

From: lucy.h.cohen@gmail.com
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: Please support amendments 34 and 51
Date: Tuesday, November 15, 2016 9:36:32 PM

Dear Commissioners,

Our streets are our largest public space and provide dynamic, integral value to our city.

So why are we giving away space on the street for free? Why do we allow car owners to store one of their most valuable possessions on public property at no cost? This is a gross misallocation of resources, benefiting the most fortunate among us while hurting those most vulnerable.

Cars are damaging our city in many ways: particulate emissions dirty our air and make it harder to breathe. Carbon emissions endanger our children's future. Collisions kill and maim: more people have died on our streets this year than ever before.

Minimum parking requirements exacerbate these ills by artificially increasing the supply of parking and artificially lowering the cost of car ownership. This runs counter to our goals as a city; let's scrap the requirements and start asking car owners to pay an appropriate price for storing their possessions. Let's begin to reclaim our public space and make our city healthier.

Amendment 34 will eliminate parking requirements in mixed-use zones. Amendment 51 will require developers to manage parking and encourage visitors and residents to use transit, walk, or bike instead of drive. Together these amendments will move our policy in a more equitable and sensible direction. Please support both amendments.

Sincerely,

Lucy Cohen
4906 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97211

From: Ross Peizer
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Cc: pdxshoupistas@gmail.com
Subject: Comprehensive Plan Implementation
Date: Tuesday, November 15, 2016 9:33:25 PM

Dear City Council,

I am writing to express my support for Mayor Charlie Hales proposal to repeal the 2013 parking requirements which increase the cost of housing and reduce the supply of new homes. Affordable housing and housing in general is more important than parking for cars. That is why you should pass Amendments 34 to the Comprehensive plan to eliminate minimum parking requirements in mixed use zones.

My wife and I share one car and are considering getting rid of that car because it is expensive and we hardly need it with all the walking, biking, transit and car share options in Portland. Buildings with car parking cost the tenants and society more money. We need solutions that will save individuals and society money and prioritizing a community where individuals do not need to own a personal car is the way to do just that.

Thanks for listening and for your public service.

Ross Peizer
709 SW 16th Ave Unit 104
Portland, Oregon 97205

Ross Peizer
rosspeizer@gmail.com | 206.719.4440

From: Sandi Mottau
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: Hayden Island bike path
Date: Tuesday, November 15, 2016 9:09:57 PM

I am a resident of Hayden Island as are more than 400 other residents, seniors, some low income and some disabled. The proposed bike path on Hayden Island would affect many of these people and change or take away their homes, parking and change their environment. The proposed bike path would threaten wildlife habitats on our island and would make transient access easier. The space needed for such a path would have to be negotiated with many owners of homes, apartments, condominiums and businesses. I would like to recommend that the city apply their dollars to other incomplete bike path projects or use funds to improve livability on Hayden Island as we have requested many times. Please consider the long term effects of the proposed bike path on Hayden Island. Thank you for your consideration.

Sandi Mottau
Riverhouse Condominiums

Sent from my iPhone

From: Holger Zeipelt
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#); [Hales, Mayor](#); [Commissioner Saltzman](#); [Commissioner Fish](#); [Commissioner Fritz](#); [Commissioner Novick](#)
Cc: [Carol L. Chesarek](#); [Wilbur Widicus](#); [Maura Zeipelt](#)
Subject: Comprehensive Plan Implementation- Change Item 48 - Help needed
Date: Tuesday, November 15, 2016 8:47:11 PM
Attachments: [Trail Draft for NW Saltzman residents 101116.docx](#)

Dear Mayor Hales and Commissioners,

We own property and live on NW Saltzman Road in Multnomah County.

I am writing to ask for your help to remove the new dead end trail segments shown on NW Saltzman Road (and NW Skyline Blvd) from your revised Major Trails Map (Change Item #48 on Thursday's agenda and Figure 8.2 in the draft Transportation System Plan). It is hard for us to understand, why you allow money being spend over years on items like this, that are not approved, are not supported by the local community and right next to Forrest Park with plenty of existing hiking trails. One would think we have better ways to spend our money and time (schools, housing, transportation come to mind to name a few).

Please find attached the full letter.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Holger and Maura Zeipelt

Holger and Maura Zeipelt
11175 NW Saltzman Rd
Portland OR, 97229

October 12, 2016

Mayor Hales and Portland City Council
1221 SW 4th Ave.
Portland, OR 97204

Re: Portland's Comprehensive Plan and Transportation System Plan

Dear Mayor Hales and Commissioners,

I own property and live on NW Saltzman Road in Multnomah County.

I am writing to ask the city to remove the new trail segments shown on NW Saltzman Road (and NW Skyline Blvd) from your revised Major Trails Map (Figure 8.2 in the draft Transportation System Plan). Taken with Comprehensive Plan Policy 8.57 (Public Access Requirements, requires public access and improvement of Major Public Trails), this map and policy would require development of these trail sections as shown without any further study.

This trail segment, if developed as shown on the Major Trails Map, would lead people down a steep on-street trail into a dead-end road surrounded by privately owned property. There is no public trail connection or public access outlet available from this privately maintained cul-de-sac in Multnomah County.

This dead-end road is maintained and surrounded by properties in the Skyline Meadows HOA. The Skyline Meadows CC&Rs explicitly forbid development of public trails on properties in the HOA. Our property owners unanimously oppose the Metro trail. The proposed Metro trail cannot connect from Washington County to NW Saltzman Road without passing through at least one of our properties in unincorporated Multnomah County.

We don't understand why the City of Portland would want to lead trail users into this dead-end situation, which can only lead to frustration for trail users and will encourage trespass onto our private property as those trail users search for a non-existent outlet or trail connection. We already have encountered trespassers on our property and are no longer willing to accept this, as it easily could be avoided by proposed action in this letter.

Metro's preliminary plan for the Westside Trail that shows a "preferred" trail alignment that includes this portion of NW Saltzman Road, but there are several serious problems with this trail alignment and Metro's trail plan¹ makes it clear that these are "conceptual," not final, trail alignments.

¹ Metro's Westside Trail Master Plan can be found at:
http://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/06092014_westside_trail_master_plan.pdf

Other segments of Metro's proposed trail are (correctly) not included on the city's Major Trails Map, so we don't understand why this dead-end trail segment was added.

Multnomah County had so many concerns about this segment of Metro's proposed Westside Trail that their acknowledgement of Metro's Westside Trail Master Plan on April 24, 2014 (Multnomah County Resolution 2014-045) recommends that the county seek additional refinement to study and resolve potential impacts of the trail alignment prior to implementation. In response to these concerns, Metro modified their trail map to show that the alignment of the trail segment connecting to NW Saltzman Road is not final.

Please remove the trail segments shown on NW Saltzman Road and NW Skyline Blvd from your Major Public Trails map (Figure 8.2 in the TSP). Simply stated, the trail segment shown is a problematic dead-end that should not be developed without further study and identification of an achievable public trail connection.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Holger and Maura Zeipelt

From: J C
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: Comprehensive Plan Implementation
Date: Tuesday, November 15, 2016 8:13:19 PM

Hello, I am writing tonight to urge you that you pass amendment 34 to the comp plan. Please abolish minimum parking requirements in mixed use zones.

Portland needs a paradigm shift when it comes to car usage. Increasing supply is not the answer - it plain doesn;t work. Our current policies put the storage of private property (ie parking) ahead of affordable housing. But Portland has a housing shortage, not a parking shortage. So why aren't we prioritizing housing for people over shelter for cars? There are many reasons to discontinue this practice, and much better tools to manage parking.

If we limit the development of new parking spaces in location with frequent transit service, it will be easier to achieve Portland's transportation and land-use goals, to say nothing of environmental goals.

Please try to "think different" and be visionary when it comes to parking. We can lead the way!

Thank you,
John Paul

From: Margo Gilham
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: "Comprehensive Plan Implementation"
Date: Tuesday, November 15, 2016 7:47:28 PM

Please vote against putting a bike path around Hayden Island. Have any of the committee ever walked the path? It's literally impossible to build a path with a 30 ft easement, most of which is private property that would have to be seized and built out to 30 ft. There are condos, houses and mobile homes closer than that! The City of Portland has a million more worthy projects for our tax dollars! This is a silly and unnecessary idea. Make a park out of the West end of Hayden Island that all residents can use instead if you have money burning a hole in your pockets. We have real, serious problems for you to address, this one is not even worthy of our time and thought, much less yours. Please vote against this stupid idea!

Thank-you, Margo Gilham

From: Norma Holland
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: "Comprehensive Plan Implementation"
Date: Tuesday, November 15, 2016 6:56:18 PM

Why??? Why would we want or need a bike path on Hayden Island? We have miles and miles of bike paths in and around the city of Portland, which by the way, were paid for by taxpayers, who may or may not ride a bike. If you insist on a bike path around Hayden Island you are setting us up for another Spring Water Corridor, which cost thousands of dollars to build and then thousands more to police. On Hayden Island we are our own little community, with a relatively low crime rate and we would like to keep it that way. Please start spending the tax payers money in a more responsible way!!!!!! Vote NO on this bike path.

Hayden Island Resident and happy to live here, despite I-5 traffic, which is another problem our leaders seem unable to solve.

From: [Council Clerk – Testimony](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: FW: Testimony in favor of Amendment 34: Eliminating Parking Requirements
Date: Tuesday, November 15, 2016 6:30:49 PM

Susan Parsons
Assistant Council Clerk
City of Portland
susan.parsons@portlandoregon.gov
503.823.4085

From: Gabriele Hayden [mailto:gabriele.hayden@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 15, 2016 4:23 PM
To: Council Clerk – Testimony <CCTestimony@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: Testimony in favor of Amendment 34: Eliminating Parking Requirements

I am writing as a resident and homeowner in Overlook in favor of repealing parking minimums for Mixed Use Zones in dense, transit-rich neighborhoods. I live 1.5 blocks from the N Killingsworth MAX station--and 1/2 a block off Interstate. I recognize that the planned development there will affect my on-street parking and will probably be inconvenient. However, that inconvenience will be more than offset by having a more diverse set of interesting neighbors as part of a vibrant streetscape. Moreover, seeing my fellow Portland residents sleeping on the street is more than inconvenient; it is unconscionable. I just heard that a friend with a high-paying consulting job is renting a garage rather than a real room because she needs to pay off their student loans, and she can't pay what she needs to pay on her student loans and market-rate rents at the same time. This is ridiculous. At a time when rents are skyrocketing and paychecks aren't, and when the federal government may be slashing services for the most needy among us--including federal housing subsidies, food stamps, TANF, and the ACA/Medicaid expansion--we need to prioritize people over cars. It's the least we can do. For that matter, I would encourage the city to eliminate almost all parking minimums, including in single family zones farther from transit, if it can be shown that there is enough on-street parking. For example, on streets that are wide enough, why not allow cars to park on the diagonal and turn the street into a traffic queuing street? At a time when resources are scarce, we need to not leave money (or asphalt) on the table.

Finally, I wonder if the city should consider doing outreach to older folks to make it easier for them to designate a handicap-only parking spot in front of their homes? I'm on the Overlook Neighborhood Association board (though I don't speak for them here), and I've noticed that some of the most vehement opponents of parking reform are older people who are facing--or who have family who are facing--mobility issues. Highlighting that they can "reserve" a spot in front of their house if they have a legitimate reason to need that might allay some concerns--and/or highlight the ridiculous nature of the concerns of the more able-bodied, who simply can't bear to walk one house down. . .

Thank you for your consideration,
Gabriele Hayden

Gabriele Hayden
Freelance Editor
Facilitator, Hack Oregon Housing Theme

Ph.D. in English, Yale University
503-380-3944

From: John Vecchio
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: Hayden Island Bike Path
Date: Tuesday, November 15, 2016 6:12:16 PM

Council Members,

As a resident of the Riverhouse condominium community, I am very concerned that the Hayden Island Bike Path Plan has once again surfaced.

Riverhouse sits on the banks of Hayden Bay. The pedestrian path is narrow, suitable for two individuals to walk abreast. The path is limited in width as the land slopes down to the bays water. This path encircles the entire bay and resides on the private property of numerous condominium associations.

I am also concerned that the expansion of the path will expose and have an adverse effect on our natural wildlife and native plant environment.

Finally, Hayden Island, as like most other communities of Portland has been struggling with the ever increasing issue of homeless who have begun constructing illegal encampments.

To build the path would require the City to acquire the property. This action I believe would require the City to negotiate with each owner resulting in a costly, contentious and protracted process.

I trust the Council will appreciate my and my neighbors concern, reconsider the plan and allocate its efforts and resources in areas more critical to the City of Portland.

John J. Vecchio
468 N Hayden Bay Dr.
Portland, OR 97217



From: [Judy Clifford](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: Comprehensive Plan Implementation
Date: Tuesday, November 15, 2016 4:41:41 PM

I am writing this in regard to the proposed bike path on Hayden Island. While I encourage such projects, i think this would be a mistake for this area.

-this is an island with limited access, and it supports a population of 2700 and shopping area which brings in many people.

Getting on and off the island is a challenge.

-the average age of the community is 60yrs. Adding a busy bike path, with the rest of the traffic, creates a safety concern.

-removal of trees and other destruction of the environment to accommodate its construction, will not be an asset to the current ecology.

Please, consider the long term effects to this special part of our community.

Thank you for your consideration.

Judy Clifford
165 N Hayden Bay Dr.
Portland Or 97217
928. 257.6696

From: [Rabbi Moshe Wilhelm](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: comprehensive plan implementation
Date: Tuesday, November 15, 2016 4:22:26 PM

To Whom it may Concern

Our address at 2450 SW Vermont St was combined about 14 years ago with the adjacent property 6612 SW Capitol Hwy to be used for a school. At present the property is proposed to have 2 zoning designations, the north part is zoned commercial and the south half is zoned multifamily.

We request that council consider a comprehensive plan map amendment and zoning map amendment to make the entire site commercial cm2, we believe it will be more beneficiary to the community. The site is located within the hillsdale town center, on the 1 44 45 and 64 bus routes and is in proximity to other commercial uses and services.

Thank You

--

--

Rabbi Moshe Wilhelm | Director
Chabad of Oregon

2317 SW Vermont St. Portland, OR 97219

☎. 503 977 9947 | C. 503 381 7119

Rabbi@ChabadOregon.com | www.ChabadOregon.com

[www.Facebook.com/ChabadOR](https://www.facebook.com/ChabadOR)



November 15, 2016

VIA EMAIL (CPUTESTIMONY@PORTLANDOREGON.GOV)

Michael C. Robinson
MRobinson@perkinscoie.com
D. +1.503.727.2264
F. +1.503.346.2264

Mayor Charlie Hales
City of Portland City Council
1221 SW 4th Avenue, Room 130
Portland, OR 97204
Attn: Comprehensive Plan Implementation

**Re: 2035 Comprehensive Plan Early Implementation City Council Amendments;
Testimony on Behalf of Providence Health and Services - Oregon Regarding
Proposed Amendment 51 at Pages 50-51 of November 4, 2016 Memorandum**

Dear Mayor Hales and Members of the Portland City Council:

This office represents Providence Health and Services - Oregon (“Providence”). I am writing on behalf of Providence about proposed Amendment 51, “Transportation Demand Management and On-Street Parking Management”.

Providence supports Amendment “A”, which requires a clarification of the administrative process for TDM requirements in the CI and Mixed-Use zones. Providence, as have the other institutions, testified about the importance of a clear process in which the institutions are involved at the earliest stages of the administrative rule development and adoption.

Providence also supports Amendment “B” as long as it has the opportunity, along with other stakeholders, to participate in the development of the expanded policy.

As with both Amendments, Providence reserves the right in the future to take any position regarding the proposed administrative rules and expanded TDM policy.

Providence very much appreciates the Mayor moving this Amendment and providing for an opportunity for further discussion on this important topic. Providence urges the City Council to approve the requested Amendment.

Very truly yours,



Michael C. Robinson

MCR:rsr
Enclosure

cc: Mr. Theron Park (via email) (w/ encl.)
Ms. Dana White (via email) (w/ encl.)

38638-0044/133591288.1

Mayor Charlie Hales
November 15, 2016
Page 2

Ms. Krista Farnham (via email) (w/ encl.)
Ms. Michelle Bernard (via email) (w/ encl.)
Mr. Jeff West (via email) (w/ encl.)
Mr. Eric Engstrom (via email) (w/ encl.)
Mr. John Cole (via email) (w/ encl.)

51. Transportation demand management and on-street parking management

Requested by: Hales

Related testimony (for or against): Portlanders for Parking Reform, Legacy Good Samaritan; Providence, Reed College, Rose City Park Neighborhood Association, other individuals

Amendment: Direct PBOT to take the following further actions regarding Transportation & Parking Demand Management policy in Title 17 prior to effective date of the 2035 Comp Plan and associated early implementation actions:

- A. Clarify administrative process for TDM requirements in the CI Zone and Mixed Use Zone sufficient to facilitate the approval process in development review and to ensure adequate administration of new program requirements, including:
 - a. Evaluation guidance for Campus Institutional zone mode split trends
 - b. Evaluation guidance for evaluating “current practices” in existing local Campus Institutional zone TDM plans to assist in adaptation
 - c. Administrative procedures for implementation of the Commercial/Mixed Use zone TDM requirement
 - d. Guidelines or standards for the required education/information materials in Commercial/Mixed Use zones
 - e. Procedures for administration of surveys in mixed use zones, including distribution and monitoring

- B. Develop an expanded (Phase 2) TDM policy for private development and bring to Council for further consideration. This expanded policy should be developed with input from stakeholders representing development, transportation service providers and advocates, business groups, neighborhood associations, as well as other Portland bureaus, including BPS and BDS. The expanded policy should address the following
 - a. Appropriate strategies in the Central City
 - b. Approaches to maintaining on-going obligations for TDM incentives (beyond the one-year requirement being adopted for mixed use development)
 - c. Relationship to on-site parking supply and management
 - d. Relationship to on-street parking management, including proposed permit programs for high growth mixed use centers and corridors
 - e. Opportunities to expand TDM program to engage existing development

50



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

Printed on 100% post-consumer waste recycled paper.

Staff recommendation: Support. On-street parking management, off-street parking regulations, and TDM should be integrated. This is consistent with actions taken by other major West Coast cities.

52. Future of the “f” overlay

Requested by: Saltzman

Related testimony (for or against): property owner

Amendment: Direct BPS to study the “f” overlay area along Skyline to determine if the overlay is still necessary, and if it should be retained, modified, or removed. Bring recommendations back to Council in 2018.

Staff recommendation: Support. The “f” overlay is necessary to fulfill requirements in Goal 14 and OAR 660-04-0040. It establishes a 20-acre minimum lot size for this area, which is outside the UGB. This ensures that this land retains a rural character. It also ensures that large parcels are retained, to make future urbanization more feasible, if the area were ever brought into the UGB. Pending a final decision on Metro’s urban reserves, there may be reasons to modify this overlay, and consider smaller lot sizes (down to two acres). Staff would want to evaluate the environmental and water quality impacts of allowing smaller lot sizes here, because any development would be served by septic systems. The City previously determined that a sewer extension would be infeasible here – and not legal under Goal 14.

53. Comprehensive Plan Map refinement.

Requested by: See below

Related testimony (for or against): Multiple

Amendment: Direct BPS to study the comp plan designation and zoning on the following sites, and others if appropriate, and return with recommendations for any appropriate post-acknowledgment amendments in 2018:

- a. 7008 SW Capital Hill Rd (Hales, Saltzman)
- b. 9808 N Edison St (Fish)
- c. Strong property - 4931 – 4947 N Williams Ave (Hales)
- d. Marquam Hill mixed use node (Novick)

51



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

Printed on 100% post-consumer waste recycled paper.

From: [Richelle Beck](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: Comprehensive Plan Implementation
Date: Tuesday, November 15, 2016 3:36:18 PM

Good afternoon. My name is Richelle Beck and I would like to address the proposed Hayden Island Bike Path. I have been a resident on Hayden Island for over 6 years. I have seen many changes on the island in that six years with the remodel to Jantzen Beach Mall that brought in more shoppers and traffic onto the west end and the new massive apartment complex that has noticeably increased traffic on the east end of the Island.

When I first moved onto the island, my husband and I, along with our teenaged son, would walk our dog at both the west and east ends, depending on the day. A few times a year we would take garbage bags with us and pick up the trash left behind from other beach-goers. Everyone we passed on those beach walks were friendly. But in the last 4 years, we have been using those areas less and less because we felt unsafe with the increasing homeless population on the beach. The trash buildup was unsightly and they were far from friendly toward the local residents.

Now I hear that the City wants to put in a bike path on the island and my first thought is, "A bike path like the Springwater Corridor?" This can't be true. We have had to say goodbye to most of our beach access in the past 4 years because the homeless have made us feel unwelcome, and in the last two years the property owners have fenced off our access due to the crime and trash. And now the City wants to come in and make a brand new perfect place for the homeless to set up camp? A bike path that will mean taking away homes from seniors and people with disabilities? A bike path that will expose our vehicles to a whole new set of people who will easily figure out that most of us live very far from our vehicles? And all this at the same time we don't even have a police officer on the island and no one knows when we will have one again?

For all these reasons, I strongly oppose this bike trail. I believe it will take us from a place where we are already feeling unsafe and fearful and catapult us even further into that mindset. This path is an invitation for increased homeless activity and increased crime, and this is not what is best for Hayden Island and its residents.

If the City of Portland wants to do something positive for the island, consider fixing the potholes or investing into securing the shoreline from erosion or maybe even putting in a park on the west end. Those are all ideas we residents can support.

Thank you so much for your time!

Richelle Beck

206 N Tomahawk Island Drive
Portland, OR 97217
503-997-8444

Sent from [Outlook](#)



Hayden Bay Condominiums

Noah & Associates, property managers
12550 SE 93rd Avenue
Clackamas, OR 97015

www.hbcondos.org

Kate Dormer, account manager
kate.dormer@noahandassociates.net
503 654 0118

November 15, 2016

Francesca Patricolo
francesca.patricolo@portlandoregon.gov
Associate Planner, Public Involvement Specialist
City of Portland
Bureau of Transportation
1120 SW Fifth Ave #800
Portland, OR 97024

RE: TSP TESTIMONY: Hayden Island Plan 10-Year update

Dear Francesca,

Thank you and your colleagues for your responsiveness in addressing and alleviating our concerns regarding the bicycle-walking path on private property around Hayden Bay (where our homes are located) and to the east end of the island.

We currently understand however that the reclassification is still in place for the walking-biking path from The Waterside, past The Red Lion, under the I-5 Bridge, along the Columbia past the Manufactured Homes Community to Granny's Cove, south to the North Portland Harbor, and then back east through the Jantzen Beach Mall to the I5.

Many of our condo residents are active cyclists and appreciate all infrastructure that is carefully built to promote safe cycling in and around our city. If the proposal is to develop a biking path, we urge you to consider a number of factors that need be adequately addressed:

1. Cycling traffic coming to the end of the proposed path at the Waterside will likely ignore the fact that the path then narrows as it enters the private property around Hayden Bay. The path is very narrow and is hard pressed to accommodate just pedestrians and strollers, so bike traffic will sorely aggravate this situation. There are other concerns of liability should people be hurt by cyclists traversing our private path.
2. If the proposed 30ft-wide bicycle-walking path does loop around the manufactured homes property, due to its width, it may cut through dwelling units there. We understand that at least 112 families may be displaced as a result. Given the City's focus on offering affordable housing this is not a good strategy.
3. There is a great deal of concern that connecting the path up to the I5 will encourage more vagrant traffic. We have had increasing levels of vandalism and theft from the influx of vagrant encampments and the police have little capacity to address these incidents.

4. Appropriate measures have to be taken to manage the increased level of garbage left behind be increased levels of foot and bike traffic.
5. It appears out of sync to have a plan in progress that was predicted on the Columbia River Crossing project coming to fruition; that project never being approved.

We look forward to your considered deliberation on the plan that affects Hayden Island and its residents.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'SP' with a stylized flourish extending to the right.

Sean Penrith
Hayden Bay Condo Chair
seanpenrith@gmail.com
503 709 6429

Skyline Meadows Homeowners Association
Richard Jaffe, President
11100 NW Saltzman Rd.
Portland, OR 97229

November 15, 2016

Mayor Hales and Portland City Council
1221 SW 4th Ave.
Portland, OR 97204

Re: Portland's Comprehensive Plan and Transportation System Plan

Dear Mayor Hales and Commissioners,

We are resubmitting our testimony letter dated Oct. 12 for your review.

We ask that you support Amendment #48 and thereby remove this trail segment west of Skyline on Saltzman Road. We note that the staff recommends against this, their reason being it is a public right of way and would connect with a Washington County trail. The problem with this reasoning is that there is no public right of way for a Washington County trail through our private properties. Our CC&R's do not support the creation of such a public right of way, and none of us has any intention of working to change this. Certainly Saltzman Road is a public right of way, but your trail map leads people to a dead end. People are being misled by this map into believing it will connect to a trail that is not there, and is unlikely to ever be there.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Richard Jaffe". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Richard" and last name "Jaffe" clearly distinguishable.

Richard Jaffe, President
Skyline Meadows Homeowners Association

Skyline Meadows Homeowners Association
Richard Jaffe, President
11100 NW Saltzman Rd.
Portland, OR 97229

October 12, 2016

Mayor Hales and Portland City Council
1221 SW 4th Ave.
Portland, OR 97204

Re: Portland's Comprehensive Plan and Transportation System Plan

Dear Mayor Hales and Commissioners,

Skyline Meadows Homeowners Association consists of three properties located at the end of NW Saltzman Road in Multnomah County. We all live there and access our properties off NW Saltzman Road. We are the only properties adjacent to this end of Saltzman Road.

We recently had a group of people drive in and turn around at a home's front door looking for "the trail head shown on a map." Lately at least one car turns around in our driveways each week, mostly on weekends, something that did not happen in the past, and which we attribute to people following these maps and looking for a trail head and connecting trails. There is no trail through our properties.

I am writing to ask the city to remove the new trail segments shown on NW Saltzman Road (and NW Skyline Blvd) from your revised Major Trails Map (Figure 8.2 in the draft Transportation System Plan). Taken with Comprehensive Plan Policy 8.57 (Public Access Requirements, requires public access and improvement of Major Public Trails), this map and policy would require development of these trail sections as shown without any further study.

This trail segment, if developed as shown on the Major Trails Map, would lead people down a steep on-street trail into a dead-end road surrounded by privately owned property. There is no public trail connection or public access outlet available from this privately maintained cul-de-sac in Multnomah County.

This dead-end road is maintained and surrounded by properties in the Skyline Meadows HOA. The Skyline Meadows CC&Rs explicitly forbid development of public trails on properties in the HOA. Our property owners unanimously oppose the Metro trail. The proposed Metro trail cannot connect from Washington County to NW Saltzman Road without passing through at least one of our properties in unincorporated Multnomah County.

We don't understand why the City of Portland would want to lead trail users into this dead-end situation, which can only lead to frustration for trail users and will encourage trespass onto our private property as those trail users search for a non-existent outlet or trail connection.

Metro's preliminary plan for the Westside Trail that shows a "preferred" trail alignment that includes this portion of NW Saltzman Road, but there are several serious problems with this trail alignment and Metro's trail plan¹ makes it clear that these are "conceptual," not final, trail alignments.

Other segments of Metro's proposed trail are (correctly) not included on the city's Major Trails Map, so we don't understand why this dead-end trail segment was added.


Multnomah County had so many concerns about this segment of Metro's proposed Westside Trail that their acknowledgement of Metro's Westside Trail Master Plan on April 24, 2014 (Multnomah County Resolution 2014-045) recommends that the county seek additional refinement to study and resolve potential impacts of the trail alignment prior to implementation. In response to these concerns, Metro modified their trail map to show that the alignment of the trail segment connecting to NW Saltzman Road is not final.

Please remove the trail segments shown on NW Saltzman Road and NW Skyline Blvd from your Major Public Trails map (Figure 8.2 in the TSP). Simply stated, the trail segment shown is a problematic dead-end that should not be developed without further study and identification of an achievable public trail connection.

All members of Skyline Meadows Homeowners Association have talked about and agree with this letter.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Richard Jaffe". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Richard Jaffe, President
Skyline Meadows Homeowners Association

¹ Metro's Westside Trail Master Plan can be found at:
http://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/06092014_westside_trail_master_plan.pdf

From: [Zoe Klingmann](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: Comprehensive Plan Implementation
Date: Tuesday, November 15, 2016 2:00:38 PM

Hello,

I'm writing in support of Amendment 34 to the Comprehensive plan to eliminate minimum parking requirements in mixed use zones. I worked on the affordable housing bond campaign this year. I'm so elated it passed (and really appreciated Council's support)--but we all know it's nowhere near enough.

I want to see Portland be a place we can all call home. That means making policy aimed at helping people, not cars.

Thank you!

Zoe Klingmann
Arbor Lodge resident

From: [Paul Niedergang](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Cc: [Annie PDG Niedergang](#)
Subject: Support for Amendment 12
Date: Tuesday, November 15, 2016 1:49:02 PM

Support for Amendments 12 & 13 of the 2035 Comprehensive Plan Early Implementation Package

City Council Testimony November 17, 2016

I am here to speak in support of Amendments 12 & 13 of the 2035 Comprehensive Plan Early Implementation Package

I support Staff's recommendation for CM2 Zoning for this site because it will allow for higher density housing which increases the potential for affordable housing in the future.

This site is the eastern gateway of the Hawthorne District and should have similar zoning to the other corners of the intersection and be congruent with the zoning of the commercial district. The fact that the site is at the intersection of two major Transit streets also allows for less auto dependent transportation.

I am also support of amendment 13 requiring the "d" overlay for this site and the CM-1 zoning to the east of this parcel.

<!--[if !supportLineBreakNewLine]-->
<!--[endif]-->

...
Paul Niedergang,
Property Owner 5008-5018 SE Hawthorne

4437 SW Twombly Ave.
Portland, OR 97239

--
Paul Niedergang, Progressive Development Group, Inc / t: 503-235-2396 f: 503-235-7001 m:
503-750-2396 e: paul@progresspdx.com

From: [Mike Connors](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: Comprehensive Plan Early Implementation - Mixed Use Zoning - Space Age Fuel
Date: Tuesday, November 15, 2016 1:38:00 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[City Council Letter Comp Plan dated 11-15-16 \(Space Age\).pdf](#)

This firm represents Pliska Investments, LLC and Space Age Fuel, Inc. ("Space Age Fuel"), which owns and operates several gas stations/convenience stores/service garages throughout the City. We are submitting the attached letter to the City Council for their consideration at the November 17, 2016 hearing for the Comprehensive Plan Early Implementation process. Please include this letter as part of the record for the City Council's consideration. Please provide E. Michael Connors written notice of the City Council's final decision at the address below. Thank you for your assistance. Mike

E. Michael Connors
Hathaway Koback Connors LLP
520 SW Yamhill Street, Suite 235
Portland, OR 97204
503-205-8401 (direct)
503-205-8400 (main office)
503-781-0280 (mobile)
mikeconnors@hkcllp.com
www.hkcllp.com



Please be advised that this e-mail and any files transmitted with it are confidential attorney-client communication or may otherwise be privileged or confidential and are intended solely for the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, please do not read, copy or retransmit this communication but destroy it immediately. Any unauthorized, dissemination distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited.



Hathaway Koback
Connors LLP

520 SW Yamhill St.
Suite 235
Portland, OR 97204

E. Michael Connors
503-205-8400 main
503-205-8401 direct

mikeconnors@hkcllp.com

November 15, 2016

VIA EMAIL

City Council
City of Portland
1221 SW 4th Avenue
Portland, OR 97204

**Re: Comprehensive Plan Early Implementation - Mixed Use Zones Project
Drive Through Facilities
Pliska Investments, LLC & Space Age Fuel, Inc.**

Dear Mayor and Commissioners:

As you know, this firm represents Pliska Investments, LLC and Space Age Fuel, Inc. (“Space Age Fuel”), which owns and operates several gas stations/convenience stores/service garages throughout the City.¹ We previously submitted a letter and testified at the October 13, 2016 hearing to express our serious concerns and strong opposition to the Planning & Sustainability Commission’s recommended amendments to drive through facilities as part of the Mixed Use Zones project, in particular the recommendation to prohibit all drive through facilities in the City east of NE/SE 80th Avenue pursuant to the amendments to PCC 33.130.260. We reviewed the Commissioner sponsored amendments to the Planning & Sustainability Commission’s recommendation regarding drive through facilities and wanted to advise you of our position.

Space Age Fuel supports Option B, which is sponsored by Commissioner Saltzman. Option B is the Bureau of Planning & Sustainability staff’s recommendation for addressing drive through facilities. This option was developed after months of analysis and dialogue between the City staff and community members who submitted comments on this issue. The City staff continues to support and recommend approval of this option. While this option is not ideal for Space Age Fuel and other drive through operators, we support this proposal as a workable compromise that balanced the competing interests and has broader support in the community.

If the City Council is not willing to adopt Option B, Space Age Fuel proposes that you adopt Option C as an alternative. Space Age Fuel supports Option C as the next best alternative because it would effectively treat quick vehicle services uses, such as gas stations, the same as

¹ The Mixed Use Zones recommendations propose to rezone the following Space Age Fuel properties as follows: (1) 16431 SE Foster Rd. from CG to CE; (2) 8410 SE Foster Rd. from EX to CM3; (3) 12920 SE Stark St. from CG to CE; and (4) 11214 SE Powell Blvd. from CN2 to CM1.

Page 2
November 15, 2016

Option B. Nonetheless, Space Age Fuel has concerns about this option because it would prohibit other new drive through facilities in commercial/mixed use zones throughout the entire City. We believe a Citywide prohibition against other types of drive through facilities is problematic for many of the same reasons cited in our October 13, 2016 letter.

Space Age Fuel remains adamantly opposed to Option A for the reasons provided in our October 13, 2016 letter.

Finally, Space Age Fuel wishes to renew its request to zone all of its properties CE. When selecting the appropriate mixed use zone for a particular property, the existing use should weigh heavily in that consideration and the City should avoid imposing a new mixed use zone that is out of character with the existing uses in the surrounding area. Our October 13, 2016 letter provides a number of compelling reasons for changing the zoning of Space Age Fuel's 11214 SE Powell Blvd. and 8410 SE Foster Rd. properties to CE.

We appreciate your willingness to consider our previous comments and propose amendments to address these issues. Space Age Fuel and other parties worked extensively with the City staff to strike a proper balance for regulating drive through facilities in the new mixed use zones as reflected in Option B. The City Council should adopt this approach as well for the reasons we and other community business and members have provided. We look forward to continuing to work with the City regarding this matter.

Very truly yours,

HATHAWAY KOBACK CONNORS LLP



E. Michael Connors

EMC/pl
cc: Clients

From: [Pam Ferguson](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: BIKE PATH VS AFFORDABLE HOMES ON HAYDEN ISLAND? REALLY PORTLAND?
Date: Tuesday, November 15, 2016 1:34:10 PM

Dear Portland City Commissioners,

Thank you for reading my concerns about the inclusion of a bike path on Hayden Island in the Transportation System Plan!

Don't do it! The proposed bike path along the Columbia River along the north shore of Hayden Island will have a far more negative impact than positive.

I live on Hayden Island in the infamous Hayden Island Manufactured Home Community - 440 homes, 1200 plus residents, single people, seniors, many people living on fixed incomes, many residents with disabilities, many families with limited incomes, and many Portlanders that would have a hard time finding reliable housing alternatives. This is an environmental justice community and needs to be protected at all cost!

The proposed Bike Path would be the DEMISE of the Manufactured Home Community! The bike path would take out (30 feet wide?) all waterfront homes (120 approximately) and without the site rents from these homes Lautrec Management Company would close this community down completely. That is a guarantee! It is that simple!

Please do everything in your power to take the proposed bike path on Hayden Island out of the Transportation System Plan!

Thank you from all Hayden Island residents!

Pam Ferguson
(Past President, Home Owners Association)
2270 North Broughton Drive
Portland, OR 97217
503-265-9479 cell
pamfergusonpdx@aim.com

From: [Mike Connors](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: Comprehensive Plan Implementation - Transportation System Plan Stage 2 Update - Proposed Bike Path - Hayden Island Manufactured Home Park Comments
Date: Tuesday, November 15, 2016 1:04:47 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[City Council Letter TSP dated 11-15-16 \(Hayden Island\).pdf](#)

This firm represents Hayden Island Enterprises, the owners and operators of Hayden Island Manufactured Home Community ("HIMHC"). We are submitting the attached letter to the City Council for their consideration regarding the Comprehensive Plan Early Implementation Package. Hayden Island Enterprises strenuously objects to the City Bikeway path proposed through the HIMHC property as part of the Transportation System Plan ("TSP") Stage 2 Update for the reasons set forth in the letter. Please include this letter as part of the Comprehensive Plan Early Implementation Package record for the City Council's consideration. Please provide E. Michael Connors written notice of the City Council's final decision at the address below. Thank you for your assistance. Mike

E. Michael Connors
Hathaway Koback Connors LLP
520 SW Yamhill Street, Suite 235
Portland, OR 97204
503-205-8401 (direct)
503-205-8400 (main office)
503-781-0280 (mobile)
mikeconnors@hkcllp.com
www.hkcllp.com



Please be advised that this e-mail and any files transmitted with it are confidential attorney-client communication or may otherwise be privileged or confidential and are intended solely for the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, please do not read, copy or retransmit this communication but destroy it immediately. Any unauthorized, dissemination distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited.



520 SW Yamhill St.
Suite 235
Portland, OR 97204

E. Michael Connors
503-205-8400 main
503-205-8401 direct

mikeconnors@hkcllp.com

November 15, 2016

VIA EMAIL

City Council
City of Portland
c/o Bureau of Planning & Sustainability
1900 SW 4th Avenue, Suite 7100
Portland, OR 97201

Re: Transportation System Plan Stage 2 Update – Hayden Island Bike Path
Hayden Island Manufactured Home Community

Dear Mayor and Commissioners:

As you know, this firm represents Hayden Island Enterprises, the owners and operators of Hayden Island Manufactured Home Community (“HIMHC”). HIMHC consists of 440 manufactured home sites, 169 RV sites and 1,500 residents located on Hayden Island and has been consistently recognized by the City as a vital affordable housing resource. We previously submitted a letter and testified at the October 6, 2016 hearing strenuously objecting to the City Bikeway path through the HIMHC property proposed as part of the Transportation System Plan (“TSP”) Stage 2 Update.

Hayden Island Enterprises is extremely dismayed and disappointed that none of the City Commissioners proposed amendments to remove the proposed bike path on HIMHC property. To make matters worse, Mayor Hales and Commissioner Novick proposed to remove the proposed bike path section along Hayden Bay but not the portion on HIMHC. We are very confused as to why the City Council would propose amendments to remove only the Hayden Bay segment of the bike path given that it will not have nearly as significant of an effect on residents as the HIMHC segment.

As we previously noted, the HIMHC segment of the bike path would require the removal of over 40 manufactured homes located along the Columbia River. Although Mayor Hales noted at the October 6 hearing that the City is not seeking an easement for the bike path at this time, the designation of the bike path is the first step in that process. There is nothing in the TSP Stage 2 Update that prohibits or restricts the City from moving forward with the bike path at any time. The TSP Stage 2 Update does not even require the City to wait until the property is redeveloped before pursuing the bike path. If the City truly does not intend to pursue the bike path improvement given the potential impact on manufactured homes and residents of the park, there is no reason to adopt the proposed bike path plan in the first place.

November 15, 2016

The bike path is inconsistent with the recently adopted 2035 Comprehensive Plan and the City's policy of protecting affordable housing resources such as HIMHC. Since the bike path would require the removal of numerous manufactured homes, it is clearly inconsistent with the 2035 Comprehensive Plan Policy 5.37 which encourages the preservation of manufactured home parks. Even if the City intends to only require the bike path be constructed if the property is redeveloped, approving the bike path sends a very strong signal that the City wants the property to be redeveloped. Encouraging the redevelopment of the park is inconsistent with Policy 5.37 and the common desire to preserve this affordable housing resource.

The City does not have the authority to compel the construction of the bike path and therefore it is completely unproductive and unnecessary to adopt a bike path proposal across private property against the wishes of the property owner. Since the bike path is being proposed for the general benefit of the public and is not necessary to address impacts from HIMHC, the City cannot establish the nexus and rough proportionality requirements necessary to justify a taking. *See Dolan v. City of Tigard*, 512 US 374 (1994); *Nollan v. California Coastal Comm'n*, 483 US 825 (1987). If the City does not have the authority to legally compel the bike path improvement, it should not adopt a planning proposal that would create significant concerns and problems for Hayden Island Enterprises and the HIMHC residents.

As we explained at the October 6 hearing, the impacts of the bike path plan will be immediate regardless of when /if it is actually improved. The mere designation of the bike plan as part of the TSP will immediately affect the value of the property and make it more difficult to plan and obtain financing in the future. It will also create uncertainty and concerns for HIMHC residents, in particular those along the Columbia River that would be most affected by the bike path.

The City should not impose a public bike path across private property against the will of the property owners, residents of this community and the Hayden Island residents whom uniformly oppose this bike path. Please understand that if the City approves this bike path as part of the TSP Stage 2 Update amendments, Hayden Island Enterprises will have no choice but to protect its interests by all legal means necessary, including but not limited to appealing the City's approval of the TSP Stage 2 Update amendments and/or filing an action in court for the unconstitutional taking.

We appreciate your consideration of our comments and implore you to remove the proposed bike path on HIMHC property. We look forward to working with the City further on this matter.

Very truly yours,

HATHAWAY KOBACK CONNORS LLP



E. Michael Connors

EMC/pl

cc: Hayden Island Enterprises

From: [Ruth Fitz](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: comprehensive plan Implementation
Date: Tuesday, November 15, 2016 12:51:06 PM

To Whom it may Concern,

It has come to the attention of people that Live and reside on Hayden Island that there is a possibility that a bike path that was part of the Columbia Crossings project may still go forward.

I and others that will be directly affected by the bike path are feeling the stress of what that means to the island and its community.

The HINooN Board and local residents oppose this plan for many reasons, I have listed some below.

The Path would result in the loss of 120 manufactured homes and likely lead to the unsustainable possibilities of the entire 450-home community, leaving hundreds of citizens homeless.

The Path will eliminate over 500 parking spaces in secure gated areas owned by residents of floating homes, manufactured homes, condos, private homes.

The Path will expose vehicles and residences to non-Islanders and increase criminal behavior.

The Path will make it easier for transients to set up illegal encampments near the adjoining, fragile natural wildlife habitats of West Hayden Island, an issue the island residents already struggle to control.

The Path could take up to 29 acres of space as a meandering, narrow land parcel (30' x 42,240') that will impact multiple residential and commercial property owners.

The City Council will need negotiate with each property owner, which could be both costly and contentious.

I have always believed that improvements made to any city plan should positively impact its immediate community as well as help the city grow in a better direction.

An addition or change to a city that hurts more than it helps should NOT be put into place.

I do not see the benefits out weighing the incredible losses the bike path will create!

And I have to say that my heart hurts to see my friends possibly lose their homes for a green space that tax payers money would be used to create and cause more obstacles for our community.

I would like to add thoughts about bike transportation in the area. The city could apply their dollars toward other incomplete bike paths, such as Marine Drive from I-5 to 33rd avenue, or use the funds to improve livability on the island with projects residents have been asking of the City for several years; however I'm starting to realize that residents are not the priority of the city which again makes me very sad.

Thank you for your time.

Ruth Fitz

(My immediate family owns property on the island and I have worked on the island for 16 yrs.)

From: [Doug K](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Cc: [Hales, Mayor](#); [Commissioner Saltzman](#); [Commissioner Fritz](#); [Commissioner Fish](#); [Novick, Steve](#); [Elmore-Trummer, Camille](#); [Shriver, Katie](#)
Subject: Comprehensive Plan Implementation
Date: Tuesday, November 15, 2016 11:02:14 AM

Mayor Hales and Commissioners:

I am writing to support Amendment 34 to the Comprehensive Plan Implementation package. This would remove the parking requirements in Mixed Use Zone, near Frequent Transit.

When the minimum parking requirements were put in place in 2013, the result was a sharp drop in the number of units built. Many projects on 10,000 s.f. sites, that would have had up to 50 units (such as at 30th and Hawthorne), are now being built as 30 units (such as at 31st and Hawthorne).

It's time to stop this loss of needed units, and make a positive change that will result in more units to help alleviate the housing crisis in Portland today. In addition to resulting in more units, removing the requirements will also reduce the cost of apartments in larger buildings, as less spaces may be built.

Now that the city has a Parking Permit plan ready to go, neighborhoods will be able to better manage their on-street parking, and builders will know what the market is, and may provide spaces as they see the economic need for them, but not have to strictly follow arbitrary minimums.

Please support Amendment 34!

Thank you.

Doug Klotz
1908 SE 35th Place
Portland, OR 97214

November 15, 2016

Subject: Testimony on Amendment 34 (Comp Plan Early Implementation Package)
Proposed elimination of off-street parking minimums

Dear Mayor Hales, Commissioner Saltzman, Commissioner Fish, Commissioner Fritz, and Commissioner Novick:

I am very opposed to the recently proposed, BPS land use policy amendment which would remove minimum off-street parking requirements for residential development sites within 500 feet of frequent transit streets. I strongly feel that, if implemented, this policy would drastically reduce the livability of our neighborhood.

Many households in new multifamily developments own cars and need to park them on public streets. With the increased number of on-street parked cars, narrow local streets essentially become one-way lanes, a safety issue for emergency vehicle access. The increased number of on-street parked cars further causes safety issues by limiting the visibility of pedestrians attempting to cross the road; reducing the travel area available to bicyclists; and greatly restricting the sight distance for drivers, especially at intersections.

The lack of realistic, minimum off-street parking standards is a number one concern both in our neighborhood (surveys of residents conducted by SMILE) and throughout the City (RIP public survey). Eliminating more off-street parking requirements will exacerbate the problems, and further shift the responsibility for and costs of parking from developers to the public. The City proposes to address the public's concerns with TDM and on-street parking management tools, but the cost of these programs and the funding sources are yet to be detailed.

I believe that the current parking requirements are the lowest reasonable minimum, given that developments with fewer than 30 units have no off-street parking. The growing number of such developments already will result in hundreds of units with zero parking. Further eliminating all off-street parking for large developments, such as the proposed 232 apartment complex that is to occupy the site of the old Boys and Girls Club in our neighborhood, is not reasonable.

The Residential Infill Project and recently passed Affordable Housing Bond should create more choices for affordable housing. I encourage you to take a balanced land use approach to maintain the safety and livability of our neighborhoods while accommodating Portland's increased population.

Thank you for your consideration of our concerns.

Shari Gilevich (Sellwood area resident)
1344 SE Rex St., Portland OR 97202

From: [Elmore-Trummer, Camille](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: FW: University of Portland amendments
Date: Tuesday, November 15, 2016 11:01:07 AM
Attachments: [UP Testimony to Council on CI Zone \(00594742xC624A\).pdf](#)

Thank you,

Camille E. Trummer

Communications and Policy Strategist

City of Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability

Phone: 503-823-3660

Email: camille.trummer@portlandoregon.gov

www.portlandoregon.gov/bps

Please note my new contact information as of November 1st, 2016.

The Bureau of Planning and Sustainability is committed to providing meaningful access. For accommodations, modifications, translation, interpretation or other services, please contact 503-823-7700 or use City TTY 503-823-6868, or Oregon Relay Service 711.

503-823-7700: Traducción o interpretación | Chuyển Ngữ hoặc Phiên Dịch | 翻译或传译 | Письменный или устный перевод | Traducere sau Interpretare |

Письмовий або усний переклад | 翻訳または通訳 | Turjumida ama Fasiraadda | שירות תרגום או שירות תרגום חיצוני | الترجمة التحريرية أو الشفهية | www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/71701

From: Christe White [mailto:cwhite@radlerwhite.com]

Sent: Tuesday, November 15, 2016 9:03 AM

To: Elmore-Trummer, Camille <Camille.Trummer@portlandoregon.gov>; Schmanski, Sonia <Sonia.Schmanski@portlandoregon.gov>; Cole, John <John.Cole@portlandoregon.gov>

Cc: Kuffner, James <kuffner@up.edu>

Subject: University of Portland amendments

I am very pleased to report that the University Park Neighborhood Association (“UPNA”) voted last night to unanimously endorse and support UP’s requested amendments to the CI zone. Those amendments are attached again here for your easy reference. The City had asked UP to seek and obtain UPNA support and you will have a letter from the UPNA later today and they plan on testifying on Thursday. If you have any questions regarding these amendments, we will make ourselves available to answer them at your convenience. CCW

RADLER WHITE PARKS  **ALEXANDER LLP**
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Christe C. White

111 SW Columbia Street, Suite 1100

Portland, OR 97201

T [971.634.0200](tel:971.634.0200) F [971.634.0222](tel:971.634.0222) Direct [971.634.0204](tel:971.634.0204)

We advise you that any discussion of federal tax matters in this email is not intended or written to be used, and may not be used by you or any taxpayer, to (a) avoid penalties under the Internal Revenue Code, or (b) promote, market or recommend to any other party any transaction or matter addressed herein. All taxpayers should seek independent tax advice.

October 13, 2016 University of Portland (“UP”) Testimony on CI Zone

UP submitted its testimony into the record which includes a September 28th letter from Jim Ravelli and a subsequent email from land use counsel with exhibits.

In UP’s record submittals, we offered our conditional support of the CI zone changes with 5 important caveats.

Sports Facilities. Staff confirmed that our current and future sports facilities and event venues will be treated as accessory conditional uses to the institution and not as major event facilities. If this is still the case, we have no objection. If that understanding changes, then we cannot comply with the new criteria.

Transportation Impact Review (“TIR”). The Transportation Impact Review threshold does not make sense for UP. Under the code if you have an approved TIR, the addition of 4 parking spaces or 20,000 square feet triggers the need for a new comprehensive TIR. Trips on the UP campus, like most colleges, are not related to building square footage but instead student enrollment. The TIR thresholds should at least be flexible enough to respond to the true traffic generators on a college campus.

Building Length. The 100-foot building length requirement for our Willamette frontage is not consistent with our current design standards that were approved in our master plan. We just finished the first project on Willamette under those standards and could have more projects complete by the time the CI zone applies to our site. (Ex. 1). To change design standards mid-course creates an inconsistent design pattern along our major frontage. Instead UP should be required to apply the existing design standards which are at or under the building height allowed in the new CI zone but allow longer, and more articulated, building facades. If the new standard applied to the recent dorm project, we would have lost 52 double occupancy dorm rooms, resulting in over 100 more students in neighborhood housing with no design upside. The UPNA and the City approved our current design standards and endorsed their compatibility with the neighborhood.

200-foot Building Setback. Lastly, please remove the 200-foot building setback along a portion of Willamette Blvd. (Ex. 2). It appears that this setback was an attempt to mirror our master plan provision that calls for a 10-year open area in that location because there are presently fields in that location. The problem is that the CI zone converts that 10-year condition to a permanent no-build area along our Willamette frontage. Instead we recommend simply applying the same setback, height and mass standards along the entire frontage instead of creating this permanent carve out.

CI Boundaries. Our master plan boundaries include 3 properties not owned by UP. The master plan does not take effect on those lands until we own or control those properties. The August 2016 Recommended CI Draft includes one of these properties in the new CI zone (the M&B site) but not the two other, single family sites. (Ex. 3). The Zoning Map now shows that all three properties are excluded from the CI zone. All three of these sites were planned, evaluated and included in our master plan approval and should be included in the new CI zoning. If they are not included, we will be required to go through a Type III zone change to include lands on our campus that have already been planned and included in our master plan.

Thank you for considering these comments.





This is a new chapter. For ease of readability, ~~strike through~~ and underline are not used.

Maximum Heights and Minimum Setbacks University of Portland

Map 150-2

Map Revised Xxxxx X, 2015




EXHIBIT 3

Maps of campus boundaries

Map 13: University of Portland





EXHIBIT 3



August 23, 2016 Recommended Zoning Map

From: [Seed, Ryan](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: FW: Eastmoreland Historic District
Date: Tuesday, November 29, 2016 11:10:15 AM

From: Frances Zeman [mailto:fran.zasa@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 15, 2016 9:48 AM
To: Hales, Mayor <mayorcharliehales@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: Eastmoreland Historic District

Dear Mayor:

I am an owner and reside at 3035 SE Martins Street, Portland OR 97202. I have attended meetings and have read the proposals for the HD. Our house is a contributing structure and within the proposed district.

I oppose the plan to make Eastmoreland an historic district. Nay.

Frances Zeman

From: [Jan Holibaugh](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Cc: [Lee Buhler](#)
Subject: Re: Proposed zoning of 04 SW Hamilton Street/ Testimony for the November 17th meeting
Date: Tuesday, November 15, 2016 9:02:57 AM

Dear Council,

Thank you for considering the **zoning of 04 Hamilton Street to CM2**. I am in **total support** of my house and my neighbor's at 018 Hamilton being brought into the present commercial zoning of Hamilton Street between Barbur and Corbett.

I have attached my previous testimony to you requesting this change. Also included is the July 2014 PDX Comprehensive Plan, page 1-15, "Western Neighborhoods- the future of SW Barbur" that shows my house (shown under the title of Present) being replaced by a large 4 story mixed-use building with high capacity transit beside it.

Please allow this change to go through. My house is located on the corner of two very busy streets across from a convenience store. It is one of only two houses on the street still zoned residential. As you can see from the drawings in the 2014 Comprehensive Plan, that corner was the model of what growth would look like with my present house used as an example of replacement by a mixed use building.

Thank you,
Jan Holibaugh
Owner, 04 Hamilton Street

On Oct 12, 2016, at 10:59 PM, Jan Holibaugh <jrholibaugh@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Council,

Please enter this as my testimony requesting that my house at **04 Hamilton Street** be considered for **commercial zoning**. My house is featured in the July 2014 PDX Comprehensive Plan, page 1-15, "Western Neighborhoods - the future of SW Barbur." At the top is a photo of my house titled "Today," and below it is a drawing titled "Future" and shows the corner where my house is located replaced with a large mixed use 4 story building and high capacity transit.

This picture in the Comprehensive Plan- and emails and conversations with the Western District city planner, Joan Frederiksen, in 2013 and 2014 - all indicated bringing my house and the house of my neighbor Lee Buhler at 018 Hamilton, into the presently existing commercial zoning of Hamilton Street between SW Barbur and Corbett. Every house and building- but ours- is already zoned commercial. Since my house is the first one on Hamilton when you turn off Barbur coming from downtown, it was puzzling that it was ever left residential: it is the one nearest the extremely busy corner of Barbur and Hamilton and across the street from the Swan Island Market. Obviously the best use of that location would be mixed use - not residential- since the drawing of that location was used as an example of good mixed use by the City planners.

This request for change from residential to mixed use has gone through all the

planning and public comment with no objections from the neighborhood. Only recently were my neighbor and I informed that our houses would no longer be considered for commercial zoning. We both have written emails asking that the zoning be reconsidered and I have testified before the Planning and Sustainability Commission.

We all want to keep our neighborhoods intact, but to keep the zoning of my house residential on the corner of two very busy streets, across from an all night convenience store with all the bus transit, does not make sense to me. Please consider changing the zoning to commercial.

Thank you,
Jan Holibaugh

From: [Connie Christianson](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: Comprehensive Plan Implementation
Date: Tuesday, November 15, 2016 8:47:00 AM

City Council,

I am writing again, less than a year after I was assured this was put to rest. I am a resident of Hayden Island and strongly oppose this new bike path in front of our homes. We currently have a walking/jogging path that is utilized by all residents of the island. The residents along this path pay for maintenance and lighting and share in the peaceful beauty of our community. Increasing the use of our path to bicyclist and skateboarders will reduce our privacy and increase the possibility damage to our beautiful landscapes. Additionally, opening the path to bicyclist and skateboarders will also increase the risk of injury to our primarily senior community.

In 2009 a comprehensive study was completed and the Planning and Sustainability Commission enacted an ordinance banning such an endeavor. So I ask you, why is it being discussed again?

Thank you,
Connie Christiansen
126 N Hayden Bay Dr
Portland, Or 97217

From: [Bowen Marc](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony; Planning and Sustainability Commission](#)
Cc: [Christianson Connie](#); [Dan McIntyre](#)
Subject: CITY BIKEWAY - HAYDEN BAY
Date: Tuesday, November 15, 2016 8:37:27 AM
Attachments: [Regarding the proposed bicycle path around Haden Bay.docx](#)

I understand the city is considering an amendment that would “kill” the proposed bike path around Hayden Bay. I am in support of such an amendment. Attached is an e-mail I sent in March explaining the many reasons a bike path would be a bad idea.

Please confirm receipt and keep me informed of decisions and meetings on this subject going forward.

Regards,

Marc Bowen
182 N. Hayden Bay Drive
Portland Or. 97217

Sent March 4 2016

Snt to PSC@portlandoregon.gov

Subject TSP Testimony

Snt: 3/4/16 10:03 AM

Regarding the proposed bicycle path around Haden Bay:

This is a bad idea. The walking path around the bay is not big enough to accommodate bicycles. It is narrow, with frequent corners some of which are visually obscured, and way to close to residential homes to provide an enjoyable experience for either bikers, or the existing walkers and joggers.

I am a home owner on the bay with a condo adjacent to the path. Daily the path is used by walkers and joggers who often, even while passing each other need to yield to the grass to get out of the way of each other. I can't imagine what will happen when bicyclists are added to the mix.

As people walk their leashed dogs, the width of the path only allows for the walker and his/her dog. Being approached from the rear by a bicyclist will only cause havoc with the Dog and the walker, and at the same time cause the biker to either stop, yell or plow through. None of which is a good scenario.

The path as it is, doesn't really lead to any destination that Tomahawk Island drive already goes to. Tomahawk Island drive is bike friendly, has slow and infrequent auto traffic, and is a pleasant ride.

In addition to the above, myself as a homeowner is concerned about the addition of more transient visitors and the possibility of vandalism at the many properties and marinas that share Hayden Bay.

Please, reconsider this idea. There are many other areas that can accommodate the bicycles.

I'd appreciate a confirmation of receipt, as well as e-mails of any correspondence on this matter.

Regards,

Marc Bowen

marcbowen77@gmail.com

182 N Hayden Bay Drive

Portland 97217

503-295-3641

From: [Kelly Tour](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: Comprehensive Plan Implementation
Date: Tuesday, November 15, 2016 8:26:05 AM

I would like to voice my opposition to the Comprehensive Plan Bike Path on Hayden Island. I am a resident of the Hayden Island MHC and I also work at Cook Engine which is also located on Hayden Island . I have lived or worked here for 15 years and can testify that having a "dead end" bike path will not only displace up 250 homes or more, it will cause a spike in crime for the island also .

The island should not have to be a bike riders mecca when most of the population of the island already use the acceptable walking paths on the island. Coupled with a low speed limit in the streets makes this also acceptable for bike riders who commute via that mode of transportation. Hayden Island has only so much room . After Salpare bay was opened and added nearly 3 times the traffic why do we need to add even more issues to a already strained and ignored problem? Do you realize that the traffic on this island in the summer and during the Christmas season will not support this? Do you care? I remember 10 years ago when some very nice ladies went around to all the local businesses and asked for input and ideas on the impact of adding 250 condo units to Tomahawk Island drive would be. We explained to them that Tomahawk island drive and the rest of the island would need to have wider roads and walkways to support normal activity for everyone on the island . Nothing was done . The road is a nightmare now . Added to that the Port of Portland wanted a port on the island and a oil terminal . Do I need to add the disaster Interstate 5 bridge proposal to this pile also? The disconnect from reality on this issue is something to behold here . All of these examples should help to set a permanent guideline for the island and then lets keep it that way.

I get confused when politicians in Portland run on addressing the "Gentrification" issue and then turn around and do something like this. Where is the gain in this? Can you imagine the already strained traffic issues present and then adding the 250 units and numerous boat houses that have to be moved via I-5 for the next 2 years after the bike path is implemented.

I also believe that Hayden Island needs to be held as an example of what Portland is about. I am a 46 year old white male living amongst the elderly ,retirees, Hispanic families , black families and the disabled all in peace and all as a community !!! This is a park that has Yard sales and Christmas Bazaars. This is a community that we donate to give out Turkeys for those who need them on Thanksgiving , we invite the local police and fire departments to tech us safety and to gain community support for our First responders . We coordinate with Hi-Noon on disaster relief in case it strikes . Most of all we are a neighborhood that is a melting pot in the United States of America located in one of the cleanest and welcoming cities in the country . People aren't coming here because Portland is a isolated bunch of gated communities , they are coming here because we want to be diverse, we want to support our veterans , minorities , elderly and prevent displacing them from their homes in order to enrich the few.

Please amend this proposal and refuse the costly bike path being set forth.

Thank you

Kelly Tour-Parts

Ph#503-289-8466

Fax # 503-286-2836

website:<http://www.cookengine.com>



530 NE TOMAHAWK ISLAND DRIVE
PORTLAND, OREGON 97217
503-289-8466

From: [Shilo Main Office](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Cc: oliverkim70@yahoo.com
Subject: Testimony
Date: Tuesday, November 15, 2016 7:24:56 AM
Importance: High

Good Morning,

I am a new resident to Hayden Island mobile home Park as of August 2016 and I am very concerned about this proposed plan to allow a bike path through the park to get to the river. There are many reasons this should not happen.

1. Liability to the property owner and residents
2. Risk of theft
3. Risk of domestic violence
4. A rise in cost of Insurance and other costs
5. Waste and garbage to the property and surroundings
6. Labor cost of clean up

The concerns are not a complaint or brought to this hearing out of fear. The list above are trends of occurrences. It is unfortunate, but human nature to take advantage of the most easiest act.

For the protection of the park residence, the park management and staff and the conditions of the property I am opposed to the proposed plan.

The Columbia River extends for miles and miles, if the City wants equality for bicycle enthusiast there is another way. I feel the City Commissioners need to go back to the drawing board on this because the easiest way is not the best way! It would have been an honor to be present at this hearing. Unfortunately, I have prior commitments I need to fulfil.

Sincerely, Kim Oliver # 93

From: [Karin Barendrick](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: Comprehensive Plan Implementation
Date: Tuesday, November 15, 2016 7:18:35 AM

We lived on Hayden Island for 7 years and finally moved because the place is beleaguered with many issues—it was a constant battle to keep our island livable, fighting crime, gambling, homeless, bridge lifts (cutting us off with access to doctors and hospitals) and the WORST possible traffic in the area, perhaps the west coast. Our government failed to build the bridge—LONG OVERDUE--caught up in politically correct mass transit and bicycle lane issues. **No one** listened to the people and businesses of Hayden Island. Our government failed us on all issues except for the diligent attention from the North Precinct regarding the crime.

Now you want to stick it to the residents again? What is wrong with this City? Have you no common sense?

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

From: [bob](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: Comprehensive Plan Implementation Amendment 34
Date: Monday, November 14, 2016 10:35:02 PM

I can't reasonably ask my neighbors to help pay for the cost of storing *my* kayak. Why should I help pay for the storage of *their* car? Free and under-priced parking is a massive ownership-based subsidy that unfairly places the greatest burden on those without cars to park. At a time of unprecedented rising rents and home prices, we --as a city-- simply can't afford to keep requiring developers to build off-street street storage for cars.

When developers are required to build parking, it isn't just car-free Portlanders that are hit hard -- everyone loses, now and for years to come. Requiring parking in new buildings falsely couples housing costs with the cost of storing cars. It encourages mindless, unnecessary driving at the expense of the environment and everyone who uses our public streets. It enables excessive car ownership and long-term storage in space that could otherwise see active use. And, all-too-often, it results in terrible architecture, less-safe sidewalks, and unfriendly streetscapes designed more for cars than people.

I strongly urge the council to pass Amendment 34. The last thing that Portland needs is more storage for cars.

Thank you,

- bob gantz
2829 SE Belmont St

From: [Richard Carey](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: Comprehensive plan implementation
Date: Monday, November 14, 2016 5:32:08 PM

Ladies and gentlemen, I will try and keep this short.

My family has lived on Hayden Bay on Hayden Island since the first condo was built at Riverhouse in 1972. We have endured so many issues that the city has never addressed that could have improved our lives over these years. I will point out ensnarled traffic and crime as just two current issues. With our roads in disrepair in and around Portland and now you consider placing an expensive bike path in an area that has no legitimate need. This proposed bike path would displace people that have lived here for years, is virtually impossible to make an area wide enough for the many individuals that walk this area to share with bikers, but from my perspective it would not be utilized since getting to the island is so restricted.

There are enough bike paths in and around Portland, this proposed path is completely a waste of time and money. If anyone would like to talk with me further, I can be reached at 503-789-8790.

Richard Carey
205 N. Hayden Bay Dr.
Portland, Oregon

Sent from my iPad

From: [Jacob Wilson](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: Comprehensive Plan Implementation
Date: Monday, November 14, 2016 9:27:35 PM

My name is Jacob Wilson and I want to make a statement about the proposed bike path around Hayden Island in Portland Oregon. I live on Hayden Island and I am a cyclist. I cycle for recreation and also to commute to work. After looking at the map for the proposed bike path, I wanted to give a cyclist's perspective and thoughts on if or when I might use the path. I want to focus my attention on the portion of the path around Hayden Bay. This part of the path is likely only going to be useful for recreational use since there are many more direct routes for commuters to use that will shave time and distance from their commute. This is why I do not believe it will be of much benefit to the city of Portland or local residents to have a bike path around the bay.

For recreation, I typically like to find a route that will take me on at least an hour ride to make it worth my time and many of the cyclists I know feel the same way. The issue with the proposed bike path is that it is a rather short ride even if I loop around the entire island. Considering that other people may choose to come to the island for a ride, I also believe it to be too short a ride to bother packing up the bikes and driving them here. The only recreational use I see it getting is from cyclist who will ride their bikes here and then take the loop, but Hayden Island isn't near enough residential neighborhoods to make that a very plausible. I just don't think it will be a popular destination for recreational cycling.

When I am commuting, I tend to want to take the shortest and quickest route possible along with every other cyclists I know. Most of the residents on the island would have a much shorter and faster route by not going around the bay and taking a more direct route on the streets. I did consider the residents who live on the bay but they all have street access as well as bay access so the bay is still going to take them on a longer route and add nearly a mile to their commute.

As a cyclist, bike safety is always my number one concern and I appreciate the city of Portland for providing so many safe bike paths for me and other cyclists to use. I believe them to be a crucial part of our transportation system and I would love to see more of them where they are needed. I just don't think any more bike paths are needed on Hayden Island. It is a small island with a slow speed limit and not much traffic. In the six years that I have commuted by cycle from my home here, I have never felt unsafe or had any incidents or near accidents on my bike.

Thank you for your time and for considering my input on this matter.

Jacob Wilson

206 N Tomahawk Island Drive

From: [Ovid Boyd](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: Comprehensive Plan Implementation
Date: Monday, November 14, 2016 9:08:21 PM

Dear Portland City Councilors & Mayor,

This last week has been difficult. Many of us are unsure where this nation is heading, and if we will still have a place in it once it gets there.

But there is something I have confidence in. I have confidence in Oregon. I grew up in this beautiful place, and have seen people working to make it better throughout my life. We do great things here, and we work to make where we live better.

Portland is Oregon's city. It is a place people love to be. Although I grew up in rural Oregon, I moved here because I love the streets, people and life of our city.

You are considering a proposal from Mayor Charlie Hales this Thursday November 17th to remove parking minimums in mixed use areas. I ask you to do that.

I'm sure you've heard from many citizens on the reasonableness and sense of removing the minimum requirements. But, I want to phrase this in a different way. When you envision a future Portland, a Portland that is better than what we have today, do you imagine parking lots? When we say we want a city that is a fantastic place to walk through, a safe place to bike around, that has transit that serves all those who need it, do you see those people walking in and out of parking garages, biking across surface lots or sitting in buses stuck behind all the single occupancy vehicles we've required so much parking to be built for? I'm guessing you do not. Would we rather let people live in this beautiful place, to build housing for our fellow and future citizens (like my husband who came here from China for a better life), or do we want to build housing for our cars?

I want you to remove the parking minimums because Portland should aim to be a fantastic place. Excess parking is not a fantastic thing.

Sincerely,
Ovid Boyd & Lunji Zhang
1104 SW Columbia St #105
Portland, OR 97201
+1 (541) 791-6843

From: [Brendon Haggerty](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: Comprehensive Plan Implementation Amendment 34
Date: Monday, November 14, 2016 9:02:16 PM

Mayor Hales and Commissioners,

I strongly support removing minimum parking requirements in mixed use zones. As one of the members of the Mixed Use Zoning Public Advisory Committee, I am familiar with these zones and I believe that builders will provide the number of off-street parking spaces demanded by occupants.

I am concerned that parking requirements add fuel to the fire of our housing crisis by unnecessarily reducing the supply of housing. Most importantly, I am concerned that we cannot meet our climate and livability goals if we continue to make it easy and convenient to drive.

Removing parking requirements is a sound policy that advances the causes of affordable housing, public health, efficient transportation, and climate stability.

Regards,
Brendon Haggerty
1720 SE 36th Ave
Portland, OR 97214

From: [Michael D. Scott](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: Comprehensive Plan Implementation
Date: Monday, November 14, 2016 7:19:29 PM
Attachments: [Michael Scott's Testimony - Comprehensive Plan Implementation.pdf](#)

RE: Comprehensive Plan Implementation - Hayden Island Bike Path
From: Michael Scott (2331 N Menzies Court, Portland, 97217)

Distinguished Council Members:

I recently moved into the Hayden Island Manufactured Home Community. I live along the riverfront. My home is within the 30 feet of proposed bike path, and would be directly impacted by its construction. With this testimony, I hope to highlight factors that I hope will influence the decision you make on this issue.

My home was built in 1974. Although it's had some modest renovations in its 42 years of existence, a lot of it is old – the plumbing, the roof, the subfloors, the insulation under the house, etc. These elements wouldn't survive transportation to another site. Because my home was made 2 years prior to the HUD building standards being approved, I've been told it can't be traded in. All of that means it would have to be demolished. I just purchased my home two months ago, and losing it so quickly would mean a huge financial loss for me personally.

The company that owns our Manufactured Home Community, Lautrec, says that 50% of the park's revenue comes from homes along the river. If these homes had to be removed, that would impact the economics of running the park. The park is home to many low-income residents. It provides much needed affordable housing – not just to Hayden Island, but the city as a whole. Portland is in desperate need of affordable housing, and losing some or all of the park would be a huge loss for the community as a whole.

Beyond these humanistic appeals, it's also important to consider some of the more empirical factors as well. The Hayden Island Plan was adopted in 2009. Back then, it was envisioned that the Columbia River Crossing would be constructed, giving island residents and Portland in general a great opportunity to remake the neighborhood. Unfortunately, the bridge was not built. And in the eight years since the plan was adopted, Hayden Island has evolved in a very different way. The City of Portland has also been presented with new challenges that didn't exist when the plan was debated and then adopted.

Extending light rail to Hayden Island was a huge part of the plan. It's importance – and the impact of its loss – can't be overstated! For example – creating a new biking path on the island would undoubtedly be a draw for other people in Portland. However, the only way for people to reach the island today is by car. If people want to drive to Hayden Island to bicycle around the river, they'll add more car trips, additional traffic on I-5, and more parking problems. Specifically, on the west side (near my mobile home park), the only place they'll be able to park is at the mall.

The charter of the TSP is to help make Portland more environmentally- friendly, accessible, and growth-oriented. Won't encouraging more car trips and I-5 traffic be counter to this goal?

Let's suppose you find that argument compelling – and I hope you do! That's not the end of the story. You'll inevitably say that we still need to reduce car trips on the island itself. And

that makes sense on the surface, especially if you read through the Hayden Island Plan. The plan suggests that new transit-oriented housing would be built. And a new neighborhood center would be constructed over east of I-5. Along with the bike path, it would totally remake the island into a sustainable community. A great plan, to be sure!

However, the loss of the Columbia River Crossing has derailed the Hayden Island Plan – not just a little, but wholly and completely! EDENS, the company that owns the Jantzen Beach outdoor mall, has constructed new retail space in the spot where transit-oriented housing was slated. And it's not just any type of retail space. It's regional retail space, which isn't a draw for locals. In fact, it's not just regional retail – it's the huge big box stores, like Home Depot! There's just no chance that anyone, island residents or mainlanders alike, need bicycle accessibility to stores like Home Depot.

Likewise, the neighborhood retail center proposed for the east-side was never built. That land was supposed to be claimed via eminent domain from the CRC project. Since the CRC was never built, the land was never condemned, and redevelopment never took place. I can say from experience that establishments in that area aren't much of a local draw. For example, one occupant in that area is Hooters. In my conversations with neighbors, I've never heard anyone say they need a biking path down to Hooters.

It's also worth highlighting the demographics of Hayden Island. My mobile home community is occupied by older/elderly, retired, and disabled people. Even the more expensive condos on the east side of Hayden Island are predominantly home to retired people. Most of my neighbors are not in good enough health to commute regularly to retail establishments or other community resources (like parks) using a bicycle. They're good walkers – I see them walking behind my home all the time! – but they're generally not the cycling type.

Speaking of parks, having more of them on the island would be an amazing thing. However, the explosion of Portland's homeless population will most certainly impact the city's expansion of parks on the island. Since the Hayden Island Plan was created, a homeless camp has emerged on the beach just west of my mobile home community. I would love to have beach access and a beautiful park! But in reality, things are moving in the opposite way. The Port of Portland is putting up a new fence – with razor wire! – to keep people out. With the blight in that area, and a new park unlikely, there's little reason to bike along the river to visit that spot.

I touched on this earlier in my testimony, but I want to explicitly mention that just last Tuesday, 186,000 Portlanders voted to have the city issue bonds in support of affordable housing. In its recommendations related to the “Hayden Island Issues”, the PSC correctly noted that our mobile home park is a source of affordable housing for the island. However, I want to reiterate: we're not just a source of affordable housing for islanders, but all of Portland! Affordable housing not only impacts the elderly and disabled. It also supports minority housing efforts. We have minority families in our community that would likely be pushed out of Portland with a loss of their homes. The extent of the affordable housing/homelessness crisis was not foreseen in the Hayden Island Plan, and the Hayden Island Plan doesn't consider how the island can partner with the larger city to address some of these problems, problems that are much bigger than just a bike path.

The city council should mirror the values and needs of the community it serves. Portland isn't monolithic, and transportation policies that work for some parts of the city may not be best for

others. I humbly ask that you respect the views of our community.

I urge you to remove the bikeway classification from west Hayden Island.

Thank you for your consideration!

Michael Scott
2331 N Menzies Court Portland, OR 97217

RE: Comprehensive Plan Implementation - Hayden Island Bike Path
From: Michael Scott (2331 N Menzies Court, Portland, 97217)

Distinguished Council Members:

I recently moved into the Hayden Island Manufactured Home Community. I live along the riverfront. My home is within the 30 feet of proposed bike path, and would be directly impacted by its construction. With this testimony, I hope to highlight factors that I hope will influence the decision you make on this issue.

My home was built in 1974. Although it's had some modest renovations in its 42 years of existence, a lot of it is old - the plumbing, the roof, the subfloors, the insulation under the house, etc. These elements wouldn't survive transportation to another site. Because my home was made 2 years prior to the HUD building standards being approved, I've been told it can't be traded in. All of that means it would have to be demolished. I just purchased my home two months ago, and losing it so quickly would mean a huge financial loss for me personally.

The company that owns our Manufactured Home Community, Lautrec, says that 50% of the park's revenue comes from homes along the river. If these homes had to be removed, that would impact the economics of running the park. The park is home to many low-income residents. It provides much needed affordable housing - not just to Hayden Island, but the city as a whole. Portland is in desperate need of affordable housing, and losing some or all of the park would be a huge loss for the community as a whole.

Beyond these humanistic appeals, it's also important to consider some of the more empirical factors as well. The Hayden Island Plan was adopted in 2009. Back then, it was envisioned that the Columbia River Crossing would be constructed, giving island residents and Portland in general a great opportunity to remake the neighborhood. Unfortunately, the bridge was not built. And in the eight years since the plan was adopted, Hayden Island has evolved in a very different way. The City of Portland has also been presented with new challenges that didn't exist when the plan was debated and then adopted.

Extending light rail to Hayden Island was a huge part of the plan. It's importance and the impact of its loss can't be overstated! For example - creating a new biking path on the island would undoubtedly be a draw for other people in Portland. However, the only way for people to reach the island today is by car. If people want to drive to Hayden Island to bicycle around the river, they'll add more car trips, additional traffic on I-5, and more parking problems. Specifically, on the west side (near my mobile home park), the only place they'll be able to park is at the mall.

The charter of the TSP is to help make Portland more environmentally-friendly, accessible, and growth-oriented. Won't encouraging more car trips and I-5 traffic be counter to this goal?

2

Let's suppose you find that argument compelling and I hope you do! That's not the end of the story. You'll inevitably say that we still need to reduce car trips on the island itself. And that makes sense on the surface, especially if you read through the Hayden Island Plan. The plan suggests that new transit-oriented housing would be built. And a new neighborhood center would be constructed over East of I-5. Along with the bike path, it would totally remake the island into a sustainable community. A great plan, to be sure!

2

However, the loss of the Columbia River Crossing has derailed the Hayden Island Plan not just a little, but wholly and completely! EDENS, the company that owns the Jantzen Beach outdoor mall, has constructed new retail space in the spot where transit-oriented housing was slated. And it's not just any type of retail space. It's regional retail space, which isn't a draw for locals. In fact, it's not just regional retail - it's the huge big box stores, like Home Depot! There's just no chance that anyone, island residents or mainlanders alike, need bicycle accessibility to stores like Home Depot.

2

Likewise, the neighborhood retail center proposed for the east-side was never built. That land was supposed to be claimed via eminent domain from the CRC project. Since the CRC was never built, the land was never condemned, and redevelopment never took place. I can say from experience that establishments in that area aren't a much of a local draw. For example, one occupant in that area is Hooters. In my conversations with neighbors, I've never heard anyone say they need a biking path down to Hooters.

2

It's also worth highlighting the demographics of Hayden Island. My mobile home community is occupied by older/elderly, retired, and disabled people. Even the more expensive condos on the east side of Hayden Island are predominantly home to retired people. Most of my neighbors are not in good enough health to commute regularly to retail establishments or other community resources (like parks) using a bicycle. They're good walkers - I see them walking behind my home all the time! - but they're generally not the cycling type.

2

Speaking of parks, having more of them on the island would be an amazing thing. However, the explosion of Portland's homeless population will most certainly impact the city's expansion of parks on the island. Since the Hayden Island Plan was created, a homeless camp has emerged on the beach just west of my mobile home community. I would love to have beach access and a beautiful park! But in reality, things are moving in the opposite way. The Port of Portland is putting up a new fence with razor wire to keep people out. With the blight in that area, and a new park unlikely, there's little reason to bike along the river to visit that spot.

2

I touched on this earlier in my testimony, but I want to explicitly mention that just last Tuesday, 186,000 Portlanders voted to have the city issue bonds in support of affordable housing. In its recommendations related to the Hayden Island issues,

the PSC correctly noted that our mobile home park is a source of affordable housing for the island. However, I want to reiterate: we're not just a source of affordable housing for islanders, but all of Portland! Affordable housing not only impacts the elderly and disabled. It also supports minority housing efforts. We have minority families in our community that would likely be pushed out of Portland with a loss of their homes. The extent of the affordable housing/homelessness crisis was not foreseen in the Hayden Island Plan, and the Hayden Island Plan doesn't consider how the island can partner with the larger city to address some of these problems, problems that are much bigger than just a bike path.

The city council should mirror the values and needs of the community it serves. Portland isn't monolithic, and transportation policies that work for some parts of the city may not be best for others. I humbly ask that you respect the views of our community.

I urge you to remove the bikeway classification from West Hayden Island.

Thank you for your consideration!

Michael Scott
2331 N Menzies Court
Portland, OR 97217

From: [Patrick Vinograd](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: Comprehensive Plan Implementation: Amendment 34
Date: Monday, November 14, 2016 4:37:38 PM

Dear City Councilors,

I am writing to urge you to prioritize affordable housing over the automobile parking. You can do so by adopting Amendment 34 to remove minimum parking requirements in mixed-use zones. Additionally you can adopt Amendment 51 to help implement transportation demand management.

We are in the midst of a housing affordability crisis - minimum parking requirements increase the cost of housing. We are facing dire effects of climate change - minimum parking requirements incentivize the ownership and use of private automobiles. We are facing rampant traffic violence - minimum parking requirements encourage people to take more trips via car. Minimum parking requirements are a subsidy to owners of cars, when that is the opposite of what the city wants to encourage.

Amendments 34 and 51 seek to right the balance and give the city meaningful tools to manage parking without imposing bad incentives in the form of parking minimums.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Patrick Vinograd
2836 SE 25th Ave, Portland

From: [Matt Greer](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Cc: [Jantzen Beach Moorage Moorage](#); richelle@rootsboundliving.com
Subject: Comprehensive Plan Implementation
Date: Monday, November 14, 2016 4:24:50 PM

To Whom it May Concern:

I am writing as an owner of a floating home located in Jantzen Beach Moorage, Inc. (JBMI). From 2007 to 2009 I served on the Board of Directors, the last year as President of the Association. During my tenure JBMI became a certified Oregon Clean Marina. The community spent countless hours seeking out native plants for bank stability to improve habitat for wildlife, a more natural appearance from the docks, and to help with slope stability.

Due to the floating homes being located below bank height, a security fence and gate is in place to minimize vehicle break ins as well as protect residents who otherwise may face a dangerous situation in a parking lot with no buildings nearby for help. The area immediately east of the moorage fence is often littered with trash and shopping carts but the fence and native plantings have kept JBMI a safe place for residents, wildlife, and our downstream neighbors.

The proposed Hayden Island Bike Path design appears to cut directly through Jantzen Beach Moorage, Inc. providing direct access beyond the fence and through the parking lot. As evident on the Springwater Corridor and in other parts of the city, while bike paths can promote cycling opportunities for some, they can also increase crime and accessibility to illegal camping. Until the City of Portland can find a way to control legal usage of bike paths, it seems unwise to create more, especially adjacent to sensitive water ways that the community has tried so hard to improve and maintain.

The importance of our waterways is evident in the name our city bears. Once trash or other debris gets onto the bank or into the water it is extremely difficult to remove. I am hopeful that the great minds of the city planners can find an alternate route so that the wildlife and our backyard as floating home owners continues to be protected.



Photo Credit: KPTV Johnson Creek at Springwater Corridor



Photo Credit: OPB Springwater Homeless Camp

Sincerely,

Matt Greer
USCG Certified 100 Ton Sailing Master
President, JBMI 2009
P.O. Box 10463
Portland, Or 97296
503.869.6333

November 14, 2016

Mayor Hales, Commissioner Fish, Commissioner Fritz, Commissioner Saltzman and Commissioner Novick

RE: Proposed Zoning Change for Central Gateway
Zoning Map Testimony

My husband and I own a commercial property at 9933 SE Pine which is located in Central Gateway. I was aware of the proposed zoning change from EX to EG1, which we support completely. My concern is the removal of "d" overlay which I noted on a recent notice.

As a property owner and a past member of the Gateway URAC, I would like to see the "d" overlay remain in place. Gateway was designated as a regional center and the residents involved in the Gateway Concept Plan and the development of the URA designation, felt it was important to have design standards and design review that would make sure the regional center was developed with quality in mind. Unfortunately throughout East Portland and Gateway URA past construction has not been done with design and quality in mind. This has resulted in deteriorating buildings that have not withstood the years of use.

In Central Gateway there are only a few buildings that have been well constructed and maintained. This area is being zoned for General Employment, so future development should result in an area where people will want to work. I would like to see that development be done with construction that will make the residents of Gateway proud. Relaxing the standards will not make that happen.

Please consider maintaining the "d" overlay in this area. Let's make sure the City and the residents will be proud of the development that occurs in what will become a true regional center.

Sincerely

Frieda Christopher
Property Owner
Former Gateway URAC Member

From: [Mister Gibson](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: Comprehensive Plan Implementation
Date: Monday, November 14, 2016 3:47:57 PM

Dear City Council,

As someone who lives and travels around Portland, I wanted to lodge my recommendation on the question of the Comprehensive Plan.

I would urge you to adopt Amendment 34 to the Comprehensive Plan as I tend to favor population density accommodation rather than automobile accommodation. We have a fantastic public transit system due to our population density - which makes it more efficient. I think we need to keep pushing in THAT direction over making allowances for more cars. Also, I subscribe to the notion that oil production has peaked and that automobiles as we know them are not long for this earth. Accordingly, just look at what Portland has done for bicycles and pedestrians - Let's keep pushing in THAT direction.

So: No to parking requirements on new housing.

Thank you for your time,

Grant Gibson
mistergibson@gmail.com
Voting Constituent

From: [Annie Niedergang](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#); [Paul Niedergang](#)
Subject: Support for Amendment 12
Date: Monday, November 14, 2016 1:59:58 PM

Support for Amendments 12 & 13 of the 2035 Comprehensive Plan Early Implementation Package

I support the CM2 Zoning proposed in Amendment #12. This amendment will allow for higher density which will increase the potential for affordable housing in the future. The site sits at an important node at the intersection of two major Transit streets, and the zoning would match the other corners of the intersection. I additionally support the "d" overlay and CM-1 zoning to the east of this parcel.

...

Anne Niedergang, Architect
4437 SW Twombly Ave.
Portland, OR 97239

Regarding removal of min off street parking

Dear Council Member/Mayor:

AUDITOR 11/14/16 PM 1:57

I am very opposed to the recently BPS proposed land use policy amendment which would remove the minimum off street parking requirements for residential development sites within 500 feet of frequent transit streets. I strongly feel, if implemented, this policy would drastically reduce the livability of our neighborhood.

The lack of off street parking is already creating safety issues as our congested, narrow streets reduce driver visibility and put pedestrians, including children walking to and from school, at risk of injury. The lack of reasonable, minimum off street parking is a number one concern in our neighborhood based on surveys of residents conducted by SMILE. Furthermore, your recent Residential Infill Project public survey revealed the lack of off street parking to be a major concern throughout the city.

I understand the need to minimize parking to accommodate increased density, reduce housing costs, and foster the use of mass transit. However, requiring no off-street parking for large developments such as the proposed 232 apartment complex that is to occupy the site of the old Boys and Girls Club in our neighborhood is not reasonable. Also, the Residential Infill Project and recently passed Affordable Housing Bond should create more affordable housing. I encourage you to take a balanced land use approach to accommodate Portland's increased population.

Thank you for considering the implications of unmanaged driving conditions.

Renate Powell

318 SE Spokane St

97202

powellrenate318@gmail.com

Portland City Council

1221 SW 4th Av, room 130,

PORTLAND, Or 97204


Dear Council Member/Mayor:

11/12/2016

I am very opposed to the recently BPS proposed land use policy amendment which would remove the minimum off street parking requirements for residential development sites within 500 feet of frequent transit streets. I strongly feel, if implemented, this policy would drastically reduce the livability of our neighborhood.

The lack of off street parking is already creating safety issues as our congested, narrow streets reduce driver visibility and put pedestrians, including children walking to and from school, at risk of injury. The lack of reasonable, minimum off street parking is a number one concern in our neighborhood based on surveys of residents conducted by SMILE. Furthermore, your recent Residential Infill Project public survey revealed the lack of off street parking to be a major concern throughout the city.

I understand the need to minimize parking to accommodate increased density, reduce housing costs, and foster the use of mass transit. However, requiring no off-street parking for large developments such as the proposed 232 apartment complex that is to occupy the site of the old Boys and Girls Club in our neighborhood is not reasonable. Also, the Residential Infill Project and recently passed Affordable Housing Bond should create more affordable housing. I encourage you to take a balanced land use approach to accommodate Portland's increased population.

James Powell

318 SE Spokane St
PORTLAND 97202

1002 SE Spokane Street
Portland, OR 97202

November 14, 2016

Portland City Commissioners and Mayor:

I am opposed to the recently BPS proposed land use policy amendment which would remove the minimum off-street parking requirements for residential development sites within 500 feet of frequent transit streets. I feel strongly if implemented, this policy would drastically reduce the livability in Sellwood-Moreland.

The lack of off-street parking is already creating safety issues as our congested, narrow streets reduce driver visibility and putting pedestrians, including children walking to and from school, at risk of injury. The lack of reasonable, minimum off-street parking is the **number one concern** in our neighborhood **based on surveys of residents conducted by SMILE**. Furthermore, your recent Residential Infill Project public survey revealed the lack of off street parking to be a major concern throughout the city.

An example of the negative impact of this amendment is the proposed 232 apartment complex bordered by SE Milwaukie Ave, Ogden St, 16th Ave and Rural St...an entire city block. This is the former site of the Boys/Girls Club. The area already has very limited on-street parking. Currently the developer has included 60 off-street parking spaces in this building. If those 60 spaces are eliminated as a result of the amendment, available street parking in that area will be virtually non-existent, with the problem extending well beyond this one block area. This is only one example; there are several other new apartments in the neighborhood (many just under 30 units) currently leasing with no off-street parking.

Reducing on-street parking will not solve the issue of high rents. Tenants of apartments who own a vehicle should be charged an additional monthly fee over the cost of the apartment for the convenience/security of off-street parking. And developers/landlords will recoup the cost of providing parking in lieu of additional apartments as a result of the additional income.

Rather than city officials presenting an early Christmas present to the developers by quietly "slipping in" an amendment, you should begin work on a comprehensive parking plan and take into consideration the status of parking availability neighborhood by neighborhood. Thank you for your thoughtful consideration.

Sincerely,


John N. Erb

November 14, 2012

Portland City Council
1221 SW 4th St, room 130
Portland OR 97204

AUDITOR 11/14/16 PM 1:57

Attn: Amendment 34, Comprehensive Plan Implementation

Dear Council Member/Mayor:

I am very opposed to the recently BPS proposed land use policy amendment which would remove the minimum off street parking requirements for residential development sites within 500 feet of frequent transit streets. I strongly feel, if implemented, this policy would drastically reduce the livability of our neighborhood.

The lack of off street parking is already creating safety issues as our congested, narrow streets reduce driver visibility and put pedestrians, including children walking to and from school, at risk of injury. The lack of reasonable, minimum off street parking is a number one concern in our neighborhood based on surveys of residents conducted by SMILE. Furthermore, your recent Residential Infill Project public survey revealed the lack of off street parking to be a major concern throughout the city.

I understand the need to minimize parking to accommodate increased density, reduce housing costs, and foster the use of mass transit. However, requiring no off-street parking for multi-family developments is not reasonable. Also, the Residential Infill Project and recently passed Affordable Housing Bond should create more affordable housing. I encourage you to take a balanced land use approach to accommodate Portland's increased population.

Let's discuss transportation management and on-street parking management regulations before eliminating all parking in our buildings. This last-minute amendment is putting the cart before the horse.

Please slow down!

Sincerely,



Miriam Erb
1002 SE Spokane St.
Portland OR 97202

From: [Steve Gutmann](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: Comp Plan Implementation -- more housing, less parking!
Date: Monday, November 14, 2016 1:07:56 PM

Dear City Council-

I've lived in the Richmond neighborhood for 15 years, and I'm writing to urge you to prioritize housing over parking by passing Amendment 34 to the Comprehensive Plan. Minimum parking requirements in mixed use zones will result in the construction of parking spaces that may or may not be needed, and the construction of these parking spaces are almost certain to raise the cost of housing.

Instead of forcing developers to build parking for their residents — many of whom won't use it unless it's "free," neighborhoods should be encouraged to manage demand for on-street parking with tools like neighborhood parking permits (with auctioned on-street parking permits for residents) and parking meters.

The auction will serve to discover the price at which parking demand and available supply will stabilize. If the price is high enough to justify the cost of building more spaces, developers will build new spaces, and the market will ensure that the right amount of parking gets built.

We live in a city, and more people want to live here. We shouldn't prioritize car storage over housing by socializing private car storage in the public right of way; instead, the ROW should be managed for the common good.

Please pass Amendment 34 to the Comprehensive Plan.

- Steve

Steve Gutmann
gutmann.steve@gmail.com
503.333.7564
Skype: sgutmann1

Please check out Stuffstr's new app!

From: [Adrienne Leverette](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Cc: pdxshoupistas@gmail.com
Subject: make pdx work for people, not cars
Date: Monday, November 14, 2016 12:41:12 PM

Dear City Council,

After all that has happened in the past week, can we please stop fighting over silly things like parking requirements? It is just a fact that parking requirements are at odds with housing affordability. It is just a fact that affordability is the only way to make Portland a place for everyone, not just privileged rich folks. We can come up with great ways to make people less dependent on cars so that density won't be such a burden on neighborhoods. Portland is good at that. We should all be working on ways to become less dependent on cars anyway. Let's lead the way.

Striking down parking requirements is a positive way forward to a better Portland.

Sincerely,
Adrienne Leverette
130 SE 53rd
Portland, OR 97215

From: [Erik Pattison](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: 635 SE Cesar Chavez Blvd
Date: Monday, November 14, 2016 11:29:24 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

City of Portland,

I was looking into a site of a fellow non-profit group at 635 SE Cesar Chavez. This is the location of their principal office and they have owned the site for a very long time. Under the current changes CN2 to CM1 they will lose the ability to locate their office upon redevelopment. The caveat allowing for more office with large sites (40,000+) does not catch this site. Given the large existing office use of the property, it's location on a major street, the long ownership history and their propensity to support affordable housing would the city consider amending the change to CM2 or a proportional limited use exemption that would benefit smaller sites (33.130.100.B).

Thanks

Erik Pattison, Housing Developer

ROSE Community Development | www.rosecdc.org

503-788-8052 ext.18 | Erik@rosecdc.org



rose
community development

5215 SE Duke Street, Portland, OR 97206

ROSE connects our community to build good homes, healthy families and neighborhood opportunities in outer southeast Portland.

Like us on [Facebook](#) | Follow us on [Twitter](#)

From: [Alan Kessler](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: Comprehensive Plan Implementation
Date: Monday, November 14, 2016 11:19:44 AM

Dear Mayor and City Council:

It is even more important than it was before the election that we do everything in our power as a city to increase the number of homes, decrease our reliance on oil, and improve our carbon footprint. Building even a single additional parking space is misguided given these converging crises.

Requiring garages to be built in exchange for the privilege of building houses for people is simply repugnant.

I am so proud that we rejected parking minimums in NW, and I hope we can spread this policy across the city. Please support the Mayor's amendment.

Best Regards,
Alan Kessler

2725 SE 36th Ave
Portland, OR 97202

Alan Kessler, J.D. | Director, Asset Services | Direct 503 200-5161 | Mobile 503 860-1020
805 SW Broadway | Fox Tower, Suite 1580 | Portland, OR 97205



www.gttgrp.com

This email may be confidential or privileged. If you received this communication by mistake, please erase all copies and attachments. Please notify the sender that it arrived to you in error and please do not forward the email. Thank you.

Written Testimony Re Amendment 25

I am writing to support Amendment 25 Option A and oppose Options B and C, leaving the Planning and Sustainability Commission recommendation intact. This best meets the Comp Plan Goals and per, the neighborhood and Landmarks Commission's recommendation getting the zoning more in sync with what is approvable through Historic Review. Please note that the 2:1 FAR is the base and can already easily be increased through the transfer of density from other property, whether owned by the applicant, or any other property in the district.

Based on past Historic Review cases, buildings proposed with an FAR greater than 3:1 will have an almost impossible time getting approved. They simply cannot meet the approval criteria. Therefore leaving sites mapped with a 4:1 FAR is simply misleading and will cause conflict and create great expense for developers.

Option C proposes to leave the FAR at 4:1 on four sites, and I want to comment on the particulars of each site:

- a. 624 NW 18th Ave (Site a). this site is one of the contiguous parcels owned by Emanuel Lutheran Church.
The other portions of their property consist of 8588 square feet of building on a 15,000 sq ft of land. This means that there is 21,412 of unused floor area that could be used on this 10,000 square foot parcel. If the base FAR is 2:1 adding this excess FAR will allow an resulting FAR of over 4:1. Changing the FAR on this site to 4:1 is unnecessary, and may tempt development proposals with an FAR even greater than 4:1 which would be much too bulky and tall to be approvable.
- b. 1727 NW Hoyt St (Site b) : With the requirement that the existing building be preserved, it would be very difficult to exceed 2:1 on this site, and would therefore create 20,000 sq ft of allowable density that could only be transferred elsewhere.
- c. 1806-1816 NW Irving St (Site c): A building built with a 4:1 FAR on this site would likely be 6 stories and 65' or more in height, towering over the existing houses across the street. If site "b" were also given a 4:1 FAR, then proposals on this site could reach an FAR of 5:1 or 6:1, clearly inappropriate. With the PSC recommended 2:1 FAR and the availability of transfer FAR, the density would be adequate to build an appropriately scaled building with an FAR of 3:1 and 4-5 stories.
- d. 777 NW 19th Ave (Site d): This site has a recently completed 73,286 sq ft apartment building on a 20,600 sq ft site, for an FAR of 3.55 : 1. Since the building is already built, and since the non-conforming provisions of the zoning code would allow the building to be rebuilt to its full size, there is no need to leave the FAR at 4:1, and doing so would create an odd spot on the zoning map.

Thanks for your consideration.

Rick Michaelson

Written Testimony Re Amendment 51

Amendment 51. Transportation demand management and on-street parking management

A. Clarify administrative process for TDM requirements in the CI Zone and Mixed Use Zone sufficient to facilitate the approval process in development review and to ensure adequate administration of new program requirements, including:

Request: Amend this item so that it applies to RH and RI and EG zones in Centers and Corridors and in Plan Districts such as NW Portland.

CI and Mixed Use zones are not the only zones with allowances for significant developments in the Centers and Corridors. RH, R1, and EG zones are also found in these areas, especially in NW, and the TDM requirements for developments in these zones should also be reviewed and clarified at the same time as the CI and Mixed Used Zones

Rick Michaelson

Vicki Skryha
1728 NW Hoyt Street
Portland, Oregon 97209

November 14, 2016

Portland City Council
1221 SW 4th Ave. - Room 130
Portland, OR 97204

RE: Testimony in favor of 2:1 FAR in RH-zoned Alphabet Historic District

Mayor Hales and Commissioners Fritz, Fish, Novick and Saltzman:

I urge you to support the recommendation of the Planning and Sustainability Commission and adopt an FAR of 2:1 in the RH-zoned portion of the Alphabet Historic District in NW Portland. I own a home directly impacted by this decision. I have worked on zoning policy issues that facilitate multi-family and special needs housing for many years at both the state and local level. Most recently, I served on the City's Mixed Use Zones Policy Advisory Committee. I've also worked in the affordable housing field for over thirty years. I believe that both the preservation of historic areas and the expansion of affordable housing are important and benefit our community. These pursuits should work in tandem. Adopting an FAR of 2:1 is the best way to ensure this.

The proposed change in FAR, from 4:1 to 2:1, addresses an existing inconsistency in the City's zoning code. I recently confirmed with City planning staff that the Alphabet Historic District, and the Historic Overlay zone that implements it in the City's zoning code, are not going away or changing with the reduction of FAR (or the retention of the existing FAR) in the RH zones. The zoning code states that "an area with base zoning, overlay zoning, or an area in a plan district is subject to all of the regulations of each." The code also clarifies that where there is a conflict "regulations in an overlay zone supersede regulations in base zones." (Section 33.700.070.e). This hierarchy will continue to apply to the Alphabet District. Given the limited available development opportunities and the small scale of existing historic structures, the 2:1 FAR will bring the base zone into alignment with the applicable overlay zoning. This will facilitate realistic expectations and help prevent many future contentious battles.

The discrepancy between the RH base zone FAR and overlay zoning was recently analyzed in depth when a contributing historic building (the Buck-Prager building) was proposed for demolition. The City Council voted unanimously to deny the demolition. In its findings and conclusions (LU 14-210073 DM), it was clear that a building designed to a 4:1 FAR would be totally incompatible with the historic district context, and a smaller scale development would still substantially increase the number of residential units without an adverse effect. An FAR of 2:1 is consistent with the maximum scale allowed by the overlay zoning under this analysis. The following is a summary of specific City goals, policies and objectives that were **not met** when the previous out-of-scale development (a six-story, 82-unit building) was proposed on NW 18th between Hoyt and Irving. (CP = Comprehensive Plan goal, and NWD = Northwest District Plan goal; page numbers refer to the final City Council Decision LU 14-210073 DM)

CP Goal 2 – Urban Development (pp 18-19): The City decision discusses the RH base zoning which assumes densities of 80-125 units per acre (a currently proposed 160-unit concept on NW 18th is considerably above this density range which pro-rates to 37-60 units on the 0.46 acre site). The finding notes that this goal is not met for the six-story 82-unit project. The City notes that "A more properly scaled development would include a

quarter block development to the north, with a smaller development to the south, and retaining and rehabilitating the existing historic building for residential use. Such a development pattern would be more in keeping with the historic development pattern of the Alphabet Historic District.” The City finding goes on to state: “Specifically, when a property is subject to an overlay zone, such as the Historic Resource Protection overlay zone or a Plan District, the zoning code has established that these overlays and Plan Districts modify the base zoning regulations. Therefore, while high-density development is desirable closer to the city center and near transit facilities, such infill development must be compatible with its surroundings, particularly when its surroundings include significant historic resources.”

CP Goal 3 – Neighborhoods (pp 19-20): The City’s findings note that historic preservation is specifically supported through Policy 3.4. The City found “Demolition of the existing historic building, and construction of its proposed replacement building, does not meet this goal, as it would be in opposition to the goals of preservation of historic character and promotion of density.” The then-proposed six story, 82-unit building was part of the determination that Goal 3 was not met.

CP Goal 4 – Housing (pp 20-21): While the previously proposed six-story, 82-unit building included 26 studios, 36 one-bedroom units, and 20 two-bedroom units, it was noted that “Objective 4.1.F encourages housing design that supports the conservation, enhancement, and continued vitality of areas of the city with special scenic, historic, architectural or cultural value.” The City found “Demolition of the existing historic building, and construction of its proposed replacement building, does not meet the goal of providing diverse housing of different types, tenures, and costs to accommodate the needs, preferences, and financial capabilities of current and future households.” Part of the City Council discussion about the previously proposed building noted the need for more family-size units. Much recent construction in the NW District has provided studio and one-bedroom units. The site, with its surrounding single family houses, a school bus stop and a nearby school, seemed to have potential for townhome-scale family units.

CP Goal 5 – Economic Development (pp 21-22): Objective 5.1.E states “Define and develop Portland’s cultural, historic, recreational, educational and environmental assets as important marketing and image-building tools of the city’s business districts and neighborhoods.” Portland walking tours, Slabtown historic tours, TV filming and local advertising have all featured the surrounding historic homes. While development that puts the half-block into productive use is welcome and desirable, if that development is incompatible and out-of-scale, it will detract from the existing historic assets from an economic perspective.

CP Goal 7 – Energy (pp 22-23): The City’s finding for this goal notes that preserving an existing building is good energy policy. While this finding pertained to not demolishing the contributing historic Buck-Prager building, consideration should be given to preserving the six-unit apartment building north of Buck-Prager. These units appear to be in good, habitable condition; their demolition and re-location of existing tenants is costly. The northern eighth-block portion of the site could still be easily developed into townhome-scaled housing units.

CP Goal 12 – Urban Design (pp 23-25): The City’s findings note that Objective 12.1.B emphasizes preserving neighborhood character, that Policy 12.3 promotes historic preservation, that Objective 12.3.A states the city should “preserve and accentuate historic resources as part of an urban environment that is being reshaped by new development projects”, and that Objective 12.3.E protects “potentially significant historic structures from demolition until the City can determine the significance of the structure and explore alternatives to

demolition.” While the demolition application argued otherwise, City Council noted that the history of the Buck-Prager building is significant. The finding notes that “the existing building is appropriately scaled for the historic district and the proposal to demolish did not include a compatible replacement building, particularly with regard to the adjacent Landmarks.” City Council noted that “early design advice from the Historic Landmarks Commission could have helped to inform the design process, ultimately resulting in a more compatible and specific design that showed greater deference to its historic neighbors and more clearly balanced the approval criteria.” It seems this important historic and design consultation, in keeping with the City Council findings, will likely result in a smaller, more appropriately scaled buildings for any development on the same site.

NWD Policy 1 – Land Use (p 25): The City’s findings cite Objectives A and F. Objective A concerns increasing housing in the district. The 82 units proposed in the demolition application were considered a significant increase over the existing 6 units on the half-block. The finding notes that “new residential units could also be provided within the existing historic building, on the ¼-block to the north and potentially on the 1/8-block to the south of the historic building. While the total number of new housing units would be less than currently proposed with the replacement building, incorporation of the existing historic building into a new development would still result in a significant increase of housing units.” Objective F supports small scale, pedestrian-oriented developments. The City’s findings state “The existing historic building and the existing noncontributing resource are considered small-scale developments; the proposed replacement building is a rather large-scale development at 4-6 stories tall. A smaller-scale and more appropriately scaled development would potentially include 2 to 2½- story rowhouse-type development which takes cues from the neighboring Landmark buildings.”

NWD Policy 5 – Housing (pp 25-26): The City’s findings cite Objectives A, B and F. Objective A states “Increase the number of housing units in the district, including rental and ownership opportunities for current and future district residents.” Objective B states “Increase the supply of housing that is affordable, accessible to a full range of incomes, and provide for special needs housing.” Objective F states “Encourage the renovation and rehabilitation of existing housing as a preferred alternative to clearance and redevelopment.” Proposing affordable units would be consistent with Objective B. The City finding notes the desirability of providing 2- and 3-bedroom units. To meet Objective F, a development that retains the existing 6-unit apartment building could be considered as an alternative to clearance and redevelopment.

NWD Policy 7 – Urban Design (pp 26-28): The City’s findings cite Objectives A and C. Objective A states “Integrate new development with the existing urban fabric by acknowledging the scale, proportions, orientation, quality of construction and other architectural and site design elements of the building’s immediate area.” Objective C states “Preserve and enhance the distinct character of different parts of the Northwest District.” This finding noted the 13 Landmarks within a block of the site and other one- and two-story structures in the immediate area. The City’s finding specifies that development on the site should be primarily compatible with the Landmark structures rather than other nearby buildings of lesser significance. The City’s findings note that the previously proposed six-story 82-unit building “is wholly incompatible with the existing urban fabric in scale, proportion, and architectural and site design” and “is not integrated with the existing urban fabric as it is not set back from the street, it does not feature intricate architectural detailing, and most significantly, it is much taller and more massive than the modest Landmark residential structures in the immediate vicinity.” The City finding describes the need for development to offer deference to neighboring Landmarks, particularly when compared to the scale and size of the existing building.

NWD Policy 8 – Historic Preservation (p 28): The City notes Objectives A and B promoting restorations that maintain the character of the original building and adaptively re-use buildings. It is not appropriate to build a much taller building next to small historic structures.

There are other factors that could constrain development on available sites in the Alphabet Historic District. If federal funding is used in an affordable housing project (including project-based rental assistance), the building will need to comply with the results of an environmental assessment that includes a Section 106 (historic) review and consultation process. The required Section 106 review will assess the impact of new construction on nearby historic buildings; an out-of-scale new building would be considered an 'adverse impact' and could interfere with the ability to use federal funding resources. Similarly, if historic tax credit financing is pursued, any new construction adjacent to historic structures would need to be compatible in scale and design.

The guidelines in the City's Community Design Guidelines and the Historic Alphabet District Community Design Guidelines Addendum will also need to be met. It is difficult to imagine how an out-of-scale building can be found to comply with the applicable Community Design Guidelines.

As a NW Portland property owner interested in both preserving our historic neighborhood and expanding affordable housing options, I am confident that appropriately scaled projects that provide desired residential units can proceed. I have reached out to the nonprofit developer proposing a senior housing project and would like to further discuss constructive ideas that will enable a compatible affordable housing project on the NW 18th site. However, if out-of-scale development continues to be proposed, it seems the road forward will only include a series of hurdles and contentiousness. Confirming an FAR of 2:1 in the RH-zoned portion of the Alphabet Historic District will enable productive discussions and much needed housing units in a properly scaled building.

Respectfully,

Vicki Skryha

11-14-16

AUDITOR 11/17/16 PM12:02

CITY OF PORTLAND - ARTICLE 588109
HAYDEN ISLAND

HOW DARE YOU PROPOSE TO REMOVE US FROM OUR HOMES FOR A BIKEWAY PATH, WE ALREADY HAVE ONE, AS WELL AS OTHER AREAS OF THE CITY. HAYDEN ISLAND IS A VERY CONVENIENT PLACE TO LIVE FOR OUR SENIOR AND HANDICAPPED RESIDENTS. WE DO NOT NEED ANY MORE TRAFFIC. NEXT THING YOU KNOW, HAYDEN ISLAND WILL BECOME THE NEXT JOHNSON CREEK CORRIDOR BECAUSE THOSE LIVING NEAR THE RAILROAD BRIDGE WILL MOVE IN BECAUSE CAMPING IS NOT AS DANGEROUS AS THE RIVER RISES. MY HOME WITH A RIVER VIEW IS MY LIFE LINE. I SHALL CERTAINLY DIE IF DISPLACED.

Pauline Nelson
Resident
Hayden Island



Pauline C. Wilson
2325 N Broughton Ct
Portland, OR 97217

PORTLAND OR 970

15 NOV 2016 PM 3 L



CITY OF PORTLAND
ARTICLE 588109
1221 SW 4th AVE
PORTLAND, OR
97204



From: naderrassouli@comcast.net
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: CPU Testimony - 6141 SW Canyon Court - Zoning Map Changes - Ordinance Nos. 165851, 177028, 187832 Testimony
Date: Sunday, November 13, 2016 9:52:53 PM
Attachments: [CPU Testimony re 6141 SW Canyon Court.pdf](#)

Dear Council Clerk and Mayor's office,

I am following up on the above matter which was submitted two months ago by my attorney.

We have not gotten any response back yet from your office. Since this is now a time sensitive matter, Please respond immediately.

You can forward your response to: naderrassouli@comcast.net .

Sincerely,

Dr. Nader Rassouli

From: "Caroline A. Richter" <CRichter@dunncarney.com>
To: cputestimony@portlandoregon.gov
Cc: "naderrassouli" <naderrassouli@comcast.net>, "Katie shriver" <Katie.shriver@portlandoregon.gov>, "tim ramis" <tim.ramis@jordanramis.com>, mike@mmcarch.com, "Ty K. Wyman" <TWyman@dunncarney.com>, "Linda K. Odermott" <LOdermott@dunncarney.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 13, 2016 11:18:50 AM
Subject: CPU Testimony - 6141 SW Canyon Court - Zoning Map Changes - Ordinance Nos. 165851, 177028, 187832 Testimony

Council Clerk,

Attached please find CPU Testimony regarding the above-referenced matter.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Caroline A. Richter

Assistant to Ty K. Wyman

crichter@dunncarney.com


Direct [503-306-5338](tel:503-306-5338) | Fax [503-224-7324](tel:503-224-7324) | www.dunncarney.com

Dunn Carney Allen Higgins & Tongue LLP

851 SW Sixth Ave. Suite 1500 | Portland, OR 97204

Member of Meritas Law Firms Worldwide www.Meritas.org

This message is intended only for the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient, or the agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited, and you are requested to return the original message to the sender.



October 13, 2016

TY K. WYMAN
Admitted in
Oregon and Washington

DIRECT DIAL
503-417-5478

E-MAIL
twyman@
dunncarney.com

ADDRESS
Suite 1500
851 S.W. Sixth Avenue
Portland, Oregon
97204-1357

Phone 503.224.6440
Fax 503.224.7324

INTERNET
www.dunncarney.com

Via Email: cputestimony@portlandoregon.gov

Council Clerk
City of Portland
1221 SW Fourth Avenue, Room 130
Portland, OR 97204

Re: 6141 SW Canyon Court
Zoning Map Changes
Ordinance Nos. 165851, 177028, 187832 Testimony
Our File No.: RAS10-1

Dear Mayor and Council:

As you know, we represent Dr. Nader Rassouli, owner of the referenced property. Recall that Commissioner Novick proposed amendment of the Comp Plan designation of this site, from R20 to R5. Tim Ramis and I testified in support of that proposal.

After substantial deliberation, the Council approved Commissioner Novick's proposed amendment at its May 11 session. In doing so, the Council specifically considered, but ultimately rejected, the idea of requiring the property owner to separately apply for a quasi-judicial zone change.


My review of the proposed zoning map before you today¹ is that it fails to recognize the Council's prior decision. In contact with Commissioner Novick's staff, I understand this to constitute a simple mapping error that staff will correct. I write today simply to go on record with the need to make this correction, specifically that 6141 SW Canyon Court be rezoned from R20 to R5.

¹ Specifically, Exhibit D-1, "Recommended Zoning Map Changes (August 23, 2016)," to Agenda Item 1152.

Council Clerk
October 13, 2016
Page 2

Again, we appreciate your consideration and look forward to addressing any questions you may have.

Very truly yours,



Ty K. Wyman

TKW:car

cc: Nader M. Rassouli, DDS (via email)

Katie Shriver, Policy Director, Office of Commissioner Steve Novick (via email)

Tim Ramis (via email)

Mike McCulloch (via email)

DCAPDX_2186369_v1

From: [Marsha Hanchrow](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: Comprehensive Plan implementation
Date: Sunday, November 13, 2016 9:17:54 PM

As sent to Council last week.

Thanks,

mh

----- Forwarded message -----

From: "Marsha Hanchrow" <m.hanchrow@gmail.com>

Date: Nov 10, 2016 6:47 PM

Subject: Comp Plan amendments

To: "Nick Fish" <nick@portlandoregon.gov>, "Amanda Fritz" <amanda@portlandoregon.gov>, "Charlie Hales" <mayorhales@portlandoregon.gov>, "Dan Saltzman" <dan@portlandoregon.gov>, "Steve Novick" <novick@portlandoregon.gov>

Cc: <pdxshoupistas@gmail.com>

> Thank you, Mayor Hales for proposing Amendment #34 to remove some minimum parking requirements from the recommended draft. I hope the entire Council will support this change when the plan comes up for approval.

>

> Once market-priced on-street parking is the Portland norm, allowing the development market to do its job will make building affordable housing much more affordable - without subsidies.

>

> Housing for people is far more important than housing for cars.

>

> Thanks,

>

> mh

From: [Lucy Wong](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: Comprehensive Plan Implementation - Amendment 34
Date: Sunday, November 13, 2016 4:31:12 PM

To Whom it May Concern,

I am writing regarding Amendment 34 of the Comprehensive Plan. I am deeply in support of having no parking minimums for new development. Parking is an unnecessary luxury when developers could be using that money instead on affordable housing. I would be interested to see if there was also a way of tying not having required parking with then requiring affordable housing. We need to be moving away from an auto-centric city and towards the future of transit and foot/bike travel.

I also support Option C of Amendment 28 regarding Drive-through facilities. I think this is the correct step towards Portland's mission of being a pedestrian friendly city. Drive-thrus are auto-oriented in terms of appeal and the emissions caused by their inevitable idling.

Thank you,
Lucy Wong
NE Portland

From: [Liana Corliss](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#); [Commissioner Novick](#); [Shriver, Katie](#); [Commissioner Fritz](#); [Adamsick, Claire](#); [Commissioner Saltzman](#); [Grumm, Matt](#); [Commissioner Fish](#); [Dunphy, Jamie](#)
Subject: Comprehensive Plan Implementation- re submission of testimony
Date: Sunday, November 13, 2016 1:47:07 PM

Dear Members of the Portland City Council,

I am resubmitting my testimony for your consideration. I previously submitted testimony prior to public testimony on October 6th. I want to take the time to re iterate my concerns and my proposal.

My name is Liana Corliss, my address is 1626 SE 38th Avenue, one block south of Cesar Chavez Street and Hawthorne Boulevard.

It appears that all the amendments to the Comprehensive Plan Zoning made after public hearings are all to increase the zoning codes/density and none were considered to provide residents with a gentler transition to increased density and commercial zones.

I understand the need for density housing and the pressure that Portland faces in providing that. However, residents need to be considered in these changes and in the words of the Comprehensive Plan the goals of the zoning changes are to encourage “economic prosperity, human health, environmental health, equity and resilience.”

The current zoning proposal would change every property on my block from R5 to CM2, with a maximum of 60 feet or 5 stories, with the exception of my house at 1626 and 1614 on 38th (zoning change of R5 to R2.5). This is a very radical change to CM2, I feel this is too severe and there are NO other blocks that proposes such drastic changes right up against a residential property.

I am proposing a more gradual transition, while still allowing density and commercial zoning, CM1 or R1 instead of CM2.

The SE District Liaison Office of the Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability in fact proposed zoning changes of R5 to R2.5 to the north properties and R1 to the east of my house.

I propose that the addresses east of mine, toward Cesar Chavez, 3829 and 1621-1627 be zoned to CM1 or alternatively R1 to restrict height to three stories and soften the transition. I propose zoning the 3 houses north of 1614, the addresses 1604, 1534 and 1524- to R2.5 or R1. The properties on the east side of Cesar Chavez are already CM1, providing density housing at Cedarhurst Village and the fire station.

Solar shading is an important issue. I have a back yard that I have created specifically for habitat and I get numerous species of birds and bees daily, even hawks and peregrine falcons have come to my yard from Mt Tabor. We grow food that we eat and share with our community. Portland also has a goal to create green spaces in the city. I had bees on flowers last week in my back yard, in November.

I am not asking to keep the zoning the same, just to consider a gentler transition on our block. I note that 40th one block away from this important corridor does not propose any abrupt zoning changes.

The individual that testified previously for CM2 on our block does not live in our block and although he had been a Richmond Neighborhood Association board member, did not inform us at all of this testimony to get our thoughts as current residents.

At the RNA meetings, we have discussed the many areas of high density housing opportunities in Richmond, including Powell. Our block does not have to burden such an extreme change.

We can provide density housing with a less extreme transition and impact on our lovely neighborhood.

Thank you for giving me your attention and time.

Sincerely, Liana Corliss

From: [Clarence Yung](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: Comprehensive Plan Implementation Amendment 34
Date: Sunday, November 13, 2016 11:38:53 AM

Hello,

I'm a resident of the Pearl District and I'd like to voice my strong support for Amendment 34 eliminating minimum parking requirements for housing development in mixed use zones.

Our city has pursued policies that encourage the development of higher density buildings in mixed use corridors. It seems counterproductive to reduce development density in these corridors with an arbitrary 30-unit threshold for the minimum parking requirement.

Also, as has been suggested by numerous economic studies on the elasticity of parking supply, in the long run, renters in these buildings end up paying the actual cost of parking — even when the parking has a price attached to it. In a time when we are all worried about the ever-increasing price of housing, it seems crazy to force developments to overbuild parking beyond market demand when that burden will eventually be shouldered by renters.

Finally, Portlanders have stated time and time again that we should aim for higher transit, walking, and biking mode share and that we should be building a designed environment around those modes. Encouraging the overbuilding of parking supply seems to be *entirely* against this goal.

I would encourage city council to seriously consider passing Amendment 34 and take further steps toward increasing housing affordability and increasing transit, walking, and biking mode share.

Thank you!

— Clarence Yung

From: [Rob Mumford](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Cc: [Commissioner Fritz](#); [Hales, Mayor](#); [Commissioner Saltzman](#); [Commissioner Novick](#); [Commissioner Fish](#)
Subject: Comprehensive Plan Implementation : Remove Parking Minimums
Date: Sunday, November 13, 2016 10:42:20 AM

Dear City Council,

I believe housing is more important than car parking.

I encourage and support a passage of Amendment 34 to the Comprehensive plan to eliminate minimum parking requirements in mixed use zones.

It's of most importance to my family and my neighbors to press the city leaders towards supporting policies that counter increases in housing costs.

We already live in a city where our citizens with middle class jobs are unable to live near their work. I myself am priced out of my own neighborhood if I were to try and buy a home here now. The alternative of living further away from job opportunities with increased commutes in cars or buses is an unnecessary burden on the middle class, an unnecessary burden on city resources and an unnecessary burden on our city's transportation infrastructure.

That is why I support eliminating parking minimums.

Thank you for your time.

Rob Mumford
SE Woodward St @ 41st

From: [Chris Rall](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Cc: [Hales, Mayor](#); [Commissioner Fritz](#); [Commissioner Novick](#); [Commissioner Fish](#); [Commissioner Saltzman](#)
Subject: Comprehensive Plan Implementation: IZ and off-street parking requirements
Date: Sunday, November 13, 2016 10:00:38 AM

Dear Portland City Council,

I am writing to express my support for Amendment 34 to the comprehensive plan, which eliminates off-street parking requirements in mixed-use zones close to transit.

There are lots of reasons to support this:

- 1) Off-street parking requirements increase the cost of building new housing, and also reduce the amount that can be built, both of which are bad for market-rate housing costs.
- 2) Off-street parking requirements incentivize car ownership which in turn will result in more traffic, pollution and energy use.
- 3) Off-street parking requirements are ineffective at addressing on-street parking availability, an issue that CAN be addressed with parking demand management tools like properly priced permits and meters. As long as on-street parking is free (or under-priced), there is little reason for tenants in new buildings to pay to park in the building's garage. Once on-street parking is priced properly, the market can determine the demand for off-street parking and the issue is addressed without clunky, ineffective regulation.

There is great concern about housing affordability in Portland right now, and I am pleased to see the city moving forward on inclusionary housing policies to ensure that we build housing affordable to lower income residents.

That said, there is irony in the comparison between the issue of inclusionary housing and the issue of parking requirements. We are looking to carefully balance the impact inclusionary housing policies could have on new market rate housing, a situation where there is a trade-off between two goals for the city - housing supply, and affordability for low-income households.

On the other hand, eliminating parking requirements helps us achieve two goals simultaneously: reducing housing costs and reducing traffic. Why are we even debating the win-win of eliminating off-street parking requirements?

Thanks for all you do,
-Chris

--

Chris Rall

From: montuckyliberal@gmail.com on behalf of [Matt Singer](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: Comprehensive Plan Implementation
Date: Sunday, November 13, 2016 7:47:36 AM

Members of Council--

I've only lived in Portland for six years, but in that short time, I've seen rents rise incredibly quickly. I'm writing today to oppose parking requirements for new construction in Portland. Parking requirements drive up the cost of housing. For many of us who do not own personal cars, they are unnecessary. For the problems that parking requirements attempt to solve, I believe there are more effective and efficient solutions that can keep the cost of housing down while doing the most to maintain the accessibility of neighborhoods for long-time residents and Portlanders who need access to cars.

Thanks for all you're doing to keep Portland lovely and livable for all of us!

Matt Singer
406-544-0211 (m)

From: Timme Helzer [<mailto:helzert@comcast.net>]
Sent: Saturday, November 12, 2016 7:42 PM
To: BPS Mailbox <BPSMBX@portlandoregon.gov>
Cc: Timme Helzer <helzert@comcast.net>
Subject: Opposition to Comp Plan Bike Path on Hayden Island

Director Susan Anderson
Bureau of Planning and Sustainability
City of Portland
November 17th, 2016

Opposition to Comprehensive Plan Bike Path on Hayden Island

The now-outdated and void 2009 Hayden Island Plan (HIP) continues to be used by the Portland Bureau of Transportation (PBOT) and the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability (BPS) as the basis for its justification of a bicycle path along some of Hayden Island's private waterfront properties. The HIP was based on the assumption that the extensive expansion of Interstate 5 and a new Interstate Bridge, all part of the ill-conceived and grossly mismanaged Columbia River Crossing plan, would be built, and Hayden Island's infrastructure, streets, walking/biking paths, and the like would be part of an integrated whole. That has not happened, and may never happen; yet, the HIP continues to be used by PBOT/BPS as if it were viable, when definitely it is not! And, our community is held captive by it.

The PBOT/BPS bike path plan remains in place on much of Hayden Island, running along the Columbia River past The Waterside condominiums, and through The Red Lion Hotel's busy loading docks. It continues around three sides of the more than 450 units of the Manufactured Home Community (MHC), and its southern side on the North Portland Harbor. The proposed bike path then continues further east through the off-street parking lots, garages, and storage areas of the 177 units of Jantzen Beach Moorage (JBMI), back to I-5.

This plan will take more than 30 acres by eminent domain, and the most dire consequence of this 30-foot wide bike path will force the complete removal of at least 112 units of the MHC, the rents from which account for approximately 50% of the revenue to Lautrec, Ltd. (a Farmington Hills, Michigan, corporation), owners of the MHC park. The remaining portion of their business will not be sustainable, and the owners will be forced to close our MHC, displacing approximately 450 families from that site. Many are low-income families, some in poor health and disabled, with no where else to go. Regrettably, they will join Portland's growing homeless challenge.

Furthermore, along the North Portland Harbor section of this bike path, another 177 units of our extensive floating home community will be impacted by this plan, eliminating more than 300 parking spaces, garages, and storage units in now off-street facilities. Not only will tax-generating revenue from these properties be lost to the city and county, but for JBMI new on-street parking will be needed at city expense to service these floating homes.

Obviously, this bike path plan will impact not only these vital neighborhoods in our diverse island community, but also it will likely bring more cyclists on to the now-restricted walking paths along the Columbia and unprotected island streets. What's more, that new path will make it easier for transients to set up illegal encampments near the contiguous fragile natural wildlife habitats of West Hayden Island. And thieves will have quicker access on their stolen bicycles to our neighborhoods along the water (Portland Police observe, "Have you noticed . . . these thieves always have the best bikes.").

I value the lives and well being of our island neighbors, and the quality of life we have now, that we share with family and friends. It is always my intention is to find more ways to

improve Hayden Island for everyone, while opposing these ill-founded plans that clearly favor only a very few for their immediate recreational pleasure, at the great expense of the safety, security, and long-term affordability of our way of life here. The media will have a field day with these comparisons.

If this bike path plan continues to be considered viable, it is likely the public will see hundreds of local families (many of whom are low-income and disabled) being displaced and made homeless. That sacrifice will be made for the fleeting pleasure of cyclists riding their \$2000 bicycles and wearing their \$500 lycra-spandex racing gear along a waterfront they can only briefly glimpse, as they whiz by.

This definitely isn't the kind of Portland anyone wants; but, that's the kind of Portland we'll have if this ill-conceived and outdated, unsafe and unaffordable bike path plan is considered any further. What we need to do is just get off our bikes, and walk away, dragging that defunct Hayden Island Plan with us; that will be better for everyone!

Respectfully,

Timme A. Helzer, Ph.D.

Founding Member, Northwest Citizen Science Initiative

220 North Hayden Bay Drive

Portland, Oregon 97217; helzert@comcast.net

From: [Colin Piethe](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: Comprehensive Plan Implementation
Date: Saturday, November 12, 2016 8:19:25 PM

Please pass Amendment 34 to remove minimum parking requirements!! Parking makes housing more expensive, and in a dense city like Portland where it's easy to get around by transit, biking, carsharing, or TNC's, parking just isn't necessary. Please make it easier for developers to build more housing and in turn make the housing market more affordable.

Thank you for your time,
Colin

From: [Patti Yeager](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: Hayden Island Bike Path
Date: Saturday, November 12, 2016 6:32:22 PM

To: City Council

From: Patti Yeager
1503 N. Hayden Island Drive #122
Portland, OR 97217

Date: 11/12/2016

Re: Proposed Bike Path Hayden Island Mobile Home Park

I just got a letter from the park informing me of a proposed bike path thru my back yard. Needless to say I am very opposed to this plan. From my front room and deck to the water is maybe 20 feet of yard. Some residents the area is even smaller. I feel my safety and privacy would be gone. I would have strangers literally in my living room.

I am all for bikes and bikes paths that serve a purpose i.e. to get cars off the roads. However, there is no purpose for this path and there are already lots of paths on the Island. It is a waste of my Tax Dollars that are needed in so many other places. How about housing for the Homeless. We have quite a population on the Island. They need a place and it is LONG overdue. There, but for the "Grace of God go I" and many others. Take care of them. NO BIKE PATH PLEASE

Thank you and please keep me informed.

From: [Thomas Dana](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: Comprehensive Plan Implementation
Date: Saturday, November 12, 2016 6:15:05 PM

City Council Members,

I live on Hayden Island in the Manufactured Home Community and I am very concerned about the Transportation Plan in the Comprehensive Plan, specifically the proposed bicycle path that runs through the Manufactured Home Community.

This proposed bicycle path will cause the removal of so many manufactured homes that the entire Community will no longer be profitable and will be forced to close down. This will be

From: [Ed Fischer](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: Comprehensive Plan Implementation -- Amendment #53(d)
Date: Saturday, November 12, 2016 4:48:40 PM

I would like to testify that I believe that Comp Plan Amendment #53(d) concerning Marquam Hill Mixed Use Zones is a very bad idea for the Homestead Neighborhood and Marquam Hill where I live.

Amendment 53(d) appears to change some current zone designations from CM1 to CM2. If I understand it correctly, this would allow development of commercial parking lots on Marquam Hill. The traffic up here is already horrendous and dangerous. Traffic coming down Marquam Hill Road and Gibbs in the morning is fast and almost non-stop, making it difficult for cars to turn out onto Gibbs and making walking along Gibbs a risky endeavor. Adding commercial parking would make the situation on Gibbs, 11th, Gaines, Sam Jackson, Homestead, and a number of other residential streets even worse than it is. The Marquam Hill Plan, that was approved by City Council in July 2003 (as ordinance 177739) called for limiting institutional parking spots on the hill in recognition of the adverse consequences to the area of increased traffic.

Allowing the development of commercial parking on Marquam Hill, via the proposed Amendment 53(d) to "upzone" would have major negative impact on the livability of the residential area here by the increases in already very high volumes of traffic. I urge you to drop the proposal.

Thank-you.

Edward L. Fischer
3404 SW 13th Avenue

From: [Brian Posewitz](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: Minimum Parking Requirements (Comprehensive Plan Implementation: Amendment 34)
Date: Saturday, November 12, 2016 2:45:19 PM

Greetings,

I support elimination of minimum parking requirements. They drive up housing costs, clutter neighborhoods with unsightly parking lots, and reduce housing choice by making more people pay for off-street parking spaces even if they don't want them. They also unfairly discriminate against new residents by making new residents pay for off-street parking (directly or indirectly) so existing residents can continue to park in the public right of way for free. We need to find better ways to balance parking supply and demand, including charging for parking in the public right of way and relying on market incentives to create off-street parking for the people who want it most and therefore should be willing to pay for it.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Brian Posewitz
8508 SE 11th Ave.
Portland, OR 97202 (Sellwood)
503-432-8249
brianposewitz@comcast.net

From: [Martha Miller](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: "Comprehensive Plan Implementation"
Date: Saturday, November 12, 2016 1:37:56 PM

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Portland City Council:

Oh no . . . a bike path through my tiny back yard rears its ugly head again.

I am a single, elderly woman on Social Security, living in a trailer park on Hayden Island. I have about 15 feet between my back door and the Columbia River. Not enough room for anything but a little grass.

I've just heard that the bike path plan is back on the table. That means, once implemented, what little peace and privacy I have in my tiny back yard will be shattered by bike riders streaming by my back door.

We live in an area that has plenty of quiet streets throughout the 'park'. We have a main entry that allows access to the small shopping mall on the Island. There is no need for a bike path through here. It will come from nowhere and go nowhere-- except through our tiny, personal spaces. What pleasure the path might give the bike riders who have no particular destination in mind will come at the price I have to pay: my privacy, my comfort, my sense of security, and my peace of mind.

PLEASE. This is my home -- a small manufactured structure that is all I can afford. I can't move due to the real estate market's escalation. So I'm stuck here and the prospect of bike riders enjoying themselves in my back yard is both frightening and maddening.

I just have to ask: What are you thinking???

I'm not the only one who feels this way.

My neighbor's grandchildren often come to visit him and stay for the weekend.

They love to play in his tiny back yard. What's going to become of them?

What about all the people on each side of me who use the small strip of land behind their houses for family gatherings?

This is a *community*, ladies and gentlemen. Real people live here. People who have made a home the best they can under the circumstances and who use their tiny outdoor spaces as often as the Portland weather allows. If you force this bike path through here, you have disrupted the lives of a lot of good people who, unable to afford to live elsewhere, have put their modest homes on this land thinking they could enjoy a bit of privacy and safety.

I find it quite incredible that you planners and committee members ignore the horrific I-5 traffic while dreaming of lazy bike paths through our back yards.

Please. This is my home. PLEASE don't do this to me.

Martha Miller

1503 N Hayden Island Drive, Unit 129

Portland OR 97217

503/286-0945

From: [judi walker](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: Proposed bike path on Hayden island
Date: Saturday, November 12, 2016 12:56:57 PM

I am submitting written testimony regarding the proposed bike path along the Columbia river waterfront in Hayden Island Mobile Home Community. Is a bike path worth displacing over 1200 residents? It is not only our homes along this proposed bike path which number over 40 it is our entire park which would be closed as discussed and informed of by our owner Lauretec Inc. Our residents are mostly low income, disabled, and senior citizens on very limited income. We would have no where to go? We can not just take our homes and move them. It would cost over 20 thousand dollars to move each home. Where would we put the home? No one has that kind of money to move it. Is the city going to find over 1200 residents affordable housing? I don't think so. Our housing shortage is well known in this city. These are our homes being ripped away from us and I think it is disgraceful that our city would even think of trading a bike path for our homes. I am submitting this for 3 other family members whom are part of this community also. I urge the council members to please have a heart and reconsider this plan. Would you want your mother and father to be displaced with no where to go?

Judi Walker
Eleanor Jackson
Amy Hood
Brenda Jackson

From: mjones@miltjones.com
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: Comprehensive Plan Implementation
Date: Saturday, November 12, 2016 12:26:00 PM

Please accept this testimony concerning Proposed Council Comprehensive Plan Amendment #53(d) concerning Marquam Hill Mixed Use Zones.

It appears that several commercial property owners have requested Council action to upzone properties on the top of Marquam Hill from the current designation of CM1 to CM2. This would be a disaster.

An upzone to CM2 would allow commercial parking lots to be developed in the area and completely defeat the purpose of the current OHSU parking space cap. That cap is in place because the unintended consequence of past action allowing OHSU parking expansion has been a very large load of daily commuter traffic cutting through residential neighborhoods; more than 9000 trips per day at last count. This load far exceeds residential street design levels and is particularly dangerous because many of the shortcut roads are narrow, steep and curvy.

The availability of increased commercial parking on the hill will also depress the current level of transit use and increase the level of daily commuter traffic on Portland's scenic Terwilliger Parkway (which unfortunately is already in danger of becoming just another high traffic commuting arterial).

Please do not consider this testimony as opposition to development. The Homestead Neighborhood has supported recent construction of a seven story residential apartment complex on the former site of the (four story, I believe) Ronald McDonald House. In addition, two other multi-family projects are currently in planning/construction with no opposition in sight. The neighborhood welcomes more complete development of the numerous underdeveloped residential and mixed use properties on the hill. With OHSU, the Veterans Hospital, Doernbecher and Shriners as an employment focus, we can complete a true walk-to-work neighborhood. What we do not need is more commuter traffic.

The proposal to consider upzoning on the top of Marquam Hill should be dropped.

Thank you,

Milt Jones
425 SW Bancroft

From: [Adam Herstein](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#); [Hales, Mayor](#); [Commissioner Fish](#); [Commissioner Novick](#); [Commissioner Fritz](#); [Commissioner Saltzman](#)
Subject: Thank you for sponsoring amendment 11
Date: Saturday, November 12, 2016 11:49:35 AM

Thank you for supporting amendment 11 on the comprehensive plan to change the zone on the 5 lots on Chavez, north of Division to CM-2. This will strengthen and expand the commercial node at Chavez and Division. Higher density near frequent transit on Chavez and on Division are important to reduce reliance on private automobiles. This also matches the zoning pattern to the south, as well as across the street.

Thank you for supporting this amendment that expands opportunities at a high-opportunity, well-served location.

From: povdoc@comcast.net
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Cc: [povdoc](#)
Subject: Land Use Plan Amendment 34
Date: Saturday, November 12, 2016 10:50:09 AM

Dear Mayor and Council Members:

I am very opposed to the recently BPS proposed land use policy amendment which would remove the minimum off-street parking requirements for residential development sites within 500 feet of frequent transit sites. I strongly believe, if implemented, this policy would drastically reduce the livability of our neighborhood.

The lack of off-street parking is already creating safety issues as our congested, narrow, streets reduce driver visibility and put pedestrians, including children walking to and from school, at risk of injury. The lack of reasonable, minimum off-street parking is a number one concern in our neighborhood based on surveys of residents conducted by SMILE. Furthermore, your recent Residential Infill Project public survey revealed the lack of off-street parking to be a major concern throughout the city.

I understand the need to minimize parking to accommodate increased population density, reduce housing costs, and foster the use of mass transit. However, requiring no off-street parking for large developments such as the proposed 232 apartment complex that is to occupy the site of the old Boys and Girls Club in our neighborhood is not reasonable. Also, the Residential Infill Project and recently passed Affordable Housing Bond should create more affordable housing. I encourage you to take a balanced land use approach to accommodate Portland's increased population.

Sincerely, Rocky Johnson
1014 SE Bidwell
Portland, Oregon 97202

From: [Mary Alice Holmes](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: Bike Path
Date: Saturday, November 12, 2016 7:34:00 AM

The current plan for a bike path going through our Mobile home park is flawed. A total of 120 homes would be destroyed to put this bike path through. There are already many bike paths in Portland for bikers to use. No new ones need be created

From: [GB Arrington](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: "Comprehensive Plan Implementation"
Date: Friday, November 11, 2016 8:13:36 PM

Mayor Hales and members of the Council –

I live in Richmond at 34th and Hawthorne. I see the pressures of growth and the changes to the fabric of our community every day. I've been a Portlander for nearly five decades, for half that time I worked in local government at Tri-Met, Metro and Portland Planning. I know most of you and have had the pleasure to work with you for a very long time.

I'm writing to urge you remove parking minimums for new development in mixed-use zones with frequent transit service. We have a real crisis in housing affordability that is being exacerbated by requiring parking which is not needed. Now is the time for action.

The challenge of housing affordability and minimum parking requirements is very real. I say that as someone who has been advising governments on these issues recently across the US in places like the San Francisco Bay Area, San Diego, Raleigh, Denver, Reno, suburban Chicago and Minneapolis.

I also bring a research perspective on these questions. I lead the definitive national research on car use, parking and transit for the National Academy of Sciences – "Transit Cooperative Research Program Report 128: Effects of Transit Oriented Development (TOD) on Housing, Parking and Travel" <https://www.nap.edu/catalog/14179/effects-of-tod-on-housing-parking-and-travel>

That research (which included Portland) confirmed for the first time what practitioners have assumed for some time – we over require parking: residential TODs produce half as many daily automobile trips as conventional development. The research's key conclusion is that the Institute of Traffic Engineers trip generation and parking generation rates overestimate automobile trips for TOD housing by approximately 50 percent.

My clients, like so many other cities, look to Portland for what works and doesn't. And happily the facts clearly support removing parking requirements for new residential development in mixed-use zones with frequent transit service. I urge you to take that step to help Portland and to help set the rest of America on the right path.

Sincerely,

GB Arrington
Principal

GB Place Making, LLC

1510 Se 34th Avenue #210

--

GB Arrington

GB Place Making, LLC - 971.282.5118

arrington.gb@gmail.com

<http://gbplacemaking.com/> NEW

From: [Nathan Emerson](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: Comprehensive Plan Implementation
Date: Friday, November 11, 2016 6:37:08 PM

Hello there,

I am writing to urge the city council to pass Ammendment 34 to the Comprehensive Plan.

Clearly Portland is facing an affordability crisis that will be tough to solve. We should not be tying one hand behind our back by prioritizing valuable space for cars when it could be housing people.

The supply/demand imbalance is real and impeding additional housing by requiring space for the private storage of vehicles will hurt Portlanders who can least afford it. There are better solutions to address worries about parking in the city.

Please pass Ammendment 34.

Thank you,

Nathan Emerson

Service 711.

503-823-7700: Traducción o interpretación | Chuyển Ngữ hoặc Phiên Dịch | 翻译或传译 | Turjumida ama Fasiraadda | Письменный или устный перевод | Traducere sau Interpretare | Письмовий або усний переклад | 翻訳または通訳 | ການແປພາສາ ຫຼື ການອະທິບາຍ | الترجمة التحريرية أو الشفهية | www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/71701

From: Jimme' Peters [mailto:jimme_peters@msn.com]

Sent: Friday, November 11, 2016 5:42 PM

To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>

Subject: No bike path please on Hayden Island

Hello Commissioners –

It is my understanding that another bike plan is being discussed for Hayden Island. Initially, the bike plan was in conjunction with the Columbia Crossing and now that is not a factor. Without the other infrastructure to support it, a bike lane would fail miserably.

Additionally, what space would be used for this bike lane? Currently, the roads are already in great disrepair and quite narrow, let alone on sand. I don't believe it would be safe for bicyclists.

Please take this off the table once and for all.

Respectfully,

Jimme' Peters
2630 N Hayden Island Drive
Portland, OR 97217

From: [Anton Vetterlein](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Cc: [Eric Schnell](#); [Frederiksen, Joan](#)
Subject: CPU Testimony-Amendment 53
Date: Friday, November 11, 2016 4:38:42 PM

I would like to endorse the letter sent to you by my neighbor, Eric Schnell (see below), regarding amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Map. He hits the nail on the head. Whoever proposed an amendment that allows commercial parking on Marquam Hill is ignorant of the Marquam Hill Plan and its intention to limit traffic on the hill by limiting parking. There is plenty of existing development potential and ever growing transit opportunities on Marquam Hill. Don't waste BPS's time on this ill-conceived exercise.

Sincerely,

Anton Vetterlein
430 SW Hamilton St.
Portland, OR, 97239

Dear City Council and Comprehensive Planners,

I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed directive regarding altering the Comp Plan map to allow for increased zoning (e.g. CM2) on Marquam Hill / Homestead neighborhood, which would allow for the establishment of commercial parking operations. Although our neighborhood has not received any direct communication that this was even under consideration, it would have massive negative impacts for neighborhood residents, and we urge you to remove it from the package of amendments under consideration Nov 17.

Our neighborhood's livability and safety have long been dramatically impacted by commuter traffic: over 9000 trips a day on small residential ("cut-through") streets daily on last count, in addition to many thousands more daily trips on the "approved" routes. This is WAY in excess of legislated maximum goals, accidents are frequent, and severe congestion is the norm. Traffic is directly related to parking, which is why the city has attempted to limit the parking on Marquam Hill, but which already is being circumvented by a few illegal commercial parking operations. These operations are mostly run by real estate speculators/investors, who in several cases have paved entire yards (front and back!) from recently purchased homes to provide parking for the maximum number of commuters, who pay high rates. If these operations were legal, we expect a dramatic destruction of the quality of our neighborhood- both from the conversion of homes to parking lots and from the intolerable traffic.

There is already more than adequate zoning to provide increased residential density near campus with the CM1 designation- most of this land has been zoned for much denser development for years, and has remained undeveloped. Our neighborhood strongly supports increased residential density CLOSE to campus (e.g., not in the farther regions of the neighborhood), if it does not involve commercial parking. For example, our NA supported the Treehouse project, which added 60+ units immediately adjacent to campus, which we hope will help reduce traffic by putting homes near where they need to be.

As a long-standing member of Homestead's Neighborhood Association (and former president), I can say with certainty that any increased zoning that would allow commercial parking would

be **overwhelmingly opposed** by our neighborhood, perhaps only with the exception of a few real estate speculators most of whom do not live in Homestead, and seem to care less about the livability of the neighborhood and the climate/planning impacts of encouraging more car commuters.

Thanks,

Eric Schnell
4408 SW Hamilton Ter
Portland OR 97239

From: [William Eichelberger](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Cc: pdxshoupistas@gmail.com
Subject: Comprehensive Plan Implementation
Date: Friday, November 11, 2016 2:55:44 PM

Hello,

I'm writing to encourage the council to vote yes on amendment 34 to the Comprehensive plan.

Any rule that increases the price of new housing development in this city deserves an extreme measure of scrutiny. A vote to uphold parking minimums is a statement by the city that forcing more cars into inner Portland is more important than making sure that Portlanders can afford to keep roofs over their heads-- a reprehensible act in my opinion.

Portland continues to improve its transit infrastructure, and more Portlanders are getting around by non-automobile methods. Parking minimums support a mode of transportation that is inefficient both in terms of energy usage and in terms of actually moving people through the city.

I recognize that I'm in the minority of Portland residents who don't own a car -- I get around exclusively by bike (and the Aerial Tram) -- and that there are plenty of legitimate reasons that people own cars, but I am also convinced that the trends in transportation and technology are away from single occupancy vehicles. Parking minimums are a regressive regulation that I believe Portland will be better off without.

Best,
William Eichelberger

From: [Kaya Blauvelt](#)
To: [Hales, Mayor](#); [Commissioner Fish](#); [Commissioner Fritz](#); [Commissioner Novick](#); [Commissioner Saltzman](#); [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Cc: [Tony Jordan](#)
Subject: Comprehensive Plan Implementation Amendment 34
Date: Friday, November 11, 2016 2:51:41 PM

Dear Council,

Our president-elect does not think global warming is real therefore we must take things into our own hands. Close parking spots are too far down the luxury list. Cars are a luxury in a bike-friendly city with great public transportation. We have houseless people and soon-to-be houseless people if rents continue to rise. Our people and our environment are more important than cars.

Please vote YES on Amendment 34.

Kaya Blauvelt
Southeast Portland

From: [Tony Jordan](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: Comprehensive Plan Implementation
Date: Friday, November 11, 2016 2:29:33 PM
Attachments: [SNA Comp Plan Amendments 34 & 51 Testimony Nov2016.pdf](#)

Council Clerk,

Please accept the following testimony from the Sunnyside Neighborhood Association regarding Amendments 34 and 51 to the comprehensive plan early implementation project.

On Thursday, November 10 with a 7-0 vote the SNA endorsed the following letter which asks council to eliminate minimum parking requirements in mixed-use zones and to implement transportation demand management as advised in amendment 51.

Thank you,
Tony Jordan
SNA President

From: [Adam Herstein](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: Comprehensive Plan Implementation
Date: Friday, November 11, 2016 2:27:40 PM

I am urging City Council to pass Amendments 34 to the Comprehensive plan to eliminate minimum parking requirements in mixed use zones. If we are to be a city that provides housing for people not for cars, and we want to discourage private automobile use, we must eliminate parking minimums along transit corridors. Given the fact that the next four year will be disastrous for combating climate change, now more than ever, it is imperative that cities take the lead in fighting against this impending disaster. We cannot rely on the feds to help us here, we MUST work on the local level. Reducing reliance on private automobiles is a huge first step in the fight against rising temperatures and sea levels. Please do not hesitate to pass Amendment 34 to eliminate minimum parking requirements in mixed use zones.

Thank you.

--

Adam Herstein
3115 SE 52nd Av, Portland
aherstein@gmail.com

From: [Eric Schnell](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: Upcoming vote on Comp Plan Directives
Date: Friday, November 11, 2016 2:25:56 PM

Dear City Council and Comprehensive Planners,

I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed directive regarding altering the Comp Plan map to allow for increased zoning (e.g. CM2) on Marquam Hill / Homestead neighborhood, which would allow for the establishment of commercial parking operations. Although our neighborhood has not received any direct communication that this was even under consideration, it would have massive negative impacts for neighborhood residents, and we urge you to remove it from the package of amendments under consideration Nov 17.

Our neighborhood's livability and safety have long been dramatically impacted by commuter traffic: over 9000 trips a day on small residential ("cut-through") streets daily on last count, in addition to many thousands more daily trips on the "approved" routes. This is WAY in excess of legislated maximum goals, accidents are frequent, and severe congestion is the norm. Traffic is directly related to parking, which is why the city has attempted to limit the parking on Marquam Hill, but which already is being circumvented by a few illegal commercial parking operations. These operations are mostly run by real estate speculators/investors, who in several cases have paved entire yards (front and back!) from recently purchased homes to provide parking for the maximum number of commuters, who pay high rates. If these operations were legal, we expect a dramatic destruction of the quality of our neighborhood- both from the conversion of homes to parking lots and from the intolerable traffic.

There is already more than adequate zoning to provide increased residential density near campus with the CM1 designation- most of this land has been zoned for much denser development for years, and has remained undeveloped. Our neighborhood strongly supports increased residential density CLOSE to campus (e.g., not in the farther regions of the neighborhood), if it does not involve commercial parking. For example, our NA supported the Treehouse project, which added 60+ units immediately adjacent to campus, which we hope will help reduce traffic by putting homes near where they need to be.

As a long-standing member of Homestead's Neighborhood Association (and former president), I can say with certainty that any increased zoning that would allow commercial parking would be **overwhelmingly opposed** by our neighborhood, perhaps only with the exception of a few real estate speculators most of whom do not live in Homestead, and seem to care less about the livability of the neighborhood and the climate/planning impacts of encouraging more car commuters.

Thanks,

Eric Schnell
4408 SW Hamilton Ter
Portland OR 97239

From: [Monique Gaskins](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: Comprehensive Plan Implementation
Date: Friday, November 11, 2016 10:28:53 AM

Hi,

I'm Monique Gaskins, a Portland resident who majored in Economics in college.

I support eliminating parking minimum requirements in the mixed use zones.

The principal reason for eliminating the parking requirement is to enable the market and each building to optimize the how many parking spots should be built.

I'm operating under the assumptions that:

1. There is a zero-sum game between parking and apartment units; Any decrease in parking being built would lead to an increase in apartments being built.
2. More apartments being built means less expensive housing as greater housing supply will drive down costs.

Not everyone has a car and needs a dedicated parking spot. Additionally, not all those with cars would chose to rent parking spaces. Some may prefer street parking.

Let each builder optimize for their profits based on their location and target consumer. Each builder should balance the constraints of building enough parking yet still maximizing the number of apartments.

Thanks,

Monique

From: [Brad Baker](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: Comprehensive Plan Implementation
Date: Friday, November 11, 2016 9:48:23 AM

Hi! I'm Brad Baker, a Portland resident.

I'm writing to let you know I am for eliminating parking minimum requirements in the mixed use zones. The three main reasons which I will outline in more detail are 1) we would be creating a feedback loop creating more reliance on cars, 2) we are past peak private car ownership, and 3) we should be working to promote transportation with less carbon dioxide emissions.

As housing becomes more and more expensive, only relatively affluent people will be able to live in the city and our poorer residents will be forced out to surrounding cities. Those living further away are more likely to have to rely on cars to get into the city and we'll have to build more parking in the city to accommodate their cars. We should help make housing more affordable by building for people instead of cars which would hopefully prevent this from happening.

I'm 31 and do not own a car. Many of my friends do not own cars. With the spread of ride-sharing apps and autonomous cars being pushed heavily by business leaders, private car ownership will only decrease. Why should we build parking that will be even more unnecessary in a few years? We should instead focus on building for people which will make housing more affordable.

By forcing new construction to build parking, we're effectively endorsing driving as a means of transportation when we should be endorsing alternative transportation methods like MAX, busses, biking, etc. that emit less greenhouse gasses into the air and keep our air in Portland cleaner.

Thanks for your time!

From: [Ryan Sullivan](#)
To: [BPS Comprehensive Plan Testimony](#)
Subject: Comprehensive Plan Implementation Amendment 34
Date: Friday, November 11, 2016 8:03:08 AM

To the Commissioners,

I am writing to encourage you to support the elimination of minimum parking requirements in mixed use zones as part of the Comprehensive Plan.

Minimum parking requirements encourage developers to build housing at densities that are just under the minimum requirements. In doing so, they suppress our housing supply. Furthermore, research indicates that when developers include parking, the additional cost to the developer is passed on to tenants. This is unacceptable as we grapple with a housing crisis.

Increasing the availability of parking should not be managed through parking minimums. Rather, we should stop giving away street parking for free and start using market-rate permits or other on-street parking management tools.

A special note to Commissioner Fritz: I respectfully understand that you believe you are representing residents and homeowners who complain about parking challenges throughout the city. Count me among them. But let's use the right tools to solve this problem. Parking requirements won't solve our neighborhood parking problems. Let's use the smarter tools available: market-rate permits and on-street parking management tools.

Thank you for your time and considering this important issue.

Best,
Ryan Sullivan




Zoning Comments
11/10/16-11/15/16

Portland


Ross Island

- Heatmap
- Comments





Major Public Trails Comments 11/10/16-11/15/16



- Heatmap
- Comments

Bike Classifications Comments
11/10/16-11/15/16)



Bybee Lake

Smith Lake



Heatmap

Comments

Map App Comments on Rec. Zoning Map (11/10/16-11/15/16)

ID	Name	Date	Comment	Feature	Neighborhood
22092	Anne Niedergang	11/10/16	I support amendment 12 correcting the zoning of this site to match that of the main commercial district. I am happy that Staff also supports this amendment.	mixed_use-1599-5347	Mt. Tabor
22094	Doug Klotz	11/12/16	I support this amendment. Zoning this area to CM-2 will help the build the viability of the Clinton Triangle across the street, as an important mixed-use node and Light Rail Station Area. This area is not only near the Clinton Max station, but also as close as one block to the 17th and Rhine Max station. The added residential units that CM-2 will allow, are a much needed addition to this vicinity.	mixed_use-1601-74	Brooklyn Action Corps
22095	Doug Klotz	11/12/16	I support the CM-2 Zoning along the south side of Powell here. This will complement the EX to the north, and makes sense with the proximity to the Clinton St Light Rail Station.	mixed_use-1601-75	Brooklyn Action Corps
22096	Doug Klotz	11/12/16	<p>I support the zoning to CM-2 at this parcel, 5000-5018 SE Hawthorne. This is a logical change, so that all three "sides" of this intersection have the same commercial/mixed use zoning. This should be a higher intensity zone than the lots to the east, which make sense for CM-1.</p> <p>I also support adding the "d" overlay to all the CM-2 and CM-1 lots east of 50th on Hawthorne.</p>	mixed_use-1599-5347	Mt. Tabor

Map App Comments on Rec. Zoning Map (11/10/16-11/15/16)

22097	Paul Niedergang	11/12/16	<p>I support maintaining the CM2 Zoning proposed in Amendment #12 because allowing for higher density which will increase the potential for affordable housing in the future.</p> <p>The site sits at the intersection of two major Transit streets and would be congruent with the zoning of the other three corners of the intersection. I also support the "d" overlay and CM-1 zoning to the east of this parcel.</p>	mixed_use-1599-5347	Mt. Tabor
22098	Raphael Goodblatt	11/12/16	<p>I support amendment 12 correcting the zoning of this site to match that of the main commercial district. I am happy that Staff also supports this.</p>	mixed_use-1599-5347	Mt. Tabor
22099	Marsha Hanchrow	11/13/16	<p>As I believe I wrote a month ago about these 5 lots, I strongly support rezoning them to CM-2. Enabling the spread of businesses and denser residential along a main arterial serving the neighborhood makes good use of that arterial. Transit service on Chavez is good, transit service on Division is good and likely to improve, so the properties are well served. People want to be on Hawthorne and Division, and a vibrant commercial street running between the two is both possible and an admirable goal.</p>	mixed_use-1529-4411	Richmond

Map App Comments on Rec. Zoning Map (11/10/16-11/15/16)

22122	Alan Kessler	11/14/16	Thank you for this thoughtful amendment. It would be a shame to see Cesar E Chavez built out with the pitiful R1 density, when it's a N-S major transit route that could stand some substantial improvements. Helping to turn the corner from Division here, will encourage more walkable development around this node. Please pass this amendment.	mixed_use-1529-4411	Richmond
22124	Alan Kessler	11/14/16	Great move, Mayor! Thank you for helping to imagine a more walkable Powell. I only wish this were CM3, and that you had extended it further East.	mixed_use-1601-74	Brooklyn Action Corps
22125	Alan Kessler	11/14/16	I support amendment 12. Thank you for providing additional density at this important node.	mixed_use-1599-5347	Mt. Tabor
22127	Alan Kessler	11/14/16	I support this zoning. Thank you for helping to increase density at an important node.	mixed_use-1418-1447	Mt. Tabor
22130	Alan Kessler	11/14/16	I support the preservation of this resource. Thank you.	residential_os-802-3950	Brentwood-Darlington

Map App Comments on Major Public Trails Map (11/10/16-11/15/16)

ID	Name	Date	Comment	Feature	Neighborhood
----	------	------	---------	---------	--------------

no comments

Map App Comments on Bike Classifications Map (11/10/16-11/15/16)

ID	Name	Date	Comment	Feature	Neighborhood
----	------	------	---------	---------	--------------

no comments

Map App Comments on Street Classifications Map (11/10/16-11/15/16)

ID	Name	Date	Comment	Feature	Neighborhood
----	------	------	---------	---------	--------------

no comments

COMMENTS BY TYPE (11/10/16-11/15/16)

