

Moore-Love, Karla

From: Jeffreys, Grace
Sent: Monday, June 05, 2017 3:03 PM
To: Moore-Love, Karla
Cc: Landon Crowell; Tim Ramis; Bob Zimmerman; Jerry Waters; Mary Elizabeth Roberts; Stephenson, Garrett H.; Mikey B; Joy Lewis; wgep.ent.1@gmail.com; Fioravanti, Kara; Heron, Tim
Subject: Testimony for LU 16-184524 DZM – Ankeny Apartments, Return to City Council June 21.
Attachments: AN Minutes 5.18.17.pdf; BCA Minutes 4.20.17.pdf

Karla,

At the first Council hearing date of April 12, 2017, the City Council requested the appellant to have two meetings, one with the Neighborhood Association and one with the immediately adjacent neighbors. These meetings have both been held. Please find attached minutes from these meetings, taken by Bureau of Development Services:

1. **Meeting with the Buckman Community Association**, Monthly Land Use Meeting, April 20, 2017
2. **Meeting with Adjacent Neighbors**, May 18, 2017

Please share these with the City Council in preparation for the upcoming return hearing, rescheduled to June 21, 2017.

Grace

Grace Jeffreys LEED AP BD+C

Design Review | Historic Resource Review

City of Portland | Bureau of Development Services

1900 SW 4th Avenue | Suite 5000 | Portland, OR 97201

p: 503.823.7840

e: grace.jeffreys@portlandoregon.gov

w: www.portlandonline.com/bds

Work Hours: Monday through Friday, 8:00 am to 5:30 pm



City of Portland, Oregon
Bureau of Development Services
Land Use Services
FROM CONCEPT TO CONSTRUCTION

Ted Wheeler, Mayor
Rebecca Esau, Interim Director
Phone: (503) 823-7300
Fax: (503) 823-5630
TTY: (503) 823-6868
www.portlandoregon.gov/bds

MINUTES

Meeting with Adjacent Neighbors

LU 16-184524 DZM - Ankeny Apartments Appeal

Objective: As directed by the City Council at the April 12, 2017 appeal hearing, this meeting is to provide an opportunity for appellant (Landon Crowell) and adjacent neighbors to meet to discuss concerns and provide an opportunity to find common ground.

Date: May 18, 2017
Time: 11:30am – 1:00pm
Location: Conference Room 5a, 1900 SW 4th Ave., Portland, OR 97201
Attendees: *Appellant* - Landon Crowell (LC)
Appellant's architects - Bob Zimmerman & Jerry Waters, Yost Grube Hall (YGH)
Appellant's attorney - Tim Ramis, Jordan Ramis PC (TR)
Appellant's contractor - Greg Vik, Vik Construction (GV)
Adjacent Neighbors - Mary Roberts (MR), Michael Beglan (MB), Joy Lewis (JL), and Bill Phillips (BP)
Adjacent Neighbor's (Mary Roberts) attorney - K. C. Safley, Schwabe Williamson & Wyatt (KS)
Design Commissioners - Julie Livingston (JLivingston), Andrew Clarke (AC)
Commissioner Eudaly's office - Marshall Runkel (MRunkel)
Bureau of Development Services - Grace Jeffreys (GJ), Kara Fioravanti (KF), Emily Hays (EH), Tim Heron (TH)
Facilitator - Clark Worth, Barney & Worth, Inc. (CW)

For brevity, abbreviations above are used in the minutes below to identify speakers.

1. BACKGROUND

a. Case History.

- At the April 12 City Council appeal hearing, the council requested the appellant to have two meetings, one with the Neighborhood Association, and one with the Adjacent Neighbors.
- On April 20, 2017, Landon Crowell and his team attended the Buckman Neighborhood Community Association's (BNCA) monthly Land Use meeting. No formal letter came out of this meeting since a quorum was not present.
- At the May 12 City Council hearing, the case was continued to provide further time for the meeting with the Adjacent Neighbors to occur.
- The return City Council hearing date is set for June 8th at 3:30PM

b. About this meeting.

- The purpose of this Adjacent Neighbors meeting is to provide a forum for the appellant, Landon Crowell, to meet with his adjacent neighbors to discuss their concerns and attempt to find common ground.
- Others attending today are an available resource if needed by those directly involved.
- Clark Worth from Barney & Worth, Inc. is providing independent meeting facilitation.
- Other attendees are here only as a resource for the appellant and the neighbors.
- Additional comments that attendees wish to have added to the minutes can be emailed to Grace Jeffreys by May 25.

2. NEIGHBORS' ISSUES AND CONCERNS

a. Prompt: Design and construction issues?

MR:

- Concerned with "Livability of my house and property".
- Noted that the directly adjacent neighbors on SE 12th are fully residential properties.
- Concerned with losing light, air, and privacy due to proposed height and lack of setbacks from the lot lines.
- Would like a reasonable setback for a residential area to allow room and space between buildings.
- Would like less height to allow sunshine to penetrate house, back deck and small yard – height will block sunlight for her and neighbors.

b. Prompt: Alternative to the proposed height and setbacks?

MR:

- Would like the proposed height to be closer to the current height of the buildings on the block, approximately 45-55', with 4' setbacks.

MB:

- Voiced concern with massing and lack of setbacks from the lot lines.
- The distance between house and neighbors to the other side is about 8'; therefore, a request for a 4' setback is derived from that measurement.
- Has no issue with the development of the lots. Concern is with the scale of the proposed development and its lack of response to its surrounding.
- The proposal does not fit in with the neighborhood and with surrounding 1.5/2 story buildings, existing housing stock. It should act as a better neighbor.
- Reduced height and setbacks on SE 12th would help mitigate the tall, blank sidewalls as viewed from their kitchen.
- All other issues flow from height and setback issues.
- Has not yet seen a proposal addressing these concerns.

c. Prompt: Construction concerns?

JL:

- Concrete technology has changed vastly after their house was built in 1895; and there is concern that their foundation will be vulnerable to adjacent excavation and construction vibrations, etc.

- If the site ends up being developed, they would like to see a plan to monitor and secure the structural integrity of the adjacent properties.
- Even with setbacks, construction of this scheme would occur only 8' from the foundation of adjacent historic homes.
- If an appropriate design is proposed, they request a Construction Impact Mitigation agreement.

MR:

- Concurs, there is a concern that construction techniques will take a toll on adjacent historic foundations.

JL:

- Primary issues that need to be addressed first are light, air, and privacy.
- Also requests 4' setbacks and less height.
- Would also like to see a nod to the local style of architecture.
- This is the oldest neighborhood in SE Portland with lots of history. This existing neighborhood has value, and demolitions are a constant issue. The more existing structures are demolished, the easier it is to justify the continual demolishing of the historic structures that define the character of the area.
- The need for (market rate) housing is on a downward trend, with current vacancies in local (market rate) infill apartments. However, the adjacent properties are currently offering affordable housing, and these will be greatly affected by this proposal.
- Would like to see less than 60' of height on SE 12th.
- Has concerns about construction techniques and foundation excavation methods.
- They have worked on their garden for 8 years, and have created a destination for native birds, etc. This would be undermined by the development.
- Additionally, their personal birds will not get natural light, and it would be difficult to keep them comfortable.

BP:

- Their birds would be highly stressed by the impact of construction noises; and they are already impacted by the construction across the street.
- Vibrations from new developments across the street can be felt, so construction so close by is an even greater concern. They are also concerned with potentially shattering of their original windows.
- Light – the building will wrap around their house allowing no sunlight into their yard or house. Does not believe the open stairwells will allow any significant sunlight into their house or yard.
- Does not think the building “pencils in” for the neighborhood.
- Not against building development or net zero goals.
- 4' setbacks should be included.
- Never saw a survey after the fence was removed, and are concerned they may have lost some property during this process.
- Concerned with stark, blank walls. The proposal will create a “stockade” feeling.
- Concerned with too much reflection into the house. Glare off the windows of new construction across the street is already an issue.
- Should not be boxed in; this proposal will damage their way of life, and infringe upon their lives.

3. APPLICANT RESPONSE

a. General discussion.

TR:

- Construction impacts are something that can be addressed, and are a solvable issue.
- The central issue here is design.
- Challenges include the narrow width of the lot (30'). Even small 4' setbacks would create a narrow (22' wide) building; and shifting height from 12th to Ankeny changes the structural system, thereby increasing the cost substantially, and requires enclosure of the stairwells.

BP:

- The impact of the height on limiting sunlight is more of an issue to them than keeping the "open" stairwells.

YGH:

- Options to shift mass from SE 12th, add setbacks, and reduce height have been explored.
- There are challenges with two side setbacks and taking a floor off to meet roughly 55' in height.
- Current iteration has five floors on SE 12th.
- Adding another floor (on the SE Ankeny side) would be a quantum leap in associated costs.
- Various options to bring in a net loss of zero were explored.

JL:

- What about responding to the Queen Anne vernacular?

b. Prompt: Flexibility on historic character?

YGH:

- Shifting bulk potentially means a 7-story building, the scale may not be right for this stylistically.
- The scale issue may be exacerbated under the pending Central City 2035 plan.

c. Prompt: Survey and real property line?

LC:

- When the lot was purchased over 10 years ago, there was a metal fence built diagonally across the lot (3') to encompass a tree; however, county records indicate a straight lot line.

YGH:

- A new survey was done 18 months ago, and the property can be staked by a licensed surveyor.

CW:

- **Agree** that a copy of the survey will be sent to both adjacent property owners.

d. Prompt: Safeguards in construction?

YGH & GV:

- There is a process for monitoring construction impact:
 - Start with photo survey of pre-construction surveys.
 - Provide Monitoring - if vibrations go above a certain point, a notice is sent out and structures are checked for damage.
- The team has experience with this in the past.
- The team has determined best options for construction methods, but based on the concerns mentioned, the foundation types/ construction methods can be changed.

All Neighbors:

- Is it possible to build without easements from the adjacent neighbors?

YGH & GV:

- The construction type could change, but this would increase cost.
- Height reduction and some setback is under study currently; however, they need to determine financial feasibility.

LC:

- Significant financial hit to make changes to the project.
- Removal of net zero possibility would remove some financial support of the project.
- Thinks the lot is only usable if built to the lot line.
- Neighbors are asking "me to take less on my property to appease" them.

MR:

- This lot would still be profitable and usable if not built to lot lines.

LC:

- Foresees loss in rents.

e. Prompt: Design reflectivity, color, and glare?

YGH:

- There is no glass facing these properties, and the stucco proposed is white, but they could be flexible on color (with Design Commission approval).
- There is also potentially flexibility in sidewall materials (with Design Commission approval).
- The zinc proposed is a more durable material than the aluminum originally proposed.

KS:

- How are you addressing the design guidelines not met?
- Are you considering neighborhood compatibility?

YGH:

- Not currently focused on addressing the design guidelines, but meeting with the neighbors to discuss their concerns.

KS:

- Addressing the design guidelines would be addressing many neighbor concerns.

f. Prompt: Old glass windows, garden, birds?

GV:

- This is a tight site.
- Would use an experienced superintendent who would be responsible for neighbor relations.
- Looking at pre-fabricated wall sections for quicker assembly with less construction noise.
- Foundation methods with less vibration and noise may be more expensive, but could address impact concerns.

4. POTENTIAL FOR COMMON GROUND?

a. General discussion.

CW:

- Common ground on construction methods? On design issues?

JL:

- If changes are going to occur, I would like to be able to see them (prior to going to Council).

YGH:

- Setbacks, height, and cost are challenges; but adjustments to the exterior of the building could be made.

MB:

- What about the blank walls? Possible to add windows in the wall?

YGH:

- Cannot increase the number of windows unless they move the building over and increase the side setbacks.

MB:

- Reducing building height to 55' tall and adding windows to sidewalls may provide some relief.

YGH:

- Adding some windows to the sidewalls may be a tradeoff in privacy, but setbacks might allow some changes in design.
- The unit layouts have to work without relying on sidewall windows.
- There will not be many windows in the sidewalls due to code restrictions.

JL:

- What about "Design Commission integrity?"

YGH:

- This meeting is to discuss what is allowed or reasonable on the site.

KF:

- The Design Guidelines are still relevant to the Council's decision.

GJ:

- Zoning with a design overlay allows potential for greater heights and FAR, and with that additional potential comes the responsibility to meet the design guidelines and to be responsive to context.
- Zoning across the street to the east has no design overlay, and much less height (45') and density (3:1 FAR max) are allowed.
- The heights and density are not entitlements, but maximum allowances.

b. Prompt: Construction Impact?

CW:

- Can these Construction Impact Mitigation commitments be memorialized?

TR:

- A Construction Management Plan (CMP) can provide these assurances. This can include notification of neighbors, a pre-construction survey, a machine that measures the vibration caused by construction, and an experienced supervisor responsible for neighbor notification.

LC:

- Agree to Construction Management Plan.

Neighbors:

- Agree this could help alleviate concerns about the impact of construction.

CW:

- Notifications could be included in the CMP as offered by the contractor, and a superintendent would be responsible for keeping neighbors informed.

JL:

- Still concerned about aesthetics and thinks the design is stark and not very enticing.

KS:

- Other construction techniques to mitigate?

GV:

- This is a small, constrained site, and other things are not as obvious.

YGH:

- Construction staging and parking may be moved too.

c. Prompt: Design?

TR:

- Would not want to go back to Council with a design that no one has ever seen; happy to meet again as necessary.

MB:

- Need to see something new in order to achieve anything; we know what you would like to do and you know our objections. Is there some modification that can be made? Another meeting would be pointless without a new design, would want to see it before the Council hearing. Need to see a different concept.

KF:

- Concept sketches of ideas (rather than fully developed drawings) would help facilitate a conversation.

JL:

- Needs to have a nod to the architecture in the neighborhood.

YGH:

- Once the math is worked out and Landon decides how he wants to move forward, the design can address this (including setbacks).

MRunkel:

- BDS staff can provide further facilitation for this process.
- Additionally, neighbor mediation without the city in the room is an option through Resolutions NW.

5. MOVING FORWARD

- If there are any proposed design changes, BDS staff can provide further facilitation for this process.
- Additionally, independent mediation without the city in the room is an option for the neighbors through Resolutions NW.
- All agreed that it would be beneficial to have at least one meeting to discuss ideas prior to returning to the City Council. If the process takes longer but progress is being made, a new Council date may need to be discussed.

Recorded by: Grace Jeffreys

Date: June 1, 2017



City of Portland, Oregon
Bureau of Development Services
Land Use Services
FROM CONCEPT TO CONSTRUCTION

Ted Wheeler, Mayor
Rebecca Esau, Interim Director
Phone: (503) 823-7300
Fax: (503) 823-5630
TTY: (503) 823-6868
www.portlandoregon.gov/bds

MINUTES

Buckman Community Association, Monthly Land Use Meeting **LU 16-184524 DZM - Ankeny Apartments Appeal**

Date: April 20, 2017
Time: 7pm
Location: Multnomah County Bldg, boardroom
RE: Monthly Land Use Meeting

Attendees: *Buckman Community Association: (BCA), Susan Lindsey (SL) and Sam Noble (SN), Co-chairs; Jeff Burns (JB), Treasurer*
Ankeny Apartments Development team: Landon Crowell (LC), Bob Zimmerman and Jerry Waters, Yost Grube Hall Architecture (YGH)
Adjacent neighbors: Michael Beglan (MB), Joy Lewis (JL), Bill Phillips (BP), Garrett Stephenson (GS) attorney representing Mary Roberts
Other neighbors in attendance: (ONA)
Bureau of Development Services: Grace Jeffreys (GJ)

For brevity, abbreviations above are used in the minutes below to identify speakers.

1. BACKGROUND

- a. The Ankeny Apartments project was the only proposal brought to this month's meeting.
- b. The meeting was facilitated by the two co-chairs of the BCA (Susan Lindsey and Sam Noble), and attended by at least one additional board member (Jeff Burns).
- c. Approximately 35 people attended (per Susan Lindsey).
- d. Landon Crowell, 2 of his architects, three of the adjacent neighbors (Michael Beglan, Joy Lewis, and Bill Phillips), and the attorney representing the fourth neighbor (Mary) also attended.
- e. The meeting provided a forum for interested parties to ask questions of development teams, and to provide comment.
- f. The majority of those who spoke voiced concerns about the scale and design of the proposal.

2. LU 16-184524 DZM, ANKENY APARTMENTS

- a. **LC and YGH** - Presented an overview of the proposal they had shown to the City Council: 18 units with no setbacks and 6-stories on Ankeny and 5-stories on 12th. Although they proposed no changes, they said they hoped to find common ground with neighbors and NA.
- b. **ONA** - Why is the City Council bringing this to the NA, as "we don't" have any power"?
 - **YGH** - *The City Council wants to hear an overall consensus from the Neighborhood Association, if there is a quorum. The Council chose not to rule and to create an uncertainty with the hope that there could be movement towards an agreement, as they would prefer not to rule in such a polarized situation.*

- c. **ONA** - What did the Design Commission see in your design that they chose not to rule in your favor?
- **YGH** - *They might disagree with what I am going to say, but the main issue is scale. This is a high transition zone. The zoning says 125', however, they are asking for something scaled to buildings that are 110 years old. Is that a good thing from a long term perspective?*
- d. **ONA** - To answer the above question, I heard the commission say the bulk of the program is simply too big for the site. Surprised at the number of hearings held on this, and I am in agreement with the Design Commission's findings that the proposal does not meet guidelines C3-1 Design to Enhance Existing Themes in the District and C3-2 Respect Adjacent Residential Neighborhoods. Examples of apartments in the area were shown; however, the area to the east which is all single family residences was conveniently left. This proposal does not respond to the single-family scaled area to the east. Additionally, why didn't you agree to a Design Advice Request (DAR)?
- **YGH** - *As far as the DAR, we met with the city prior to detailed design (the required Pre-Application Conference) and didn't do a DAR because they were hoping for a faster time frame.*
- e. **SL** - The Design Commission was unanimously opposed and it is highly unusual for a rejection to happen, can you (GJ) summarize the issues?
- **GJ** - *quick background – A mandatory Pre-application conference was held, and applicant was highly encouraged to do a DAR prior to submitting a full DR application. Applicant chose to not have a DAR, and submitted the DR. 5 hearings were held, but changes were only made after two of these. After the third hearing, no revisions were submitted to the city for review. At the 5th hearing, sketches brought directly to the hearing. 5 hearings sounds like a lot, however, revised submissions were not given to the city to review at the 4th or 5th hearings.*
 - **YGH** - *The Design Commission essentially wants the bulk and height reduced, which didn't work for the developer.*
 - **GJ** - *The commission was concerned about the 77' tall wall along the adjacent neighbor's yards, so they were looking for possible setbacks to adjacent yards and lower scale on SE 12th. They suggested the applicant look at moving that mass away from 12th so the development better responds to the adjacent row of houses.*
 - **YGH** - *There is code that once you go over 5 over 1 your stairwells need to be enclosed, which makes for a different massing scenario, and (the development team) felt that would be more mass and more sunlight blockage than the proposal they had. This would also change the construction type and the stair enclosure.*
- f. **GS** - Representing Mary Roberts, the owner of the house adjacent to the south. The proposal to do net zero is awesome. Landon's goal of home ownership and intergenerational wealth building is extremely important. And we are not here to oppose those goals. What we are looking at is what it will be like to live next door to this building. We disagree on their analysis of the code, but that needn't be talked about today. What the City Council wants to see is a compromise. So I suggest we have a dialogue and see if there is any room for compromise. I don't know if this is the right forum, but our main question is: Are you willing to go lower on the 12th St tower and provide setbacks there? If the answer is absolutely no, do us the courtesy of telling us that. It sounds like you have critical needs you are working with. Your answer will determine whether it is fruitful to have additional discussions.
- **YGH** - *Those coming out of council would have come to the same conclusion that if there is an area for compromise, it is either in lowering and/or pushing in from the side. While*

setbacks were part of code 100 years ago, they make no sense in long-term EXd infill types of urban zones. It is a transitional issue. Height is a much easier thing for us to trade, however, the side setbacks are probably of more valuable to the homeowner, but harder to address. If I lived next door, I would prefer the side setbacks.

- g. **SL** - I am wondering, while the setbacks may make no sense from (your) point of view, they might make sense for moving this project forward. From hearing from Landon and his goals of home ownership and net zero, as well as the long term residents there, and the DC's continued rejection of the proposal, if you include setbacks and lower the mass on 12th street, you might get it built. Aren't we trying to work together to accomplish something here?
- h. **ONA** - There is a serious lack of housing in the city and it's a big problem. I have been involved in housing projects and it's hard to get projects to pencil out in urban Portland. Especially when you put forth a priority of net zero. Net zero is an asset to the city and the neighborhood and globally. I have been in neighborhood 3 years. The area is a transition, and the question is what the outlook is in 30 years. Maintaining a 5' setback for one individual's privately owned home or shaving off a floor or two derails this, and then it doesn't pencil out, or it isn't net zero, or its cheaper materials. Should we prioritize an individual's setback over the long term good of the neighborhood and the city? And there isn't a better location for multi-family housing, on a busy street with great transport options.
- i. **MB** - As the adjacent neighbor, I will be greatly impacted by this proposal. Listening to the last person speak to the rights of the individual, and note that according to jurisprudence, it's about the rights of the individual, not the mass. I believe this problem was fundamentally created by the EX zoning of site by allowing construction to the property lines. This conflicts with existing housing. So there are rules that allow infill to the property line. This directly conflicts with the residential need for light, air, and privacy. We will have a 77' tall blank wall along the length of the property line. This will be 4' from our kitchen window. This will impact our light, air, and privacy. If you add another story to the other towers, you are going to be putting a even taller building against two-story houses one-story warehouses, which may go away, or may not. The guidelines ask for a graceful transition to the residential areas. We are not opposed to development of the site. We appreciate Landon putting up a fence and taking care of the lot that was not taken care of. However, we need space between our house and this large-scale proposal. We are asking the mass and bulk of the proposal to be reduced (along SE 12th). Our house was built in 1895, and I restored it over a very long period of time. We are supportive of new development, however, it needs to be respectful of the existing context, and this is why we have guidelines. And they have been repeatedly told this proposal doesn't meet the guidelines.
- j. **ONA** - Wanted to bring to everyone's awareness that the National Park Service determined that the neighborhood directly to the east and this half block on 12th met the definition of eligibility for a National Historic District. This part of Portland is one of the first areas on the Eastside that was developed, and this occurred during the explosion of growth that happened during the Great Exhibition. It is unusual in that this is a historic district that did not focus on wealthy houses but on telling the story of the working class, and also that it was primarily developed by women. Houses on this half block were designed by Williams Stokes and Zeller, prolific architects of the time. You can see from the map there is texture in the area that relates to the rest of the district. When you do a tall, modern intervention, the tendency will be that the rest of the block also turns over, and this rich texture will disappear. I am not saying that a historic district is more important than achieving net zero; however, it is a fact that this existing area provides affordable, dense housing. Additionally, there is an environmental cost to tearing down existing structures. If there doesn't seem to be an interest on the part of the (city) government to preserve the existing character, Portland will end up just like anywhere (else). Although it was

eventually voted down by the property owners, there was an effort to make the area a National Historic District and that included this block of homes.

- k. **SN** - In relationship to Christine's comments, and putting aside scale and setbacks, in terms of materials and architectural detail, can this building be designed to fit in better, and still achieve its goals?
- *YGH – Initially, wood was proposed (as one of the cladding materials). Materiality is a subjective zone.*
- l. **SN** - If this doesn't get approved by council; do you foresee asking LUBA to build a 6-7 story building on SE 12th?
- *LC - Yes, here's why. I would prefer dealing with this building the way it is because we have spent so much time designing it. It's not easy doing Net Zero, which is about 15% more (cost). Based on the amount of money I have spent going through this, it makes more sense to just let it go, appeal to LUBA, and get a bigger building.*
 - *LC - We would rather get approval for this proposal rather than go through to LUBA. If we go there, we are not going to build the same building. The building still has to pencil out.*
- m. **LC** - What do you (adjacent neighbors) want?
- *GS - I think we already said. We want a shorter building with setbacks.*
 - *MB - We would like equal amounts of setbacks that adjacent house has.*
- n. **GS** - I think the best thing to do Landon is to sit down when we are not in this big of a format and go through this and talk about specifics. You understand what we are asking for. I want to talk a little about some questions I heard from the audience:
- *What we are talking about is a quasi-judicial land use permit, not rezoning the city or carrying the whole burden of climate change and affordable housing on the backs of these two lots. The stakes are highest for Mary, Landon, and the other (direct) neighbors. This isn't about if this gets denied we are rejecting net zero development or additional housing.*
 - *Landon wants to get this thing built, and we want to get it built smaller.*
 - *Take the aspects of solar and housing off the table, as these are not part of the approval criteria for design review approval. This was a quasi-judicial process. Proposal was denied because it didn't meet the applicable design guidelines (which are the approval criteria for this DR). Even if the DC wanted to approve it, they couldn't if they felt it did not meet the approval criteria, such as compatibility with adjacent neighborhoods.*
 - *The CC is looking for a compromise. We don't have veto power; we are here because the council wants to hear from us.*
 - *YGH - At the 4th DZ hearing, we submitted a letter that said if they would stop trying to make the building smaller, we were happy to have an extended conversation about moving the mass around, and perhaps making the portion of the building on 12th much smaller. We went to the 5th DZ, and showed sketches, and it was clear to us they wanted a smaller project.*
- o. **BP** - We (the neighbors to the north) also want setbacks on our side. And we are on the inside of this building. We also concerned with open stairwell, as we do not believe they will allow enough light through to allow us to continue to grow our garden. Supports net zero development, but does not feel this particular design fits in with the context. The tricky L shape and the risk of losing all solar access makes this proposal not work in this location.

- p. JL - How will this zero lot line building be maintained without neighbors either side allowing access? Note there are apartments all over SE that are not filled. This is too much building on too small of a lot, and there is no nod to the Queen Ann vernacular. Noted Buckman is the oldest neighborhood in SE Portland.
- q. ONA - Did you look at not making the L shape, but rather the two towers? It looks like the main problem is the leg on SE 12th. What about something more community friendly on 12th?
 - *YGA – Need two ways of egress, and cannot provide both on Ankeny side because 34' isn't big enough for a 100' deep lot. A compromise with a smaller building on 12th and larger on Ankeny can be done, but there is an immediate cost to go up in height.*
- r. ONA - Following this reasoning, why not do a conventionally sized building on SE 12th that is not net zero, and put all the solar on a taller building on Ankeny so you are not stealing away solar?
 - *LC – We are beyond that now. Doesn't pencil, and, beyond this, have invested too much to make these types of changes now.*
- s. SL - Clarification for everyone – this is not affordable housing, this is market rate. It is notable that recent new density in the area has not helped the affordability of housing in the area, but ironically has contributed towards raising the rates. This proposal will destroy the quality of life for the existing adjacent affordable housing and replace it with market rate units. We have design standards for a reason. Regarding the next steps, my understanding is that the CC punted it back to the NA, which hadn't happened before - YGA were here, but Landon was not. We (the BCA) have a history of working cooperatively and collaboratively with developers in this neighborhood, and we would like to see some compromise happen here.
- t. GS - To Landon, find out what you are willing to do, mass, setbacks, etc. and then schedule to meet to discuss.
- u. SL - We don't have a quorum tonight, and we usually don't have a quorum at land use. Our next meeting with a quorum is May 11, where we could have taken a position. However, for now, the neighborhood is unable to provide a formal submittal.
- v. LC - Appreciates neighbors (input, however) would like my rights and concerns as a property owner be acknowledged as well.

Prepared by Grace Jeffreys, BDS, May 18, 2017