we are now in danger of losing, perhaps at an accelerated rate, if the city approves the zoning amendments now being proposed.</p> <p>Anyone truly interested in slowing gentrification in our "new close-in" neighborhood must seriously consider nothing short of a moratorium on demolitions made for the sake of lot splits, or where a stand of more than one mature conifer still exists. Our urban forest is disappearing at an alarming rate, and I couldn't help but notice that this is not being addressed at all in the proposal coming out of the residential infill working group.</p>	
<p>08/08</p>	<p>Residential Infill:</p> <p>PROHIBITING GARAGES ON DETACHED HOUSES ON NARROW LOTS</p> <p>As I explained to city staff at the July 6 meeting at Kenton Firehouse, I have huge concerns with element #8: not allowing garages for detached houses on narrow lots. I fail to recognize what this part of the proposal is even intending to accomplish.</p> <p>Instead of increasing parking (1.5 spots in front of a narrow house), it decreases parking (down from 3.5 spots: 1 in the garage, 2 in the driveway, and .5 between houses).</p> <p>If the intention is to encourage attached units rather than detached if people want to have a garage, than it may accomplish that, but it will not prevent this type of detached housing from being constructed on narrow lots. If the intention is to discourage cars and encourage biking and mass transit, then it will probably increase this on a very limited scale in the areas that are truly close to mass transit, and when that mass transit is a relatively short trip to city center (NOT the case in many supposed Centers and Corridors).</p> <p>Overall, it seems like it is an unnecessary limitation that wastes existing space-- middle income folks that buy and rent these narrow detached houses want yards and storage space, and most have cars, so why force everyone into attached housing who can't afford a larger house on a larger lot? Having another interior room inside the house at the loss a garage that most people use for storage anyway just doesn't give any real benefit. Space for more landscaping? Great, but there's nowhere to store your stuff or park your car. I think it's creating an affordability issue that wasn't there before, and I simply don't understand the point.</p> <p>Come to the last block north on N Burrage Ave in Kenton (one of which I live in, comfortably and somewhat affordably with 2 roommates and pets) and see for yourself how little street parking there is between these types of houses, and how silly it would be to cut out the driveways.</p> <p>HEIGHT LIMITS, SETBACKS, WINDOWS</p> <p>The new square footage reduction overall is a great improvement in reducing conflict between the scale of existing construction vs. new. Measuring height from the lowest point on the lot instead of the highest point is also an improvement, but it's far from the scale of</p>	<p>Email</p>

	<p>change that is needed, especially on relatively flat lots where it will make little difference.</p> <p>It seems like regulating the difference in number of stories versus the surrounding homes makes much more sense. When new construction is 1.5 stories higher than surrounding houses, it looms over them in a manner that's obviously out of character with the neighborhood. There are many examples of this in North Portland, where 2.5 story homes but right up against the property line of single story homes. Make it simple-- one story higher than surrounding homes maximum, end of story.</p> <p>It also seems worth addressing the placement of windows on new construction. There are also many examples in North Portland of windows on new construction that are both numerous facing close up to existing construction, and directly across from someone else's windows. The intrusion on privacy is crazy. Regulating both the number and placement of windows on new construction within a certain number of feet of existing construction seems to make common sense, and better neighbors.</p> <p>Increasing the setback distance of new construction from existing would also help mitigate this loss of privacy, as well as the loss of sunlight and views from existing homes. This setback should be greater for infill than when new construction is being built adjacent to other new construction-- people know that to expect in the latter case, and privacy can be planned together. In the former case, existing residents are literally being pushed out of the neighborhood by having their property imposed upon, always by a bigger home with more windows that's really close by. That's not right-- that's bullying. Seriously, and the city can stop it if you want to.</p>	
<p>08/08</p>	<p>Dear Mr. Tracy:</p> <p>I support the Residential Infill Project Proposal in the main. There are some points where I would allow taller buildings, less setback, and more units. I also support the Portland for Everyone positions, which go further than the Staff Proposal.</p> <p>I support the 2500 s.f. maximum house size, except for on corners. With the Triplex allowed, houses on corners should have a 3300 s.f. maximum house size, to get decent sized units inside.</p> <p>I oppose increasing the minimum Front Setback to 15'. It should be kept at 10' everywhere, in order to allow houses closer to the sidewalk, giving a more friendly, community feel to the street. This also allows more use of the rear yard for large trees, and/or an ADU.</p> <p>I oppose lowering the maximum height in the R-2.5 zones. Regardless of whether there is a single house on a 5000 s.f. lot, or houses on 2500 s.f. lots, the 35' height limit should remain the same as it is now. The R-2.5 zone is mapped as a "buffer" or "transition" between the 45' height limit along Corridors, and the 30' limit in the R-5 zones. This 35' limit allows a "stepdown" from one zone to the next. This should be true in all R-2.5 zones, whether "Narrow" lots or "Skinny" lots.</p> <p>I support Portland for Everyone's call for all these types of housing to be allowed everywhere in the city that is mapped R-5 or R-2.5. But if that is not adopted, I would support the "Near Centers and Corridors" geography that the project has proposed.</p> <p>I support eliminating any and all parking requirements in the R-5 or R-2.5 zone, wherever it occurs. Parking requirements drive up the price of housing and reduce the amount of housing that can be built. Parking is not required currently within 500' of Frequent Transit</p>	<p>Email</p>

	<p>Streets. Beyond that point, there is plenty of on-street space available, so there’s no point in parking requirements anywhere in these zones.</p> <p>I support the Staff proposal of a House with 2 ADUs, or a Duplex with one ADU, and Triplexes on a corner lot. I also support Portland for Everyone’s upgrade of this scenario, which would allow an extra unit in each of these cases, as long as one of the units on a lot is either “accessible” or “affordable”, using a metric between 60% and 80% MFI, whichever is chosen.</p> <p>I support a minimum 2 units per each 5000 s.f R-2.5 lot. However, I am concerned about the proposal to count an ADU as one of these units. Examples at 1407 SE 16th and at 902, 908, and 914 SE 28th Ave, supposedly used ADUs to satisfy minimum density requirements (on R-1 lots in these cases), yet there is no visible way to reach these units from the street without trudging across the front lawn to a gate. No mailbox is obvious, and it seems that these are just “studios” for the main house residents.</p> <p>So, any minimum unit requirement in R-2.5 should include having the front doors of both units visible from the street, with address numbers and mailboxes, and a requirement that one unit can be no more than 30% larger than the other.</p> <p>I support all the Historic Narrow Lot options, but everywhere, rather than in a limited geography.</p> <p>In short, we need to allow a variety of housing types in our “single-family” zones. I do not buy into the opponent’s cries that mass demolitions will occur. This plan will allow incremental increases that fit into the neighborhood, and should be written up as code and adopted.</p>	
<p>08/09</p>	<p>I am writing to provide comments regarding the Residential Infill Project, managed by BPS. I have read many of the documents including the proposal as brought to the communities via the stakeholder meetings. I also attended the meeting on July 30 in SE Portland. As I have followed the RIP process and proposal (as well as Metro and City of Portland planning over the years), I have come away with more answers than questions.</p> <p>As you know, the RIP plan includes 8 separate proposals. Most of my questions center around Proposal 4 which would allow duplexes on all lots that are within ¼ mile of frequent bus service, MAX or Streetcar service. It would also allow triplexes on all corner lots within the above areas.</p> <p>It is fair for me to provide some context for my input—my husband and I currently own and reside in a (modest) bungalow just north of Grant Park. So I have followed this process as a stakeholder that has committed significant financial resources to my largest investment—my home in Northeast Portland. However, I believe that the questions I pose should be considered as the Portland City Council moves toward discussion of the RIP proposal.</p> <p>As part of educating myself about the current zoning and the Comprehensive Plan, I have encountered some numbers that (as far as I know) are not in dispute.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current plans and zoning inside the UGB indicate room for an additional 650,000 residences. (December 2015 Metro 2014 Urban Growth Report, page 17). • The report estimates an additional 600,000 people residing inside the UGB by 2035 	<p>Email</p>

(December 2015 Metro 2014 Urban Growth Report, page 14).

- Portland estimates 132,000 new Portland households by 2035 (BPS Buildable Lands Inventory-Summary for Future Development Capacity; adopted by Council October 3, 2012, p. 6).
- This report also states “Zoned capacity in Portland is sufficient to meet projected household need; that is, enough land in Portland is currently zoned to accommodate the projected number of new households” (p. 18).

The current Comp Plan has a capacity of 231,500 new dwellings, which leaves an excess capacity of at least 100,000 new units JUST WITHIN THE CURRENT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN. This is before the proposed city-wide upzoning in current single family neighborhoods is even considered.

Thus, my questions begin to emerge: has the number of households projected to reside in Portland in 2015 changed? Have the number of potential new dwellings under existing zoning changed? (I couldn't find any evidence of this).

IF these numbers haven't changed, what is driving the RIP process? If existing zoning, by the City's admission, is sufficient to meet demand, where is the compulsion coming from to rezone nearly all the single-family neighborhoods in the city for duplexes and triplexes?

There are a few properties near my house that are on corners and have been redeveloped into duplexes. These duplexes sell for in excess of \$500,000 EACH. If the impetus for this process is to increase affordable housing, WHERE IS THE AFFORDABILITY? Developers will charge what the market will bear. No matter what the developer members may be telling the SAC, this proposal will NOT increase affordability.

The only way to achieve affordable housing is for the City to mandate it via inclusionary zoning and other measures. The market will simply not provide cheap housing in expensive areas otherwise.

I have a serious concern about the livability impact of rezoning nearly all single-family neighborhoods. It means that those of us who have invested into our properties have no way of knowing if a developer will suddenly build expensive duplexes (with no parking) next door. Most homeowners don't know about this proposal, but when the duplex/triplex development wave comes to their block, they will be livid. Their only question will be how much damage developers will do before the homeowners fight back.

I would ask you to consider NOT passing Proposal 4 in the RIP Plan. This is the proposal that would upzone entire single-family neighborhoods. The Centers and Corridors zoning plan we have in the existing Comp Plan is working. It may be that developers aren't extracting every penny they could from the market, but it is the most efficient way to bring new housing to Portland without seriously disrupting livability and quality of life for existing residents.

I also have questions about RIP proposal 7, which would allow new houses on historically narrow lots within ¼ mile of transit (as defined above) in R5 zones. The way I understand it, the historically narrow lots the proposal is referring to is the process developers follow to reopen historical lot lines. I find this to be a bizarre practice and I have to wonder why it is allowed by the city. If we know that these lot lines are a historical oddity that is superseded

	<p>by current zoning, why are developers allowed to exploit them to increase the zoning? No planner has ever been able to explain why this is allowed. In fact, it seems to be something that has been increasingly popular with developers as the housing market heats up. Please reconsider allowing the reopening of underlying lot lines.</p> <p>I hope that you can consider rejecting proposals 4 and 7 given the mandate of the current Comprehensive Plan to “continue development patterns in residential areas and their green-edged tree-lined streets.” Please also take to heart the statement, also in the current Comp Plan that “future development and public infrastructure should respect and enhance each area’s positive characteristics, strengths and assets.” Wholesale upzoning of huge swaths of SFR-zoned areas clearly does not respect or enhance the factors that make these areas loved by so many Portlanders, including myself.</p>	
<p>08/09</p>	<p>I have been a resident of Portland since 1988. Neighborhoods make Portland great. Zoning and building codes should protect Portland's unique neighborhoods. Changing zoning codes to allow duplexes and triplexes will alter the fabric of the city. Zoning codes ensure property owners that what attracted them to their neighborhood will be protected. Your plan will destroy the neighborhoods that make Portland great. Skinny houses, duplexes and triplexes are not compatible with my neighborhood and with most of Portland's neighborhoods. Your proposals for higher densities are bad for Portland. Zoning guarantees property rights are upheld, these rights should remain fixed, your obligation as a city is to protect the rights of the property owners. You should be protecting Portland's livability not destroying it.</p>	<p>Email</p>
<p>08/10</p>	<p>I purchased my home in good faith and it is my sanctuary.</p> <p>I do not agree with changing corner lots to triplex potentials.</p> <p>This process has not been citizen oriented. The number of appointees who are in the development field is disturbing to say the least.</p> <p>Please leave Portland neighborhoods intact. There is enough density to develop along Beaverton hills dale hwy and what we need are affordable houses, not expensive infill.</p> <p>The new huge homes that are infill are NOT affordable at \$7-900,000.</p> <p>Take a moratorium to plan thoughtfully with residents as a majority or at least equal to developers on your Advisory committee.</p> <p>Do not disregard my letter please. Instead, disregard this proposal.</p>	<p>Email</p>
<p>08/11</p>	<p>Hello Residential Infill team!</p> <p>Here are my unstructured comments on your first post-RIPSAC proposal. There are a lot of them. Please let me know if I'm unclear.</p> <p>On density: I like this part of your proposal.</p> <p>I lived in Buckman for ten years adjacent to two duplexes and a four-plex. It didn't create a problem, and that added density helped support a walkable neighborhood and frequent bus service. I think it's indefensible that this kind of neighborhood is impossible to create today (primarily due to zoning rules), and I desperately want whatever additional density I need in order to get more frequent buses and commercial services in the part of Mt. Tabor where I live, which is just at the edge of the 1/4 mile radius around centers and corridors.</p> <p>I would like to someday have an ADU in my basement, in addition to the detached above-</p>	<p>Email</p>

garage ADU currently in design.

On building height: I don't think this is a good idea. If the city "gives away" building height, you won't be able to get it back without incredibly strong political leadership. Based on the attention (and Council response) that recent comprehensive plan hearings garnered, I'm not optimistic.

On base points and dormer rules: In the last year, the city revamped its rules for accessory structures. This included raising the allowable height to 20 feet. On a lot with any slope at all, the new height measurement rule is going to pull accessory structures back down. The new dormer rule (if applied to accessory structures) will completely eliminate 2nd-story ADUs like the kind I'm building over my (fully-permitted) detached 2-car garage built in 2006.

On floor area: most new houses seem like they're on lots smaller than the "standard" 5000 square feet. I think a better aim is 2500 sq. feet on the minimum conforming lot (3000 square feet in R5), and scale accordingly. That suggests a FAR of ~ .8, which is large enough that you might be able to use it uniformly rather than making allowances for skinny lots. I would also think that a 2500 sq. foot duplex is going to be a little tight for three bedrooms and some family-friendly common space in each unit.

On roof height for flat roofs -- as a more-flexible alternative to the lowered roof height, consider changing the envelope that the roof must fit inside -- pretend it had a pitch, limit the flat roof extent at any given height to the extent of the pitched roof (perhaps with a dormer). I'm hope this idea is clear.

Please consider more floor area in R2.5. Also please consider floor area bonuses for ADA compliance, since IIRC, ADA rules don't automatically apply for two-unit buildings.

I have some general concerns on proposed limitations on the scale of new houses, many of which can be summarized by, "most existing buildings are constrained by decisions made long ago, and although any general modification may be reasonable, if it impacts the ground around the structure or the roofline, it runs the risk of being un-permittable." I've attached a photo of a house down the street from where I live -- "basement_garage.jpg," I didn't have to look very hard to find this. The ground is constrained. The lot isn't technically "steeply sloped" but there is a 10 foot rise from the street. A new house on this lot would... be 1 story? run the driveway up behind the house in a funny way? Completely regrade the existing topography?

There are many houses in Buckman that have a high square footage relative to lot size. While a lot of these houses are non-conforming due to setback requirements, they usually sit on conforming (36'-wide, 3000 sq. foot) lots. Making it impossible to expand the envelopes of these houses isn't going to aid in their preservation.

I am very concerned about ways in which my currently conforming house could stop conforming. My own property is at 420 SE 62nd Ave, and has frontage on both SE 62nd Ave and SE 62nd Pl (both are streets, but 62nd Pl is unimproved). The lot is a little unusual, since it slopes downward to the West, toward 62nd Ave, and -also- to the North (away from

SE Stark St).

Clearly, some impact on sloped lots is intentional, particularly lots that slope -up- from the street. The impacts seem too severe for houses on lots which slope down from the street.

I've attached a very crude 2-d drawing of a side-view of my property. It captures slope from East to West. I'm attaching a photograph of my driveway (garage_slope.jpg), which also captures the slope from South to North.

One suggestion, that preserves the "public realm" benefit of lower-scaled structures, is to let the street be the base point if it's higher than the low point around the structure. Another is to try to create a rule like the rule for steeply sloped lots that can apply in this situation. I don't have a concrete suggestion as to how to do this yet.

More about my above-garage ADU project, and how changing the rules would prevent it:

I have -significant- investment in grading, drainage, concrete (footings, foundation, slab, driveway), in exterior finishes (cedar siding), wiring, plumbing, etc. of my garage. The ADU budget for does not allow for demolishing the garage and redoing all these things in order to satisfy a new base point rule.

There are several conflicts between the garage and the lower base point:

Because my lot and driveway slope down from the street, the earth at the back of my garage is at least 3 feet lower than the garage floor, 5 feet below my base point today, and 8 feet below the street at the corner of my property. Today's base point is the lot level 5 feet South East of my garage.

My above-garage ADU is being built with Passive House and Earth Advantage standards in mind. This requires almost two feet of insulation between the garage ceiling and the ADU floor. I need another 18 -- 24" of insulation above the ADU ceiling. As you might imagine, doing this using today's relaxed base point rules is a challenge. With the proposed rule, I'd have to choose between 9' ceilings and energy efficiency. This could be ameliorated by exceptions (or height bonuses) for above-code insulation.

There is also a staircase leading to the basement of the main structure (my house) 3 feet from the garage wall, so in fact the "low point" under your proposal is closer to 5 feet below the existing garage floor.

If space allows, it should be possible to wind a staircase around the perimeter of the house so that it always within 5 feet of the structure. What is the public benefit of forcing this particular configuration over a straight staircase that goes away from the foundation wall?

There are lots of great reasons to want an exterior staircase for a basement including emergency egress and ADU access. New rules shouldn't prohibit them on existing tall structures (where the new base point would move the house out of conformance) or prevent them from being built on new houses. I think exempting (suitably defined) staircases, ADA ramps, etc, from the base point definition is an easy way to resolve this. If BPS wants to allow and encourage ADU construction, making allowances for separate entrances (via

	<p>basement staircases, for instance) is really important!</p> <p>My 1890s Queen Anne (two stories + an attic) is constrained by decisions made over a century ago. I want my house to be more useful, not less. I want to be able to invest in my house: in particular, I'd like to (eventually) add a dormer and reclaim a little attic space for another bedroom. I'd like to add insulation above the roofline. I believe that today's rules would allow me to do this, but if the base point rule changes, I don't know if it becomes un-permittable or just prohibitively expensive (due to regrading my lot around the house). My lot is fairly large, so I don't know if the proposed FAR is too severe, but I'm nervous.</p> <p>---</p> <p>And some final thoughts:</p> <p>Land is the scarcest resource in the city. What is the long-term policy benefit in requiring less intense use?</p> <p>Have you considered perverse incentives to combine lots and build bigger houses? Will max-lot-size rules completely mitigate this? I suspect that 20 years ago, the idea that a house would be bought and demolished to build two smaller houses was pretty absurd. Today, if I want a big house, I don't need a big lot. Under overly-strict FAR rules, I would need to buy multiple smaller lots and combine them.</p> <p>While it's hard to see this happening tomorrow, I don't like the tension this creates.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration!</p>	
08/11	<p>In 1916, New York City adopted the nation's first Zoning Resolution. New York was spinning out of control with growth. The plan restricted building height and industrial development. Their aim was to reduce growth, and they succeeded. The NY Times states that: "The 1910 population of Manhattan was 2,331,542, or 164 people per acre. In 2010, the population was 1,585,873, or 109 people per acre."</p> <p>The City of Portland is doing the opposite: promoting growth. Right on the heels of the new Comprehensive Plan, you are starting the Residential Infill project to radically alter this new Plan for single family neighborhoods all across Portland.</p> <p>At first glance, it seems like a good idea for creating smaller homes to help with the housing crisis. Some of your ideas are worth consideration: reducing the scale of homes, allowing internal division of existing homes into flats, and encouraging the development of ADUs, Accessory Dwelling units or granny flats. However, it would also allow duplexes and sometimes triplexes and even courtyard apartments in areas that are zoned for a single home. Modest homes all over the city could be demolished and replaced with 3 living units per one 5,000 square foot lot. That will effectively rezone neighborhoods without going through the rezoning process.</p> <p>The problem is that the City of Portland just doesn't understand the concept of enough. You say you want to encourage a mix of housing, but you don't have any method to make sure it stays a mix of housing. With your plan, alternative infill could swallow up whole blocks, because you have no mechanism to stop it from doing so. You just leave it up to chance and</p>	Email

the market. You don't seem concerned with the possibility of too much infill. I know, because I live on a block that already has 3 duplexes, 1 triplex, and 2 fourplexes, plus three homes on flag lots. We are packed. I live right next to this dense housing. I don't mind. What I mind is that you want to add more. Right now my street has a good mix of housing types, but enough is enough. Your plan would allow more living units on my block than is wise (and in our case safe because of public safety issues and the fire code) because it is in one of these designated overlay zones.

You need to seek out ideas for controlling the amount of housing that will be redeveloped and use incentives to encourage the less destructive infill that will keep the rate of demolitions in check. One idea would be to use the existing code to restrict new infill while incentivizing the retention of existing homes (and therefore reducing demolitions). This would have two parts:

1) Allow the internal division of a house into duplexes or allow a second internal ADU to go ahead only when the existing home is retained.

2) For new housing, modify the existing code provision that allows duplexes on corners for R5 lots. According to Joe Zehnder, only 3% of these corner duplexes have been built. Use that allowance to regulate the amount of new infill by allowing that allowance of one duplex per corner to be shifted to anywhere on the two adjacent blocks. Once that allowance has been used up, then no more duplexes can be built. Block by block, we could get some new infill, but not too much.

Another idea is to use a percentage measure to allow a certain percentage of new infill on a block, say 25% of the lots. I am sure there are other ways to regulate the amount of infill, rather than to just open the floodgates and let developers rush in.

Part of the reason for starting this project was to help retain the character of neighborhoods. Without some way to control the amount of infill, the character of neighborhoods will be lost... some faster than others. By regulating the new infill the City will be making sure that the rate of development is controlled and dispersed so that one neighborhood is not unfairly impacted.

There are other areas of concern. The zones where alternative infill is proposed is quite extensive, consuming most if not all of many neighborhoods. These maps constructed by the City are not accurate. According to Morgan Tracy, Project Manager, frequent transit means service of 20-minute or less between 7-8:30 am and then 4 to 6 pm. Studying several routes, I know some bus routes have been left off the map, such as the #17. This route fulfills the parameters of this frequent service definition. Including this route would add transit corridors in Alameda, Brentwood-Darlington, and more of Woodstock. Morgan Tracy confirmed that the maps were actually drawn using Trimet's definition of frequent service route: ones which run every 15 minutes or better most of the day, every day. Which definition will the City choose when they draw up the maps? Will the definition of transit corridors mean that even more of the City is consumed by residential infill. Why aren't people being informed of this?

I would argue for the use of the Trimet definition to draw transit corridors, which is truly frequent service (every 15 minutes or better most of the day, every day). You have to keep in mind the City's definition of 20 minute peak service during "rush hours" discriminates against a whole class of workers who are shift workers, or who work at night in restaurants, retail, and entertainment venues. What about those who work in the trades and must move

	<p>from location to location because the job site changes, or are landscapers or house cleaners or those who have to work a second job and get from one to another in a hurry. The City's definition of frequent transit is geared toward 9 to 5 professionals who work downtown because that is where most of the transit routes head. It is a very white, affluent definition of peak service.</p> <p>Like your maps, your studies are inadequate. There is no provision for affordable housing. Morgan Tracy admitted at the Tabor Space Open House that the new infill housing may only be slightly cheaper than current prices. You just don't know because you have not studied it. Joe Zehnder, Chief Planner, told me he assumed that duplexes won't overrun neighborhoods because developers want to build single family homes instead, but that is pure assumption because you haven't done economic studies to confirm this. I don't think assuming that these neighborhoods won't be consumed by duplexes is not good enough.</p> <p>I am even concerned that your best proposal, the one for reducing housing scale, is not good enough. Los Angeles recently has had to move to revise their rules to reduce housing scale because their rules had too many loopholes. McMansions were still being built. Los Angeles is now reducing the square footage of new homes from 50% of lot size to 45%, and taking out exemptions and bonuses which allowed developers to still build huge homes (see: http://www.latimes.com/local/lanow/la-me-ln-mansionization-law-20160714-snap-story.html) Portland should understand where Los Angeles went wrong to make sure the same mistakes are not being repeated here.</p> <p>I also do not see anything that addresses unimproved streets, the complications of dead ends (which can't safely absorb as much density), and parking congestion. No matter how hard the City of Portland wants them to disappear, cars will not vanish overnight. Off street parking requirements can currently be ignored for ADUs and for lots within 500 feet of a frequent service bus line. In these new proposals, parking can be eliminated for historically narrow lots. That will create parking issues. Where is the plan to address this?</p> <p>Historically narrow lots are also another issue that is not well thought out or mapped. I don't think the mapping on those lots are accurate (like with the bus routes). In the past, the City of Portland promised local neighborhoods that historically narrow lots would not be developed too rapidly to prevent developer overreach. Only one portion of a subdivided historically narrow lot could be developed at once. The second half could only be developed after 5 years. Now the City is going back on its word with these proposals and allowing development to occur quickly. That is a black mark against the City for not being an entity that keeps to its word.</p> <p>100 years ago New York created a zoning plan to ensure that their city didn't have out of control development. The City of Portland seems to be racing in the opposite direction. You need to take more time to study this. If the City approves these proposals this fall, then the code and overlay maps will be changed in 2017. That is a mighty fast timeline. At the very least, I hope you consider ways to control infill to ensure whole blocks are not demolished to make room for this new infill, and that streets and transit can handle the new density.</p>	
<p>08/11</p>	<p>I am a long time resident of the city of Portland and I am so sad to see what our planners, city leaders and commissioners have allowed to happen in a city that I HAD loved. The infill project is just one more example of not listening to the people you are suppose to represent and assuming that you all have better intelligence and are saving us from our ignorance. I and my husband are college educated and value quality of life. The city appears to not care about infrastructure and allow large developers to do pretty much as they like (cutting down beloved old old trees and century old homes). I believe tax dollars are</p>	<p>Email</p>

	<p>your primary goal and the heck with the neighborhood! The traffic in the Portland area is abominable and has exponentially increased by the month yet you want to cram more people in with little regard for the neighborhoods that may have one story smaller and affordable homes for the large developers tearing them down and replacing with two or more that cost \$800,000 apiece. What is your thinking? No wonder we have homeless! In a couple of years our grandchildren will be on their own and we will definitely look at other places to live where people are the first consideration and the not the tax dollar. Fix the infrastructure, use some common sense and realize that when you build a building that is 3 stories and has 80 units with the requirement that it have .5 parking places that those who ride bikes still have a car and where will they and their spouse or partner or roommate park their 2 cars? I will tell you. They will park them in front of their neighbor's houses and once again destroy why people used to call this a great place to live.</p> <p>I have little hope that this letter will be read or considered but I had to write. I believe meetings and letters are a requirement so that you fulfill your obligation to post meetings and ask for citizen input with little plan to consider or change YOUR plan.</p> <p>How do you consider your job well done when you do what you do?</p>	
<p>08/11</p>	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I took extensive notes while viewing the material on changes to residential infill development thinking I would be able to share that feedback, but the survey at the end did not allow for extensive qualitative feedback on the proposals as it seemed it would. I've copied my notes below. The design of the webpage and the survey itself were pretty difficult to navigate.</p> <p>Thank you for undertaking this process and soliciting feedback.</p> <p>Notes on infill proposal: The proposal to limit house size to be in more proportion to the lot size makes a lot of sense. Some of the worst new development in my neighborhood are huge single family homes that fill an entire lot. These are totally out of character with the neighborhood and reduce green space, shade smaller homes, and even seeing the sky.</p> <p>The only problem with the new setbacks (which I think are quite reasonable) are that they allow new construction to match what is existing. Thus, it will encourage developers and builders to follow the very designs where they currently exist that are leading to a call for change.</p> <p>I think this proposal to allow more duplexes and ADUs is a promising way to increase density. My main worry with this is that the scale of these new structures or clusters of buildings would dwarf everything around. Increased density with provisions for setbacks for duplexes and triplexes and keeping ADUs to a small size could increase density but maintain the livability of our neighborhoods and actually diversity. What I see now are 4-plexes going up next to single family homes that seem to use nearly every available space (very little setback) and I worry this will happen with overly large duplexes, triplexes, and ADUs.</p> <p>I strongly disagree with the proposal for changes to garages and parking for historically narrow lots. The part where front loaded garages are not allowed and on-site parking is not</p>	<p>Email</p>

	<p>required are particularly problematic. This would increase density and take away more parking from neighborhoods that are already heavily impacted by this kind of development. It would not just take away garages, but driveways that people park their cars on as well. I don't believe that the reduction of curb cuts would offset the loss of several parking spots per dwelling.</p> <p>The worse kind of development in my neighborhood are when they tear down one or two single family homes and put in 30 unit buildings with no parking. These are often on narrow streets and it is clear that most of the new residents have cars. It really reducing quality of living for old and new residents.</p>	
<p>08/11</p>	<p>To: Bureau of Planning and Sustainability and City Council</p> <p>I tried to take the online survey and found it too biased toward demolition and new construction to accurately reflect citizen input. So I am sending you my concerns in letter form.</p> <p>The most crucial aspect and public concern that this plan is supposedly responding to was how to avoid demolitions when addressing our housing needs and yet the changes suggested incentivize demolitions.</p> <p>Preserving our existing houses is the answer to affordability; gentrification; keeping the aging population in their homes and neighborhoods; maintaining quality and more durable housing; increasing home ownership; keeping our city sustainable and resilient; preserving open space, sunlight, garden spaces (better than parks); providing homes that are healthier and more educationally beneficial for our children (their own yards). These are all the things the City says it works for and yet none of them were a sincere priority in the plan they are pushing for. Insignificant token statements were thrown in for ways to incentivize existing houses, but they are laughable compared to the incentives given to developers to tear down homes. The benefits will all go to developers, especially those that greenwash and try to present themselves as socially concerned. The citizens and community will pay the price and it is huge.</p> <p>If this were a sincere effort to change our land use to meet real needs, the City would have used the existing system of zone changes. Instead, this circumvents the law and dishonestly pushes a one-size-fits all plan. This is called corruption, not representational governing, and certainly not governing in the public's best interest.</p> <p>The RIPSAC was dominated by those who would financially profit from demolitions. There was no provision to not allow conflict of interest of those who supposedly represented the neighborhood coalitions even though the City is well aware that neighborhood associations are strongly influenced by realtors and developers since they can afford the time to participate and stand to benefit financially more than the regular citizen. The RIP was supposed to address the needs of the public and yet the developers were given equal footing, even beyond those who supposedly represented the neighborhoods. It is the City's responsibility to protect its citizens as citizens, not to protect business' profits. It needs to be clear that what the City is doing is not that they are protecting developers' rights, it is that they are subsidizing their profits through zoning laws.</p> <p>The RIPSAC meetings were so controlled by the City that the true citizen concerns, e.g. demolitions, were not allowed to be discussed.</p> <p>The plan says it is limiting house size but is actually incentivizing demolishing existing housing by allowing more units on the same amount of land instead of encouraging the flexible use of the houses and neighborhoods we have. There is no reason any needed new</p>	<p>Email</p>

	<p>housing cannot happen where demolition is not necessary. New housing will always be more expensive than retaining the old.</p> <p>The variety of types of housing proposed always have been available. Dividing large houses into smaller units or building ADUs alongside preserves the house and the neighborhood and is more affordable than any new structure could be. The only benefit of tearing down houses to build what is already available is to the developers. It is not true that we are missing our middle housing.</p> <p>It is flat out untrue that the most of the 25X100 lots the City referred to were historically platted to be used as separate lots. The City knows this and yet continues the lie.</p> <p>It is obvious to all that the old way of thinking that density needs to happen near transportation routes, does not work. One, we don't have any of the infrastructure for it and, two, it renders other neighborhoods unwalkable. We need to undo the 1980s codes that discourage neighborhood services and go back to the way our neighborhoods were designed originally, i.e., the neighborhood grocery, etc. The proposed plan means much of the city will have to drive to bus service to get to services.</p> <p>So far, this density focused on transportation corridors, etc. has resulted in fewer services in those corridors because the developers build housing clear to the ground level anyway (with no commercial services).</p> <p>The demolition of our small, even rundown, storefronts and incentives for multi-story buildings are destroying small business opportunities. Having to make rent each month rather than developing sweat equity in a building you own (and can live in) means middle- to lower-income citizens not being able to take chances as an entrepreneur or innovator. This approach to development is destabilizing our economy by concentrating wealth and control of jobs with the wealthy.</p> <p>The City cannot claim to be a victim of market forces when they incentivize demolition and subsidize development by developers and, often, out-of-state investors who have no stake in our communities, and then demand the taxpayers pay for affordable housing, and other problems caused by the City's policies. I have read the documents and participated in most of the open houses and have seen no thought, creativity, or even sincere concern for affordability, gentrification, and negative impact on our children and seniors. The City has ignored true options for supporting healthy housing options in existing houses or for incentivizing development in areas where it is not destructive. They haven't even done the research to verify how effective or how destructive this plan would be! I have to assume that these options and research are being ignored because they would not benefit developers.</p>	
<p>08/12</p>	<p>Dear Representatives,</p> <p>I am a homeowner in Sunnyside and am so concerned about the upzoning proposals. Upzoning will place so much economic pressure towards development. Upzoning leads to teardowns and threatens the historic integrity of our neighborhoods. I note that other cities (Berkeley for example) value the beauty of historic neighborhoods. I have been so discouraged to learn what Portland city planning already allows, before the proposed upzoning. Truly it is clear that the new construction is not affordable, and mostly favors developers. Expensive new housing in my neighborhood is attracting investors and folks from the Bay Area who think a \$700,000 tall skinny home is a good deal.</p> <p>Specific concerns besides general livability are such things as solar rights, infrastructure</p>	<p>Email</p>

	<p>stresses, pollutants released by teardowns (left by neighbors to monitor), environmental impacts of materials waste, lost tree canopy... I had so much excitement about my neighborhood and my wonderful neighbors. That feeling is being replaced by dread. What happens when my elderly neighbor who has been in her house over 60 years dies? What happens to the double lot kitty-corner from me? So much we love about our neighborhood is up for grabs for the benefit of developers and investors. Can you help before it's too late? I had thought of Portland as having enlightened public policies. Thank you so much.</p>	
<p>08/12</p>	<p>Four major issues:</p> <p>1 - We don't all want pitched roofs - flat roofs allow the architect some basic design latitude.....Please let it go.</p> <p>Flat roofs are design. Flat roofs are very active in all larger communities. Don't squeeze the design - modern is good.</p> <p>2 - Portland received perks for being a bike city = the bikes have taken over. Yes we need garages. You are squeezing out good traffic flow. What about the proposal for foster blvd. That was the most stupid suggestion this year....at least in the top two.</p> <p>3 - ADUs are great, but the back story is that the city gets more taxes. Another alternative is to chat with or discuss with the apartment associations or the state and stretch the law that says only two people per bedroom. That would solve some problems. Unique approach???</p> <p>4 - Even if you squeeze more homes in, the SDC/BDS fees in Portland is the real reason nothing is affordable. The big builders compensate with crappy quality materials that won't last like the historical homes.....A basic person can spend thousands before even one piece of wood is framed.....years in the permit cycle.</p> <p>I love Portland and have been here all my life.....</p> <p>One of the best things that has happened is the quality of the construction on the sellwood bridge.....contrast that to the concrete one on Grand.....great choice on the contractors!!</p> <p>One of the worst things has been the PDX apt house on the east side of the burnside bridge.....it truly looks like Batman built it.</p> <p>It's the bat house - all in black. It blocks out the sky. Worst this year by far!!.</p>	<p>Email</p>
<p>08/12</p>	<p>I have lived in the same house in southwest Portland for over 40 years. I grew up in Maplewood and was the 2nd class to go all 4 years at Wilson High School. My friends and family think I am crazy to stay in Portland and Multnomah county. At the rate your plans are going, you will drive many long- time residents out and will discourage potential home buyers from even considering living in the City of Portland.</p> <p>The latest plans will ruin residential neighborhoods by allowing multiple family dwellings to be be shoved in wherever they can find space. My property taxes are high and your plan will bring the value or homes down by ruining single family home designation.</p> <p>Building any structure without adequate parking is asking for trouble. Our narrow, unimproved streets of southwest Portland are already parked up with cars belonging to local residents.. People will use mass transit for going in and out of the core area but they will still want to use their cars for weekend activities, travel, emergent situations. Stop thinking that if you have no parking, there will be no cars!</p>	<p>Email</p>

	<p>There is no proof that this latest plan will actually make homes/residences affordable for low income families. The idea of forcing every neighborhood to have “low income or affordable housing” is not realistic and it will serve to lower home values.</p> <p>I am going to say it “There is a reason that we live where we do”. We wanted to live in a safe area. If we would have wanted to have less security and more opportunities to be shot, wounded or traumatized, we would be living in a different part of the metro area. People don’t want to be labelled as bigots and in reality, they are not. They/we are just being smart about where we live to keep our families safe and to get the best education possible. So stop making people feel guilty for making good decisions. A plan to bring in rental properties does nothing but bring down the quality of a single family residential community.</p> <p>Things have already gone from bad to worse with home owners having to obtain permits or approvals to do just about anything to their own property. The city has set things up so that builders and contractors can cut down just about any tree or other significant planting anytime they want. Preserving trees, buildings and other identified with historical significance is hard when builders are allowed to ignore protection of trees and green.</p> <p>The City of Portland has their priorities backwards and the cry of affordable housing will not be met with the plans to destroy residential neighborhoods. It is time for the home owner to be treated with respect.</p>	
<p>8/13</p>	<p>At the beginning of the info re infill there was a space for comments, but by the time I finished looking I could not find a space.</p> <p>Re infill: Yes, the maximum square feet for single family homes needs to be smaller; flexibility needs to be greater; on number 7 I liked the newer rules. On all - parking, or the lack of it, needs more thought, though it was obvious there had been concern about it. I have no easy answer.</p> <p>On the map showing open spaces, there are two very obvious areas where open spaces are missing, one is in North Portland, the other on the northern side of East Portland. I want to put in a word about the importance of open spaces, unimproved, where children can play. I was fortunate in living close to such spaces while raising my five children. They were important in helping develop creativity and independence. (I have been living in this house or within a few blocks of it since 1956.)</p>	<p>Email</p>
<p>08/14</p>	<p>To BDS RIP project management:</p> <p>After attending many of the RIP SAC work meetings as well as recent public informational meetings, I can appreciate the time and effort that many BDS personnel have dedicated to the Residential Infill Project. However, I feel that some have let the populist banners of affordability and density blind them to the significant potential harm the present draft proposal would bring to bear on many Portland neighborhoods. Rather than somewhat curtail demolition it would significantly encourage it. In addition, the large “de facto” rezoning of most of the existing residential sections of Portland is founded on a faulty premise that the new construction market will somehow self manage itself and balance the desires of existing taxpayers with developer’s pro forma and business models. I’m sure planners 20 years ago could not have dreamed of today’s developers buying \$700 - \$800K homes and turning them into rubble the next day! Sweeping changes always bring unintended consequences; and, therefore, need to be limited in nature until these unknowns</p>	<p>Email</p>

	<p>become better understood and effectively addressed. Creating a culture of developmental “open season” on small and modest bungalows (that only a few years ago were considered starter homes) in most existing built out neighborhoods, is not the answer.</p> <p>While most Portlanders would altruistically desire more affordable housing options for more residents and have a degree of understanding of density related to future forecasted needs, I believe they would also expect these goals to be in better balance with preservation of the city’s existing, irreplaceable resources. Focused, meaningful incentives to design and build internal conversions, along with compatible ADU’s, has to be part of the program to aid in maintaining this balanced approach to change.</p> <p>The cottage cluster concepts have one positive going for them in that they primarily create opportunities for ownership rather than replacing single family homes with rental units (duplexes, triplexes, detached ADU’s); but, yet again, at a cost to existing housing stock within built out neighborhoods. This reinforces that one size does not fit all and zoning considerations and language needs to be neighborhood specific in many cases. The argument that everyone should be covered under the same rules for equity purposes fails badly, when looking at the reality of the diversity of existing stages of neighborhood development exhibited throughout the city. Move towards creating more desirable walkable neighborhoods where none exist now; rather than erode the neighborhoods we have now by putting undue pressure on them.</p> <p>Portland needs a deft and nuanced planning touch not the bulldozer leveling approach! I remain hopeful in your reflective critiquing of the existing draft proposal prior to submitting to City Council.</p>	
<p>08/14</p>	<p>I tried to log onto the survey questions but nothing came up. Is this a subtle maneuver to squelch residents’ comments ? I attended one of the open houses and was flabbergasted at what the city’s proposal contained. It sounded like a slam dunk deal from the participating leaders. At one point, tension was so high in the room that I intended to leave as no matter what anyone suggested or questioned was dismissed by the meeting’s presenters.</p> <p>I did not fill out the questionnaire given to at the meeting because I felt the outcome had already been determined; the "city that works for you" was already set in stone. Having lived in this city for 70 years, I have never felt so railroaded as I did at that Open House . I have more to say, but as already noted: I cannot access your link by clicking on the residentialfill.participate.online/ . Anyway, it probably wouldn’t be read and noted for all others to see if I did.</p>	<p>Email</p>
<p>08/14</p>	<p>Hello,</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to take the infill code update survey.</p> <p>I also took a look at the detailed map for the NECN area and have some additional comments regarding areas with historically narrow lots, such as in Concordia where I live and own such a lot:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed boundary for these areas should take into consideration neighborhood character and consistency—not simply the radius from transit, etc., as currently proposed. For example, the boundary as proposed would allow a skinny house on one part of the block but not another. Perhaps a transition at the end of a block would make more sense. For example, on our street with the boundary currently proposed, we would still be allowed to 	<p>Email</p>

	<p>develop our vacant 25x100 lot (which we support and hope to retain our development rights) while someone a few houses to the north would not be. There are already two narrow lot homes on our block and a few more would fit right in if scale and design elements are updated as proposed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing infrastructure is available throughout many of the areas with historically narrow lots that are proposed to be restricted from development. So I don't think this should be a major consideration in terms of limiting development on these historically narrow, vacant lots. In our location, I don't think the public infrastructure two block to the east of us or a half a block north of us is much different than what serves our house in terms of being able to serve a few more houses on narrow lots. I assume SDCs would apply, so that'll provide funding for additional infrastructure needs. <p>Thanks for your consideration.</p>	
<p>08/14</p>	<p>Your form did not allow me to exceed 150 words and I have a bit more to say on the topic. Here are my additional comments.</p> <p>Although the 5' setback for back and side yards appears to be a given, increasing front setbacks will encourage decreasing back setbacks -- doing away with yards basically. While I'm not adverse to increasing front setbacks (in many places buildings appear to be up to the front lot line!), consideration should be given to overall green space needs.</p> <p>Visually eaves are a nice idea . But allowing dormers to extend into the setback further impedes people's privacy. Dormers should not project beyond the roofline of a house, that's standard for older homes. You're already allowing houses to essentially be built to the lot line (a 5' setback is visually and practically at the lot line) and basically minimizing setback to less than 4' by allowing dormers. (Eaves too but that doesn't seem to me to be as problematic.)</p> <p>"Code changes to allow and encourage more housing types in Portland's single-dwelling zones and other areas are key to increasing housing supply that is affordable to a broad spectrum of households." I'd like to see evidence that this is true in other cities.</p> <p>You've got to be kidding duplexes on ALL lots in a 2.5 zoning. ALL of them! That's how I read this anyway. Proposal: Establish a minimum unit requirement for all R2.5 zone lots. Require one unit per 2,500 square feet of site area Allowability of narrow houses: Absolutely a downside -- narrow houses often not reflective of neighborhood character with wider homes Comment about this: Allow taller houses with a smaller footprint or shorter houses that are more spread out, but not houses that are both tall and spread out. Tall houses are a problem w/ solar access. Increasing height has disadvantages for neighboring including loss of privacy</p> <p>This level of change, and development, ignores some of the unintended consequences of built environments. For example, more density = less green space (potentially fewer trees, and almost certainly fewer large trees). This in turn leads to the inability of the land to absorb rainfall culminating in creased flooding (combined sewer overflows, etc.). Taller buildings lead can lead to the inability of neighbors do to solar due to shadows cast.</p> <p>I can understand the good intentions to try to deal with the influx of newcomers and affordability. The plan however has approaches that will not solve these issues. In addition, it does not address the continued demolition of older, often well-built homes and the</p>	<p>Email</p>

	<p>concurrent environmentally impact and negative impact on neighborhood character. Basically we are selling Portland's lauded livability down the river.</p> <p>BTW how can I give you substantive feedback if I am limited to 150 words. Perhaps this is indicative of how much the city really values citizen input.</p>	
<p>08/14</p>	<p>Dear City Planners,</p> <p>We are offering feedback on the Residential Infill Project that does not fit within the confines of the online survey.</p> <p>Our primary concern is that we have just been through an enormous process with the Comprehensive Plan, trying to sift through the values that Portlanders hold important for the next decade and a half. The Residential Infill Project would ignore that process and proceed on zoning changes driven by only one goal, increasing density. The increase of this density is painted with a broad brush stroke, over most of the city, regardless of the underlying context and infrastructure.</p> <p>Portland has always been a city culture of distinct, livable neighborhoods. With a one-size-fits-all approach to zoning city-wide, the result will be the destruction of the values deemed important in the Comprehensive Plan and a more pervasive attitude of treating land and buildings strictly as investments, not homes for people.</p> <p>Relying on the free market to provide affordable housing and right-type housing will not succeed, because the free market wants to maximize profits. Supply will never exceed or meet demand, except in a recession.</p> <p>I would like to call your attention to this article: http://vancouver.sun.com/opinion/opinion-affordability-crisis-more-of-the-same-is-not-the-solution , from which I have taken the following quote.</p> <p>"There now is no such thing as 'single-family' zoning in Vancouver [BC]. Most every lot can have three units: the main dwelling, a secondary suite, and a laneway house. but rather than using these as an incentive to retain and upgrade solid older homes, they are leading to more demolition, waste and inflation.</p> <p>Older, more-affordable character and heritage houses that often had secondary suites are being replaced with monster 'McMansions' at generally twice the price. These are often left vacant and flipped multiple times, increasing land values that are disconnected from the local economy.</p> <p>So the pattern is upzoning for more housing supply, land speculation, demolition of older more affordable housing, and redevelopment to expensive units marketed as offshore investments."</p> <p>We do not yet have the same level of international speculation as in Vancouver, and RIP is trying to address the issue of the McMansion; however, we are in an extremely speculative real estate environment, and many people from cities other than Portland are investing in Portland real estate, because they see the possibility of local regulations enabling huge profits for developers.</p> <p>The other area where this proposal falls short, is that many of the city neighborhoods with this proposed zoning change are already dense, walkable and provide middle housing, all</p>	<p>Email</p>

	<p>with a variety of housing types, character, and historic significance. To propose such a sweeping change without first testing the results puts the entire city's stock of neighborhoods with character at risk, results in environmental harm from loss of embodied energy in existing structures, and will result in a monoculture of houses built in the twenty-teens.</p> <p>We would support a proposal that tests the RIP in one or two neighborhoods, which the Comprehensive Plan has already identified as needing more housing and development of centers. These test locations need to be in parts of the city lacking these qualities, such as Cully or Gateway. The success of the proposed zoning changes could then be evaluated after a year.</p> <p>Zoning is a tool to control where growth happens, and infill means filling-in areas not already occupied.</p> <p>We hope you will consider our concerns. We have heard many similar concerns at workshops and neighborhood meetings.</p>	
<p>08/14</p>	<p>Dear Residential Infill Decision-Makers,</p> <p>I attended several of the residential infill open houses, and came away better informed of the proposed changes the city deems necessary to address the housing needs of the future. I have many concerns about this that I have addressed at the open houses as well as the on-line survey, but I would like to point out unintended consequences that have resulted from this proposal:</p> <p>It is pitting neighbors against each other in ways that I haven't seen in my adult life. Home owners are now being characterized as the "owning class" by some renters, and there is now a strong divide between younger folks (around 40 and younger) and older. It has caused groups to form in resistance to the city's proposal on both ends of the spectrum. Those who want much more infill, and those who wish to slow down the infill. Thus, our city, particularly the inner neighborhoods, has become fractured.</p> <p>There is mis-information, strong opinions and accusations flying on Nextdoor sites and our Neighborhood Associations have become battlegrounds.</p> <p>According to the just-completed comprehensive plan, adequate space for infill already exists within the UGB, just perhaps not in the "desireable" neighborhoods. C</p> <p>an we not incentivize developers to build in neighborhoods that NEED walkable access to resources, rather than further stress the close-in neighborhoods that already are "complete"? (I'm thinking of Foster-Powell, Lents & Gateway).</p> <p>I continue to ask, what are the density goals for each neighborhood? I was hoping to age in place in my home, but I don't want to live in a city that feels that I, as an older resident, have nothing to offer and just take up valuable land that could be split up into countless residences for countless people. This is the only home I have ever owned.</p> <p>I hope the City leaders and the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability will take this into account as the process moves forward.</p>	<p>Email</p>

08/15	Hi thanks for that, but I think you left out many bus lines if that is the case. In my area it could be the 19, 10, 17, 71. Could you tell me what the exact times are for the am and pm peaks? That way I can check the bus schedules.	Email
08/15	Sorry to keep asking but is this Monday to Friday, or Monday to Saturday or 7 days a week?	Email
08/15	<p>To Whom it may concern,</p> <p>I attended five of the RIP open houses primarily to observe the public testimony. I appreciate the City’s efforts, however I have many reservations.</p> <p>Personally I feel that the City of Portland, acted prematurely in publicly presenting the RIPSAC recommendations. There was no economic impact study performed and consequently other special interest groups have piggybacked on the public roll-out of RIP making affordable housing claims that would not result from implementation. This confusion has created strife and divisiveness within our community.</p> <p>In addition, RIP doesn't have specific and stated density goals for various neighborhoods. There are no incentives built into the proposal to help shepherd "walkable neighborhoods" into areas that currently need it most.</p> <p>In spite of the fact that RIPSAC was in great part a result of the public's concern about demolitions of viable existing housing stock, this concern was not addressed.</p> <p>Furthermore, Portland’s Growth Scenario Report estimates that proposed zoning in the 2035 Comprehensive Plan will produce an excess capacity of 110,000 residential units within our city limits.</p> <p>Our inner SE neighborhoods need some time to absorb the tremendous changes that have occurred over the last few years as well as development that is planned and in-process. We know that the developers will in all likelihood double their efforts in the "desirable" neighborhoods leaving others behind.</p> <p>I believe the design guidelines proposed in the RIP have merit, such as internal conversions, building envelope, height, etc. in assuring that new construction is compatible with adjacent housing, but we already allow one ADU in R5 lots, which has not even had time to mature. I feel that we need to address demolitions before encouraging duplexes on all lots and triplexes on corners.</p> <p>I feel that we need to take more time and incorporate measures that encourage development in areas that need it most, discourage demolitions of viable housing stock and perform the due diligence that such sweeping zoning code changes demand before moving forward.</p>	Email
08/15	<p>In regards to Residential Infill Project Stakeholders Advisory Committee (RIPSAC) proposals I submit the following testimony:</p> <p>1) RIPSAC was created on the heels of an extended and intensive public participation process on Comp Plan 2035 where the messaging and mapping indicated most zoning changes and new growth would be located on corridors/centers and the SFR zoning (which already includes duplexes thru R2.5 and on corners) would mostly remain untouched. Launching a major new initiative that ending up proposing just the opposite is sewing distrust among citizens who had just participated in a major planning process.</p>	Email

	<p>2) RIPSAC occupied a confused perceived space in public policy. Much of the public understood this effort as one focused on better infill in terms of context and with at least some attention on deterring demolitions. While some of the former occurred, the perceived mission and focus of RIPSAC were not in alignment with public expectations.</p> <p>3) The impacts of the proposal were not clearly communicated. In particular, the potential of building (8) units on a 5000sf lot zoned R2.5 and how parking would be handled were never clearly communicated. 4) The RIPSAC timeline is too fast. It is ill advised to even think of concluding this process and writing code until Comp Plan 2035 is fully adopted.</p> <p>5) RIPSAC lost its one key representative for historic preservation at a crucial time in the process.</p> <p>6) There seems to be broad support for a modest scaling down of allowable floor area. Personally, I support a .5 FAR on all lots including R2.5 with a small bonus for attached units (with basements not included).</p> <p>I would like to see some of the modest reforms in scaling implemented sooner than later. However, overall, the entire RIPSAC timeline needs to be extended and the mission expanded to include a broader scope:</p> <p>1) Preventing demolitions and historical preservation 2) Impacts and management of parking 3) Clearer study of existing population density by neighborhood and how this proposal would impact different areas 4) More precise zoning approaches instead of broad brushes</p> <p>The RIPSAC composition needs to be adjusted to include more historic resources representation and representatives concerned about existing neighborhoods and context.</p> <p>Finally, we should step back and recognize we have more time than less. We have plenty of zoning capacity on the books today. These are Portland’s vintage neighborhoods. Let’s slow down and do it right.</p>	
<p>08/15</p>	<p>Dear Morgan,</p> <p>I am writing to express my position on the City of Portland’s proposed infill (RIP, Residential Infill Proposal).</p> <p>I, and my family, are completely and strongly opposed to the infill plan, particularly as applied to neighborhoods which are currently primarily single-family housing.</p> <p>The current infill proposal disregards the desires of residents currently living in neighborhoods with primarily single-family housing, such as Laurelhurst. I have spoken with scores of residents in Laurelhurst, all of whom seem vehemently opposed to the infill proposal. Neighborhoods such as Laurelhurst were never designed or intended to accommodate the ‘high density infill’ proposed by the RIP. Furthermore, these neighborhoods already have relatively high population density, and work just fine as they are – why would you want to destroy them, and in the process degrade the quality of life enjoyed by those of us who currently live here?</p> <p>Shouldn’t your higher priority be to those of us that currently live in Portland, rather than</p>	<p>Email</p>

those you are trying to attract who might move here in the future? We are the voters and taxpayers, and your primary responsibility should be to us.

Most importantly, the RIP is a misguided attempt at a 'one size fits all' plan for the entire city (albeit prejudiced against the east side). It disregards the historic character and architectural value of neighborhoods such as Laurelhurst. Neighborhoods like these are rare and precious gems, which should be preserved for future generations. Examples of neighborhoods with their early 20th century Craftsman architecture still largely intact and preserved, are rare, and disappearing. This historic significance is one of the defining characteristics of Portland, and should be protected. Once lost it can never be recovered, and an essential aspect of Portland's personality, and the very reasons many of us choose to live here, will be lost. A cost/benefit analysis must be performed to balance the relatively small incremental increase in population infill in single-family neighborhoods will accommodate vs. the irreversible loss of historically important structures and resulting loss of tourism. I believe that such an analysis would show that to impose infill and destroy irreplaceable historic neighborhoods would be sheer foolishness.

The current infill plan is also woefully deficient in that it does not consider critical aspects of infrastructure. The impacts on infrastructure - and the costs that would be needed to upgrade them - are crucial in determining which neighborhoods might be candidates for additional density, including:

1. School capacity – the need for additional classrooms and teachers.
2. Sewer capacity – and costs of needed upgrades.
3. Traffic congestion on already busy streets.
4. Parking on already crowded streets – it is nonsensical to assume that most new residents won't have cars, and I believe experience shows that most do indeed own vehicles.
5. Increased traffic will only result in increased accidents and deaths, particularly to bicyclists. How does the bicycling community feel about this?
6. City park capacity – park usage will increase – will they become over-crowded? What will the increased maintenance costs be?
7. Additional infill and construction should be focused on those areas that both currently have low population density, and where historically significant structures would not be threatened, such as Gateway and the SW waterfront. Why is there no attempt to identify specific areas such as these to be initial 'test cases' for infill?

Additionally, it is disingenuous to promote or even allow the perception that RIP will provide affordable housing. The RIP proposal was driven in part by the hypothesis that increasing housing density will lead to more affordable housing. While such a link between density and affordability might seem intuitively obvious, there is disagreement about whether this cause and effect really exists.

Below are a few different views on this.

The "Illusion of Local: Why Zoning for Greater Density Will Fail to Make Housing More Affordable" points out that local market forces of supply and demand are irrelevant in driving down market prices, because influx of folks with established wealth moving in from more expensive real estate markets (e.g. California, Asia) and foreign investment, lead to "a decoupling of housing from local labor market participation."

See: <https://psmag.com/illusion-of-local-why-...>

	<p>"Urban containment" (i.e. relatively inflexible urban growth boundary) is primarily responsible for the rising land/housing prices in Portland, and the reduction in its diversity as a result.</p> <p>See: http://www.newgeography.com/content/0038...</p> <p>Gerard Mildner (Director, PSU, Center for Real Estate) in "Density at Any Cost" argues that reversing the housing mix to (much) more multifamily dwellings would substantially increase housing costs in Portland over the next 20 years, making it the 4th most expensive metropolitan area in the country. He also points out that use of cars has not appreciably changed over the past 20 years despite development of light rail and extensive bus routes, and warns "we shouldn't base our land use planning decisions on commuting assumptions that won't happen". He also advocates for a more liberal --though thoughtful -- approach to the Urban Growth Boundary.</p> <p>See: http://www.pdx.edu/realestate/sites/www....</p> <p>I hope you will truthfully and genuinely consider all opinions on the RIP, particularly those in opposition - which to me seem to be in the overwhelming vast majority. At every infill related meeting I have attended, the overwhelming majority of attendees strongly oppose the RIP – I hope you will listen to our voices. I hope you will also honor your primary responsibility to the people who live in Portland today, the people whose taxes pay your salary – the majority of whom are opposed to the RIP.</p>	
<p>08/15</p>	<p>Hi Mr. Tracy,</p> <p>I'm writing as an architect and Passive House energy consultant to encourage the Residential Infill Project to consider ways to avoid dis-incentivizing well-insulated buildings (with thick walls) in any proposed square footage limitation rules. For example, a Passive House with walls ~12" thick is a significant contribution to meeting local, national and international carbon emission goals, but it will have about 5% - 10% less interior square footage than a conventional house of the same gross area.</p> <p>By allowing housing built to the Passive House energy standard a 5 - 10% square footage bonus this type of construction would not be penalized by square footage limitations.</p> <p>Thanks for your consideration.</p>	<p>Email</p>
<p>08/15</p>	<p>The City's proposed Residential Infill project gets some things right, but ultimately fails to recognize or learn from the varied housing types we already have in Portland's many neighborhoods. The project seeks to create more housing in single-home residential neighborhoods, but its significant downfall is that the proposed changes are not tailored to the unique character and diversity currently existing in each neighborhood. Instead, allowed or encouraged housing types are applied across the City regardless of whether they fit in.</p> <p>As proposed, the Residential Infill project focuses on three major categories: Scale of new infill housing; Housing types; and Narrow Lot development. There are a number of positive ideas within the proposal that seek to accommodate the future growth of Portland. One of these is limiting the size of new singlefamily homes, a proposal that may help to curtail "McMansions" and limit demolition. Another good idea is no longer allowing skinny lot houses to have a front garage, which would fix a policy that created some really sad street fronts. But the Infill proposal's housing type options are applied across the board,</p>	<p>Email</p>

with the only requirement being that sites are within a quarter mile from transit corridors and gateway nodes, and this is where the proposal loses its focused, thoughtful approach.

Over the last five decades or so, the growth of Portland has led to the development of neighborhoods with their own unique character and vibrancy. There are distinct differences between east side neighborhoods such as Woodlawn, Ladd's Addition, Buckman, Cully, and Alberta Street. These distinct characteristics attract residents that support that area's life style and features. Each neighborhood matters as a unique place. The Residential Infill proposal needs to use the major categories as base line strategies but then tailor the application to better fit and match the dynamics of the neighborhood.

Addressing the mass, scale, height, and set-back of new infill housing will go a long way to ameliorate the pace of demolition within existing neighborhoods. By regulating the scale of infill in direct relation to the surrounding context, new development will more likely be in harmony with the existing neighborhood fabric. Some neighborhoods currently are in plan districts with greater front set-back requirements than proposed by the infill project. Allowing new housing to sit closer to the street than currently permitted under many plan district guidelines would erode the existing streetscape that embodies the unique character in a plan district.

R5 residential zones are currently limited to one dwelling unit per 5,000 sf of lot area (a typical urban 50 x 100 foot lot) and Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) are permitted. The Infill proposal seeks to overburden R5 lots by allowing more ADUs per lot. There is no proposed regulation on mass, scale, and height relative to the existing structure, or regulation on location of the ADU. Would an ADU be allowed in front of a house? There are neighborhoods such as Mississippi Avenue and Alberta that are synonymous with small houses, tiny houses, and multiple dwelling units on one lot where the proposal needs to be tailored to allow for multiple new units but regulated to fit the appropriate mass and scale of the neighborhood context. To retain character, some neighborhoods need to retain a limit of one ADU per lot.

Many neighborhoods (e.g. Alphabet Historic District) have existing older/historic homes that have been converted to duplex rental units. The conversion of these homes is readily apparent because of the multiple entry doors, duplicated balconies, and visual division of the street façade. In other neighborhoods, if you did not live in the neighborhood on the street near the duplexes, you would not know the duplex exists. Many neighborhoods may support the Infill proposal that encourages the conversion of older homes to duplex units, if certain stipulations were included: the conversion of existing homes should retain a primary single entry on the primary façade in the same location as the original front door; and basement apartments should be accessed from side entries away from the street façade. As much as possible, the City should add stipulations to reward retaining an older house and to discourage demolition.

Triplexes simply don't belong in some established single dwelling neighborhoods. The proposal encourages triplexes on corner lots, which tends to create more development closer to the street- not always a pattern which fits the neighborhood. There are transition neighborhoods, like the west end of Buckman and west end of Kerns, which already have triplex and quadplex units. Within some older neighborhoods, there are already models for higher density that work well in the context of that neighborhood; courtyard apartments and multi-dwelling units around a shared green space. These historic types as models for new development are far more sympathetic to existing development and more effective in reaching density goals than encouraging triplexes in the wrong locations and scattered

	<p>without discretion throughout the city.</p> <p>Density goals should primarily target transit corridors and close-in, underutilized commercial areas.</p> <p>While there certainly is room for increased density in older residential neighborhoods, haphazard development will damage these neighborhoods more than the increase in units will provide affordable development. Major transit roadways like Sandy Blvd, West Burnside, and West Glisan should have minimum height requirements to encourage higher density. Single story commercial structures or car lots along these corridors add to the development pressures within residential neighborhoods.</p> <p>The Infill project does not recognize that capitalistic market economics drive affordability. Rental rates for apartments in neighborhoods with high real estate values will not be affordable. However, the Residential Infill proposal is laudable for seeking a broad solution to the need to provide more housing options.</p>	
<p>08/15</p>	<p>Dear Residential Infill Project Staff,</p> <p>Residential infill Project Comments As the comment period comes to a close I would like to add a few more thoughts.</p> <p>It concerns me about where and how much residential development will be added to the inner Portland neighborhoods. Unfortunately the ideas about 20 minute neighborhoods with all the needed goods and services available within short walking distance from every residence is not possible to create without additional regulations for the private business sector and developers. This is almost impossible to do. Businesses go where the market dictates. In this economy it is to the higher income neighborhoods – where their volume is enough to make a good profit. This leaves lower income neighborhoods without the goods and services they need. In most cases the automobile will be the preferred mode of transportation due to convenience. Two other things are working against 20 minute neighborhoods. One is the big box retail. They dominate the markets due to their variety of goods and their low prices. The other is on-line shopping with its low prices and its home delivery. Both of these businesses models make small businesses difficult if not impossible in many places. And new buildings will have high rents making having a profit even more difficult. I am pretty sure you can see the problem.</p> <p>You should know that the least expensive housing is the single family home on a cost per square-foot basis. Thus as the apartment buildings get larger the affordability is reduced or the livability is reduced, a-la the tiny house movement. And single family homes are often the most attractive form of housing unless cost is no issue. The next thing is about the silo effect of so many different businesses and public services. With the higher densities people are giving up their private yards in favor of public recreational amenities. This is provided by public parks, but very few new parks are being created in the inner Portland neighborhoods and this is not likely to change. In fact many services provided by the public and the private sectors have financial limitations that prevent their spread to the neighborhoods where they are needed or wanted. This might include community policing, parking, utility changes, social services, schools, health care, etc. All these depend on profit and economies of scale dictate thus limiting the number and location of their facilities.</p> <p>You need to consider these issues in creating more density in Portland. From the start the Bureau of Planning stated that there was enough existing capacity in the zoning map to</p>	<p>Email</p>

	<p>accommodate all the projected population growth in the next twenty years. Therefor is seems best to limit additional areas of growth to only the most favorable locations. It is my fear that more than this will only feed a development and property owning community to make investments that are not in the best interests of the locations where they will be built and in addition lose the identity and character of many neighborhoods.</p>	
<p>08/15</p>	<p>To: Residential Infill Project Staff</p> <p>As a member of the Residential Infill Project Stakeholder Advisory Committee, I have submitted comments through SWNI (attached) and through the SAC Neighborhood Context Group. I am writing now to reinforce my positions of various aspects of the draft proposal.</p> <p>The draft proposals do not support neighborhood context. One size DOES NOT fit all. Mayor Hales initiated the Residentail Infill Project in response to citizens' concerns about the demolition of viable, affordable homes and their replacement by oversized and much more expensive houses. He stated his priority was to preserve and strengthen Portland's diverse and cherished neighborhoods and reduce the number of demolitions. These neighborhoods are the product of history, economics, hard work and investment by residents, and, according to BPS, good planning decisions made thirty years ago. Recognizing and preserving this diversity are also goals of the Comprehensive Plan. To repond to neighborhood context, the following are required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scale standards of height, setback, bulk and floor area that respond the to the context of community pattern. (Note: this is not the same as the Comprehensive Plan's five pattern areas.) • Limiting development on narrow lots and resurrected historic lots only in the R2.5 zone. • Limiting the FAR of attached houses and plexes to that of single family homes. <p>One size fits all zoning will not lead to affordable housing. It will steer demolitions to areas of smaller, older, more affordable homes. Replacments houses, even plexes, will be much larger and more expensive than those lost to the wrecking ball. Displacement will be accelerated, driving those who are most vulnerable from their homes and our city. Standards need to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • System development charges that reflect the true cost of the services. • Incentives for the preservation of existing housing stock. <p>The proposed standards shift the burden of new development onto current residents. Homeowners have made investments in both their homes and neighborhoods. To protect the interests of current residents the standards need to provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Predictability. • Standards which protect solar access, sunlight, privacy, mature trees, and curbside parking. • Limit density to that which is supported by available infrastructure. <p>The proposed standards do not demonstrate truth in zoning. Portland's zoning is based on density. The new standards will allow R5 density greater than that allowed in the R2 zone. To provide clarity and predictability, the standards should:</p>	<p>Email</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Achieve changes in density or use through changes in the zoning, not through exceptions and overuse of overlays. <p>Density should be focused around centers and corridors which are compact, complete walkable neighborhoods. The quarter-mile boundary for middle housing, consumes entire neighborhoods and almost the entire east side from the Willamette to I205. The current code provides much underutilized potential for higher density. Policies and standards should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage development close, less than 500 feet, around complete centers. • Encourage development of more complete centers. • Protect areas adjacent to middle housing from negative impacts, eg. solar blocking, parking, etc. • Place middle housing only "where appropriate" as called for in the Comp Plan. These areas should be identified on a case by case basis. • At the present time there is no definition of "where appropriate" and no process for determining appropriateness. No middle housing should be allowed until these issues are resolved. <p>The draft proposals are not supported by modeling, economic analysis and infrastructure assessment. Proposing zoning changes and development standards without these studies can only serve to benefit special interests and not those of the entire city. Modeling and analysis need to be done hand in hand with proposal development.</p>	
08/15	<p>Morgan, Joe, and Sandra,</p> <p>I have noticed that BPS staff on the RIP and Portland for Everyone are using, what I would call, revisionist history when representing that there were no single family zones prior to the 1959 zoning ordinance. I wrote my master’s thesis on the development of Portland’s first zoning ordinance which began with work done by national consultant Charles H. Cheney (his proposal was narrowly defeated by a vote of residents in 1919) and ended with the passage of what has been called the “realtors’ code” in 1924.</p> <p>The thought then was that single family neighborhoods and, for that matter, industrial areas, were being invaded by other uses and that both single family and industrial lands were being economically undermined as a result. Cheney, using Sanborn Fire Insurance maps and field work, inventoried the entire city in terms of land use and developed his code accordingly. Cheney’s survey indicated that 86% of all buildings in Portland were single family dwellings (Cheney, 1919).</p> <p>The realtors’ board was opposed to zoning for Portland and lobbied for a vote of Portland residents – and, as I said, the proposal was narrowly defeated. Over time, however, the realtors began to see the advantages that the certainty of zoning would offer as a good thing so long as they were instrumental in drawing the map. In particular, they were interested in protecting the development possibilities for commercial and industrial activities and, some said later, overzoned Portland for both of those uses (the entire waterfront areas were zoned industrial and all major arterials, commercial).</p> <p>Like Cheney’s proposal, the 1924 code included a Class I zone (exclusive single family). Although smaller in land area than Cheney's proposal, for the 1924 code, approximately</p>	Email

	<p>19% of the city’s land area was zoned Class I. These areas included not only neighborhoods that had previously been protected against multi-family, commercial and industrial uses by deed restrictions (the Ladd Company’s deed restrictions are well known) but also areas such as parts of Sunnyside, not including major arterials. In fact, even Buckman, during this period, east of 26th was overwhelmingly single family according to the 1909 and 1924 Sanborn maps and Cheney's proposal would have zoned much of the eastern portion of Buckman single family. However, the 1924 code zoned it Class II, or multi-family and it is that that changed the character of the neighborhood.</p> <p>All of this is to say that it is factually inaccurate to say that there was no single family zoning prior to 1959. Because of public pressure, the 1959 code did promote single family zones and put into effect quite large minimum lot sizes especially on the west side.</p> <p>Here is the citation for my thesis:</p> <p>Merrick, Margrete. 1998. Patterns of Time, Place, and Culture: Land Use Zoning in Portland, Oregon, 1918-1924. Master’s thesis. Portland State University.</p> <p>Here is the definition for the Class I zone:</p> <p>The 1924 Ordinance (the “Realtor’s code”) Class I residential: covering 18.7 percent of the city’s land area (City Planning Commission 1924:3) – essentially all of Portland’s elite neighborhoods – was restricted to single family residences. A private garage, a pergola, a greenhouse for private use, and a “summer house” per residence were also included as were in-house offices for physicians, surgeons, and dentists (Oregonian 1923: August 5). The “local option” provision for this class required the consent of 40 percent of property owners within 200 feet of a property contemplated for business use.</p>	
<p>08/15</p>	<p>I live in the Arbor Lodge neighborhood of North Portland, and I feel the current infill proposal is lacking in some very important ways. Here are the issues I see that should be addressed in any approved plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No proposed or required infrastructure changes to support infill. For instance, there is a 180-unit apartment building going up at Interstate & Ainsworth near our house, and I haven't seen any suggestion for how our local streets (most notably Interstate Ave, which is one lane each way) will be updated to support this sudden and massive influx of people, many of whom will have cars, despite the proximity to the MAX Yellow line. - Air quality is obviously an issue getting lots of press right now, and North Portland already has some of the worst, due to the nearby industry, proximity to I-5, abundance of railroad lines, shipping on the Columbia, and many other factors you are most likely aware of. Air quality ramifications should be taken very seriously, as adding infill population to an area will almost certainly have negative affects on the air quality. Again, if you are counting on all these new residents to use public transit exclusively, you have your head in the sand. With more people come more cars. And likely less greenspace as large multi-family units replace smaller houses with more trees and greenery surrounding. This needs to be factored in when deciding on a reasonable target for infill. - Simply adding multi-family requirements to zoning for certain areas does not constitute planning. This should be broken down further, rather than forcing a large area of the city to add infill organically wherever a developer can grab some land. Some parts of a 	<p>Email</p>

	<p>neighborhood are more strategic targets than others, but there is no weighting based on that factor with this plan.</p> <p>- Please don't read this as a NIMBY statement - I'm resigned to the fact that infill is part of the growth strategy for this city, and will be necessary to deal with the rapidly increasing population. But it's always painfully obvious that areas like the west side and eastmoreland get a pass, while other neighborhoods bear the brunt of handling the infill. I want to see an equitable distribution of the growing pains here, and this plan does not reflect that. So I'm ok with this happening in my backyard, but I don't think the real NIMBY's should get their way and put a greater burden on us.</p> <p>- Adding infill does not equate to keeping housing affordable. An example - there was a small house in my neighborhood that was for sale for quite a while, I think they were asking around \$250k for it (was on Concord between Ainsworth and Colfax, I can get you addresses if you'd like to confirm). I'm guessing there wasn't much interest because it was just too small, I think it was a 2-bedroom maybe. So of course it ended up going to a developer, who built a large 3-story duplex there. Fine, that's infill, much increased capacity for people to live there. The problem is, each side of the duplex went on the market for \$589k, and both sold for around that price. How exactly is that helping to improve the availability of affordable housing? From where I sit, it seems that wiped out one affordable housing option and replaced it with two unaffordable ones. More people, less affordability. This plan needs to implement expanded affordability requirements for the neighborhoods it affects, or else it is just helping further gentrification. Put the onus on developers that, for every \$1.2 mil they make on a duplex, they need to build low income housing elsewhere in the same neighborhood. Should be part of the same proposal if possible.</p> <p>That's my feedback. I hope it is considered.</p>	
<p>08/15</p>	<p>I generally agree with the proposals regarding size, scale, height, and setbacks. These proposals seem likely to improve the quality of development occurring across the city, and help newer structures fit with existing ones.</p> <p>I also support the notion of allowing (or requiring) adjacent skinny houses to intrude on the setback between them and be built as a single larger duplex structure. This idea could well help address most of the issues associated with this type of development, and would allow occupants to enjoy a larger living space while eliminating awkward design issues such as the "dead zone" between structures.</p> <p>As for the proposal for redefining the zoning in inner Portland to accommodate higher densities ("Housing Types" portion of the proposal), I would urge you to be cautious. I believe the measure will exacerbate issues related to affordability and equity.</p> <p>Affordability - While it may seem obvious that increasing development will relieve our current housing problems, the consequences in the short and medium term may be very destructive to the availability of affordable (or relatively affordable) housing.</p> <p>In HAND and other close-in neighborhoods, we are already seeing our most affordable housing being redeveloped, with the new units selling or renting for much more than the original property did. Increasing development pressure on these neighborhoods will only accelerate the disappearance of affordable housing options. One could argue that building more units will depress prices, but the new units being built are targeted at the high end of the market, and it will take a very long time to build enough capacity to lower prices</p>	<p>Email</p>

	<p>significantly; we may not have enough physical capacity to ever achieve that. In the meantime, the rental crisis will worsen as currently affordable housing is replaced with unaffordable housing.</p> <p>Building enough housing so that everyone can live in the inner city with affordable rent is probably impossible.</p> <p>Equity - The proposal excludes large areas of SW and NW Portland, as well as some of the most economically exclusive communities on the east side, including Alameda, Eastmoreland, and Reed neighborhoods, all of which enjoy good proximity to downtown Portland and are accessible by bicycle and other modes of transportation. Excluding these areas from the proposal will only increase economic and racial segregation, driving up the cost of housing in these neighborhoods, putting them and their high-quality schools out of reach of even more Portlanders. Any proposal for wholesale reinterpretation or reimplementing of the zoning code should include the entire city, not just the less-wealthy neighborhoods.</p> <p>Transit Accessibility – The ¼ mile buffer around transit lines used to generate the areas affected by the proposal does not take into account how far a person would actually have to walk to access transit. For example, on Division Street, Tri-Met is proposing eliminating a number of stops that would require some households that fall within your buffer to walk at least a half mile to access a transit stop. If we continue to use the buffer to define properties affected by the proposal, it should be redrawn to include only those households within a true ¼ mile walking distance of a stop. A revised buffer would be simple to generate using the City’s GIS.</p> <p>Neighborhood Amenities - Any proposal to significantly increase density in the inner neighborhoods needs to include a mechanism for upgrading streets, transit systems, parks, and other amenities that are stressed even by the current number of residents. I understand that infrastructure planning is beyond the scope of this project, but I feel you should highlight the need for additional planning and resources in your recommendations.</p>	
<p>08/15</p>	<p>For what it is worth, I’ve done my best to alert the general public.</p> <p>And I do acknowledge your patience in responding to my zillion questions and concerns. My fear? Portland for Everyone a.k.a. Portland for Every-Developer paid Lobbyists and Project Manager efforts to garner public support [in taverns/pubs] will actually blindsides 1958 Lloyd L. Keefe planners post WWII single dwelling on one lot. Peacock Lane is but the tip of the ice-berg. Should this proposed draft be fact tracked approved by the Three Musketeers again — Bungalows on every corner within 92 neighborhoods will be subject to demolitions and replacement with triplex and no on site parking or for that matter parking in the public street.</p> <p>I trust my comments directing in-fill-middle and mapping 0.25 overlay along transit corridors are seriously considered — Culley, Lents, St. Johns, Gateway, and East Portland.</p> <p>Your work has just begun — and I look forward to reading the RIP final proposal — to be reviewed by PSC for comments and their recommendations to City Council.</p> <p>Worth repeating:</p> <p>Should this proposed draft be fact tracked approved by the Three Musketeers again —</p>	<p>Email</p>

	<p>Bungalows on every corner within 92 neighborhoods will be subject to demolitions and replacement with triplex and no on site parking or for that matter parking in the public street.</p>	
<p>08/15</p>	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Below are my comments:</p> <p>I don't agree with a scale limit. This restriction does not allow for an elderly homeowner whom wants perhaps a single story home without the extra story to climb. In this example, if they would need to maximize their footprint and the restriction does not allow for flexibility. Or perhaps a property owner whom wants less yard due to disability issues for maintenance care. Individuals who want larger yards can have that now, simply don't require others to conform to these requirements particularly if special needs do not make it practical.</p> <p>I don't agree with the measurement from the lowest point for roof height. Roof pitch style should be left to the property owner to choose from. By lowering the standard does not allow the property owner to have flexibility in their design. Not all roofs should have a low pitch, particularly in the climate of the Pacific NW. I don't agree with the increased setbacks and to match existing homes. Many existing homes have reached their lifespan material wise and will be torn down. To match an adjacent home's setback which may not conform to a new development, poses challenges when creating a site plan to maximize house placement for sustainability purposes.</p> <p>I vote to keep the above existing code intact other than the changes to the housing types near Centers and Corridors and within Inner Ring neighborhoods. That offers more flexibility and makes sense to me for density reasons and I do agree with allowing new houses on historically narrow lots near Centers and Corridors within the R5 zone which offers more flexibility and makes sense to me for density reasons</p>	<p>Email</p>
<p>08/15</p>	<p>Hi,</p> <p>I wanted to leave feedback that I could not leave as part of the residential infill proposal. I do appreciate the efforts that are going on with zoning and related rules.</p> <p>I do want to express a concern with the survey instrument (the survey itself) that was used for the Residential Infill Proposal. It was apparent to me very quickly that there was not a professionally qualified person who constructed, reviewed, and tested the survey before it was used. Several questions were fundamentally flawed. Please ensure the Bureau requires as part of future public surveys has someone (employee or contract) who has been trained to look for survey errors (i.e. a sociologist, anthropologist, or some other equally qualified social scientist). Just so you can know that I am not trying to complain, but in fact be constructive, this was a repeated error in the construction of the survey (below). It is called a "double-loaded" survey question. A respondent may want to affirm or respond positively to the first component/question, but is conflicted because in fact a second component (or question) is forced into the sentence. It is really two questions in one--therefore there is no validity as to if the question measures what it intends to measure. This is an example of the double-loaded question--of which there were many in this survey. I was actually a little embarrassed that the City would send out a survey in this condition. Copied straight from the browser:</p> <p>"Allow taller houses with a smaller footprint or shorter houses that are more spread out, but not houses that are both tall and spread out. "</p>	<p>Email</p>

	<p>I wanted to answer no the the taller house and no to the house more spread out. This shows the error of the double-loaded question. It forces an inaccurate response.</p> <p>Lastly, survey instruments actually must be tested before they are used. Testing this survey in person would have revealed that it was forcing an response on the respondent-- invalidating the response, and decreasing the overall validity of the survey.</p> <p>Feel free to contact me if you have any questions. I would like to know the Bureau's policy for how they will have qualified people constructing, reviewing, and testing surveys before they are implemented by the City. It does not convey that the City is serious about public comment when they do not have a qualified person construct or at least review the survey instrument.</p>	
08/15	<p>Dear Morgan Tracy,</p> <p>I have deliberated on the current Residential Infill Project’s concepts and urge City staff to embrace Portland for Everyone’s Residential Infill policy recommendations including the following to be applied in all Single-family zones (not restricted around “centers and corridors”):</p> <p>I. Scale of Houses - Sliding scale maximum square footage of house:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2,500 square foot house on 5,000 square foot lot - 1,750 square foot house on 2,500 square foot lot - additional square footage of home allowed on larger lots <p>II. Housing Types - Alternative housing types allowed in all Single-family zones:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a duplex within house, plus external ADU or, house with one internal and one external ADU - Triplex allowed on corner lot, but no ADU - One extra unit within house, if “affordable” or “accessible”, for maximum of four units on lot. <p>III. Narrow Lots</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Narrow lots in all Single-family zones, including lot remnants at least 25’ wide. 	Email
08/15	<p>Please add the following to the comments on the BPS proposal:</p> <p>If you ever doubted the power developers have in this city, read this link about how the Homebuilders Association (HBA) manipulated the Mayor and City Council to defeat the demolition tax and now are bragging about it:</p> <p>http://www.nahbclassic.org/directory_details.aspx?sectionID=0&directoryID=3576&directoryRecordID=706941&search=pageNumber%3d1%26directoryID%3d3576%26version%3d1%26keyword%3d2015%26activeFlag%3d1%26proximityLimit%3d0%2661090%3d17751&_ga=1.62605740.1002012887.1471295726</p> <p>From the above HBA link:</p> <p>“Since Portland prides itself on being progressive, the HBA engineered a testimonial lineup that featured a leading housing/economics professor from Portland State University – the</p>	Email

	<p>training ground for most of the city planners, an expectant mother seeking to tear-down her existing home and rebuild but could not afford an additional \$25,000, a gay gentlemen who had recently adopted a son with his husband hoping to move their new family back into Portland but realized that the tax would hinder the chances of finding an affordable home, and an African-American retiree living in a rapidly gentrifying area of the city who understood that any tax would hinder the value of his “nest egg” and was not fair to him and other long-time residents that had seen that neighborhood through from the “tail to the top”.</p> <p>I’m still holding on to some slight hope that BPS will revise the ‘concept proposal’ based on economic data and responses at the open houses, and not continue to be manipulated by the developers.</p>	
<p>08/15</p>	<p>Dear BPS staff;</p> <p>We live in the Multnomah Village area. We have read carefully your 20 page proposal and attended three open houses. We do not support the proposal, and believe you should expand your vision for Portland's growth. Thank you for your hard work and we hope you continue your deliberations with and input from various community representatives.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Urban Vision: The BPS density recommendation for residential neighborhoods envisions a city that will follow the examples of San Francisco and Seattle. Look at San Francisco. There are no trees except in parks. Seattle is experiencing significant reduction in its tree canopy. This urban model envisions neighborhoods where lots are filled with a diverse mix of housing types. The trees and habitat that once existed in large single home lots are destroyed. In these cities open space will be limited to parks and waterways. On street parking will be in high demand, traffic will increase, and public transportation will be inadequate. A better urban vision would begin with coordinated planning with all the neighborhoods and communities within the urban growth zone. Identify areas for denser growth while at the same time protecting existing neighborhoods and their urban eco systems; examples include the Orenco Station area in Hillsboro which is near Intel plants and was built in an open area that was once a plant nursery and farm. Barbur Boulevard and its surrounding property contain many older commercial buildings. Portland could promote dense growth along this corridor which will include a proposed light rail line. There are places in the urban growth zone that will accommodate all the proposed population increase. Portland’s growth does not have to occur at the expense of existing neighborhoods. 2. Environmental impact - The BPS 20-page recommendation and presentations at open houses fail to seriously address residential density increase including middle housing on the existing Portland urban environment. If the City of Portland and its agencies are serious about climate change, carbon reduction and the protection of plants and animal species, it must undertake a comprehensive environmental impact study before embarking upon a residential infill plan. Otherwise Portland does not want to be known as a “green” city. What effect will the proposed residential infill plan have on the tree canopy, other plant, animal and insect habitat, air quality, water quality, watershed and runoff. These are serious concerns that should be addressed in advance of promoting increased building within existing neighborhoods, particularly those that contain a mature tree canopy and well developed urban ecosystem. 3. Middle Housing: This idea is another way to involve private developers in building 	<p>Email</p>

	<p>more structures within single family home neighborhoods. Many of our neighborhoods contain on average 1500 sq. foot houses on 5000 to 10000 sf lots that contain mature trees, gardens, yards and native landscaping which provide nonhuman habitat, shade, water storage and clean the air. As soon as you fill these so called large lots with two houses, accessory dwelling units, duplexes and triplexes, the eco system dies. Many of these neighborhoods do not have sidewalks, curbs or improved streets. Where will additional parking go? Middle housing is an obstacle to trees, habitat, gardens, privacy, infrastructure, additional parking, traffic as well as neighborhood compatibility and character.</p> <p>4. Elderly neighborhood residents. BPS states that a diverse supply of housing “is especially important for elder adults seeking to age within their communities”. Our neighborhoods and particularly those in the southwest are home to many older adults who will live in their average 1500 sq. foot homes on 5000 to 10000 sf lots. I have presented to you photos of 6 such homes in my immediate two block area that are occupied couples and individuals in their 80’s (2), 70’s (2) and 60’s (2). We would like to enjoy, live and die in our homes. This is what really happens here. The tragic irony is that when an older homeowner dies, developers will swoop in to buy the property from heirs; then divide the lot, build more houses, ADU’s, triplexes and duplexes. Why not create incentives for persons to buy these houses, update them if needed and leave things as they are? What is wrong with 46% of Portland’s homes being located on so called large lots?</p>	
<p>08/15</p>	<p>Greetings,</p> <p>Please consider my comments below on the current proposals for the Residential Infill Project.</p> <p>By way of background, I have owned a single-family house in Sellwood (south of Tacoma) for 20 years. I am not in the development or real estate business. The house next door to me was demolished in early August and is being replaced by a much larger house. About five years ago, the same thing happened two houses away from me. Here are my comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposals to reduce size, scale and setbacks seem more reactive than rational. Cities and neighborhoods change over time; especially when they grow as fast as Portland has grown and is expected to continue growing in the future; and especially when we are trying, as we should, to concentrate the footprint of the urban area. (The current character itself once changed the then “existing character.”) Change should be expected and welcomed. Clinging to current development patterns and housing stock will prevent many good things from happening, including: (1) the replacement of old, run-down houses that really should be torn down (there are many in my neighborhood), which is less likely to happen if you reduce the options for rebuilding; and (2) construction of taller, higher density buildings that in turn stimulate new businesses and create a more vibrant, walkable neighborhood. 2. The size, scale and setback proposals seem subjective and arbitrary. Existing height and size limits presumably had a rationale. The materials I have read, and the information I have heard at an open house, haven’t explained how that rationale was incorrect or why the proposed new limits are better. The proposed changes seem designed purely to console one particularly loud point of view (“don’t change my neighborhood”), regardless of its merit. 3. The size, scale and setback proposals put too much value on uniformity. An overriding theme of the size, scale and setback proposals is that everything should look like what’s around it and/or what was there before. Why is that good? My neighborhood now seems extremely varied (in size, scale, housing types, design and setbacks). Some very old houses are much bigger than what would be allowed under the proposed new limits on size and 	<p>Email</p>

	<p>scale. I don't think that makes the neighborhood unappealing. Why don't we value diversity in residential housing within a neighborhood like we value diversity in other respects. Also, wonderful neighborhoods get created through construction of new buildings that don't fit in with what was there before (e.g., the Pearl and South Waterfront). We should not simply default to what exists now as the ideal size and scale for a neighborhood, and what is ideal for a neighborhood should reasonably be allowed to change over time. Small, working-class bungalows might have been ideal for Sellwood in 1900 while tall, multi-story houses (both single-family and multi-family to encourage socio-economic diversity) might be ideal for 2017.</p> <p>4. The size, scale and setback proposals fail to give adequate consideration to impacts on private property rights. Ten years ago or so, Oregonians got fed up with government passing regulations that reduced their property values and overwhelmingly approved ballot measures that required government to pay compensation when it did that. One hopes government became more circumspect after that, but these proposals suggest not. They would tell someone who bought property thinking they could build one type of house that they can no longer build that house. That is a very nefarious type of government regulation that should only be passed when there is a compelling rationale. It should not be done simply to appease a particularly strong case of NIMBYism.</p> <p>5. The proposals to generally allow more units and different types of housing are a good thing but may be too aggressive in response to what may be only short-term market distortions. While I generally support the proposals for more density and more choice in what people can do with their property, the proposals are perhaps a bit too aggressive in essentially turning single-family zones into multi-family zones. Also, the proposals seem to be based on current housing affordability issues, which could well be short-term market distortions driven by artificially low interest rates and a temporary increase in renters relative to buyers due to an over-reaction to the real-estate collapse of 2008. Housing was cheap eight years ago, and my understanding is that rents were low 10 years ago. Zoning codes presumably are meant for a long time horizon and should be based on long-term forecasts, in light of historical patterns, not just the concerns of the moment.</p> <p>6. Don't forget the efficiency of a free market. Many neighborhood activists demonizes developers and criticizes their desire to make money. In fact, developers provide us with shelter and places to work, eat, drink, etc. They make money only if they build what people want (or at least what many of them want). Personally, I think markets do a better job than government at figuring out what people want and how to deliver it in the most cost-effective way. I support planning and zoning as necessary to protect community interests, but planners should not forget the value of markets and should give people as much freedom as possible to build what they want and to live the way they want, without having the subjective tastes of others imposed upon them.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my comments.</p>	
<p>08/15</p>	<p>Good Evening, I realize that this is a little bit late but I'm hoping that my voice might still be heard when considering comments regarding the Residential Infill Project.</p> <p>I agree with all the proposals to limit the size of houses while maintaining flexibility in form.</p> <p>I agree with proposed zoning for house roofline.</p>	<p>Email</p>

	<p>I agree with the proposals to make front setbacks consistent with setbacks on existing, immediately adjacent homes.</p> <p>In regards to allowing more units on lots, I think:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Only one ADU per house – either internal to the house or one detached. -No ADUs on a lot with a duplex -Only allow duplexes on corner lots and triplexes should not be allowed. -No additional unit for providing an affordable unit. -I like cottage clusters but I think the current proposal is a little too dense. -I don't think a minimum build size is needed, but I'm not hugely opposed to it. <p>I prefer the current zoning regarding historically narrow lots to the proposed zoning, but I think there is a happy compromise somewhere. Same goes for the zoning regarding garages/parking.</p>	
<p>08/15</p>	<p>Dear Bureau of Planning and Sustainability Staff:</p> <p>I am writing to submit my comments regarding the Residential Infill Proposals. While there are several elements that either wholly or partially support, I am strongly opposed to Proposal 4, as currently written. Below I provide detailed feedback on the proposals, along with specific suggestions for amending proposal 4 in order to achieve the desired goals of additional units in single-family zones while minimizing damage to neighborhood integrity and affordability.</p> <p>Proposal 1: I support the reduced scale and height of houses in Proposal 1. However, I am concerned that there are loopholes that would result in buildings effectively larger than 2,500 square feet. Specifically, if basements will not be counted toward the 2,500 sq ft. limit, they should only be allowed to extend a maximum of 2 feet above ground level, not 4 feet.</p> <p>Proposal 2: Regarding height limits: I feel that the proposal--while it is a move in the right direction--will still allow houses that are too high and will dwarf neighboring houses in many areas. For this reason, I urge you to make the maximum height either a) 30 feet from the lowest grade to the *top* of the roof (not the mid-line), or b) 25 feet from the lowest grade to the roof mid-line.</p> <p>Proposal 3: Setbacks: While I support increasing the minimum setback to 15 feet, I do not support the proposal to waive this minimum to match a neighboring house. The reason is simple: over time, this will result in a "creeping up" of the setbacks along entire blocks, as homes are demolished and allowed to match smaller adjacent setbacks. This would effectively proliferate the very small current setbacks over time. 15 feet is a good minimum, and should be enforced across the board.</p> <p>Proposal 7: Historically narrow lots: I support putting new homes on historically narrow lots in the R2.5 zones, but I do not support it in the R5 zones.</p> <p>PROPOSAL 4: HOUSING TYPES NEAR CENTERS AND CORRIDORS: This is the element that I am most strongly opposed to, as currently written. I want to state at the outset that I support the overall goal of creating many more new housing units in Portland, and I am aware that the city will need to accommodate a large number of new residents and households. I also agree that not all of those new units should be located in areas currently</p>	<p>Email</p>

zoned for multi-unit housing. However, as I explain below, there are alternative means to add units in existing R5 zones that will generate far less displacement, demolition, and conflict.

A) This proposal is effectively a "rezoning" of enormous swathes of Portland's residential areas, but without the democratic process, careful scrutiny, and local public input processes required for zoning changes. The distance from centers and corridors in this proposal is unreasonably large, and the map illustrates that it would dramatically transform a huge percentage of the city's land. The vast majority of Portlanders have no idea that this wholesale "rezoning" is being proposed, and the current proposal appears to be a way to sidestep the needed public process that ought to accompany such a dramatic change.

B) As written, allowing duplexes and triplexes in R5 areas would dramatically increase land acquisition by developers, and subsequently demolition of many intact, functional homes. The numbers of demolitions are already creating a very high level of opposition, anger, and conflict in Portland's neighborhoods. This "upzoning" will suddenly raise land values, which will increase speculation and investment in Portland land by out-of-state and international investors. These processes will *never* create housing that moderates home prices--on the contrary, it will exacerbate the home price inflation that is already causing great displacement in Portland.

C) As written, Proposal 4 would dramatically increase demolitions of existing, functional, truly affordable homes, which the market can never replace at their current level of affordability to low- and middle-income residents. It will thus increase displacement of the very working-class residents that the city aims to retain. It will also unnecessarily increase carbon emissions through the demolition of intact, functional homes and their replacement by new buildings.

D) I believe that there is an alternative approach that would still generate a substantial number of new units in areas currently zoned R5, without increasing demolition: the internal conversion of existing homes into duplexes and triplexes, and the increased construction of ADUs (both internal and external) by existing homeowners. The difference is that these units would be created by homeowners, rather than through purchase, demolition, and new construction by developers and investors, which both increases displacement and dramatically raises housing costs. I urge BPS to amend proposal 4 to ONLY permit the creation of duplexes and triplexes through internal conversions of existing homes and the construction of ADUs by the current homeowners. The creation of these additional units through demolition and new construction should be prohibited.

It is important to note that BPS and other city staff have acknowledged that there is currently adequate room within already existing R2.5 and multi-unit zones to accommodate all of Portland's projected new growth. I am in agreement with BPS staff that despite this fact, some of the new units should be located in single-family zones. However, the fact that there is already sufficient room within our existing zoning makes it imperative that we adopt the approach that is least invasive and damaging to both low- and middle income homeowners and renters, and to the character and integrity of existing neighborhoods. This path is much more in line with the "Portland Process," which historically has taken the concerns of residents seriously and weighed them far more heavily than the profit margins of real estate developers and speculators.

I want to add one more comment. At the two public meetings/workshops on these proposals that I attended, a clear majority of the audience was opposed to changes that

	<p>would increase demolition in the R5 zones. In particular they were opposed to the blanket "rezoning" of huge areas of the city outside of the normal zoning change process. I also saw that the majority of attendees were supportive of the proposal that existing homeowners could create added density with thoughtful, responsible new units via internal conversion and ADUs.</p> <p>These proposals do not have to be adopted as a single package. The majority of the proposals move in the right direction, but proposal 4 (and to a degree, proposal 7) are very problematic. As written, they would increase displacement of lower- and middle-income residents, needlessly increase the demolitions that have caused great conflict and anger among residents in most Portland neighborhoods, increase carbon emissions via increased demolitions, and fuel speculation that will exacerbate Portland's affordability problem, not resolve it.</p> <p>Thank you very much for considering my comments.</p>	
<p>08/15</p>	<p>Dear Mr. Tracy</p> <p>Thank you to you and your staff for coming to our neighborhood to discuss the city's proposed residential infill plans. These are my thoughts from that meeting.</p> <p>In general, we hope that the city does not continue its efforts to IMPOSE a density plan on our neighborhood. Instead we request a PARTNERSHIP with the city to create a density plan that will have a POSITIVE impact on our schools, library, community center, traffic, safety and livability - for those who already live here and for those who wish to live here.</p> <p>We urge the city to:</p> <p>Be Fair and Honest in Specifying what Proportion of Density our Neighborhood is Required to Accommodate.</p> <p>The city's GSR estimates 20,000 new households in SE by 2035. Our neighborhood has 8.1% of the land area of SE Portland. Therefore our fair share of assuming population growth would be an additional 1,620 households.</p> <p>Since we currently have...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hundreds of 5,000 square foot lots that are ALREADY zoned for R 2.5. - Zoning that ALREADY permits the addition of ADUs - Hundreds of units recently built and ALREADY permitted <p>...the Sellwood-Moreland neighborhood has ALREADY EXCEEDED our fair share of assuming density growth for Portland. And we still have excess capacity given the current zoning codes.</p> <p>What, then, is the justification for rezoning our neighborhood? The proposed R 5 to R 2.5 will potentially shape our community into one that nobody wants or welcomes?</p> <p>Spread Density Proposal to ALL Portland neighborhoods.</p> <p>By focusing ALL density (mixed-use and residential) to ¼ mile from main corridors, density is unjustly impacting specific neighborhoods. Sellwood-Moreland is only about ¼ mile wide, so the city's proposal suggests packing even more people into an already very dense area.</p>	<p>Email</p>

	<p>Wealthy neighborhoods seem to be exempt from the city’s proposal. Why isn’t the city responsible for requiring all neighborhoods to assume responsibility?</p> <p>The city seems to be employing a ‘one-sided measuring stick’ - wedding density with neighborhood business districts, when there are many more ways to figure out the density puzzle so that the impact is shared equally, throughout Portland.</p> <p>Perform a Neighborhood Impact Study How can we provide intelligent feedback to the city on their proposals when the city has not analyzed the true impacts of their density plan?</p> <p>We have not seen any data from the city on how its proposed zoning plans will impact neighborhood infrastructure: equal access to quality education, green space and parks, community centers, and library. We have seen no research on traffic and emergency vehicle access. What about postal service, water, sewer and garbage. Internet access and other utilities?</p> <p>Llewellyn Elementary School is already bursting at the seams with students. The building is old and has limited space, and no wheelchair access. There are not enough classrooms to house all of the classes. Though we pay the art tax, there is no art program (except one facilitated by parent volunteers). Music is held on the stage, which prevents the stage from being used for performances, and which causes the music to be heard throughout the school. Speech therapy is behind that very noisy stage.</p> <p>Sellwood Middle School is facing similar problems – with not enough physical space to accommodate already existing students, let along the large numbers of children entering from the other SE neighborhood elementary schools.</p> <p>With all of the proposed density plans, there will be no option but to increase class size, which goes against the goals of Portland Public Schools. Has the city assessed the impact of all the development on our educational resources.</p> <p>Think about Earthquakes, recession, and other things we don’t like to think about, but we should (like lead problems in the school) Jamming as much as 3 buildings (R 5 to R 2.5 with ADU) where one used to be, what will the impact be when there is an earthquake? How will we deal with emergency services in case of a health scare? What would the impact of a recession be, given all the potential development?</p> <p>Slow Down Finally, with zoning changes looming, can’t the city slow down issuing permits until a full impact analysis is done?</p> <p>In Summary, here is Sellwood/West Moreland, we already have capacity with the currently zoned R 2.5 lots and with the ability for individuals to build ADU’s. Why make a blanket change from R5 to R 2.5, when we don’t need or want such a change; a change that can potentially destroy the livability and safety of our neighborhood?</p>	
<p>08/17</p>	<p>Please let me know if this is the correct email to send input for the Residential infill plan. I couldn't find the online questionnaire.</p> <p>Thanks!</p>	<p>Email</p>

	<p>WHAT I LIKE :)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I like the cottage cluster idea. I think this should be done in a way that still maintains a consistent street frontage. Ie, one structure fronts the street in a way that feels like neighboring homes, at least more dominant aesthetically than others. Other cluster homes pattern on the site. - yes on trying to keep the scale in nature with existing structures and finding creative ways to do this. - I like integrating smaller spaces into existing urban form in places where appropriate (existing nbhds). Single family that become 2 or 3 units, or having an ADU, makes sense to me and is a creative way to have people live in smaller spaces with the advantages of being more central often, while keeping the character mostly the same. - There are many homes with large lawns. If property owners want to divide, I think this is OK, as long as the new building is contextually appropriate (hard to define, I realize). - DO NOT ALLOW garages as the face of a house. It reinforces an auto culture, and that is not who we are in Portland. <p>CONCERNS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - many of the developers do not seem to care about how new structures fit into nbhds. This results in a patterning within nbhds, not on larger streets, that is incongruous. Ie, a single family house being torn down and a 7 unit apartment building goes in, sitting flanked by other single family homes. This isn't just about the way they do it, but where it is allowed. - materials used by absentee developers are cheap and not in character with neighborhood. I am actually very on board with evolving and contemporary architecture trends. This is part of the evolution of design in urban places. However, cheap, poorly designed architecture is not an evolution. It's a way to build fast, make money, and not be responsible for the long term effects on a place. <p>When would this go into place? My neighbor (the developer) bought the lot next door and applied for a lot line to lot line 7 unit (2 added variance) apartment complex. This happened before the Comp Plan proposed to DOWN ZONE the whole street. I am not happy with downzoning. In fact, I am OK with increased density. But I am VERY frustrated that the rest of the street will be held to a lower density zoning category while this property will be developed ABOVE what is allow even now. It will look odd, out of place, and it will disadvantage others who decide that as the street gets busier, a denser building type is more appropriate.</p> <p>My address is [Address], if you'd like to take a look at the issue.</p> <p>Apologies on the caps - I feel quite frustrated by trying to work through this in flux period of time in planning, design and construction.</p>	
08/17	Hello, would have liked to have given my opinion. Learned about this from se examiner today. Very poorly publicized. But I will say this infill is ruining the neighborhood, and only serves to make money for developers and the city through taxes. Devastating to the people in place.	Email
08/18	Please include Jim Labbe's recommendations from Urban Fauna re: incentives and variances for maintaining large trees in new development situations. These have also been shared with you by the Tree Commission and the Title 11 Oversight Advisory Committee.	Email

	<p>As to "middle housing' and "downzoning". I strongly feel that this is/was beyond the scope of what the Committee was convened to do. This is a wholesale rezoning without publicizing or adequate vetting. It has taken on a life of its own. Now folks have to play "catch-up" .It continues to put the infill pressure on the inner Eastside. Hell, we don't have a Commissioner living there anymore. Developers never should have been part of the process. If downzoning occurs it should only be allowed w/in 2 blocks of Corridors/Centers. I like the downsizing of new houses to be built and the respect for setbacks.</p> <p>Increasing density damages the livability of the the existing neighbors and neighborhoods. The only ones sure to benefit are developers and they have pocketed enough.</p> <p>One final point about "flag lots". I do not think they should be allowed in any situation where they would place a new driveway w/in 20 feet of an existing home. Why should someone in an existing home have their sleep ruined and livability robbed.</p>	
<p>08/18</p>	<p>Good morning Todd,</p> <p>I am emailing you because I unfortunately missed the meeting when you came here to Portland Housing Center. As I understand it, you came here to hear our perspective of what our clients are telling us are their desires and obstacles when it comes to home ownership. You may have heard of the obstacle of affordability because it is probably the single biggest obstacle to our clients purchasing in the Portland area. I am a homebuying specialist which means it is my job to counsel people in order to get them mortgage ready. So what I hear is what potential buyers are telling me their desired goal is and what they are willing to settle for. Most of my clients still want what was shown to us as children when it comes to home ownership; that picture of the single family detached home with a yard. Most are coming from apartments and so the second to the last thing they want is to purchase a "home" when in reality some of the freedoms that come with home ownership not there because the home is an apartment style condo. Some of my clients are actually looking to leave Portland and the NW because of the unaffordability of the market. Unfortunately, a trigger that is moving them into homeownership is the unaffordability of rent. So for them, a smaller living space, freedom essentially the same as renting, lower loan amounts and continued rent in the form of HOA's is not appealing. However, some are looking into options that would allow for communal type living. In these instances, their vision is to buy a piece of land, and add several small homes to it with shared community space. The dwelling units would not be attached so as to give a bit more privacy, but if all contribute then the property could become affordable. I must say though, that this is the vision of couples and individuals. This idea has never been presented to me by clients who have children. Nor has it ever been presented by any of my non-white clients.</p> <p>Also, from what I was told, the vision that the new zoning and development would carry, is that individuals and families would see moving into a smaller, yet closer to Portland central, as an upgrade and so they would potentially sell their "affordable" homes and upgrade to the newer homes. It appears to me that as most home owners are selling their homes for the most they can, it still does not create affordability. So I am not sure who new zoning would change the current market behavior. True supply and demand is not what is at work in Portland driving up prices. If that were the case, then over the last two years as more homes have entered the market the prices would have stabilized and gone down. Unless I am missing something, this development is more of city revenue growth plan, than community sustainability plan, unless of course revenue is the sustainability goal.</p>	<p>Email</p>

08/13	<p>Neighborhood context perspective August 13, 2016</p> <p>RIPSAC Members advocating for the “Neighborhood context perspective” Linda Bauer, Appointee – East Portland Action Plan Sarah Cantine, Architect – Scott Edwards Architects Jim Gorter, Appointee – Southwest Neighbors, Inc. Rod Merrick, Principal – Merrick Architecture Planning Rick Michaelson, Appointee – Neighbors West/Northwest Michael Molinaro, Appointee – Southeast Uplift Barbara Strunk, Appointee – United Neighborhoods for Reform</p> <p>The SAC members above support the neighborhood context perspective and are opposed to one-size-fits-all zoning standards that we perceive as contradictory to goals in the adopted comprehensive plan, not respectful of the variety of neighborhood characteristics that exist in the city, and which would lead to simplistic and polarizing situations. Not only is it important to support the diversity of the neighborhood character, but the condition of housing, scale, history, and economic factors can play a significant role in defining what is appropriate.</p> <p>During the entire SAC process, we repeatedly emphasized that “truth in zoning” is essential for rebuilding public confidence in the planning and zoning process and providing clear guidance for owners, designers, builders, and for the review process. We say that considering the primary metric for the zoning code is the density of dwelling units, and are concerned that the alternative housing proposals are further undermining the intent and purpose of this tool.</p> <p>Current zoning density around centers is under-built and scattered middle housing defeats comprehensive plan goals to focus density around walking scale centers. This is a successful model advocated during the past 40 years and is yet to be realized, especially in the newer areas of the city. A complex of cyclical market forces, not existing zoning regulations, are driving the current housing price escalation and, consequently, the proposals under consideration will not mitigate the cost of housing. Rather the widespread application of “middle housing” is likely to accelerate price increases in an already overheated market, destabilize neighborhoods, and cause loss of viable and more affordable housing and increase demolition and displacement.</p> <p>Key recommendations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test and model physical and economic impacts for proposed code changes prior to drafting and implementing zoning code changes. • Create development standards that fit neighborhood context and aspirations. • Ensure that scale of houses fits neighborhood context, protect solar access and privacy, and maintain individual green spaces. • Use commonly understood terms and provide clear definitions of what is allowed in each zone, a concept known as “truth in zoning.” Avoid contradictory criteria such as the use of density when lot sizes are the governing criteria. • Rezone areas in the City that are appropriate for higher density and alternative housing. • Allow historically platted narrow lots to be recognized in zone R2.5. • Save viable existing housing. • Actively engage neighborhood and business associations to participate in decision-making during planning exercises and for major developments to improve understanding of context 	Letter - Group of individuals
-------	---	-------------------------------

and needed design guidelines.

- Direct density to centers, as called for in the current and new Comprehensive Plan, to reinforce the establishment of centers, walking scale neighborhoods, use of transit and reduction of auto dependency.

Specific recommendations:

Code element Neighborhood context perspective

Height

- Measure height from the low point of the lot
- Maximum height:
 - o 22 feet: Varies with lot width, up to 32 feet for lots greater than 90 feet wide. (Option: average of adjacent houses)
 - o Measure to the average height of highest roof; include dormer roofs greater than 50 percent of the length of the wall of the house below.

Setbacks and projections

- Front: 20 feet minimum which may be adjusted to average of adjacent homes.
- Sides: Average 7.5 feet, minimum 5 feet. Increase for larger lots. Exception: Minimum 3 feet for bay or bump out and for one level ADU or garage with up to 10 feet high sidewall, 10-foot side setbacks on corner lots
- Rear: 20 feet; Detached ADUs 5 feet, 0 feet for 1 level ADU or garage.
- Allow eaves to project within 2 feet of side setback to encourage shading and weather protection.

Bulk and building coverage

- Use floor area ratios (FAR) to regulate bulk in addition to building site coverage; exclude basements lower than 4 feet below grade in calculation
- Use 0.5:1 floor area ratio in R5 regardless of lot size
- Use 0.5:1 FAR in R2.5 with a significant bonus of higher FAR for attached housing.
- Allow 10 percent bonus for accessory dwelling unit above the base FAR, for preserving existing to include an ADU.
- Outdoor area: 15x15 square foot minimum in R5 zone.

Parking / Garages

- Garage wall setback: align with or behind plane of main front wall. Attached garage width: 12 feet wide when above basement level or within 30 feet of front property line.
- Garage door width less than 50 feet from front lot line: 9 feet maximum.
- Narrow lots: Disallow street facing garages within 50 feet of the front lot line; do not require off-street parking.
- Attached houses: Allow street facing garages only if other options are unfeasible.

Main entrance

- Limit the height of the main entrance to 4 feet above grade

Middle housing

- Applicable for R2.5 and higher density zones: Total building envelope must match FAR

	<p>for the zone; 0.5:1 for R5, 0.5:1 for R2.5, except as noted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zoning should regulate allowed density and lot size. • Form: Allow the following types in R2.5 and R2: Row houses, duplexes, internal conversions of existing homes, and ADUs, consistent with density standards. • Number of units under separate ownership: As allowed by the base zone. Accessory Dwellings may not be sold separately from the primary unit. • Location: Within 400-600 feet of centers, where services are available. • Location: Within 200' of corridors where services are available and where appropriate. • The particular areas need to be mapped “where appropriate” in concert with Neighborhood Associations and Business Associations. <p>Narrow lot development on historically platted lots</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location: Allow historically platted narrow lots to be developed only when zoned R2.5 and higher density. • Form: Regulate by scale, 25-foot lot width minimum; allow both attached and detached structures. • Do not allow development on a portion of a lot (i.e., “lot remnant”). <p>Submitted: Rod Merrick Barbara Strunk Michael Molinaro James Gorter Linda Bauer Rick Michelson Sarah Cantine</p>	
08/15	<p>We do not support the Residential Infill concept at this point. It does restrict the size of new homes, but it encourages demolitions and threatens to alter the character of single family RS neighborhoods, essentially designating them R2.5 without going through the zoning process. Though smaller scale housing is important, there needs to be a mechanism that will restrict the influx of duplexes and triplexes so they don't overwhelm whole blocks (some is good, too much is bad). There is no such mechanism in this set of proposals.</p> <p>Our block, SE Henry Street just east of 52nd, is a perfect example of how this proposal can go wrong. We already have 3 duplexes, 2 fourplexes, 1 triplex, and 3 flag lots. That should be enough, and the City Council agreed, voting last spring to not rezone the remaining RS lots on this block to R2.5 because it would increase density on a dead end street that does not meet the fire code and only has one way out. This set of proposals would overturn that decision according to the conceptual map, adding the potential for 26 more living units on this block on top of the 30 already built for a total of 56 (18 units are recommended for dead end streets, 33.654.110.8). There is nothing in the proposal to guard against adding too much density to this block or any other block in the City being considered for this indirect rezoning effort.</p>	Letter - Group of individuals
08/08	<p>August 8, 2016</p> <p>Re: Residential Infill Testimony To: Mayor Charlie Hales Commissioner Amanda Fritz Commissioner Nick Fish Commissioner Dan Saltzman</p>	Letter - Individual

Commissioner Steve Novick
 Susan Anderson, Director BPS
 Eric Engstrom, Principal Planner
 Joe Zehnder, Chief Planner
 Morgan Tracy, City Planner
 Sandra Wood, Supervising Planner

From: Michael J. Molinaro AIA, SAC Member- Southeast Uplift Neighborhood Coalition Representative

I support the Neighborhood Context Perspective and am opposed to one-size-fits-all zoning standards that I perceive as contradictory to goals in the adopted comprehensive plan, not respectful of the variety of neighborhood characteristics that exist in the city, and which would lead to simplistic and polarizing situations. Not only is it important to support the diversity of the neighborhood character, but the condition of housing, scale, history, and economic factors can play a significant role in defining what is appropriate.

During the entire SAC process, I repeatedly emphasized that “truth in zoning” is essential for rebuilding public confidence in the planning and zoning process and providing clear guidance for owners, designers, builders, and for the review process. I say that considering the primary metric for the zoning code is the density of dwelling units, and am concerned that the alternative housing proposals are further undermining the intent and purpose of this tool.

Current zoning density around centers is under-built and scattered middle housing defeats comprehensive plan goals to focus density around walking scale centers. This is a successful model advocated during the past 40 years and is yet to be realized, especially in the newer areas of the city. A complex of cyclical market forces, not existing zoning regulations, are driving the current housing price escalation and, consequently, the proposals under consideration will not mitigate the cost of housing. Rather the widespread application of “middle housing” is likely to accelerate price increases in an already overheated market, destabilize neighborhoods, and cause loss of viable and more affordable housing and increase demolition and displacement.

Key recommendations include:

- Test and model physical and economic impacts for proposed code changes prior to drafting and implementing zoning code changes.
- Create development standards that fit neighborhood context and aspirations.
- Ensure that scale of houses fits neighborhood context, protect solar access and privacy, and maintain individual green spaces.
- Use commonly understood terms and provide clear definitions of what is allowed in each zone, a concept known as “truth in zoning.” Avoid contradictory criteria such as the use of density when lot sizes are the governing criteria.
- Rezone areas in the City that are appropriate for higher density and alternative housing.
- Allow historically platted narrow lots to be recognized in zone R2.5.
- Save viable existing housing.
- Actively engage neighborhood and business associations to participate in decision-making during planning exercises and for major developments to improve understanding of context and needed design guidelines.

- Direct density to centers, as called for in the current and new Comprehensive Plan, to reinforce the establishment of centers, walking scale neighborhoods, use of transit and reduction of auto dependency.

Specific recommendations:

Code element Neighborhood context perspective

Height

- Measure height from the low point of the lot
- Maximum height:
 - o 22 feet: Varies with lot width, up to 32 feet for lots greater than 90 feet wide. (Option: average of adjacent houses)
 - o Measure to the average height of highest roof; include dormer roofs greater than 50 percent of the length of the wall of the house below.

Setbacks and projections

- Front: 20 feet minimum which may be adjusted to average of adjacent homes.
- Sides: Average 7.5 feet, minimum 5 feet. Increase for larger lots. Exception: Minimum 3 feet for bay or bump out and for one level ADU or garage with up to 10 feet high sidewall, 10-foot side setbacks on corner lots
- Rear: 20 feet; Detached ADUs 5 feet, 0 feet for 1 level ADU or garage.
- Allow eaves to project within 2 feet of side setback to encourage shading and weather protection.

Bulk and building coverage

- Use floor area ratios (FAR) to regulate bulk in addition to building site coverage; exclude basements lower than 4 feet below grade in calculation
- Use 0.5:1 floor area ratio in R5 regardless of lot size
- Use 0.5:1 FAR in R2.5 with a significant bonus of higher FAR for attached housing.
- Allow 10 percent bonus for accessory dwelling unit above the base FAR, for preserving existing to include an ADU.
- Outdoor area: 15x15 square foot minimum in R5 zone.

Parking / Garages

- Garage wall setback: align with or behind plane of main front wall. Attached garage width: 12 feet wide when above basement level or within 30 feet of front property line.
- Garage door width less than 50 feet from front lot line: 9 feet maximum.
- Narrow lots: Disallow street facing garages within 50 feet of the front lot line; do not require off-street parking.
- Attached houses: Allow street facing garages only if other options are unfeasible.

Main entrance

- Limit the height of the main entrance to 4 feet above grade

Middle housing

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicable for R2.5 and higher density zones: Total building envelope must match FAR for the zone; 0.5:1 for R5, 0.5:1 for R2.5, except as noted. • Zoning should regulate allowed density and lot size. • Form: Allow the following types in R2.5 and R2: Row houses, duplexes, internal conversions of existing homes, and ADUs, consistent with density standards. • Number of units under separate ownership: As allowed by the base zone. Accessory Dwellings may not be sold separately from the primary unit. • Location: Within 400-600 feet of centers, where services are available. • Location: Within 200' of corridors where services are available and where appropriate. • The particular areas need to mapped “where appropriate” in concert with Neighborhood Associations and Business Associations. <p>Narrow lot development on historically platted lots</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location: Allow historically platted narrow lots to be developed only when zoned R2.5 and higher density. • Form: Regulate by scale, 25-foot lot width minimum; allow both attached and detached structures. • Do not allow development on a portion of a lot (i.e., “lot remnant”). <p>Sincerely submitted</p> <p>Michael J. Molinaro, AIA SAC Member- Southeast Uplift Representative</p>	
08/18	<p>August 12, 2016</p> <p>Re: Comments on Residential Infill Draft Proposal Dear Committee Members:</p> <p>I applaud the Committee's efforts to encourage greater housing choices through the city by providing a greater diversity of housing to meet varying family sizes, incomes and ages.</p> <p>However, as a past Chair of the Portland Historic Landmarks Commission and historic preservation advocate, I have significant concerns that the draft proposal does not do enough to prioritize historic preservation as a key component of achieving this goal.</p> <p>Before further explaining this concern, I want to make it very clear that the historic preservation objective that I am advocating is not about freezing any particular structure or neighborhood in amber. It is also not about using historic preservation as a means to achieve other goals such as limiting density, preserving on-street parking, or impairing affordability in any way. This is also not about designating additional historic landmarks or historic districts, although I do applaud such efforts. This is about being cognizant of how actions to encourage one thing could have devastating consequences on something else. We can diversify housing options without sacrificing existing structures that, whether they qualify for landmark designation or not, they contribute to the character of individual streets and make neighborhoods and communities places where people want to live, work and thrive. The 2035 Comprehensive Plan memorializes this objective in the following policies:</p> <p>Policy 4.46 Historic and cultural resource protection. Within statutory requirements for owner consent, identify, protect, and encourage the use and rehabilitation of historic buildings, places, and districts that contribute to the distinctive character and history of Portland 's evolving urban environment.</p>	Letter - Individual

Policy 4.55 Cultural and social significance. Encourage awareness and appreciation of cultural diversity and the social significance of both beautiful and ordinary historic places and their roles in enhancing community identity and sense of place.

Again, this is not just about National Register designated structures or historic districts; it is about "ordinary historic places" that contribute to community identity. Awareness and appreciation of historic resources cannot occur if the City's plan for encouraging additional housing diversity implicitly (or explicitly) promotes demolition and new construction over preservation and adaptive reuse. Without a concerted effort to incentivize adaptive reuse of existing structures over new development, demolition of historic resources will result. Regret is a one-way street. Once these resources are gone, we can never get them back. The Plan is replete with policies that require encouraging historic preservation and adaptive reuse over demolition, particularly when it comes to housing. These state:

Policy 5.7 Adaptable housing. Encourage adaption of existing housing and development of new housing that can be adapted in the future to accommodate the changing variety of household types.

Policy 4.27 Protect defining features. Protect and enhance defining places and features of centers and corridors, including landmark, natural features, and historic and cultural resources, through application of zoning, incentive programs, and regulatory tools.

Policy 4.17 Demolitions. Encourage alternatives to the demolition of sound housing, such as rehabilitation and adaptive reuse, especially affordable housing, and when new development would provide no additional housing opportunities beyond replacement.

Policy 4.48 Continuity with established patterns. Encourage development that fills in vacant and underutilized gaps within the established urban fabric, while preserving and complementing historic resources.

The proposed Infill Policy allows more housing types but fails to consider what affect it will have on existing community-defining built resources. We would never consider destroying natural resources such as filling a wetland or stream to accommodate additional housing. Why are we so willing to absorb the loss of our built resources that contribute just significantly to the history and livability of our communities? Plan policy 4.60 prohibits such a result. It states:

Rehabilitation and adaptive reuse. Encourage rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of buildings, especially those of historic or cultural significance, to conserve natural resources, reduce waste, and demonstrate stewardship of the built environment.

In addition, restoration and redevelopment consumes less energy than demolition; whereas new construction and preservation recovers the worth of past energy investment. Demolition and new construction not only consume present-day energy, but negates and wastes the past energy investment made in a building. In other words, preservation is a remarkably effective method of sustainability that is ignored entirely in the proposed draft that focuses solely on encouraging 2 infill. See *The Greenest Building: Quantifying the Environmental Value of Building Reuse*, The National Trust for Historic Preservation, (2012) available at:

http://newbuildings.org/sites/default/files/NTHP_TheGreenestBuilding_MHuppert.pdf.

The draft proposal is not grounded in any evidence that increasing housing diversity will actually result in the construction of less expensive units. Certainly, reason says that the smaller the unit,

the less expensive it will be but the construction of new housing at any size is going to be more expensive than increasing density within an existing historic structure. In other words, if the provision of more affordable units is the goal, as the draft Plan states, adaptive reuse of historic resources is essential.

Allowing more units and cottage clusters on single lots as well as recognizing historic lot lines as the draft proposal provides, without paying any attention to what may already exist on the property at the time of redevelopment is tantamount to "throwing the baby out with the bath water." We should not be so reckless, particularly when we have no empirical evidence suggesting that these new units will, in fact, increase affordability or density, as opposed to just providing a greater economic windfall to a developer. We need to encourage developer creativity in designing projects that provide some public benefit for the community, along with the pecuniary benefit the developer will realize in exchange.

In order to avoid this result, I implore the Committee to identify objectives that prioritize adaptive reuse of existing structures over demolition and new construction. This could be accomplished through the following steps:

- Allow unlimited ADUs within an existing structure subject only to limitations imposed by the building code. This would include working with the State Building Codes division to identify any areas where the codes could be changed to encourage adaptive reuse.
- Allow unlimited detached and attached ADUs to structures that are designated historic resources subject to historic design review. Identify some financial incentive or provide expedited review to off-set increased costs associated with design review.
- Limit Proposals 4, 5, 6 and 7, the allowance for more or larger sized units, to existing vacant parcels or on lands where the existing structure was built after 1975. This will allow testing of the proposed in fill regulations initially in areas where the City wants to encourage additional development rather than allowing the market alone to drive infill location decisions.
- Further incentivize preservation by granting system development charge (SDC) credits for reuse but charge new development the full SDC charge on one to one or one to many replacements.
- Proceed with plans to update the City's historic resource inventory. As we see how the infill project evolves, we could concurrently be updating the historic resource inventory with input from stakeholders and make the difficult decisions about what resources are critical to our built environment and what resources we are willing to let go. Decisions about where additional infill authorization may be expanded could be informed by that list.

In conclusion, the proposed draft Residential Infill Project proposal does not adequately take into account the City's existing built resources that are identified for protection within the 2035 Comprehensive Plan.

Thank you for your serious consideration of these comments.

	<p>Restore Oregon endorses and reiterates the statements in this letter of testimony, which expands upon the points of our previous letter of testimony submitted on August 9th.</p>	
<p>08/19</p>	<p>To City planning staff and City officials:</p> <p>I am a Portland homeowner (Address) and I have been a land planner in this state for more than 35 years. I am very concerned with how the City of Portland is allowing land developers to hijack the “infill mitigation process” to justify “middle housing”.</p> <p>I attended two of the planning department’s summer open houses addressing infill. I thought that the City would only be addressing how to mitigate impacts caused by infill construction of new single family dwellings. However, I was surprised that the City is also entertaining the idea of allowing other housing type sin single family residential zones to address a “so called housing crisis” and need for “neighborhood diversity”. Moreover, I noted that the City planners have been strongly influenced by the “Portland for Everyone” movement. That consortium, affordable housing groups and land development companies, are suggesting that people who own existing homes in low density residential zones need to respond to the “problem” of housing supply and cost. Part of this response would be allowing the City to essentially ignore density limitations while allowing duplexes, triplexes and courtyard housing in R5, R7, and R10 zones.</p> <p>As a planner, I agree that different, affordable housing types such as duplexes and triplexes can be made compatible with residential dwellings in single family zones utilizing adequate site area, site design and sensitive building design measures. However, I do not agree that density limitations should be ignored in low density residential zones to accommodate those housing types. To make this point clear, if ia duplex is to be allowed in an R7 zone, the site should be at least 14,000 sq ft. for a triplex, 21,000 sq ft.</p> <p>Earlier this year I testified at City Council comprehensive plan hearings stating that over the last 10 years of the comp plan development process, the City planners, the planning commission and the City council have had time to address land supply and housing needs; And subsequently designate underdeveloped land with appropriate zone districts to better accommodate a whole array of housing types. Because the City planning staff and officials did not address the need for more “middle housing” through the comp plan process, they are now playing catch-up in the name of a “Housing Crisis”. This urgent need to address the “Housing Crisis” is a political scare tactic. There is an adequate supply of housing units in Portland, and especially in the whole metropolitan region, to meet the present demand. Through a thorough and extensive process, City comprehensive planners established that the present “zoned capacity in Portland is sufficient to meet projected housing need” for the next 20 years. This is stated in the “Residential Development Capacity Summary” adopted October 2012.</p> <p>The present cost of Portland housing is very high because of the temporary high rate of incoming residents and subsequent overpricing of homes causing a price bubble similar to that of 2001-2007. We now know that was a bubble once it burst and home prices plunged.</p> <p>Over the past 20 years this City “That Works” has had the ability, but not the political will, to better provide for affordable housing, especially needed now with such high housing demand and subsequent overpricing. The City council could have and now has the ability to develop a 21st Century mix of economic inducements, incentives and requirements to engage the housing development industry in providing for affordable housing. Instead, some council member(s) and City staff appear to be in the pocket of the building industry</p>	<p>Letter - Individual</p>

representatives who target infill opportunities (demolishing older homes and replacing them with McMansions). The building industry and affordable housing groups claim that simple supply/demand economics is an appropriate approach to the housing supply and cost problem. Part of this proposed “more supply” approach is to allow middle housing in single family residential zones with no regard for density limitations. Any intelligent person knows that housing in this country is a laissez-faire market commodity with no city or state boundaries. In Portland, like many desirable US cities, If “you” build it they will come; And “you” (the land developer) will be able to price whatever you build at your will – for big time profits.

For the City to even be suggesting that density increases possibly be allowed in low density residential neighborhoods is an affront to those of us long time residents who have bought homes here and have been paying taxes to this City Government. The owners of homes in existing neighborhoods with low density residential zones bought those properties with the understanding that their neighborhoods would not appreciably change. This understanding is based on City Land Development Code Zoning designations, i.e. R5, R7, R10.

Residential Zone designations provide homeowners in existing neighborhoods certainty in how intensely land can be developed adjacent to and sometimes adjoining their property. City adopted Comp Plan and Zone Districts provide land owners this form of certainty which is a major principle in the practice of Land Use Planning. I am disappointed that the City professional planning staff and City officials seem to have lost sight of this important legal, planning principle I will not idly stand by as city staff and officials recklessly play politics with my and my neighbor’s property to address a trumped up “housing crisis”. I, with other Portland homeowners, will fight this by whatever legal means we can employ.