

1 "ADDRESS","CCITY","CCOMMENT","CEMAIL","CNAME","COMMENT_ID","CPROPOSAL","CSTATE","CSTATEI
D","CTESTIMONYID","CTIMESTAMP","CZIP","CSPATX","CSPATY","COMMENT_ORIGIN","LIAISON_DISTRICT",
"NEIGHBORHOOD","COMMENT_STATUS","PRIORITY","TAGS","TAG1","TAG2","TAG3","TAG4","TAG5","
PROPOSAL_STAGE","VIDEO_TIMESTAMP","VIDEO_URL","COMPLETE_VIDEO_URL","FOLLOW_UP","STAFF_SUM
MARY","CREATED_BY"
2 "349 e paseo way ","Phoenix","I was born and raised in North Portland ..what is going
on is criminal ...the entire city is no longer affordable ...everyone in city hall
should be fired / voted out of office ...you tax beyond reason then waste millions in
city resources with out penalty ...as you can see by my address i had to leave because
of your policies ...beginning to hate Portland and what it stand for
","gmdowney6@gmail.com","Greg downey","28093","rip","AR","","","rip-null","2018-05-07
07:01:08.0","85042","0","0","Submitter","","","Active","False","","","","","Propose
d","","","","",""
3 "3620 SE Henderson Street","Portland","I support the RIP code changes, and ask that
Portland for Everyone's suggested improvements be incorporated to encourage more
affordable and accessible housing options:
4 - Allow the "housing options" provisions in all areas of the city to improve equity
outcomes and encourage the creation of additional walking scale neighborhoods.
5 - Allow internal conversion of existing houses into multiple homes in all areas, and
provide additional incentives for housing preservation and reuse.
6 - Incentivize more housing, accessible housing, and affordable housing, but ensure
that requirements and bonuses are structured so that each may be more feasible.
7 - Revise the affordable housing bonus to include an additional home as well as FAR
increases for below-market rate, family-sized homes.
8 - Create an accessible housing bonus, allowing an additional home as well as FAR
increases for projects that are 100% fully accessible.
9 - Allow small triplexes on mid-block lots. Also allow these projects to access the
improved affordable and accessible housing bonuses.
10 - Create a true cottage cluster code that encourages the development of smaller, more
affordable homes.
11 - Rezone all historically narrow lots from R5 to R2.5, with design improvements, to
let more households share land costs and provide housing options that more families
can afford.
12 - Support a healthy urban tree canopy by designing flexible code provisions that
incentivize saving trees and create less impervious surfaces.
13 - Eliminate minimum parking requirements for all housing types
citywide.,"Liz@revealarchitecture.com","Liz
Dexter","28094","rip","OR","","","rip-null","2018-05-07
07:29:14.0","97202","0","0","Submitter","","","Active","False","Housing types,Mapping
the ""a"" overlay,Mapping R2.5
rezones,Affordability,Visitability,Parking","","","","","Proposed","","","","",""
14 "5034 NE Rodney Avenue ","Portland ","I OPPOSE RIP.
15
16 RIP will incentivize more demolition of our city's remaining affordable housing stock
in favor of new, luxuriously unaffordable market-rate apartments, mcmansions, &
commercial spaces. Spaces that ultimately sit empty and held as investments. RIP will
exacerbate the affordable housing crisis by replacing affordable homes with
unaffordable ones. The up-zoning outlined in RIP will make lots with existing homes
more valuable as teardowns than they are as affordable homes.
17
18 RIP does nothing to address our near complete lack affordable-housing, which has risen
to the level of humanitarian crisis. We are seeing disturbing-numbers of Seniors,
disabled folks, and children among Portland's homeless population. RIP does nothing to
bring to these Portlanders back into the stable housing that they need. It is inhumane
to build more luxury housing while thousands of people sleep on the street.
19
20 RIP encourages environmental degradation via toxic, un-contained and poorly overseen
demolitions and threatens our established urban canopy through rampant tree loss.
Attritions that create an unhealthy living and working environment for all our citizens.
21
22 Our neglected infrastructure can't handle overwhelming developer-driven, market rate
growth. Our combined-sewage system, our water problems, our schools, roads, and
public-services aren't being improved in ways that match either current or future
growth.,"Jacquiewalton@hotmail.com","Jacquie Walton ","28095","rip","OR","1S1E03BA
7300","rip-R246084","2018-05-07
07:36:42.0","97211","-13656215.389","5703556.782","Submitter","Central

23 City", "Downtown", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""
24 "3236 SE Johnson Creek Blvd.", "Portland", "I firmly oppose RIP as currently proposed!

25 I'm a native Portlander and am shocked that at the sweeping changes RIP could make to
the affordability of our housing. With homelessness on the rise and displacement so
prevalent why are we considering removing existing stock of affordable living wage
single-family homes for multiplexes that will simply NOT be affordable?

26

27 Have you considered the sweeping changes that would come to our historic neighborhoods
and architecture?

28 Is this handout to developers really the precedent we should be setting for the future
of our beautiful City?

29 Is this push for density just to enrich the City coffers?

30

31 I strongly encourage you to let the citizens of the City vote on this issue and to
perhaps do a test study in a particular area that will NOT lead to any more demolitions.

32

33 ", "scotttice@mac.com", "Scott Tice", "28096", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-07
07:40:19.0", "97222", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Housing
types, Affordability", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

34 "5414 se cesar e chavez blvd", "portland", "I own a single family home, built in 1927 in
an R5 zone, and surrounded by other homes of the same vintage.

35

36 I am having difficulty understanding what Zoning Code and Map changes the Planning and
Sustainability Commission are considering, which changes they will actually put in
effect, and how these changes will affect the character and beauty of my neighborhood
and other neighborhoods in Portland.

37

38 I fear that despite the hard work and good intentions of all involved, these changes
will not preserve existing housing and encourage new development that is compatible
with and supportive of the positive qualities of existing residential neighborhoods.

39

40 I fear that the concept of increased density will not meet design compatibility
requirements but may encourage knock down and replacement of older traditional Portland
homes with units that simply maximize developer profits.

41

42 I urge the PSC to consider the budgetary impact of increased density.

43

44 How will the average property tax of \$5,000 per home cover increased demands on
existing infrastructure, fire and safety staffing, and traffic congestion?

45

46 How will the average property tax of \$5,000 per home cover increased demands on the
school budget with per pupil costs of \$11,830 for a High School student and \$10,442 for
a Grade School student?

47

48 I know the intentions are to ease the housing crisis and improve peoples lives, but I
urge all involved to get this right before making policy that could negatively impact
the lives of existing home owners.

49

50 Development must be slow enough to include balanced finances that will allow
infrastructure, city services, and education spending to keep pace without causing
property tax increases so large that they create a hardship for, or displace existing
home owners, especially seniors and retirees whose taxes support education while
putting no demands on educational spending.

51

52 Please try to avoid the negative consequences that result from rapid growth and
increased density. Make decisions that strengthen and not destroy the character and
beauty of Portland.

53

54 I hope you will make the right decisions that will not sacrifice the historic, and
iconic Portland neighborhoods that make this city unique.

55

56 A cities identity can be lost one neighborhood at a time.

57

58 Anthony and Joyce Fantasia", "afantasi@gmail.com", "anthony
fantasia", "28097", "rip", "OR", "1S1E13AD 15400", "rip-R312805", "2018-05-07

06:18:28.0","97202","-13650255.184","5697922.893","Submitter","Southeast","Woodstock","Active","False","Housing types","","","","","","Proposed","","","","",""
59 "7938 SE 35th Ave.,"Portland","I firmly oppose the RIP as currently proposed!
60
61 If the purpose of the RIP is to increase affordable housing and density, and help house those who are homeless or displaced by the current epidemic of demolitions, the RIP as proposed does neither.
62
63 Tearing down historic, living wage, single family homes, only to be replaced with one or two large, significantly more expensive, unaffordable single family homes, clearly helps neither affordability nor density. Yes, some are replaced w multiplexes, all with soaring rents or purchase prices often close to \$1,000,000.
64
65 This plan helps no one but developers, and only exacerbates the current housing crisis.
66
67 I strongly request that you let the citizens of Portland vote on this issue. Portland neighbors and neighborhoods will be - with demolitions at epidemic proportions, we already are - irreversibly affected by the proposed RIP. We deserve to have a voice in the development and direction of our city.
68
69 Thank you, Kristi Ana Byrd
70 ","kristiab@comcast.net","Kristi Ana Byrd","28098","rip","OR","","rip-null","2018-05-07 08:45:25.0","97202","0","0","Submitter","","","Active","False","Housing types,Affordability","","","","","","Proposed","","","","",""
71 "PO Box 13172","Portland","1-4 units is considered a single-family house by the FHA, VA, Fannie Mae, and Freddie Mac and can be purchased with a standard 30-yr mortgage.
72 Our zoning codes should reflect this, and allow a four-plex on any residential lot, otherwise, our conservative banks will be more progressive and committed to housing choices than our zoning code.
73
74 This 4-unit single family house coexists between two 1-unit single family houses.,"neilheller.pdx@gmail.com","Neil Heller","28099","rip","OR","1S1E01AC 6700","rip-R280718","2018-05-07 09:18:35.0","97213","-13650833.042","5702933.924","Submitter","Southeast","Sunnyside","Active","False","Housing types","","","","","","Proposed","","","","",""
75 "PO Box 13172","Portland","The 'a' Overlay should be applied broadly. Whole sections of neighborhoods should not be excluded based on demographics or income levels. ","neilheller.pdx@gmail.com","Neil Heller","28100","rip","OR","1N1W01DA 20101","rip-R590379","2018-05-07 09:21:11.0","97213","-13664010.124","5715650.388","Submitter","North","St. Johns","Active","False","Mapping the "a" overlay","","","","","","Proposed","","","","",""
76 "6719 SE 29th Ave","Portland","I oppose RIP. These neighborhoods do not have the parking, school and street infrastructure to handle more of your infill. I am born and raised in Portland and we are turning into SFO or Seattle. Dirt, traffic and crime. Sad to see a city that I once loved go down this road.
77
78 ","mwilliams@tumac.com","Mark Williams","28101","rip","OR","","rip-null","2018-05-07 09:23:24.0","97202","0","0","Submitter","","","Active","False","Parking","","","","","Proposed","","","","",""
79 "PO Box 13172","Portland","The St Johns Neighborhood Association has asked to be fully included in the 'a' Overlay in order to allow additional housing options/opportunity for their residents. The SJNA request is supported by Anti-Displacement PDX.,"neilheller.pdx@gmail.com","Neil Heller","28102","rip","OR","1N1W01DD 2000","rip-R245130","2018-05-07 09:45:12.0","97213","-13664316.573","5715593.819","Submitter","North","St. Johns","Active","False","Mapping the "a" overlay,Displacement","","","","","","Proposed","","","","",""
80 "4227 NE 10th Ave","Portland","The attached 11 page .pdf contains techical criticisms of the ADU code changes within RIP, as well as proposed code fixes, representing the concerns of 22 companies that specialize in ADU design, construction, and development across Portland.,"kol@accessorydwellingstrategies.com","Kol Peterson","28103","rip","OR","","rip-null","2018-05-07 09:58:43.0","97211","0","0","Submitter","","","Active","False","Scale,Housing types","","","","","","Proposed","","","","",""
81 "3923 NE 9th","Portland","The City cannot make these sweeping changes destroying the

inner Eastside neighborhoods without a vote of homeowners. Our lovely city is being demolished every day. Nothing about the RIP is designed to build affordable housing it is instead a land grab. I demand to vote on this proposal.

82

83 ", "eileen_schill@hotmail.com", "Eileen
Schill", "28104", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-07
10:10:25.0", "87212", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "Propose
d", "", "", "", "", "", ""

84 "5044 NE Rodney ", "Portland", "To Whom It May Concern:

85

86 I am writing this note, and will keep it short this time, to share that I greatly oppose the city's decision to shove density down our throats. Portland, like many other smaller cities were not designed to support large amounts of people, let alone having the tax revenue to pay for those that come here with no jobs or money.

87

88 These types of decisions need to be put up for a vote, not based on the local democrats in office and their desire to remain in power by bringing in guaranteed voter bases.

89

90 I am getting more and more frustrated with how Portland is being run, all I see are big ugly apartments all over the place with large amounts of vacancy. Using low income, affordability and other "hot topic" buzz words is merely a ruse.

91

92 I demand the local city put this to a vote and hear what the people say. And be clear, no smoke and mirrors.", "dawn@orcaservices.net", "Dawn
DelCastillo", "28105", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-07
10:49:17.0", "97211", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "Propose
d", "", "", "", "", "", ""

93 "5044 NE Rodney ave", "Portland", "To Whom It May Concern:

94

95 I have lived in this city my entire life and as an African American I am appalled by how the city uses minorities to get what they want. Many of the families I grew up around lived in NE Portland and were primarily Black with some other races mixed in. It took all we had to purchase our family home, like the others and the city has made it too expensive to live here. Not only because of housing costs, those that owned or own their homes aren't effected, is the other bills and taxes you keep adding on.

96

97 Many of the older more established residents are on a fixed income, when you raise the taxes, water bills, garbage, gas, electric and other ridiculous levies all you do is make it impossible. They then become forced to sell, to which you blame rising housing costs. Wake up.. This rests solely on your shoulders.

98

99 These families should be allowed to remain, if they need help paying your high taxes then help them. If they want to sell and make a nice profit then that is their choice. They own a home to do just that.

100

101 I oppose your plan to infill and bring in density, take care of your own people and stop inviting other non-residents to come here.

102

103 This needs to be added to the ballet so that the citizens of the city can decide what they want to happen with their tax dollars.

104

105 ", "JSCOTT.NWMH@COMCAST.NET", "Joanne
Scott", "28106", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-07
10:58:34.0", "97211", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "Propos
ed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

106 "2019 SE Cypress Ave", "Portland", "Type or paste your testimony in this box...I oppose the RIP infill project. This is not a move to make affordable housing. It is a neighborhood wrecker.

107

108 Annie Meyer

109 ", "anniemeyerartwork@gmail.com", "Annie
Meyer", "28107", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-07
11:13:22.0", "97214", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "Propose
d", "", "", "", "", "", ""

110 "2027 SE Madison St", "Portland", "Type or paste your testimony in this box...Please stop producing multi-dwelling homes on small parcels of land here in Portland. The

population of this town has already exceeded critical mass density. Quality of life is plummeting here. Protect the reasons people want to come here in the first place. Don't ruin it by selling out and making residents unhappy and developers happy.

111 Sincerely,
112 Kimberly Critelli
113 ", "critellikim@yahoo.com", "Kimberly
Critelli", "28108", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-07
11:14:35.0", "97214", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Housing
types", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", ""
114 "1624 SW Carson Street", "Portland", "Hello,
115

116 I've lived in the south Burlingame area of Portland for almost 40 years during which
time there have been many changes in the neighborhood and surrounding areas. Ours is a
safe and lovely part of Portland, where people take pride in their homes and yards and
relationships. We're fortunate to experience the friendliness of people living here, of
those moving into homes, and our friends walking past and conversing with neighbors.

117
118 More and more frequently, however, I'm noticing construction of new homes that do not
fit the existing character of our wonderful old neighborhood. Ours is part of an old
community with some homes that date back almost 100 years. The new homes constructed by
unscrupulous developers stand out because they're tall eyesores built on narrow lots
and the thought of also constructing ADUs without planning for the congestion that will
result without adequate off-street parking is just foolish. And there are also
ridiculously large homes being erected that are far from affordable for most people and
certainly can't be considered in line with your mission to increase density in Portland
neighborhoods.

119
120 These sly developers are taking advantage of the existing infrastructure by attempting
to build their eyesores in existing neighborhoods. This is just wrong. As it is, we do
not have sidewalks in many parts of our neighborhood, so walkers are forced to walk in
the street. The congestion that comes with additional parked cars on our streets is
going to make it more dangerous for people walking their dogs or taking their children
to parks or walking them to school.

121
122 Conversations with my neighbors confirm that we are all extremely unhappy with the
Residential Infill Project currently before the Portland Planning and Sustainability
Commission. We want to retain our single family zones, we want to measure home heights
from the lowest point of the lot and average setbacks to allow infill to blend into the
neighborhood.

123
124 This is my firm vote against the "a" overlay opportunity zone.
125

126 Linda Billings
127 ", "ljbillings@comcast.net", "Linda
Billings", "28109", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-07
11:16:03.0", "97219", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Scale, Housing
types, Parking", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", ""
128 "4130 NE 18th Avenue", "Portland", "Type or paste your testimony in this box...Planning
and Sustainability Commission
129 Attn: Residential Infill Project
130 1900 SW 4th Ave, Suite 7100
131 Portland, OR 97201
132 cc: SusanAnderson@portlandoregon.gov; Morgan.Tracy@portlandoregon.gov;
JuliaGisler@portlandoregon.gov; brandon.spencer@portlandoregon.gov
PeggyM@RestoreOregon.org; Dan@RestoreOregon.org; wolsey_9@hotmail.com;
janbak@pacifier.com

133
134
135 Dear Mayor and Commissioners,
136 On November 16, 2016, Professor Loren Lutzenhiser testified to the Portland City
Council that the Residential Infill Project would produce duplexes that "are only
affordable as an ownership option to the highest income 15-20% of the current renter
population (incomes of \$75,000-\$85,000/year are required" and that "ADUs would be
affordable for as much as 40% of the renter population (i.e., households with incomes
of at least \$45,000/year)."

137

138 He also found that "renovation of existing dwellings (rather than demolishing them),
and adding ADUs to those and additional sites, would achieve the same density as
demolition - with - duplex+ADU - replacement - at about 15% of the total cost to the
households involved."

139

140 But his most important conclusion was the high environmental cost of demolitions as
compared to adding ADUs to existing homes. "Although new construction is often claimed
to be highly energy efficient (e.g., with various green certifications and modern code
requirements), detailed building energy performance modeling finds that the consumption
and CO2 emissions differences are negligible between a duplex plus ADU combination vs.
a renovated existing building with an ADU. The newly constructed buildings use only
about 3% less energy than the "renovate + ADU" configuration."

141

142 "Our demolition and new construction carbon emissions estimate is in the neighborhood
of 47,000 pounds of CO2 emitted in the demo-construction process. The estimate for a
major energy retrofit of an existing house is about 1,500 lbs (about 1/30th as much),
and building a new ADU is estimated to produce around 12,000 pounds of CO2."

143

144 The continued demolition of buildings across Oregon amounts to a staggering amount of
embodied energy that is literally being thrown away. Every time we raze an older house
and replace it with a new, more energy efficient one, it takes an average of 50 years
to recover the climate change impacts related to its demolition. See January 28, 2014
article entitled "The Impact of Oregon's Increasing Demolition Trend" by Brandon
Spencer-Hartle on the restoreoregon.org website.

145 "According to a recent national study, if the city of Portland were to retrofit and
reuse the single-family homes and commercial office buildings that it is otherwise
likely to demolish over the next 10 years, the potential impact reduction would total
approximately 231,000 metric tons of CO2 - approximately 15% of [Multnomah County's]
total CO2 reduction targets over the next decade." See January 28, 2014 article
entitled "The Impact of Oregon's Increasing Demolition Trend" by Brandon Spencer-Hartle
on the restoreoregon.org website.

146

147 In an Oct 7, 2015, article entitled "The State of Demolition in Portland" by Brandon
Spencer-Hartle on the restoreoregon.org website, Mr. Hartle updated his January 28,
2014 letter.

148 "Using data compiled from the demolition applications, PortlandMaps, and the Bureau of
Planning and Sustainability, the 172 demolitions that occurred from April 27 to October
5 had the following average characteristics: Built in 1930, 1,340 square feet in size.
Generated 58,558 pounds of landfill waste upon demolition (not including recycled
materials). Assuming that 400 houses are indeed demolished in Portland this year, it
will mean that 23 million pounds of waste will end up in Oregon's landfills. That's the
equivalent of sending 2.5 billion pieces of paper to the landfill!" In fact over 300
single-family homes in Portland are demolished annually. BPS website,
portlandoregon.gov/BPS/70643.

149 The City should reject the RIP proposal, but continue to allow the current ADU policy
to apply to existing homes. Applying the RIP to new construction would accelerate the
demolition of smaller older homes. In the Residential Infill Project Update of June
2016, p.4, the Stakeholder Advisory Committee acknowledged the problem current
residents have asked the City to address. "The average size of houses built in 2013
was nearly 2,700 square feet, more than 1,000 square feet larger than houses built
forty years ago. . . ."

150 City planners propose to discourage construction of larger houses by setting the floor
area ratio (FAR) limit at .5 for the main structure in a single-family zone, allowing
one internal ADU. But under the RIP Draft City planners also propose to allow an
additional .15 FAR, 750 sq. ft., for a detached ADU. Due to these allowances the
"2,500 square foot" house described in the RIP Draft could actually be 3250 square
feet, nearly twice the size of houses built forty years ago.

151 For the reasons stated above, discouraging unnecessary demolitions would also better
meet the 2035 Comprehensive Plan's Guiding principles than the City's RIP proposal:
Environmental Health - weave nature into the city to sustain people, fish and
wildlife; Resiliency - improve the ability of the natural and built environment to
adapt to climate change.

152

153 The most energy efficient and cost-effective way to accommodate new residents while
preserving the character of existing neighborhoods, including existing yards, gardens
and trees, preventing shading on adjacent lots, avoiding greater energy and material

consumption and stopping the building of larger incompatible structures, is to retain existing homes and allow ADUs only at those homes.

154
155

The City should turn its attention to other policy initiatives that would reduce the avoidable climate change impacts of development and preserve our existing neighborhoods and vegetation. The City should limit new construction to the size and footprint of the home proposed to be demolished, thereby discouraging the demolition of smaller older homes for more profitable larger new construction. Backyard habitat certification of existing homes should be supported and encouraged. The City should update its historic resource inventory to protect more older homes. The City should also begin public review of demolitions, require deconstruction when a home cannot be saved (not just for pre-1917 homes), tax landfill waste, remove hurdles to relocation and provide financial incentives for preserving existing homes. See January 28, 2014 article entitled "The Impact of Oregon's Increasing Demolition Trend" by Brandon Spencer-Hartle on the restoreoregon.org website.

156
157

I conclude with two observations from Professor Loren Lutzenhiser in his November 16, 2016 testimony:

158
159

"There has long been considerable support for demolition and new construction because of the large profits and resource flows involved for developers, builders, investors, and city agencies. Renovation and retrofit solutions need comparable support from environmental actors, affordability advocates and Portland residents committed to sustainable solutions. Advocacy is needed for a better balance of community versus economic benefits and needs."

160
161

"Policy could focus on how we can re-occupy homes and neighborhoods that used to shelter families and foster community. The multiple benefits of having families and children in neighborhoods – to schools, intergenerational community and voluntary institutions centered in neighborhoods – should be recognized and pursued in public policy. Demolitions, Mansions

162

occupied by small adult households, and unplanned multiplexes do not offer positive policy pathways to realizing those benefits."

163
164

Paul Majkut

165

", "paulsmajkut@gmail.com", "Paul Majkut", "28110", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-07 11:17:44.0", "97211", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Scale,Housing types", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

166

"4341 NE Glisan St", "Portland", "I am writing regarding the zoning code changes proposed via the Residential Infill Proposal. I believe that this proposal is ill-conceived and essentially uses density to address the city's affordable house needs without regard to the impact on east side neighborhoods, many of which will be radically and transformed for the worse should this proposal become official city policy. I sincerely appreciate that there is a great need for affordable housing in Portland, however the RIP proposal won't do much, if anything to increase affordable housing. In fact, RIP is likely to encourage the demolition of smaller, more affordable homes to be replaced by larger, more expensive structures. Instead, the city should make it easier to internally convert a single-family home to a duplex. Allowing an ADU is a sensible form of growth. Additionally, this proposal should spread the impact by placing the overlay zone on all single-family zones in Portland, not just on the east side. It makes no sense to exclude areas east of 82nd St. or the entire west side.

167
168

Please preserve maintain Portland's long tradition of preserving the best of what we have while adapting to the future we want and need. Thank you for your consideration.", "mills2323@gmail.com", "Rick

Briasco", "28111", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-07 11:50:03.0", "97213", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Housing types, Mapping the "a" overlay", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

169

"2618 NE 8th Ave", "Portland", "This Residential Infill Project draft should probably be retitled the Developer Enrichment Project.

170
171

I recently received notification from the City regarding proposed zoning changes. After investigation, I believe that RIP (as currently proposed) will likely seriously hurt Portland neighborhoods and livability while simultaneously worsening the affordable housing crisis. Some of my neighbors, including experienced architects, urban planners, affordable housing activists, and land use attorneys have followed the RIP process.

They have summarized in testimony they have given (or are planning) the many ways in which the RIP proposal is flawed and how it may have unintended and harmful consequences. The organization "united neighborhoods for reform" has summarized many of the concerns that I share. I will attach a document they have prepared discussing some of their views on RIP.

172
173
174
175

The two primary concerns that I have are:

1. The assumption that there is a shortage of land zoned for housing development is absolutely not correct. The truth is that developers desire a larger supply of parcels that are centrally located and highly profitable to develop. City planning should be honest and reality-based, not based on "alternative facts." An honest approach is also critical to addressing the affordable housing crisis - If building affordable housing is not profitable, developers will have no incentive to build it. Pretending that replacing a small and affordable single family home with two luxury townhomes increases the supply of affordable housing is the type of Trumpian logic that will harm our city, not help it.

176
177

2. RIP as currently proposed neither requires affordability nor provides funds to enhance the availability of truly affordable housing. Instead, changes to allowable FAR, the exclusion of basements and attics, and other technical changes seem designed to replace current relatively affordable housing with much more profitable luxury housing. The incentives in RIP seem to be tilted towards demolition, profiteering, and a transformation of close-in neighborhoods into luxury enclaves.

178
179

I urge City Council to carefully consider the analysis from UNR and address the problems that have been identified with the current RIP draft. I understand that our city will inevitably become more dense, and as a former New Yorker and twenty-year resident of Portland's second-most-dense residential neighborhood I welcome increased density. Increased density, however, should not come at the cost of livability, neighborhood character, and affordability.

180
181

","seangreen@mac.com","M Sean Green","28112","rip","OR","","","rip-null","2018-05-07 12:06:47.0","97212","0","0","Submitter","","","Active","False","Scale,Housing types,Mapping the "a" overlay","","","","","Proposed","","","","","","","3043 NE 35th Avenue","Portland","I STRONGLY OPPOSE the RIP proposal in its current form. Allowing the demolition of existing homes in well-established neighborhoods will only remove affordable homes from the housing stock and rip apart the character of our neighborhoods. It's illogical to think that developers are going to build affordable homes in their place as they would not maximize profits.

183
184

The Buildable Land Inventory certified that there was adequate land available for residential development on existing vacant land for the next 20 years. Please utilize that space before causing irreversible damage to our existing neighborhoods. The use of our vacant land and sensitively adding ADU's into and around existing homes should be sufficient for growth.

185
186

Additionally, the RIP ignores the Councils approved amendment to disallow the rezoning of 'historically narrow' lots in R5 zones to R2.5. These 'split' lots have been treated as full lots for almost 100 years and have been zoned correctly as R5. The split lot was a marketing tool used by the original land developer. It is unfair to the current owners of these properties to utilize this historical remnant now to create an easy land-grab for developers.

187
188

Changes this drastic should be brought up for VOTE by the citizens of Portland.

189
190

","jbelliveau@gmail.com","Jacqueline Belliveau","28113","rip","OR","","","rip-null","2018-05-07 12:47:46.0","97212","0","0","Submitter","","","Active","False","Housing types,Narrow lots","","","","","Proposed","","","","","","","8642 SE Holgate Blvd","Portland","Consideration of building height, FAR, front door height adjustments in floodplain areas-

191
192

- Building homes that conform to flood mitigation requirements in these zones often requires additional height to raise the home above flood grade. Please consider allowing 3-5 feet of additional height in floodplain areas.

193

- Building homes that conform to flood mitigation requirements often requires having a

"throw away" first floor. This floor could be used for occupancy - but only for uses where flood damage isn't a threat (like shop space, garage, storage). Please consider allowing these areas to be held exempt from FAR calculations so that only 100% livable space is counted toward FAR.

194 -Front doors for homes in floodplain areas often need to be raised higher than standard homes. Please consider allowing 3-5 ft of additional height for front doors of homes within flood plains. ", "cora.potter@gmail.com", "Cora Potter", "28114", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-07 13:24:37.0", "97266", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Scale", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

195 "1207 SW Broadway", "Portland", "Type or paste your testimony in this box...", "jerome@housingoregon.org", "Jerome Brooks", "28115", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-07 13:33:52.0", "97205", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

196 "2905 NE 51st Avenue", "Portland", "Testimony Regarding Proposed Zoning Code

197

198 The proposed zoning code attempts to achieve two mutually contradictory goals:

199

200 A. Preserve neighborhood character by imposing a maximum FAR of .5:1, thus disallowing replacement of small homes with large homes.

201

202 B. Increasing density by allowed duplexes on all lots with (a) overlay and allowing triplexes on corner lots.

203

204 Clearly, Goal B undercuts Goal A, as owner-occupied housing would make way for rental units.

205

206 But if one only looks at increasing density to accommodate growth, the proposed zoning code fails to deliver.

207

208 1. Duplexes and Triplexes cannot be affordably developed today in most Portland Neighborhoods

209 Duplexes and triplexes have not been built for decades in Portland for the simple reason that the development cost per unit far exceeds achievable rents. Given this cost structure, any developer would attempt to minimize development costs with the only factor under their control: quality.

210

211 If the high cost of land, City permits/fee/SDC's and construction were to somehow to go down, the following unintended consequence would occur:

212

213 2. Shift from Owner-Occupied to Renter-Occupied Housing

214 Over time, the replacement of single-family homes by duplexes and triplexes would reduce the supply of owner-occupied housing and increase their prices, exacerbating the current lack of affordability of family housing in Portland. Traditional neighborhoods would feel the impact of increased on street parking, potential conflicts with absentee landlords regarding upkeep and maintenance, and the inevitable destabilizing effect of frequent turnover among renters.

215

216 One form of higher density housing is expressly disallowed.

217

218 3. No Opportunities for Row House Development

219 Minimum lot width of 36 feet disallows the development of row housing, a development type that has wide acceptance in Portland neighborhoods. Row houses add density, provide units for owner-occupants and generally provide garages and off-street parking.

220 ", "n.guitteau@comcast.net", "Nancy Guitteau", "28117", "rip", "OR", "1N2E30BD

1800", "rip-R260613", "2018-05-07

15:00:54.0", "97213", "-13648992.815", "5707554.406", "Submitter", "Northeast", "Rose City

Park", "Active", "False", "Scale, Housing types, Narrow

lots, Parking", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

221 "456 SE 68th Ave", "Portland", "Letter attached.", "", "Betsy

Hayford", "28118", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-07

00:00:00.0", "97215", "0", "0", "Email", "", "", "Active", "False", "Displacement", "", "", "", "", "",

"Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

222 "646 NE Hazelfern Pl.", "Portland", "It seems that if you have InFill, then no neighborhood should be exempted. This will not help us with good affordable housing.

It will only increase people per sq.ft. prices will not go down due any of these infills. OK, Yes an 800K home will be torn down and 2 or 3 unit building could take it's place, but the price will still be up there in the 600K range, due to the location. You End up driving up housing & land prices pushing people out of their homes. Parking is already at a premium on a lot of streets. Is this what we want for Portland. How about creating mini-city centers like around the Montavilla area. Plenty of room to go UP as well as having a great area. Making valleys like you have done on inner Division St. or what you have done on Burnside is Horrible. Plan it out and do a MAJOR project. Have an idea like: Make Montavilla a destination FRENCH/SPANISH Area. Make sure the laws are such that you need to use those styles in all multi-unit buildings. Even assist businesses to change to the new format of the area. Large roundabouts with cafes and room for outdoor seating for restaurants. BUT MAKE IT A DESTINATION Point. Get Tri-Met involved for transportation. Get Builders inspired and involved as you do with the new garbage apartments that are being built right now. Require parking. This isn't the first time this has been done, why are you not dictating how you want the city instead of letting the builders drive this show? Very disappointing. Infill is not the answer, unless you are really trying to ruin Portland.", "dennis.j.lundahl@outlook.com", "Dennis Lundahl", "28120", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-07 15:52:08.0", "97232", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Parking", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

223 "3806 SE 26th Ave", "Portland", "I am strongly opposed to the Residential Infill Project and the new proposed overlay on my property.

224
225 There is more than enough capacity under the current zoning to accommodate growth. Why aren't you supporting the PEOPLE THAT ALREADY make Portland their home? Shame on you.

226
227 I've seen detrimental changes in my neighborhood and RIP will only make it worse with these proposed overlays-taking away the character and livability of the neighborhood.

228
229 I feel my property rights are being violated. The RIP is waging an assault on SE Portland neighborhoods. This is not being pushed in SW Portland because those neighborhoods have the money and time to a fight proposal like this.
", "k_hauke@hotmail.com", "Kristi Hauke", "28121", "rip", "OR", "1S1E12CB 7200", "rip-R158974", "2018-05-07 16:11:50.0", "97202", "-13652143.391", "5699845.189", "Submitter", "Southeast", "Creston-Kenilworth", "Active", "False", "Housing types", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

230 "10135 N Mohawk ", "Portland", "I am opposed to the RIP because it is not well thought out, gives too much power to developers and no mandates to protect Portlanders who have lived here most of their lives. Also, the Mandate for URM (Unreinforced Masonry Which would destroy Historical Buildings that House Small Business Owners unless they can hand over exorbitant sums of Money to fulfill the mandates required for repairs.
", "ktadlock2001@yahoo.com", "Kelly Tadlock", "28122", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-07 16:12:57.0", "97203", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

231 "5411 NE Broadway ST.", "Portland", "Clearly there is a great influx of people into the Portland area. As a property owner of a single family dwelling, I am opposed to the proposed changes being considered.

232
233 1. Over time, the acceptance of the proposal will increase property taxes and reduce the resale value of residential property.

234
235 2. With additional car parking on the streets, it will make it more difficult for traffic flow on the narrow residential streets and may require making many streets into one-way streets.

236
237 3. Some of the unintended consequences will involve exceeding the capacity of:
238 a) the electrical power system, b) the sewage system, c) the water treatment system, d) the education systems, e) the law enforcement system, among others.

239
240 The cost of increasing the capacity of these systems will fall on the property owners in the form of increased property taxes.

241
242 Joe A. Baxter
243 Professional Engineer", "baxternm@comcast.net", "Joe Baxter", "28123", "rip", "OR", "1N2E30DC 10500", "rip-R156686", "2018-05-07

16:58:55.0","97213","-13648612.095","5706185.159","Submitter","Northeast","Rose City Park","Active","False","Parking","","","","","Proposed","","","","",""
244 "10135 N Mohawk ","Portland","Against RIP it is not a democratic process. This represents a Sea Change in Portland and so needs to be put to a vote","ktadlock2001@yahoo.com","Kelly Tadlock","28124","rip","OR","","rip-null","2018-05-07 17:12:53.0","97203","0","0","Submitter","","","Active","False","","","","","Proposed","","","",""
245 "4827 NE 35th Pl","Portland","I oppose the proposed zoning change from R5 to R2.5 in Portland.
246
247 This zoning change would be a radical change to neighborhoods, mine included. It would result in many existing homes being demolished, along with established trees, yards, and gardens that provide habitat to local wildlife.
248
249 The flyer I received states this zoning change will "give more people opportunities to live in vibrant neighborhoods close to schools, parks, shopping and good transit options." Over the last 2 years, I have noticed any new house built in my neighborhood has been at priced least \$150,000 over existing houses for sale in the same area. Splitting lots and allowing builders to build massive duplexes does not guarantee affording housing.
250
251 I believe the most affordable and 'green' option for housing is to keep what is already standing. The proposed zoning change does very little to encourage the retention of existing houses in perfectly good living condition.
252
253 Finally, the Residential Infill Project does not incorporate the amendments approved by the City Council on December 7, 2016. The Residential Infill Project violates the purpose of that zoning code, which is to provide stability and predictability to neighborhoods and development process.
254
255 ","taki5b@hotmail.com","Genevieve McMillen","28126","rip","OR","1N1E24AC 10200","rip-R307226","2018-05-07 17:23:42.0","97211","-13650879.212","5709790.536","Submitter","Northeast","Beaumont-Wilshire","Active","False","Mapping R2.5 rezones","","","","","Proposed","","","",""
256 "1250 E Burnside Ave","Portland","I would like to write in support of the Residential Infill Project including the Portland Small Developers proposal and the Portland for Everyone proposal.
257
258 More specifically, I support the following list of revisions:
259 Proposed revisions to Residential Infill Plan:
260 --Don't impose any FAR limits in single-family zones. Larger houses can house more people!
261 --Allow group living with up to 15 residents in all residential zones by right, not as a conditional use subject to review. Group living can provide abundant, inexpensive housing for many people, even without subsidies.
262 --Allow internal conversion of existing houses into multiple residential units in all residential zones. This allows large, underused houses to serve as less expensive housing for more people. It also preserves historic home exteriors.
263 --Continue to measure height from the highest point near the house, not the lowest. This will continue to allow construction of larger houses that can hold more people.
264 --Increase height limits on standard lots to 40 feet if the house includes three or more units.
265 --Reduce the minimum required front setback limits by 5 feet in all single-family residential zones. This leaves more room for ADU's in the backyards.
266 --Allow triplexes and 4-plexes on all lots in all residential zones.
267 --Allow 6-plexes and 8-plexes on all corner lots in the R5 and R2.5 zones.
268 --Revise the cottage cluster code as recommended by Portland for Everyone.
269 --Eliminate minimum parking requirements for all housing types citywide.
270 --Expand the 'a' overlay citywide.
271 --Rezone all historically narrow lots from R5 to R2.5.
272 --Rezone all R10 and R7 areas to R5.,"moksha_matt@yahoo.com","Matt Stewart","28127","rip","OR","","rip-null","2018-05-07 17:34:12.0","97214","0","0","Submitter","","","Active","False","Scale,Housing types,Narrow lots,Mapping the ""a"" overlay,Mapping R2.5

rezones, Parking", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

273 "10135 N Mohawk ", "Portland", "I am against the RIP and the URM mandate. I am 60 years old and have spent more than 40 years in Portland I had a housecleaning /Dog walking / Gardening Business and also worked in Homeless Shelters in Portland. I did not own a car and rode a bike all over to my clients. I was fortunate enough to buy a home in Portland when housing costs were affordable still at age 40 I moved from a house I rented in Hawthorne Neighborhood to St Johns. I was lucky enough to have a client help me with a large enough down payment to purchase a small one level ranch home. I became catastrophically disabled ParaPlegic who relies on a wheel chair in 2011 and I now rely on a fixed income. My house is One story but still had to have many modifications so that I can stay in it. The infrastructure surrounding my house is in disrepair we have no sidewalks. I use a wheelchair Van to get around outside my house for Drs appt shopping etc. I have to park on the street in front of my driveway in order to access my Van. The City has refused to allow me a wheelchair only parking space because I have no sidewalks so I make due by using my driveway. If more cars block my entry I will not be able to use my wheelchair Van I see the houses that I rented and now own being demolished at a rapid pace. I do not see any affordable or accessible. Because I am disabled I know all too well the struggle faced by Mobility impaired to find adequate housing . This leaves many with no option but a nursing home. I worked hard in Portland for over 40 years I paid taxes and I contributed to my community I believe I should be allowed to have a Quality of life and Age in Place without threat of being displaced to make way for newcomers or new money. I oppose the RIP because people like me are not being heard. I do not believe this is a democratic process.", "ktadlock2001@yahoo.com", "Kelly Tadlock", "28128", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-07 17:50:48.0", "97203", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Parking", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

274 "3626 SE Woodward", "Portland", "I am extremely OPPOSED to RIP in its current form. Jamming more houses into close-in neighborhoods does not guarantee affordability. What it does guarantee is the destruction of my neighborhood by developers. The majority of the RIP Advisory Committee were home builders, architects and real estate agents, who have a clear conflict of interest and will profit off the destruction of block after block of smaller, affordable single family homes. I have owned a home in close-in SE for over 30 years. My neighborhood will be profoundly affected by RIP. That is why this should be put to a vote. I deserve a voice in this matter more than the Home Builders Assn does. ", "kap0305@earthlink.net", "Karen Peinl", "28129", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-07 20:04:33.0", "97202", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "Propose d", "", "", "", "", "", ""

275 "7605 SE Lincoln St.", "Portland", "I ABSOLUTELY OPPOSE THE RIP IN ITS CURRENT FORM. THE RIP IS A POLITICAL PROCESS. PSC IS A HAND-PICKED ADVISORY COMMITTEE STACKED W/ DEVELOPERS. MY PROPERTY RIGHTS & NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER ARE UNDER

276 ASSAULT BY THIS COWARDLY PLAN BASED ON GREED. PORTLAND'S CITY GOVERNMENT COULD CARE LESS ABOUT ORDINARY PORTLANDERS WHO DON'T WANT THEIR AREAS COMPLETELY SOLD OUT TO DEVELOPER AFTER DEVELOPER WHILE NOTHING IS DONE FOR THOSE SEEKING AN AFFORDABLE PLACE TO LIVE. ", "jynxcd@gmail.com", "Jynx Houston", "28130", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-07 20:36:36.0", "97215", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "Propose d", "", "", "", "", "", ""

277 "7745 SE 18th Ave", "Portland", "I oppose the new 'a' overlay. Increasing density will exacerbate traffic, parking, pedestrian safety and loss of neighborhood character already occurring in my neighborhood due to construction of multi-story apartment and condominiums. The quality of life that led me to invest in Portland is diminishing due to overcrowding. This overlay will make it worse. ", "maryanddrew@comcast.net", "Mary King", "28131", "rip", "OR", "1S1E23DB 100", "rip-R273507", "2018-05-07 21:17:48.0", "97202", "-13652935.885", "5695613.44", "Submitter", "Southeast", "Sellwood-Moreland Improvement League", "Active", "False", "Housing types, Parking", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

278 "7306 SE 28th Ave", "Portland", "I strongly oppose the current RIP proposal. It does not take into account the nature of traditional neighborhoods. It is advanced by developers, for developers. In many cases it will not add to low-cost housing, just destroy the livability of parts of Portland. It reflects poor zoning and land use choices in a one-size fits alls action that will not effectively remedy the problem.", "jlevy49@comcast.net", "Jeffrey Levy", "28132", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-07 21:51:14.0", "97202", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "Propose

d","","","","","","",""

279 "R607462","Portland","This is my parent's property and we STRONGLY OPPOSE this plan. You are calling this the "infill project" but on my parent's property you are reducing the occupancy that is currently possible by imposing your FAR rule as well as not allowing a house to be built on a plot that is less than 36ft wide (this plot is 25ft wide). After you limit the amount of housing that can be built on this plot you don't even include it in the "a" overlay that allows you to have extra ADUs on the premise. Your "infill" proposal makes no sense in regards to this property and it essentially causes my parent's to have a huge financial loss. We tried to build this property a while back and you wouldn't let us until we paid for paving the whole street in front of the property which we couldn't afford (nor should it have been our responsibility), then we tried to sell the property and the cost of building that street put developers off, and now you are trying to impose new rules that are going to further reduce the value of the property. And while you have been screwing us over for years and years, you have let the whole neighborhood fall apart, it looks like a third world over there now. There have been homeless camps, crime, and violence in that neighborhood and you haven't done anything about it, heck you're the ones who caused it. If my parents had been able to build over there, there would be nice housing that would attract nice families that would have taken care of the neighborhood. You invited homeless people from all over the country to come with your "end homelessness by 2015" plan and now the entire city is suffering trying to compensate for your poor decision making and in this case, my parent's are really footing the bill.

280 If you are going to pass rules, you need to pass them so everyone benefits. If nothing else, you can't pass plans that completely screw over "some" people. This plan is political, it is self-serving, and in contradiction to it's name "infill", it actually does exactly the opposite on my parent's land.

281 ","shakeel_shafi@hotmail.com","Shakeel Shafi","29129","rip","OR","1S2E19CC 1802","rip-R607462","2018-05-07 23:16:55.0","97206",-13649642.406,"5694842.722","Submitter","Southeast","Ardenwald-Johnson Creek","Active","False","Scale,Housing types,Narrow lots","","","","","Proposed","","","","","",""

282 "R607463","Portland","This is my parent's property and we STRONGLY OPPOSE this plan. You are calling this the "infill project" but on my parent's property you are reducing the occupancy that is currently possible by imposing your FAR rule as well as not allowing a house to be built on a plot that is less than 36ft wide (this plot is 25ft wide). After you limit the amount of housing that can be built on this plot you don't even include it in the "a" overlay that allows you to have extra ADUs on the premise. Your "infill" proposal makes no sense in regards to this property and it essentially causes my parent's to have a huge financial loss. We tried to build this property a while back and you wouldn't let us until we paid for paving the whole street in front of the property which we couldn't afford (nor should it have been our responsibility), then we tried to sell the property and the cost of building that street put developers off, and now you are trying to impose new rules that are going to further reduce the value of the property. And while you have been screwing us over for years and years, you have let the whole neighborhood fall apart, it looks like a third world over there now. There have been homeless camps, crime, and violence in that neighborhood and you haven't done anything about it, heck you're the ones who caused it. If my parents had been able to build over there, there would be nice housing that would attract nice families that would have taken care of the neighborhood. You invited homeless people from all over the country to come with your "end homelessness by 2015" plan and now the entire city is suffering trying to compensate for your poor decision making and in this case, my parent's are really footing the bill.

283 If you are going to pass rules, you need to pass them so everyone benefits. If nothing else, you can't pass plans that completely screw over "some" people. This plan is political, it is self-serving, and in contradiction to it's name "infill", it actually does exactly the opposite on my parent's land.

284 ","shakeel_shafi@hotmail.com","Shakeel Shafi","29130","rip","OR","1S2E19CC 1803","rip-R607463","2018-05-07 23:20:05.0","97206",-13649631.552,"5694842.572","Submitter","Southeast","Ardenwald-Johnson Creek","Active","False","Scale,Housing types,Narrow lots","","","","","Proposed","","","","","",""

285 "R274965","Portland","This is my parent's property and we STRONGLY OPPOSE this plan. You are calling this the "infill project" but on my parent's property you are reducing the occupancy that is currently possible by imposing your FAR rule as well as not allowing a house to be built on a plot that is less than 36ft wide (this plot is 25ft wide). After you limit the amount of housing that can be built on this plot you

don't even include it in the "a" overlay that allows you to have extra ADUs on the premise. Your "infill" proposal makes no sense in regards to this property and it essentially causes my parent's to have a huge financial loss. We tried to build this property a while back and you wouldn't let us until we paid for paving the whole street in front of the property which we couldn't afford (nor should it have been our responsibility), then we tried to sell the property and the cost of building that street put developers off, and now you are trying to impose new rules that are going to further reduce the value of the property. And while you have been screwing us over for years and years, you have let the whole neighborhood fall apart, it looks like a third world over there now. There have been homeless camps, crime, and violence in that neighborhood and you haven't done anything about it, heck you're the ones who caused it. If my parents had been able to build over there, there would be nice housing that would attract nice families that would have taken care of the neighborhood. You invited homeless people from all over the country to come with your "end homelessness by 2015" plan and now the entire city is suffering trying to compensate for your poor decision making and in this case, my parent's are really footing the bill.

286 If you are going to pass rules, you need to pass them so everyone benefits. If nothing else, you can't pass plans that completely screw over "some" people. This plan is political, it is self-serving, and in contradiction to it's name "infill", it actually does exactly the opposite on my parent's land.

287 ", "shakeel_shafi@hotmail.com", "Shakeel Shafi", "29131", "rip", "OR", "1S2E19CC
1800", "rip-R274965", "2018-05-07
23:21:40.0", "97206", "-13649620.708", "5694842.857", "Submitter", "Southeast", "Ardenwald-John
son Creek", "Active", "False", "Scale,Housing types,Narrow
lots", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

288 "R607464", "Portland", "This is my parent's property and we STRONGLY OPPOSE this plan. You are calling this the ""infill project"" but on my parent's property you are reducing the occupancy that is currently possible by imposing your FAR rule as well as not allowing a house to be built on a plot that is less than 36ft wide (this plot is 25ft wide). After you limit the amount of housing that can be built on this plot you don't even include it in the "a" overlay that allows you to have extra ADUs on the premise. Your "infill" proposal makes no sense in regards to this property and it essentially causes my parent's to have a huge financial loss. We tried to build this property a while back and you wouldn't let us until we paid for paving the whole street in front of the property which we couldn't afford (nor should it have been our responsibility), then we tried to sell the property and the cost of building that street put developers off, and now you are trying to impose new rules that are going to further reduce the value of the property. And while you have been screwing us over for years and years, you have let the whole neighborhood fall apart, it looks like a third world over there now. There have been homeless camps, crime, and violence in that neighborhood and you haven't done anything about it, heck you're the ones who caused it. If my parents had been able to build over there, there would be nice housing that would attract nice families that would have taken care of the neighborhood. You invited homeless people from all over the country to come with your "end homelessness by 2015" plan and now the entire city is suffering trying to compensate for your poor decision making and in this case, my parent's are really footing the bill.

289 If you are going to pass rules, you need to pass them so everyone benefits. If nothing else, you can't pass plans that completely screw over "some" people. This plan is political, it is self-serving, and in contradiction to it's name "infill", it actually does exactly the opposite on my parent's land.

290 ", "shakeel_shafi@hotmail.com", "Shakeel Shafi", "29132", "rip", "OR", "1S2E19CC
1804", "rip-R607464", "2018-05-07
23:22:35.0", "97206", "-13649609.853", "5694842.707", "Submitter", "Southeast", "Ardenwald-John
son Creek", "Active", "False", "Scale,Housing types,Narrow
lots", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

291 "R607465", "Portland", "This is my parent's property and we STRONGLY OPPOSE this plan. You are calling this the ""infill project"" but on my parent's property you are reducing the occupancy that is currently possible by imposing your FAR rule as well as not allowing a house to be built on a plot that is less than 36ft wide (this plot is 25ft wide). After you limit the amount of housing that can be built on this plot you don't even include it in the "a" overlay that allows you to have extra ADUs on the premise. Your "infill" proposal makes no sense in regards to this property and it essentially causes my parent's to have a huge financial loss. We tried to build this property a while back and you wouldn't let us until we paid for paving the whole street in front of the property which we couldn't afford (nor should it have been our responsibility), then we tried to sell the property and the cost of building that

street put developers off, and now you are trying to impose new rules that are going to further reduce the value of the property. And while you have been screwing us over for years and years, you have let the whole neighborhood fall apart, it looks like a third world over there now. There have been homeless camps, crime, and violence in that neighborhood and you haven't done anything about it, heck you're the ones who caused it. If my parents had been able to build over there, there would be nice housing that would attract nice families that would have taken care of the neighborhood. You invited homeless people from all over the country to come with your "end homelessness by 2015" plan and now the entire city is suffering trying to compensate for your poor decision making and in this case, my parent's are really footing the bill.

292 If you are going to pass rules, you need to pass them so everyone benefits. If nothing else, you can't pass plans that completely screw over "some" people. This plan is political, it is self-serving, and in contradiction to it's name "infill", it actually does exactly the opposite on my parent's land.

293 ", "shakeel_shafi@hotmail.com", "Shakeel Shafi", "29133", "rip", "OR", "1S2E19CC 1805", "rip-R607465", "2018-05-07 23:23:53.0", "97206", "-13649598.999", "5694842.557", "Submitter", "Southeast", "Ardenwald-Johnson Creek", "Active", "False", "Scale,Housing types,Narrow lots", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

294 "4925 SW Miles St", "Portland", "I am STRONGLY OPPOSED to this "Infill" project as it pertains to the buildability of my property. On this R7 property, you are essentially capping the square footage of the house to a maximum of 2800SF. Look around this neighborhood, the builders have already built numerous houses that dwarf the house next to them. Its too late to "save" this neighborhood. After the builders have come in and reaped the benefits, you are now trying to prevent the homeowners, me, from capitalizing on valuation that we could potentially realize by building housing greater than 2800SF. You put this in a measure calling for increased "infill" and yet this decreases infill. If you want to increase infill, you allow for larger housing. A larger house would allow our aging parents to potentially live with us. Other family members or friends can also live with us in a time of need if the house was larger. Are you going to tear down the large houses that are already built, that "in your opinion," are making the neighborhood "look bad". No you aren't, the so called "damage" is done. Let the homeowners who already own the land decide how they want to build it. The current planning and zoning rules are more than sufficient to tell us how to build our properties. Why are you tacking this anti-infill proposition onto an "infill" measure anyway? Is it so that you can slip it through on something that "sounds" good. This proposal will not do anything to this neighborhood that isn't already done but what it will do is screw over property owners that could possibly increase their house value or build a house large enough for extended family to live in (and actually increase infill). This proposal seems to be political, it is devious, as it is being tagged onto a proposal that does the opposite and at the end of the day it harms me. Again I am STRONGLY OPPOSED to it.", "shakeel_shafi@hotmail.com", "Shakeel Shafi", "29134", "rip", "OR", "1S1E19AD 2800", "rip-R208410", "2018-05-08 00:09:11.0", "97219", "-13661950.364", "5696131.614", "Submitter", "West", "Maplewood", "Active", "False", "Scale,Housing types,Narrow lots", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

295 "1805 SE 58th Ave", "Portland", "I'm writing to voice my support for the Residential Infill Project. While the proposal doesn't go far enough to create the housing Portland needs, it's a step in the right direction. All neighborhoods—not just the ones in the zone overlay—should be upzoned to allow more diverse housing types so that we can build "missing middle" housing and increase affordability throughout Portland.

296
297 I'd like to see some changes to the current proposal to allow for bonus FAR with each additional unit added as well as smaller setback requirements. It seems counterintuitive to increase setback requirements since this will likely limit the size and amount of units that end up being built as well as ADUs. I like that parking requirements are being eliminated from duplexes and triplexes, but I'd prefer to see parking requirements eliminated entirely.

298
299 Our housing crisis is pushing less fortunate Portlanders further and further away from the central city. By limiting housing in the central city, we are adding to our city's congestion and air pollution woes (with their concomitant public and environmental health impact), while burdening less fortunate people with longer and longer commutes.

300
301 The RIP is a step in the right direction to help Portland build its way out of our housing shortage. The proposed changes aren't a panacea for our crisis, but with the improvements to the plan such as those supported by Portland for Everyone

(http://portlandforeveryone.org), they can serve as one part of a solution.

302 ", "aaronilika@gmail.com", "Aaron Ilika", "29135", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-08
04:23:32.0", "97215", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Scale, Housing
types, Mapping the "a" overlay, Parking", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

303 "6506 NE Alameda St", "Portland", "While some aspects of the RIP, lowering height,
avoiding large structures inconsistent with current established neighborhoods its
disappointing to see still encourages destroying neighborhoods in the process which
also seems to only be happening and encouraged on the east side of Portland.

304 Tearing down current houses is not infill. Taking a backyard of an existing home is not
infill. Finding open undeveloped land it is. Developers buy existing homes that are
adequate or could use a bit of TLC and provide smaller homes more affordable for
smaller families. People initially purchased their homes in existing neighborhoods
because they like it that way to begin with. Now you are coming to destroy it and have
the owners pay even more taxes when you cant adequately support what you have.

305 Do not like the overlay at all. That should be eliminated in established
neighborhoods. The plan seems to suggest that ADU are great & will be occupied by
"grandmothers" along with others all on the assumption that they do not drive cars.
Well the do & they park them on the residential streets many of them narrow. This IS
noticeably increasing the danger for pedestrians and bicyclists who use these streets
rather than the main one already. ", "blarrain@aol.com", "Barbara
Larrain", "29136", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-08
06:14:00.0", "97213", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Scale, Housing
types, Parking", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

306 "2115 SW Tyrol St.", "Portland", "With the exception of ADUs, no increased density
allowed on a lot until the following happen

307

308 All streets are paved with curbs within a two-block radius of the lot

309 Sidewalks (with provision for street trees) are built two blocks in all directions from
the lot.

310 Utilities associated with any increase in density are undergrounded. (as in Western
Europe and as in the Pearl district...how did that happen?)

311 Needed stormwater management is built.

312

313 Dedicated Funding for the above will be provided from the property taxes on properties
affected in the area (defined by the block of the lot and all contiguous blocks or
properties within 200 yards of the property). No increase in taxes will be permitted on
affected properties to pay for these improvements.

314

315 5. The city will challenge subdivisions with CC&Rs that are incompatible with city
zoning. CC&R's for years had racial-exclusion provisions that were deemed by federal
law as discriminatory violating the rights of minorities...and hence unenforcible
privately.

316 Subdivisions with CC&Rs prohibiting higher densities are contributing to harmful
pollution violating the health of the citizenry and future generations. Said CC&Rs
discriminate against the rights of people living in the area to a full, healthful
life.", "wfseifert@gmail.com", "Rick
Seiferf", "29137", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-08
07:01:43.0", "97239", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Housing
types", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

317 "55 NE Meikle Pl", "Portland ", "I firmly oppose RIP in its current form.

318

319 I believe it will encourage more demolitions of affordable homes and encourage
replacing them with very expensive homes.

320

321 I would like to see RIP put to a citywide vote by its
citizens.", "Lasher.greg@gmail.com", "Greg Lasher
", "29138", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-08
07:42:50.0", "97213", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "Propose
d", "", "", "", "", "", "", "", ""

322 "539 SE 59th Court", "Portland", "RIP is a cynical, self-serving plan to maximize
developer profit in the conversion (destruction) of wonderful neighborhoods of
owner-occupied homes into dense, rental housing. Developers mask their profit motive by
claiming greater affordability. RIP is draconian, untested, and non-responsive to the
public comment process. City commissioners' duty is to citizens of Portland who elect
them, pay their salaries, and entrust their safety and well-being to them. City
commissioners' duty is not to millions of people who live outside Portland but may wish

to move to Portland in the future. Housing the world is not your job. Enhancing the lives and serving the interests of people who live in Portland is your job. Including those who have invested their life savings in their Portland homes. That is your duty. I vow to help remove from elected office officials who support RIP. And to speak out and help organized efforts to prevent their election to other positions. The mayor and city commissioners almost without exception live on the West side. RIP largely exempted their homes and neighborhoods. Appears hypocritical.", "tad.everhart@comcast.net", "Tad Everhart", "29139", "rip", "OR", "1S2E06AA 7409", "rip-R303230", "2018-05-08

07:49:41.0", "97215", "-13648126.757", "5703559.904", "Submitter", "Southeast", "Mt. Tabor", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

323 "6115 SE 34th Ave", "Portland", "I oppose the RIP because it is bad public policy to embark on the wholesale transformation of a complex system, i.e., the City of Portland, without due regard for unintended consequences.

324
325 For example, my R5 "a" overlay lot supports 4 large trees, 10 smaller trees and many woodland plants in a fairly small space. My neighbor's backyard is devoted to food crops and bees. Experience has taught us that when lightly regulated developers buy a property, they demolish existing buildings, remove vegetation, and squeeze every inch of allowable square footage into the lot, polluting the atmosphere with construction vehicle emissions and demolition-related toxins in the process. The wasteful destruction of old-growth timber and manufacture of new, less durable, construction materials also come with an environmental cost. Has the city calculated what the loss of tree canopy, vegetation, and permeable surface area on thousands of lots like ours will mean for Portland's air quality, water run-off, and city-generated heat? Has it commissioned a study to assess the possibility that redevelopment will be a greater contributor to climate disruption than preservation?

326
327 Instead of addressing complex urban and environmental problems with blanket zoning changes, a wise city would opt for a more incremental and thoughtful approach, using such unglamorous measures as increasing the frequency and reach of bus routes, facilitating the upward expansion of older one-story commercial buildings, and gradually replacing strip malls with well-designed mixed-use buildings and green space. Progressive income taxes, speculation taxes, and land taxes can be used to buy and maintain low-income housing, deter profiteering, and subsidize public transportation. There are strategies for increasing density and reducing fossil fuel use that don't have the effect of turning Portland into a place for investors to park their money. The city has to give itself the space to see what works, what doesn't, and adjust its policies accordingly. What I see right now is a loss of affordable housing and historic buildings, a loss of tree canopy, a die-off of small businesses providing conservation-minded services like small-appliance repair, and neighborhood commercial areas increasingly dominated by generic boxes, chain stores and restaurants. Implementation of the RIP will only accelerate that process.

328
329 Lastly, RIPSAC, the committee that was supposed to represent the interests of all residents, was dominated by developers and pro-density non-profits. Portland should retire the word "stakeholder," replace it with "community" and exclude people and organizations with a financial interest in the committee's findings.

330 ", "ksmlcom@gmail.com", "Katherine Showalter", "29140", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-08 09:03:43.0", "97202", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

331 "2031 SE Harrison St.", "Portland", "I strongly oppose the Proposed Draft of the Residential Infill Project, primarily because it does NOT contain comprehensive and specific provisions for increasing the amount of affordable housing necessary to address the current housing emergency.

332 In addition,
333 1) In considering the award of bonus units (on the grounds of affordability), the definition of "affordable" as 80% MFI is unrealistic and unfair. It should be changed to 60%.

334 2) ADU regulations must be revised so that there are incentives for renting to long-term tenants.

335 Neighborhood character must be a factor in regulating building and remodeling. Therefore,
336 3) Developers MUST be required to automatically notify neighbors well in advance of any plans to demolish existing housing or install multiple dwelling structures.

337 4) Proposed structure sizes remain too large, making them out of proportion with

existing neighborhood buildings. Height restrictions in line with what exists in the neighborhood are an important addition to the proposed draft. Size also needs to be further reduced. More units or bigger units do not correlate with more housing, rather, they often foster higher purchase or rental prices.

338
339 Equity has become quite the buzzword in Portland. Economic equity must be as important as racial equity. The RIP is an essential step in demonstrating the city government's commitment to true equity for all people.

340
341 Thank you for your consideration. ", "labonte.k@gmail.com", "Karen
LaBonte", "29141", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-08
09:24:21.0", "97214", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Scale, Affordability", "", ""
", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

342 "616 ne hazelfern pl", "Portland", "I oppose the RIP when it involves buildings with no parking spots and if it allows apartment buildings in neighborhoods with single family homes.", "ftschneider@msn.com", "Francis
Schneider", "29142", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-08
09:47:13.0", "97232", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Housing
types, Parking", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

343 "459 NE Hazelfern Place", "Portland ", "I am very concerned about the new neighborhood zoning under consideration, the Residential Infill Plan (RIP), and I do oppose it as currently envisioned. While more affordable housing and increased density is a worthy goal for Portland, implementation of RIP is not the optimal way to achieve this. Many older neighborhoods, such as the Laurelhurst neighborhood, are incredibly beautiful and should be preserved as best they can. They are a Portland jewel, a real asset to the city. They should be subjected to a more thoughtful urban plan -- yes, with increased density, through the addition of accessory dwelling units and large-home conversions, where multiple apartments can be created. RIP seems to not take a lot of the historical significance of the homes/neighborhoods into consideration, but simply, "we need more density." I think most people agree that Portland needs to address its housing problem, but allowing for the easy demolition of beautifully crafted historic homes is not the way to do it. Older homes that are beyond repair should certainly come down. But very often when small bungalows are torn down, what replaces them is not affordable...which is ironic as the original bungalows actually were affordable for some couples starting out. In addition, the impact to the schools and infrastructure, parking, etc. also must be factored in to this growth plan. It seems that these impacts have not been adequately fleshed out either. To sum up, yes, we have a housing problem, but we need to address it with more thought and creativity, and not wipe out some of Portland's most beautiful and established neighborhoods.

344
345 Thank you for taking my concerns into consideration.
", "jeanneschapp@sbcglobal.net", "Jeanne
Schapp", "29143", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-08
10:07:14.0", "97232", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Housing
types, Parking", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

346 "200 SW Market Street", "Portland", "May 8, 2018

347
348 Director Susan Anderson
349 City of Portland Bureau of Planning & Sustainability
350 1900 SW 4th Avenue, Suite 7100
351 Portland, OR 97201

352
353 Dear Ms. Anderson:

354
355 The Portland Business Alliance (Alliance) represents more than 1,900 small, medium and large businesses in the Portland-metro region. As Portland prepares to welcome nearly 123,000 new households by 2035, there is a need to increase housing supply at all levels of affordability to address the current and future gap between population and housing units. The residential infill project presents a significant opportunity to this end and while we are supportive of its mission, we have concerns that certain aspects of the proposed draft could restrict the potential of the project to meet the city's housing needs.

356
357 It is our understanding that the new housing opportunity overlay zone, which will cover approximately 60 percent of single-family residential neighborhoods, will encourage development of more accessory dwelling units, duplexes with detached accessory dwelling

units and triplexes on corner lots. While it's logical that the overlay zone was designed to include densely populated residential areas and mixed-use corridors based on the proximity to amenities like community centers, schools, parks and public transit, we urge the city to evaluate applying the zone to single-family neighborhoods citywide. The proposed boundaries limit the areas that are available to accommodate additional housing options. We do, however, appreciate that the new zone will not include areas with infrastructure or environmental constraints, such as the central eastside industrial sanctuary.

358

359 The limitation on square footage of single-family homes appears arbitrary and does not necessarily ensure new development is compatible with the character of existing neighborhoods. Reducing the maximum allowable size of new residential homes on 5,000-square-foot lots from 6,750 square feet to 2,500 square feet is a very significant decrease. So long as it is compatible with neighborhood character, we believe the market should regulate the size of new development. The residential infill project as proposed favors smaller developments that will increase the number of units available, possibly at the expense of an increase of total square footage. Relatedly, we do appreciate that small dormers, attics, basements and detached structures, such as garages, are excluded from house size limits and not calculated in the total square footage of a single family house because they do not constitute living space.

360

361 Our final concern with the proposed project is the potential devaluation of land. According to economic analysis commissioned by the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability, the increase in allowable units could be offset by the restricted square footage of new development, which has the potential to reduce supportive land value for new development. When considering adjusted property tax revenue, this could have significant economic impacts for the city of Portland and Multnomah County. We are concerned that the proposal fails to adequately address this possibility. We also suggest the city explore whether actions that result in lowering the land value of property within the city raises potential legal questions, such as those related to takings.

362

363 Ultimately, fewer constraints will help promote affordability and increase supply throughout the city. The Alliance recognizes Portland is experiencing a serious housing emergency and the city's efforts to increase supply are welcome. However, we must be smart and thorough before imposing new regulations on development. We have appreciated the opportunity to engage in this project and look forward to working with the bureau on improvements to the proposal before it is considered by Portland City Council.

364

365 Thank you for your consideration.

366

367 Sincerely,

368

369 Jim Mark

370 Chair, Board of Directors

371

","nbrown@portlandalliance.com","Jim Mark","29144","rip","OR","","rip-null","2018-05-08 10:08:48.0","97201","0","0","Submitter","","","Active","False","Scale,Housing types,Mapping the "a" overlay","","","","","Proposed","","","","","",""

372

"2133 SE 32nd Ave","Portland","RIP need to go on a ballot so the tens of thousands of affected renters and homeowners get to vote on it.

373

Without a vote on this, there is no transparency or democratic process. The public testimony process is just a way to appease the public.

374

375 Tying the A Overlay with all the other RIP considerations forces an ALL OR NOTHING proposal, probably by design.

376

377 Let the people decide! Democracy NOW!

378

","bhoch@teleport.com","Brian Hochhalter","29145","rip","OR","1S1E01CD 2700","rip-R273958","2018-05-08 10:26:54.0","97214","-13651444.626","5701758.856","Submitter","Southeast","Richmond","Active","False","","","","","","","Proposed","","","","","","" "4619 NE 30th Ave","Portland","Hello,

379

380 I support the goals of the Residential Infill Project. I want to see more "missing middle" housing and more diversity of housing choices in all neighborhoods. I generally support the cap on size of single family homes, as I do not see any great

value to allowing giant mansions all over the City- they both are very expensive and are not great for neighborhood character. However, I think that the size cap for duplex and triplex units should be higher than for single family homes, to make the more economically feasible. In the end, I want to see a change that encourages MORE building of diverse units, not less.

381 Additionally, I think it would be helpful if the City provided sample plans, that have
382 some financial grounding, for property owners and developers to use and be inspired by.
I also want to note I am a homeowner in inner Northeast. We already rent out our
basement to a roommate. I am considering adding a DADU in the backyard. IN the end, my
property could be home to three households! And it is a small-scale bungalow. I think
it is a fine example of density in a single-family looking neighborhood.

383 Thanks for all your work!

384 ", "horstmegana@gmail.com", "Megan Horst", "29146", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-08
10:44:46.0", "97211", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Scale,Housing
types", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

385 "3224 SE Alder Street", "Portland", "Please allow higher density housing options, such as
duplexes, triplexes, multiple ADU's, etc.

386 As the city grows, we need more housing density to keep Portland from becoming too
divided on socio-economic lines, and improving the experience of living in Portland for
all residences, not just those that can afford \$400K homes.

387

388 Thank you.", "bill@stitesdesign.com", "Bill
Stites", "29147", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-08
11:00:05.0", "97214", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Housing
types", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

389 "1222 NE 58th Ave", "Portland", "I am a strong supporter of the Residential Infill
Project. Portland needs to accommodate more people, and this will help us do it in an
equitable, practical way. I am a resident of the Rose City Park Neighborhood and am
annoyed with my Neighborhood Association for their vocal resistance to this project. I
wish I had more time to attend public meetings and make sure by voice was heard, but am
a busy professional. Thank you for providing this convenient way to submit
testimony!", "madeline.steele@gmail.com", "Madeline
Steele", "29148", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-08
11:06:55.0", "97213", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "Propose
d", "", "", "", "", "", ""

390 "1633 SE Sherrett St", "Portland", "I fully support the RIP to allow for new duplexes,
triplexes and multiple ADU's to help solve the "missing middle" housing shortage.

391 Thanks", "thkieltyka@gmail.com", "Tim
Kieltyka", "29149", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-08
11:22:52.0", "97202", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Housing
types", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

392 "1915 NE 59th Ave.", "Portland", "To the Planning and Sustainability Commission:

393

394 In regards to the proposed RIP project and how it applies to Rose City Park, I don't
believe this will provide any real relief to our city in terms of creating more
affordable housing - it will simply create more houses in a sought-after neighborhood
that developers will sell to the highest bidders, not more affordable ones.

395

396 Also, just because the neighborhood was platted many years ago for 2,500 square foot
lots isn't enough reason to return to it. This is an established neighborhood serving
many families. Our elementary school, Rose City Park, is finally going to reopen and we
have a real opportunity to improve the livability for our kids with this opening. The
RIP will act against this.

397

398 There are no metrics to prove this particular neighborhood is the best fit for such
extreme in-fill. There isn't enough room for additional cars and the streets are
narrow.

399

400 Finally, the RIP will promote the destruction of beautiful, well-maintained homes that
are constantly being upgraded and improved. Any action that encourages the destruction
of perfectly fine houses is wasteful and the opposite of sustainable.

401

402 Please take into consideration mine and others' testimonies. We are real people living
in a real neighborhood, not simply an outline on a map.

403

404 Thank you for your time. ", "ariane.hopman@gmail.com", "Ariane

Hopman", "29150", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-08
11:24:04.0", "97213", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Mapping the "a"
overlay", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

405 "2640 SE Ankeny St", "Portland", "Please help reinstate more dense, multi housing in
Portland for better, more affordable neighborhoods. ", "Kolenslager@gmail.com", "Keith
Olenslager", "29151", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-08
11:31:05.0", "97214", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Housing
types, Affordability", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

406 "3921 NE 81st Ave", "Portland", "I support the infill project as the most sustainable way
to accommodate growth in Portland. I'm especially concerned with the city's transport
system. We have a wonderful transit system and perhaps the best cycling network in the
country, but they are both underused due to the city's sparse development patterns.
Portland's going to grow, and this is the smartest way to do
it.", "hg.spencer@gmail.com", "Greg Spencer", "29152", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-08
11:32:17.0", "97213", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Housing
types", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

407 "7105 SE 21st Ave", "Portland", "Hello, my name is Devin Sills. I grew up in the King
neighborhood and now own a home in Sellwood.

408 I have known Portland for roughly 30 years, and in that time Portland has become a
sanctuary city for the wealthy, privileged, and upper class.

409 The City of Portland, through its exclusionary zoning, parking requirements, and
historic districts has constructed a wall, an economic barrier, that prevents the poor
and underprivileged from accessing affordable housing.

410

411 In 2005, Portland made a 10 year plan to end homelessness. Today, Portland is in the
middle of a homelessness crisis and is generating more homeless people every day as
folks try and fail to find a home.

412 Yet some of our friends in Eastmoreland are really concerned about preserving the
historic charm of their neighborhood.

413 In the early 1900s, Eastmoreland enacted restrictive covenants preventing Americans of
Chinese, Japanese, and African descent from living in their neighborhood.

414 Is that the history these districts wish to preserve?

415 We need to stop looking backwards, to the past, for solutions.

416 We need to be looking forwards, to the future, with a vision for the Portland we wish
to live in, because the future is not historic.

417

418 And that future invokes a simple solution to our housing problem: build more housing.
419 That future gives people in all of our neighborhoods the freedom to convert or build
duplexes, triplexes, and ADUs.

420 It incentivizes affordable housing and also gives developers the opportunity
421 to build more housing by eliminating off-street parking requirements, exclusionary
zoning, and costly building codes.

422

423 Let's make a choice today to build an inclusive, forward looking, and diverse city, to
build a Portland for everyone.

424 ", "devin.sills@gmail.com", "Devin Sills", "29153", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-08
11:33:45.0", "97202", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Housing
types, Affordability, Parking", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

425 "4315 SE Glenwood St", "Portland", "Hi there, while I'm appreciative of the overall
spirit of this project, there are a few areas that could use improvement.

426

427 1. Raise the 30 foot cap on residential height, specifically for duplexes, triplexes,
and four plexes.

428

429 2. Allow more size for four plexes. The current 3,000 square foot cap makes the
individual house size too small, and a four plex design is ideal for adding affordable
housing within the \$250,000 assisted max.

430

431 3. We should include outer SE in this proposal. In a time when the city openly
acknowledges transportation inequities of outer east Portland, why not acknowledge it
for housing as well.

432

433 Best regards,

434 Howard Draper, "howarddraper@gmail.com", "Howard
Draper", "29154", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-08
11:56:54.0", "97206", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Scale, Housing

435 types,Mapping the "a" overlay,"","","","","","","Proposed","","","","","","",""
"2333 SE Market St","Portland","Please be advised that I have lived as a homeowner at
this address for 29 years. I am vehemently opposed to the proposed changes to this
property (and others on the north side of Market St.), which will allow an 'a'
overlay. ","pcox10@msn.com","Philip Cox","29155","rip","OR","1S1E02DA
700","rip-R138058","2018-05-08
12:22:24.0","97214","-13652392.653","5702342.966","Submitter","Southeast","Hosford-Aberne
thy","Active","False","Mapping the "a"
overlay","","","","","","","Proposed","","","","","","",""
436 "2116 SE Salmon St","portland","I support residential infill projects. We need more
housing so future generations of people can live here affordably.
","jaenlund@gmail.com","Jesse Enlund","29156","rip","OR","","rip-null","2018-05-08
12:23:40.0","97214","0","0","Submitter","","","Active","False","Housing
types","","","","","","","Proposed","","","","","","",""
437 "6042 NE 35th Place","Portland","I applaud efforts to address the "missing middle" to
expand affordable housing options. A critical consideration that has gone missing in
the conversation is the need to proactively address potential (likely) increase in wood
burning stoves via increased density. Data show pollution "hot spots" are a problem
in the Metro area and are only getting worse. Housing vulnerability takes many forms,
including putting public health in harms way with greater density via increased wood
stove use.
438
439 I support advancing "missing middle" housing solutions and ask that air quality
solutions are baked in: such as requiring gas, propane, electric or other low-impact
heating options for new builds/mobile dwellings, as well as removal of wood burning
stoves from existing conversions.
440
441 ","scremmers@gmail.com","susan remmers","29157","rip","OR","","rip-null","2018-05-08
12:29:54.0","97211","0","0","Submitter","","","Active","False","","","","","","","Propose
d","","","","","","",""
442 "1220 SW 12th Ave","Portland","See attached PDF","mary@plangreen.net","Mary
Vogel","29158","rip","OR","","rip-null","2018-05-08
12:46:38.0","97205","0","0","Submitter","","","Active","False","Scale,Housing
types","","","","","","","Proposed","","","","","","",""
443 "3115 NE 34th","Porland","I strongly oppose the RIP proposal to rezone my established
neighborhood from R5 to R2.5. My house is 85 years old and I've spent many thousands
of dollars in historically conscious, and sustainably conscious, improvements which
will make this house livable for another 85. The 32 lots in my plat of Meadow Park all
contain similar homes which give this area unique liveability characteristics. A
zoning change would be an incentive for developers to demolish many lovely, well cared
for homes in order to profit by building 2 or 3 new ones in their place. In order for
these houses to be affordable they would need to be built of inferior materials to what
is existing. This does not bode well for the residents who have paid top dollar to buy
and maintain their homes. The proposal is contrary to a City Council amendment made in
Dec 2016 disallowing narrow 2.5 lots. Many years ago government actions like this
resulted in the complete destruction of a vibrant neighborhood and this could happen
here. I recognize the need for affordable housing and for reduction of urban sprawl
but Meadow Park is not the place to try to solve this problem with a capricious and
possibly illegal zoning change.,"MD","Edward
Doyle","29159","rip","OR","","rip-null","2018-05-08
13:05:17.0","97212","0","0","Submitter","","","Active","False","Mapping R2.5
rezones","","","","","","","Proposed","","","","","","",""
444 "6025 N. Vancouver","Portland","Dear Planning & Sustainability Commission,
445
446 I am writing as a homeowner at 6025 North Vancouver Ave in North Portland to
447 express general support for the Residential Infill Project proposal (RIP).
448 Generally I support this effort to increase housing choices for Portlanders
449 in all neighborhoods. Allowing more smaller units within existing lot
450 coverage limits makes sense. It helps preserves the character of our
451 neighborhoods defined not just by the architectural integrity but also the
452 people who can afford to live in them. Smaller units are more affordable.
453
454 I support, wherever possible, improving incentives within the RIP to
455 increase affordability and accessibility of new dwelling units, and to
456 preserve and plant trees. I also support adding flexibility to make tree
457 preservation and planting easier and eliminating parking requirements to

458 increase access to nature and homes for people.

459

460 I live on a large lot zoned R5 with an existing ADU occupied by a family
461 member. I strongly support provisions that would allow for a internal ADU
462 and making basement ADU's as large as the main structure footprint. This
463 would specifically allow me to eventually provide a new affordable dwellig
464 unit at my residence.

465

466 Thank you for your consideration,

467

468 Sincerely,

469

470 Rita Sabler

471 6025 N. Vancouver Unit A

472 Portland, OR 97217", "rita@rosecolouredglasses.com", "Rita

Sabler", "29160", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-08

13:20:12.0", "97217", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Scale, Housing

types, Affordability, Visitability, Parking", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", ""

473 "6025 N. Vancouver ", "Portland", "I am submitting testimony in support of the
Residential Infill Project. I support of the City's proposal to increase housing
options in single family zones and to incentivize smaller, more affordable and more
universally accessible units. I support the City of Portland eliminating or reducing
off-street parking requirements as much as possible to eliminate unnecessary impervious
surfaces, expand access to nature, and help make housing more affordable. I urge the
Planning Commission to reject the staff proposal to expand the front lot line set back
to as much as 15 feet. This reduces onsite flexibility to avoid tree removal. Finally I
urge the Planning and Sustain ability to apply Title 11 (the Tree Code) to all sites
smaller than 5000 square feet to ensure all new development mitigates for tree removal
and is subject to tree planting requirements.

474

475 Sincerely, Jim Labbe", "jlabbe@urbanfauna.org", "Jim

Labbe", "29161", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-08

13:30:08.0", "97217", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Scale, Housing

types, Visitability, Parking", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", ""

476 "8701 SE Yamhill", "Portland", "I oppose the R.I.P. and the destructive means they employ
towards the city of Portland, and our future. The demolition of existing affordable
housing, and the construction of oversized, expensive townhomes, and jumbo apartment
structures, will keep properties financially out of reach for most residents.

Additionally, I estimate the OVER BUILDING of Portland, will crash our local economy
leaving us with cheaply made housing options that will remain 60% vacant for the next
20 years! I truly feel the R.I.P. is less a call for affordable housing than it is for
developer property investment and for profit purchases and demolitions. The greed is
out of hand. Please put an end to R.I.P.", "odelly2k@hotmail.com", "Greg

Odell", "29162", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-08

14:13:20.0", "97216", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "Propose

d", "", "", "", "", "", ""

477 "6971 NE Bellevue Avenue", "portland", "I am strongly in favor of the Residential Infill
Project. I moved to Portland in 1996 and watched in dismay as, just as I established a
professional career, housing costs skyrocketed out of control. I left Portland in 2006,
figuring I couldn't afford housing, so why not try someplace else? But I missed a lot
about Portland and returned in 2012 - happily for me, while housing was still
recovering from the slump. I bought a house immediately and now, a mere 5 years after
moving into Woodlawn, housing prices city-wide have gotten so high I would definitely
not be able to buy today - and I am well above the median income for Portland.

478

479 We must increase density and discourage these nonsense McMansions blooming in every
area. Multi-family is where it's at! Let's get our code in alignment!

", "bethheins@yahoo.com", "Beth Heins", "29163", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-08

14:14:01.0", "97211", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Scale, Housing

types", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

480 "3025 NE 35th Avenue", "Portland", "I oppose this project and in particular the rezoning
of my neighborhood from R5 to R2.5. Developers will target my neighborhood for
reproduction and destroy what is a very livable, mature area. The fact you plan to
reproduce this Portland-wide is extremely alarming and will result in increased
demolition of existing homes of character and the spawning of cheap, ugly units. The
result will be, obviously, a reduction in privacy, an increase in noise, more traffic,

less parking and hotch potch of architecture. ", "Bensomatic@comcast.net", "Robert Benson", "29164", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-08 14:14:34.0", "97212", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

481 "1416 SE 49th Ave.", "Portland", "I am writing to support that the ban on new duplexes, triplexes and double ADUs be allowed in the middle of the city to offer less expensive housing and build density and create a more bike-friendly environment. We need ALL solutions on the table. Allowing huge apartment complexes but banning duplexes makes no sense. I have lived close-in in both a courtyard apartment and an older duplex and believe these kinds of structures, if allowed to be built now, would offer more diverse options which are so desperately needed. Thank you. ", "t.burkholder@comcast.net", "Tracy Burkholder", "29167", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-08 14:20:56.0", "97215", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Housing types", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

482 "622 SW 9th Ave", "Portland", "As an aspiring future homeowner, I have plans to purchase a home in a close-in neighborhood in Portland. As a future resident of a close-in neighborhood, I have no qualms about parking availability or neighborhood densification.

483
484 To be honest, I am quite surprised that the city does not allow this kind of residential infill. Why is it illegal? Why are some homes allowed but not others? I wish I had more options in terms of homes to buy. Americans are not a one-size-fits-all people but somehow we're forced to choose only apartments or single family homes. Allow neighborhoods to become more interesting by giving permission for many different styles of homes built at different price points. If a resident thinks it's a good idea to build a second home on her lot, please let her. Allow lots to be subdivided so that the space between homes can be used for housing.

485
486 Maybe you think this will create some kind of urban dystopia with crowded and cheap housing resembling slums. It won't as long as there is a minimum standard for the quality of the homes. I don't think it's a downside, but some people might not like seeing more people on the streets at all times. I think that a livelier city is a safer city with more eyes on the streets.

487
488 My ideal type of house is a townhome. Why? There is a lot less maintenance involved. Sure, I'd like to live in a house one day but I don't need a big yard with a white picket fence and a lawn to mow. I hate yard work. Give me a 1,000 sq ft, 3 bedroom attached home with a small patio in back where I could garden or have friends over for a barbecue. A garage is a plus so I would have a place for a car but it's not a dealbreaker. Both my wife and I would like this kind of house.

489
490 I also hope that this proposal comes alongside parking reform with permit parking put in place. I've pondered keeping a car parked on the east side somewhere simply because there aren't strict parking restrictions. If the entire east side from the Willamette to 82nd became permit parking then I would stop considering storing a car in those neighborhoods.", "joseph.d.mcginley@gmail.com", "Joseph McGinley", "29168", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-08 14:25:26.0", "97205", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Housing types, Parking", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

491 "3014 NE 32nd Ave", "Portland", "Dear Commission-
492 I am alarmed to see that lots on the southern end on my quiet Residential street are being rezoned to R2.5 to R5.0 apparently allowing a combination of a duplex and a detached ADU on each of these lots. This will radically change the character of the street I have lived on for nearly 30 years. I think it is great to allow people in historic neighborhoods to build within their existing structures to provide additional living spaces (internal or garage ADU's) and to limit tear downs/construction of "McMansions" that are high priced and destroy the character of historic neighborhoods, but encouraging destruction of historic homes in order to build multiple family dwellings in the heart of a neighborhood for just a half a block will destroy the character of these neighborhoods that have been in existence for that past 100 years or so. I am particularly perturbed that I can see no rationale for the placement of this increased density in the middle of this block - we are NOT in easy walking distance of stores, banks, restaurants etc. I can not fathom why half my block and the one to the east of it are having a zoning change when hundreds of residences that are much closer or adjacent to these types of amenities have not been rezoned in this way. This defies logic.

493 I urge you to rescind the proposal to change (from R 5 to R 2.5) the zoning on NE 32nd

Ave and NE 32nd Place -it does not make any sense to put these zoning changes so far from amenities.

494
495 I would like to add that I don't think most people who are directly affected by these changes really understand the implications. This is going to shock and dismay a lot of people in these small pockets that don't understand how they will be directly affected.

496 Sincerely,
497 Jennifer Stolz,"jendave3@earthlink.net","Jennifer
Stolz","29169","rip","OR","","","rip-null","2018-05-08
15:18:28.0","97212","0","0","Submitter","","","Active","False","Scale,Housing
types,Mapping R2.5 rezones","","","","","Proposed","","","","",""
498 "1017 NE 117th Ave.,""Portland",""
499 May 7, 2018
500

501 Re: Request for Statement of Adjustment: East Portland Action Plan did NOT
authorize the signature on the Residential Infill Project "Recommendations - A Critique
of the Residential Infill Project October 17, 2016 Report to Council Submitted by
"RIPSAC7".

502
503 Dear Mayor; Commissioners Eudaly, Fish, Fritz, and Saltzman; Planning & Sustainability
Commission; Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability Director Anderson; and
Residential Infill Project Stakeholder Advisory Committee:

504
505 The Residential Infill Project "RECOMMENDATIONS - A CRITIQUE OF THE RESIDENTIAL INFILL
PROJECT OCTOBER 17, 2016 REPORT TO COUNCIL SUBMITTED BY "RIPSAC 7" statement (see
below) was not brought before the general East Portland Action Plan (EPAP) for
consensus consideration, so the signee designated as the "Appointee - East Portland
Action Plan did NOT have the authority to sign for the organization, based upon our
system's "Structures" document:

506
507 "Campaigns and public statements on behalf of the membership organization should be
brought before the EPAP if there is any possibility that the campaign or statement is
not in alignment with the Action Plan or "Principals" documents, or if there is
ambiguity that needs to be addressed by consensus at the general EPAP"

508
509 It was never established that the Residential Infill Project (RIP) "RECOMMENDATIONS - A
CRITIQUE OF THE RESIDENTIAL INFILL PROJECT OCTOBER 17, 2016 REPORT TO COUNCIL SUBMITTED
BY "RIPSAC 7" reflects EPAP's position. Please remove reference to the East Portland
Action Plan as supporting this statement. Linda Bauer has been apprised of this request
and agrees that it was a personal statement.

510
511 Thank you,
512
513 Mustafah Finney and Arlene Kimura
514 Co-Chairs on behalf of the East Portland Action Plan
515

516 EAST PORTLAND ACTION PLAN
517 www.eastportlandactionplan.org
518 1017 NE 117th Ave. Portland, OR 97220
519 503.823.4035 or lore.wintergreen@portlandoregon.gov
520 Type or paste your testimony in this box...,"arlene.kimura@gmail.com","Arlene
Kimura","29170","rip","OR","","","rip-null","2018-05-08
15:32:48.0","97220","0","0","Submitter","","","Active","False","","","","","Propose
d","","","","","","",""

521 "3710 SE Kelly St.,""Portland","RIP is a coordinated attempt shaped by a select group
of politicians, planners and business interests to colonize Portland without placing
value on the needs of the people who have built and sustained this community for
years. RIP will cause the destruction of older homes paired with the construction of
high-priced new homes to intensify further in our neighborhood. It will not promote
affordable housing-It will just give developers a chance to build more and more
expensive housing on less and less land. The complete disregard the city of Portland
displays for any citizens who live outside its vision of unlimited economic growth has
deeply alienated many of us who have been active participants in city life here for
decades. Did you think we would just hand you our neighborhoods, our values, and our
cherished, livable city without a whimper? The quality of life goes down by the day
in this town, and RIP is an appropriate acronym for a plan that will deal the death

blow to the Portland we loved.", "leslie@lmraz.com", "Leslie Sharp", "29171", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-08 15:42:59.0", "97202", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", "", ""

522 "4246 NE Hoyt St", "Portland", "Thank you for this opportunity to weigh in on the Residential Infill Project. I support these efforts as a means to address our current and future housing shortage while limiting sprawl. My neighborhood (Laurelhurst) is currently seeking Historic status, which I feel is an attempt to ensure our neighborhood doesn't pitch in to help address the desperate need for affordable housing. While our neighborhood is beautiful, and I would be in favor of some basic design standards to keep the beauty of the neighborhood intact, I am disheartened by my neighbors' consistent NIMBY perspective on this and other critical city issues. I think ADUs and duplexes are a wonderful way to use existing close-in space to house more people. I'm in support of this proposal, and I am hopeful the historic district proposal does not pass.", "jenniferballpmp@gmail.com", "Jennifer BALL", "29172", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-08 16:36:29.0", "97213", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Housing types", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

523 "9217 North Allegheny Avenue", "Portland", "I'm very much in favor of the RIP plan with the following exceptions:

524

525 -Using Smith in St. Johns as the line for RIP. Aside from restricting property options for owners within an immediately identifiable neighborhood, many of the homes outside of the boundary are more walkable and accessible to public transit than those inside the proposed RIP boundary. It seems there was little consideration for where the line should exist or if it should exist at all. I understand goal of attempting to keep developers from purchasing cheaper properties, but close-in is close-in either side of Smith. Low walk scores are low walk scores inside of RIP. What drives property values is access to public transit, services, restaurants, bars, and movie theaters. Too, multi-generational families who have owned properties for decades, could benefit with new ADU rules etc, allowing grandparents and young adults to remain in the neighborhood.

526

527 -Allow fourplexes.

528

529 -Improve requirements for visitability. I'm generally anti parking (or parking set-backs), but absolutely understand that ADA accessible parking is a near necessity for people with mobility concerns. Maybe one triplex unit could have off-street or immediate curb access to front door. ", "travisstj1902@gmail.com", "Travis Parker", "29173", "rip", "OR", "1N1W01DD 7200", "rip-R245346", "2018-05-08 17:32:11.0", "97203", "-13663982.899", "5715390.129", "Submitter", "North", "St. Johns", "Active", "False", "Housing types, Mapping the "a" overlay, Visitability, Parking", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", ""

530 "5014 NE Simpson St", "Portland", "Dear friends at the Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission,

531

532 Thank you for the opportunity to write on about the proposed Residential Infill Project. I respect the important work you are doing attempting to balance welcoming 100,000 new Portlanders by 2035, while preserving the green spaces that are treasures of Portland--parks and urban farms.

533

534 Urban farms are like parks and need to be protected by designating all of Cully neighborhood as a "Displacement Risk Area".

535

536 Cully neighborhood is home to many thriving urban farms, and many new urban farms are in the planning stage. Urban farms are a crown jewel of Portland, like our parks. It can be argued that they are even more important than parks, because you can't eat a park. People visit Cully neighborhood urban farms to not only relax, but also to get the farm experience. Get their hands in the dirt. Do some weeding in exchange for free organic tomatoes, lettuces, grapes, and peas. Bicycle with Pedalpalooza to visit Cully neighborhood urban farms to pet goats, see cedar boughs distilled into homemade cleaning solution like Pinesol, roam medicinal herb gardens with a resident herbalist who introduces you to multi-use flowers, roots and leaves. Walk down a Cully neighborhood street at harvest time and enjoy the free zucchini, cucumbers and tomatoes urban farmers set out in boxes that say "free". Urban farms are amenities, jewels, of Portland. Cully neighborhood farms provide produce to many Portland restaurants,

especially the every-growing farm-to-table restaurants that are sprouting up around the city. Cully neighborhood urban farms are a treasure that needs to be cherished and protected for the enjoyment of everyone in Portland.

537

538 Cully neighborhood urban farms are a model for other areas of Portland. Like parks, we all need local produce grown in walking or bicycling distance or a bus ride away. I urge that the treasure of urban farms of Cully neighborhood (existing farms and those yet to be sown) be protected, maintained and promoted by designating all of Cully neighborhood as a "Displacement Risk Area" in this proposed Residential Infill Project. Urban farms--crown jewels of Portland that are as important as parks--need to be protected by designating Cully neighborhood a "Displacement Risk Area".

539

540 Thank you for the important work you are doing attempting to balance welcoming 100,000 new Portlanders by 2035, while preserving the green spaces that are treasures of Portland--parks and urban farms.", "lynette@musicandes.com", "Lynette Yetter", "29174", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-08 19:46:27.0", "97218", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Mapping the "a" overlay, Displacement", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", ""

541 "2440 SE Main", "Portland", "I oppose the RIP proposal draft because it fails to address Portland's needed housing under Goal 10 (<http://www.oregon.gov/lcd/docs/goals/goall10.pdf>) and the 2035 comprehensive plan (<https://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/57352>). From the outset, the RIP process excluded tenants/tenant advocates from planning and overemphasized the views of real estate interests, housing providers, and neighborhood associations (most of whose members are homeowners). As a direct consequence of this planning bias, RIP's height, FAR, and unit limits favor owned housing and discourage rental housing. In particular, FAR and height limits place constraints on multi-unit development that make development of needed affordable housing unlikely. Moreover, the 0.1 FAR affordable housing bonus is so grossly insufficient that it makes a mockery of the comprehensive plan's affordable housing goals. My criticisms of the fundamental inadequacy of this proposal are validated by city's own economic study which states: "...our analysis indicates that the proposed changes in entitlements would likely result in a lower rate of development and redevelopment in the study area, yielding less in terms of residential investment but likely a similar number of new units."

542

543 <https://medium.com/@pdx4all/portlands-residential-infill-project-still-has-major-flaws-ho-using-advocates-say-6a225ec290e>

544

545 One of the authors of this report was also quoted by Michael Andersen as stating:

546

547 "... the net impact of the infill project on Portland's housing count would be 86 extra homes for each of the next 20 years."

548

549 <https://medium.com/@pdx4all/portlands-residential-infill-project-still-has-major-flaws-ho-using-advocates-say-6a225ec290e>

550

551 Given that the city's own report finds that RIP is a wash when it comes to generating needed housing, I would suggest that this process has failed. I urge the commission to 1) recommend rejection of RIP and 2) recommend a new process that is more inclusive and focused on the city housing goals. Our chronic and continuing affordable housing crisis is displacing and traumatizing our community. We need a new residential infill process that does more than rearrange the "status quo" deck chairs. We need a residential infill proposal that opens up residential areas to greater density and, most especially, to realistic incentives for affordable housing production.", "sorenimpey@gmail.com", "Soren Impey", "29175", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-08 20:14:36.0", "97214", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Scale, Housing types, Affordability", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", ""

552

"2026 SE 28th Place", "Portland", "Myself and my wife, Kathleen O'Leary oppose the new RIP overlay zone for SE Portland. It is a solution that uses a sledge hammer to fix a broken pocket watch. Wholesale changes to the lot requirements, set backs and so on to perfectly viable, cohesive neighborhoods will lead to friction among neighbors, overcrowding, and changes to the basic ambiance of this great city. It should not be done in a wholesale manner!

553

554 The Portland east side neighborhoods are already overcrowded because of earlier

attempts at increasing density. When most of them were built, and I take as a prime example, the Hawthorne neighborhood between that street and Division....many houses do not have driveways or garages. Many share driveways and have co-habited garages due to the original plotting for density. This leads to a need for much on-street parking since there are few households in these times that do not have a car. Increasing the density of each lot will only aggravate the parking problems which plague the whole of the east and west side neighborhoods. In addition, here is a comprehensive list of other issues arguing against the changes the city and planning department are proposing:

555

556 1. The infill will *not* provide affordable housing. All the evidence to date, and independent studies, supports this. It will provide more housing, but not affordable housing.

557 2. The least expensive housing is always existing housing.

558 3. You can't always get what you want.

559 There has been a lot of new construction in north Portland, Mississippi, Burnside, Slabtown, Division, and other areas - is any of it "affordable"? Drive in any of those areas and you will see many new buildings. The prices seem pretty high to me. The infill program has even removed 'affordable' from its mandates, because they know it will not happen. I think it was disingenuous at best, and outright misleading at worst, for them to have talked about it at all when they knew it wouldn't happen.

560 Think about who is doing the 'building': real estate developers. They are smart, shrewd business people. They have been very effective in sponsoring groups that make it look like there is 'grass roots' support for the infill. They are not putting up buildings as charity - they are doing it to make money. They have a fiduciary responsibility to their investors to make as much money as possible - and that means charging the most they can for rent and sale prices. The continued influx of people with money coming into Portland (such as, from northern California) means there is an ample supply of people willing - and able - to pay high prices for real estate.

561 While a link between density and affordability might seem intuitively obvious, there is disagreement about whether this cause and effect really exists. Academic and other independent studies suggest that increased density does not result in more affordable housing:

562 Gerard Mildner, Director, PSU Center for Real Estate, November 2014: "Density at Any Cost" argues that reversing the housing mix to (much) more multifamily dwellings would substantially increase housing costs in Portland over the next 20 years, making it the 4th most expensive metropolitan area in the country. This work points out that use of cars has not appreciably changed over the past 20 years despite development of light rail and extensive bus routes, and warns "we shouldn't base our land use planning decisions on commuting assumptions that won't happen". Mildner also advocates for a more liberal - though thoughtful - approach to the Urban Growth Boundary.

563 <https://www.pdx.edu/realestate/sites/www...>

564 Jim Russell, July 7, 2014, Pacific Standard: The "Illusion of Local: Why Zoning for Greater Density Will Fail to Make Housing More Affordable" points out that local market forces of supply and demand are irrelevant in driving down market prices, because influx of people with established wealth moving in from more expensive real estate markets (e.g. California, Asia) and foreign investment, lead to "a decoupling of housing from local labor market participation."

565 <https://psmag.com/social-justice/illusio...>

566 Wendell Cox, August 3, 2013, Urban Geography: "Urban containment" (i.e. relatively inflexible urban growth boundary) is primarily responsible for the rising land/housing prices in Portland, and the reduction in its diversity as a result.

567 <https://reason.org/wp-content/uploads/fi...>

568 The only way that more construction would result in reduced housing costs would be if supply exceeded demand - which developers are too smart to ever let happen. They maximize their profits - which they are legally bound to do - by keeping supply just short of demand. They make more money by (for example) building 1,000 units that rent for \$2,000 each instead of 1,100 units that might rent for only \$1,500. GM and Ford make millions of cars every year, but the price doesn't go down with each one. The price is what people are willing to pay. They don't over-build because it would reduce the price, and likewise, developers in Portland will not over-build either.

569 With any new housing, there are three elements: the cost of the land, the cost of construction, and the need for profit. That will always make new construction more expensive than existing housing. Especially on the inner east side, the land itself is so expensive that there is just no way to make the numbers work out to result in inexpensive housing. As long as people want to live there, it will be expensive.

570 I realize that everyone would like to live 'close in'. I'd like to live on the upper

west side of Manhattan. But I can't, because I can't afford it. Likewise, the reality is that close in housing will always be more expensive. If you want affordable housing, it will almost certainly have to be 'farther out' - such as Gateway.

571 One only has to look at other cities where infill has happened to see the results, such as Seattle, San Francisco, New York, London, and Tokyo. All of these cities have seen extensive development and 'infill'. Nowhere has this resulted in 'affordable housing'. It has resulted in destroying the character of the place, creating soulless ant farms where there once were livable spaces, and a lot of expensive new housing. Development and infill will certainly increase supply of housing, but not affordability. It hasn't anywhere else, and it won't here in Portland either.

572 The infill also disregards the desires of residents currently living in neighborhoods with primarily single-family housing. The old inner east side neighborhoods were never designed or intended to accommodate the 'high density infill' that would be the result of the proposed zoning changes. Furthermore, these neighborhoods already have relatively high population density, and work just fine as they are.

573 The infill plan is also woefully deficient in that it does not consider critical aspects of infrastructure. Such as:

574 1. Sewer capacity - the old clay sewers under the streets of the inner east side were designed for a fraction of the population that will result. Imagine what will happen when they overflow. There will be unpleasant results, and significant costs, for the upgrades needed to accommodate the increased population.

575 2. Water capacity - like the sewer systems, the old water pipes under the streets of the inner east side were designed for a fraction of the population that will result. Think about what will happen when everyone tries to shower at the same time in the morning. Again, there will be unpleasant impacts, and significant costs, for the upgrades needed to accommodate the increased population.

576 3. Less sunlight reaching street level. Have you walked around Burnside and 14th lately, where the new buildings are going up? Notice anything? Such as, there is less sunlight reaching street level? That is going to happen wherever such taller buildings are built. Portland used to have a solar index ordinance, which prohibited impairing it for neighboring dwellings. Not surprisingly, lobbying (by guess who?) had it eliminated. There is precious little sunlight as it is in Portland, I hate to see even that little bit further reduced.

577 4. School capacity - the need for additional classrooms and teachers because of the increased population. Portland schools are hurting already - where will the additional money come from?

578 5. Increased traffic congestion on already busy streets and highways. Think traffic is bad now? It will only get worse with more cars and people.

579 6. Parking on already crowded streets - it is nonsensical to assume that most new residents won't have cars, especially when real-world experience shows that most do indeed own vehicles.

580 7. Increased traffic will only result in increased accidents and deaths, particularly to bicyclists.

581 8. City park capacity - park usage will increase - will they become over-crowded? What will the increased maintenance costs be?

582

583 Prior to moving to Portland I lived in San Francisco, California. I know what density means to both the individual and the community. We do not want to follow in the path of SF or New York or many of the other American cities that have opted for tearing down the desirable neighborhoods and injecting a new aesthetic.

584

585 So: Do Not Pass the overlay zoning changes known as RIP! There will be a reckoning at the ballot box in the next rounds of elections of city council and mayor if this goes through.... ", "douglas.sweet@gmail.com", "Doug Sweet", "29176", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-08 20:50:20.0", "97214", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Housing types, Parking", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

586 "2301 NE Rodney Ave", "Portland", "We need to do more to ensure that there is more housing built to help alleviate displacement, allow more people the opportunity of home ownership, help make transit work better, fight climate change, and make Portland more walkable and livable.

587

588 Therefore, please allow 4-plexes on all lots in all single family zones.

589

590 Provide FAR and height bonuses for each additional housing unit built to encourage and incentivize more dense housing.

591
592 Provide height and FAR bonuses for affordable housing.
593
594 Eliminate all off-street parking minimums, ban parking for new single family homes, and
set strict parking maximums for multi-family homes.
595
596 Thanks!
597
598 ", "moniqueg2002@gmail.com", "Monique
Gaskins", "29177", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-08
21:04:48.0", "97212", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Scale, Housing
types, Displacement, Parking", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", ""
599 "2020 SW Miles Street", "Portland ", "I oppose the changes to the density to include
triplexes and duplexes in this neighborhood. As a homeowner I live in fear of my
backyard suddenly overlooked by not only 1 but up to 2-3 additional houses. Our
Stormwater management is terrible in this area and more hardscaping will only worsen
this situation. None of the additional houses built will be affordable. The city isn't
monitoring or controlling for light or sound pollution which increases cortisol and
stress levels in us and our wildlife. This plan is a plan for teardowns, an end to
single homes, and pricing current neighbors out of their homes with huge surges in
property taxes. City isn't taking care of infrastructure now, I don't foresee
improvements with twice the traffic on these residential streets.
", "Alisonmcallister@gmail.com", "Alison McAllister", "29178", "rip", "OR", "1S1E21BC
3300", "rip-R252909", "2018-05-08
21:29:01.0", "97219", "-13658754.804", "5695872.768", "Submitter", "West", "Hillsdale", "Active"
, "False", "Housing types", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", ""
600 "4315 SE Morrison st", "Portland", "I am writing to register my strong objection to the
residential infill project proposal currently under consideration
601 I am a 3rd generation Oregonian and Inner SE/NE Portland resident for Over 30 years.
602 I feel the city refuses to consider the opinions and preferences of the citizens of
this city that have shown strong organized resistance to the demolitions of single
family homes, the loss of historic neighborhood character, the unsustainability of
demolitions and the replacement of these homes with giant modern boxes that are 3x the
cost of the original structures.
603 The city and proponents of RIP have used misleading population projections and data
as well as correlating what is in reality the building of McMansions in inner SE /NE
with alleviating the homeless issues in Portland. I feel that our City Council is
largely in service to developers and treats the concerns of those citizens who will be
profoundly impacted by these changes with patronizing disdain. All the RIP maps show
the disproportionate impact in close in and middle SE Portland. All of inner SE
Portland could be torn down with the RiP plan.
604 I am frustrated that we are catering to people yet to live here , and their interest
in the most desirable neighborhoods. So the plan is to tear them down so the
newcomers can move right in?
605 When I moved back after college I moved to a funky affordable neighborhood and grew
with it. Outer NE, SE, Foster etc. are the neighborhoods that could benefit from the
development of clustered shopping dining and housing with walkability. If RIP is
allowed to continue as proposed I can't imagine what will be left of my neighborhood.
I already feel the impact right by my home with the addition of 2 large apartments
built on Belmont 100 feet from my front porch in the last 2 years and dozens of small
starter homes demolished for giant \$800,000 plus ""infill"" within a few miles.
606 I am disappointed in my city, in politics as usual, in the feeling that I have no
voice and for the first time in my life I am considering leaving a place I have owned
for 23 years and planned to retire in and the city I have lived in most of my life.
607 Thank you for your consideration
608 Sincerely.
609 Cathryn Heron
610
611
612
613 ", "Catbirdheron@gmail.com", "Cathryn Heron", "29179", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-08
21:58:50.0", "97215", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "Propose
d", "", "", "", "", "", ""
614 "1174 NE 76th Ave", "Portland", "As I understand the proposal, the new cap on building
sizes is intended to apply no matter how many homes are in a building. I encourage the
city to allow greater square footage for buildings with more units, even if it's not

very much per unit. Replacing an old single-family home with a new home that includes an ADU is a net gain for the city. If allowing developers some extra square footage to create the ADU makes the new development happen, the City should do it.", "dougkelso@yahoo.com", "Douglas Kelso", "29180", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-08 22:06:00.0", "97213", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Scale,Housing types", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

615 "1303 NE Shaver St.", "Portland", "Thank you for granting me the opportunity to share with you, my perspective as a resident homeowner, regarding the proposed changes to our zoning code.

616
617 I've lived in Oregon for nearly 30 years, East Portland for 25+ years, and in the Sabin Neighborhood for the better part of 2 decades. I've owned my tiny 100 year-old 749 sqft bungalow on Shaver St for 15 years.

618
619 It's hard to ignore the changes our city is experiencing, particularly if you've lived here for more than a year or two. I don't think it's hyperbole to say that it has changed more in the last 2-3 years than it has in the last 20-30. Some of the recent changes have fallen the hardest on the longer-term residents and those with less resources. The rapid rate of development has led to a housing crisis and is one of the primary reasons why we're having this debate.

620
621 I myself have had many conversations with friends and neighbors about the changing face of our neighborhoods and how out-of-character most of the newly built homes looks. But I'm not going to disparage those homes or their occupants, nor will I debate the value of imposing a degree restriction to what feels like unchecked development. I WILL however make the point, that as well-intended as this proposal is, a major disservice will be done to the countless R5 zoned homeowners with old houses on lots smaller than 3000 sq ft (the minimum lot size proposed for a house on an R5 zoned lot), if this goes into effect.

622
623 I'd also like to take a minute to draw attention to how this would negatively impact many neighborhoods like Sabin, AND the future residents searching for affordable ACCOMMODATING FAMILY-APPROPRIATE HOUSING in our Portland neighborhoods.

624
625 Sabin, if nothing, is a FAMILY NEIGHBORHOOD. The proximity to schools and parks, a public library, grocery stores, and other neighborhood amenities, as well as the easy access to public transportation, make this an ideal community in which to raise a family.

626
627 However, under these proposed changes, countless properties in my neighborhood, and all over this city, would be limited to building uncomfortably small houses (<1500 sqft) more appropriate for the increasingly common AirBnB visitors who have no real roots here, or make any significant contribution to the community that is unwittingly being forced to host them. Raising a family in a 1250 sqft home with a 350 sqft ADU (as a consolation?) is not what most people in this community envision when they think of affordable functional housing for families. Even if you could find a practical way to house a spouse or one of your children in the ADU (possibly when they're 17 or 18 years old), it's not conducive to healthy family interactions. Furthermore, the triplex provision would appear to be a total non-starter for most people (a family the least of which) on my corner lot given the proposed FAR restrictions - try to imagine a triplex that is limited to a total of 1250 sqft (415 sqft per unit), and the functional quality of living one might have in such a space.

628
629 The proposed Floor Area Ratios (FARs) will negatively impact those of us with R5 zoned lots that are less than 3000 sq ft. UNLESS, a provision is made that at least mirrors the proposed overlay for houses zoned as R2.5. Those R2.5 properties would be assigned a floor area ratio of 0.7 and could more reasonably accommodate a family with children (1750 sqft - additional 0.5 FAR ADU aside). I'm asking that this same provision be applied to 50' x 50' lots (and those of rough equivalents) so as to accommodate the building of more affordable family-appropriate dwellings, not fewer.

630
631 While the ADU provisions of this plan are well intended and may have a slight benefit, It will not solve the problem of producing more affordable housing (dollar-for-dollar, they cost more to build and accommodate fewer people. I do not believe that the diminutive nature of ADUs can appropriately accommodate a family, which should be a priority for this neighborhood. Instead, these fancy new ADUs seem more often to be

purposed for the transitive AirBnB-type residents, a phenomenon that has only served to drive the cost of housing stratospherically upward.

632

633 Thank you for reading my comments and for giving them judicious consideration as you take time to revise the draft work we see here. It is well-intended and deserves support, but warrants some further changes if it is to have the intended effect.", "patrondrone@gmail.com", "Patrick Taylor", "29181", "rip", "OR", "1N1E23CA 17500", "rip-R226672", "2018-05-08 22:20:26.0", "97212", "-13653620.357", "5708874.108", "Submitter", "Northeast", "Sabin", "Active", "False", "Scale, Housing types", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", ""

634 "3509 ne Alberta Ct", "Portland", "Hello, very concerned attending the BPS public hearing 5/8/18 today as it appeared the majority of persons testifying were either employed by an organization or selling their own products. It appeared to be dominated by an organization called Portland for Everyone. Additionally, people were promoting their ADU/building companies. It is sad, as it appears the main constituents that the city of Portland should serve, and who will be most affected by the changes, the taxpayer/homeowner, were probably too busy working to have a voice.

635

636 And sadly, the majority of the persons who testified appear naive. That have some belief that the city is capable of providing affordable housing.

637

638 Lets look at the their demands for triplexes. Based on communication with your own planning department, on a 5000 sq. ft. lot in the new 2.5 zoning change area, the developer could combine FAR to have 4625 sq. ft. to build with. That's 1541sq. ft per triplex, and that does not include potential basement or attics which are excluded from FAR. Let's be honest with ourselves, developers give up nothing. They will build these triplexes as large as they can. And the rules you are proposing allow that, such as increasing heights to 35 ft. in R2.5 zones and with increased intrusion into setbacks. Those triplexes, based on home prices in my neighborhood, will sell for 500-600k minimum. The developers won't build them unless they can make money. Lots of money.

639

640 And this will lead to more demolitions. The money is too great. This is why developers are for RIP. They stand to make a killing tearing down a 1500 sq. ft. bungalow they pay 400k for and building three connected houses they can sell for 1.8 million total. Ironically and sadly, the cheapest and most affordable homes in my neighborhood are the ones being demolished. And the most sustainable home is the one that is not torn down.

641

642 And yet persons like myself are the ones who will be most affected by RIP. Your proposals will fundamentally change the character of my neighborhood. When someone like myself buys a home, they expect consistency in the land use laws. Your proposal to change R5 lots to R 2.5 is blatantly unfair to long time taxpayers and homeowners like myself. RIP makes draconian changes and it will not solve anything, except line the pockets of developers. I can't voice my opposition enough to RIP.

643

644 On 10/26/16, a group of seven of RIPSAC members wrote a letter detailing their concerns with RIP, using the word draconian to describe RIP. It also gave solid suggestions to fix RIP. I suggest that all involved with RIP read it. If I could find the document online, I'm sure your staff can as well.

645

646 Ervin Siverson
647 ", "ervnancy@msn.com", "Ervin Siverson", "29182", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-08 22:23:01.0", "97211", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Scale", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", ""

648 "6435 SW Burlingame Avenue", "Portland ", "I live in Hillsdale, SW Portland, and I say "NO" to the Residential Infill Project.

649 I am opposed to the RIP because it will negatively impact the quality of life in the city by burdening existing infrastructure with increased population density.

650 Unmaintained streets, sewer and storm drainage problems and overcrowded public schools are already a big problem in SW Portland and will only worsen if the RIP proposal is approved without addressing these issues.

651 The blanket imposition of untested policies will not meet RIP stated goal of producing affordable housing for the "missing middle", but will forever damage the neighborhoods we love.

652 The RIP dictates what the homeowners can and can't do to their properties and

essentially mandates that they give up some of their current property rights. For example, the new FAR restrictions will no longer allow additions to many existing homes. This means that if a family wants to expand their home for a relative to move in, they will have to build an ADU is which more expensive to build and not all homeowners can afford it.

653 The "a"overlay opportunity rezoning changes will take away significant property rights not only from current, but also from future generation of homeowners. There is enough land capacity in Portland and the 2035 Comprehensive Plan certified that there is adequate land available for residential development on vacant lots in Portland. There is no need to change zoning requirements and take away our homeownership property rights.

654 Also, I believe it is irresponsible to increase the density in the area which is overdue for a devastating earthquake. A new state study projects that the major Cascadia earthquake would destroy up to 677 buildings throughout Multnomah County and would cause thousands of immediate deaths. Please be more cautious and considerate before you approve the RIP which increases the density in a potentially dangerous place to live.

655 ", "natalia.bronner@gmail.com", "Natalia Bronner", "29183", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-08 23:21:45.0", "97239", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Scale,Housing types", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

656 "6221 NE 22nd Ave", "Portland", "I Oppose RIP

657 As a native Portland resident of 61 years I am outraged as to how the City Council of Portland could even remotely back this in the best interest of the citizens of the city. It truly shows the self interest of the elected officials of the city and the backdoor ties to developers and your own interests. It's past time you truly serve the current residents of this city and not make decisions based on speculative marketing projections and developer contributions. This should be a vote of the PEOPLE of the city you have sworn to serve. There is so much wrong with this I will spare everyone the endless pages it would require to write it as 99% of the opposing comments about this I've read I agree with. If you value my vote when you are up for re-election, I would hope you consider your choices wisely.

658 ", "jammingmj@gmail.com", "Michael Johnson", "29184", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-09 00:03:55.0", "97211", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

659 "2846 SE holgate", "Portland ", "I approve and encourage this proposal. I believe Portland will benefit from increased density in the core area as long as we also maintain our access to outdoor spaces and parks. ", "Mhart3@gmail.com", "Molly Hart", "29185", "rip", "OR", "1S1E13BB 200", "rip-R186969", "2018-05-09 07:32:22.0", "97202", "-13651831.296", "5699010.841", "Submitter", "Southeast", "Reed", "Active", "False", "Housing types", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", ""

660 "9206 N. John", "Portland", "First, thank you for making all this effort to improve Portland's livability. Having sat through most of the testimony last night, I understood there are people on many different sides of this issue. My concern is that the 'a' overlay will not cover our property, as the northern border as it is now proposed is at North Smith. My husband and I want to build an affordable unit on our property and will do so as soon as this 'a' overlay covers our neighborhood. A planner explained to me that it wasn't proposed to cover our neighborhood due to the (erroneous) assumption of a vulnerable to eviction population. Our neighborhood and surrounding area is comprised of homeowners, there are VERY few non-owner occupants. Please consider another "vulnerable" population, which for our neighborhood includes seniors living alone and singles. Both would benefit by being allowed to be in the 'a' overlay. A senior living alone, for example, could have an adu in the house, for help with home care and possibly a relative building an adu on the lot and helping the senior financially by paying rent. As was heard in the testimony, please consider covering ALL of Portland and let the people decide what works. Yes, some developers may make money, though it seems from how you all have written the proposed regulations, more affordable, small units will be the end result. Portland doesn't need any more large houses that take up the entire square footage of the lot. We need many smaller units that are affordable for the majority.", "dagrazul@gmail.com", "Dorothy Krahn", "29186", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-09 08:01:37.0", "97203", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Scale,Housing types,Mapping the "a" overlay,Affordability,Displacement", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", ""

661 "3509 NE Alberta Ct.", "Portland", "Here is a letter written by members of RIPSAC sharing concerns about RIP. I want it submitted as testimony. It coherently shares how

flawed RIP is.

662

663 October 26, 2016

664

665 Linda Bauer, Appointee - East Portland Action Plan Sarah Cantine, Architect - Boise NA
Land Use Jim Gorter, Appointee - Southwest Neighbors, Inc. Rod Merrick, Architect -
Eastmoreland NA Land Use Rick Michaelson, Appointee - Neighbors West/Northwest Michael
Molinaro, Architect, Appointee - Southeast Uplift Barbara Strunk, Appointee - United
Neighborhoods for Reform

666

667 We are representing a coherent and cohesive third of the RIPSAC appointees. Our shared
perspective is to approach planning as neighborhoods, building around centers in
neighborhood context consistent with supporting Goals in the 2035 Comprehensive Plan.
668 Subject: Comment on the October 2016 Residential Infill Project (RIP) Concept Report
669 We focus first on the big picture impacts of the latest iteration, the "Concept Report
to Council". Following this is a discussion of the issues that frame our concerns, from
speculative demolitions to the zoning code that is misaligned with values in the
Comprehensive Plan together. The numbered Recommendation refer to the RIP Proposals. We
then look for common ground in the three subject areas that the RIPSAC was chartered to
address. In the summary we highlight our recommendations.

670

Significant Implications of the "Concept Report" ? The entire inner east side and part
of the west side of Portland is to be rezoned by assigning an overlay designation that
increases allowed density by 200 to 300%. The already compromised R5 zoning density
designation with its substandard minimum lot sizes is retained. The plan encourages
triplexes on every corner, duplexes or a house with two accessory dwelling units on
every 3,000 to 7,000 SF lot, and cluster housing on every lot of 10,000 SF or greater.
The speculative justification is that such innovative housing is desired in Portland.
? Ownership standards are implicitly restructured from fee simple to a condominium
basis since ADUs will no longer be "accessory" but able to be sold independently as
will the duplexes, courtyard clusters, and corner tri-plexes that will be constrained
to a single tax lot under the plan. Portland will likely transition to a city of
investor-owners and renters as resident owners are displaced. ? The density encouraged
by this "overlay" is greater than that permitted in the multifamily R2 (2,000 SF per
dwelling) zone further confusing the intent and integrity of the density designated
code. The single family neighborhood zone, an essential characteristic of this city
with one house per lot is effectively erased from most of Portland. ? By widely
distributing density the proposal fails to focus density around centers consistent with
the 2035 Comprehensive Plan. Neighborhoods that did not fit the ¼ mile bubble distance
from corridors have been declared "housing opportunity zones" with insufficient
justification. Parking impacts are not addressed and transportation benefits are not
analyzed. West side neighborhoods not within 1/4 mile of corridors and Portland's west
suburbs are not impacted presumably to diffuse opposition. The David Douglas school
district is excluded while they develop a school expansion plan.

671

672 NEIGHBORHOOD BUILDING IN NEIGHBORHOOD CONTEXT Page | 2

673

674 ? The purported scale reduction is a paper tiger. The one size fits all approach allows
structures greater than roughly 80% of the existing housing stock. Except for
constraining the few very large houses and limiting the size of triplex and small lot
units, little has been done to reduce the scale of buildings. Nevertheless the
home-builders, who vigorously supported the concept, are already asking for a larger
envelope. ? The proposal entitles developers of new or remodeled multi-family
structures a salable area of roughly 4000 square feet, including the basement level and
the 15% density bonus in all impacted neighborhoods zoned R5. An additional size bonus
for converting existing homes to multi-family with additions is proposed. The economic
analysis (Appendix A) presumes that the saleable area of the structure is 2500 SF for a
5000 SF lot. Consequently the economic analysis may be characterized as erroneous at
best. Increasing the number of rental or condominium housing units on a site will
certainly accelerate speculation, demolition and displacement in the most vulnerable
neighborhoods and remove our most affordable housing stock. ? The building types
proposed are neither innovative nor in demand in this form. All are currently allowed
in the appropriate multi-family zones in the city of Portland. Thus far there appears
to be a very limited market for these housing types except in the form of older houses
divided into low rent apartments. Because of fire, seismic, and acoustic privacy
requirements such remodeling is expensive. Despite areas zoned to allow such housing,
few if any such buildings are now being constructed. New multi-family structures are

far more efficient and tested. Planning staff suggested that they will recommend changes to the Building Code to reduce requirements tailored to such conversion projects. ? The proposal is draconian, untested, and non-responsive to the public comment process. Out of all the opposition in public meetings, and of the 30 NAs that provided comment three have expressed support for this concept. It may be that those neighborhoods are in need of such redevelopment and the residents may be supportive. If so they should be considered as test sites for the "overlay" for a period of 5 to 7 years to better understand the implications.

675 Discussion of Concerns that Set the Stage

676 We oppose one-size-fits-all zoning standards that we perceive as contradictory to goals in the adopted comprehensive plan and are not respectful of the variety of neighborhood characteristics that exist in the city, and which lead to simplistic and polarizing regulations. While Recommendations 1, 2, and 3 address scale, height, and setback in a way that addresses problems with the zoning code, they fail to recognize that contextual standards should be a guiding principle. Los Angeles and other cities are modeling this approach. Portland is proposing a generic solution that encourages undifferentiated neighborhoods.

677 We support the diversity of the neighborhood character. District planning is needed to guide where and how additional density should be accommodated recognizing that the condition of housing, scale, history, economic factors, and displacement considerations all play a significant role in defining what is appropriate.

678 We support "truth in zoning". This is essential for rebuilding public understanding and confidence in the planning and zoning process and providing clear guidance for owners, designers, builders, and for the land use review process. Considering the primary metric for the zoning code is

679 NEIGHBORHOOD BUILDING IN NEIGHBORHOOD CONTEXT Page | 3

680

681 density, we oppose the "alternative" housing Recommendation 4 in the R5 and R7 zones that further undermines the intent and purpose of this tool. Densities proposed for the now meaningless "R5" zone would exceeds those now allowed in the R2 zone.

682 We oppose recognition of historic underlying lot lines except where these align with the density standards within the zone designation. The result for our neighborhoods has been destabilization, demolition, and speculation. Recommendation 7 begins to address this issue but only for skinny houses.

683 We support additional zoning density around Centers and where appropriate along Corridors as in the current and 2035 Comprehensive Plan, to reinforce the establishment of new and existing centers, walking scale neighborhoods, use of transit and reduced auto dependency. This is a successful model advocated during the past 40 years and is yet to be realized, either in Portland or in the Metro Region. Scattered site middle housing in Recommendations 4, 5 and 6 undermines this goal.

684 We Support density around centers and some corridors an oppose the scatter site density that results from the rezoning the entire eastside "housing opportunity zones" and ¼ mile bubbles in Recommendation 4. Scattered "middle housing" defeats comprehensive plan goals to focus density around walking scale currently underbuilt centers. The widespread application of "middle housing" zoning is likely to accelerate price increases in an already overheated market, destabilize neighborhoods, and cause loss of viable and more affordable housing and increase demolition and displacement. Already we encourage ADUs that alone, if fully utilized, would increase density by 50% everywhere.

685 We object to speculative zoning the practice of implementing zoning regulations without testing and modeling physical and economic impacts for proposed code changes prior to drafting and implementing zoning code changes. Often these changes seem to be driven by interests whose primary concerns are for a particular niche of real estate development in contrast to the public interest. Earlier decisions to allow recognition of underlying lot lines and compromised lot sizes as well as Recommendations 5 and 4 are examples.

686

687 We object to unsubstantiated claims of creating "affordable" housing for everyone by Portland For Everyone. Recommendations 4 and 5 are being promoted as a "grand bargain" by housing advocates who have modeled their faith on a failing (<http://www.seattletimes.com/seattlenews/politics/mayor-murray-withdraws-proposal-to-allow-more-density-in-single-familyzones/>) Seattle initiative by using the same slogan. There has been no analysis and no evidence that these proposals will result in affordable housing regardless of how it is defined.

688 At a recent presentation, a lead Portland planner claimed that if you placed more units on a given piece of land the cost per square foot would be lower. If the land price remained unchanged, yes the cost of the land would be divided among the units. But the

reality is otherwise. As long as there is strong demand for housing and it can be profitably built and sold, rezoning for increased density will cause the value of the land to increase. Where is the example of a split lot where the one or two replacement houses (regardless of size) without public subsidy are less expensive than the house demolished? Show us the densified city that is thereby made more affordable unless in a state of decay. When is the cost per square foot for a smaller house less than for a larger house? Given the same quality the reverse is true. We must address housing affordability as a regional issue with care and urgency not an excuse to provide a handout of speculative profits and the cost of demolition, displacement, and livability.

NEIGHBORHOOD BUILDING IN NEIGHBORHOOD CONTEXT Page | 4

Common Ground And Points Of Agreement

Considering the three areas included in the RIPSAC charge there are areas where we found common ground and points of agreement with the staff proposal and with housing advocates and construction related interests on the RIPSAC:

Scale and Massing Issues: One of our principle concerns and one clearly expressed in the Comprehensive Plan is "one size does not fit all". The staff report fails to satisfy that issue or the issue of scale in general. However, there is a good deal of consensus about the general direction of the recommendations regarding size, height, setbacks, placement of off-street parking, etc..

Narrow and Skinny lots and Recognition of Underlying lots of record (lot splitting): There is a good deal of disagreement here since the one-for-two house demolition infill and skinny garage housing has become a business model for some developers who have represented these as "affordable" housing and thus aligned themselves with housing advocates.

These lot line policies have been applied indiscriminately across the city, are making a lot of folks very unhappy, are certainly not producing much new housing. Market rate new housing is not affordable but rather very profitable and is systematically removing more affordable housing. We support the staff recommendation that begins to address Truth in Zoning by limiting the use of these underlying lot lines for splitting lots in the R5 zone.

We also agree is that the underlying lots should be recognized where the lot division is consistent with the density standards in the zoning code. Otherwise the experiment with complex and confusing code provisions encouraging this kind of wasteful demo-development should end. The Concept Report states that the State made the city recognize these lot lines above zoning standards. This is false.

Innovative housing Types: As we explored these ideas it became increasingly clear that developers are not building to the density already generally allowed around centers and corridors. The housing types discussed were not so much innovative as not being built where the code allows. The current zoning around centers is appropriate and needs refinement not more scattered density across broad areas of the city. This proposal received a widespread and justifiably hostile reaction from the public as a handout to developers and a formula for speculation, accelerated demolition, and neighborhood disruption and displacement.

Summary Recommendations Key recommendations include: ? Create development standards that fit neighborhood context and aspirations. ? Test and model physical and economic impacts for proposed code changes prior to drafting and implementing zoning code changes. Testing includes implementing zone changes in neighborhoods that support the proposals and evaluating the impacts. ? Ensure that scale of houses fits neighborhood context, protect solar access and privacy, and maintain individual and shared green spaces.

NEIGHBORHOOD BUILDING IN NEIGHBORHOOD CONTEXT Page | 5

? Use commonly understood terms and provide clear definitions of what is allowed in each zone, a concept known as "truth in zoning." Avoid contradictory criteria such as the use of density when lot sizes are the governing criteria. ? For areas in the City intended for higher density and alternative housing, proceed with rezoning for the higher density. ? Allow historically platted narrow and skinny lots to be confirmed only in the R2.5 zone. ? Save viable existing housing. The most affordable housing is almost always housing that is already in place. ? Actively engage neighborhood and business associations to participate in decision-making during planning exercises and for major developments to improve understanding of context and needed design guidelines. Respond to thoughtful suggestions and criticism. ? Direct density to

centers, consistent with the above recommendations and the Comprehensive Plan, to reinforce the establishment of centers, walking scale neighborhoods, use of transit and reduction of auto dependency.

705
706 We have given many hours both in the RIPSAC meetings and many more hours in meeting as
a group to formulate our analysis and recommendations summarized in this analysis.
707 We all care deeply about our city and we applaud the effort to consider how and where
to focus housing density and how to guide the growth of the city in a period of rapid
growth. This was a promising start that ultimately ran off the rails. If the concern
is affordability this project is a false promise. If the concern is a more walkable
lively city, this is a false promise.
708 We challenge ourselves and all Portlanders to think in terms of a vision for Portland
and the region that builds on the good neighborhoods that we have and figure out how to
encourage those elsewhere in the region before we do irreparable harm to what we have.
", "ervnancy@msn.com", "Ervin Siverson", "29187", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-09
07:59:49.0", "97211", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "Propose
d", "", "", "", "", "", ""
709 "5052 SE 33rd Pl", "Portland", "The residential infill project proposal is a thoughtful
and comprehensive approach to developing more affordable housing in Portland.
Encouraging property owners to build more "missing middle" housing instead of
overpriced "McMansions" will lead to more balanced development patterns in our
neighborhoods. I encourage you to forward the proposed draft to city council for
approval.", "jcohen71@gmail.com", "Joshua
Cohen", "29188", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-09
08:59:21.0", "97202", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Scale,Housing
types", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""
710 "1935 NE Couch St.", "Portland", "I am writing to express my support for the Residential
Infill Project. Our city needs more housing—and especially a wider range of housing
types and housing prices. The Residential Infill Project will help us achieve this.
More generally, it will help support Portland's climate goals and transportation goals.
Please vote yes for this important project. ", "ryan@sparkssullivan.com", "Ryan
Sullivan", "29189", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-09
09:21:11.0", "97232", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Housing
types", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""
711 "3640 SW Nevada Ct", "Portland", "Residential Infill Project
712 Remove the A Overlay!
713 I support the provisions of the Residential Infill Project that promote retaining
existing neighborhood character. This will allow Portland to grow in a way that
protects the great place it is today.
714 I am opposed to the A Overlay that is being applied to 87,324 properties in the City.
In the Draft of the 2035 Comprehensive Plan, it clearly stated there is more than
enough capacity under the current zoning for the growth that is projected to occur
through 2035. There is no need to add over 100,000 units of housing capacity.
715 The Residential Infill Project is adding this unneeded capacity by changing the number
of housing units allowed in the base zones. The single family zones will be turned into
multifamily zones. The RIP staff has projected that within the A Overlay, even with
all the new code incentives, the number of new ADU's and the amount of corner lot
redevelopment would be the same as if this radical concept were not implemented. The
A Overlay is a flawed concept that I do not support.
716 If added capacity is needed, I support the best practices of land use planning that
require that the base zone be changed with community-based planning consistent with
Oregon's Land Use Goals.
717 Please add this to the record. Thank you.", "joanieq143@gmail.com", "Joanie
Quinn", "29190", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-09
11:25:45.0", "97219", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Housing
types", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""
718 "3330 NE 38th Ave", "Portland", "I am writing to oppose the overlay allowing duplexes and
multiple ADUs on properties in Beaumont Wilshire. The streets are already difficult to
navigate with parked cars on all side streets. Doubling or tripling the number of
residents will destroy the neighborhood. Thinking that people will walk, bike or use
mass transit is progressive, but the reality is they still own cars. On my street
alone, one couple has four, another three, rental homes can have upwards of two. The
streets were not designed for this type of density and neither were the lots. It is
unthinkable to have three dwellings on a 50 x 100 lot. The houses are already close to
each other. Please consider preserving our beautiful neighborhoods instead of
destroying them.", "karen@event-group.net", "Karen

Siegle", "29191", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-09
12:20:33.0", "97212", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Housing
types, Parking", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""
719 "1736 SE 21st Ave", "Portland", "This is a copy of the testimony I delivered orally on
5/8/18.

720 My name is Gerson Robboy and I am a home owner in the Hosford Abernethy neighborhood.
I have lived in Portland for about 50 years, mostly on the inner east side. I want to
address two points in two minutes.

721 We have a housing crisis and one response to it would be to remove the requirements for
off street parking on new construction. Car ownership is already declining due to ride
services. Even public transportation use and bicycling are declining as people use
ride services instead. The big car manufacturers are already changing their business
models to cope with lower demand for cars.

722 Off-street parking is not a good investment today. Besides being expensive to
construct, parking consumes space that could be devoted to more dwelling units or green
space. I speak as a home owner and a car owner. We have a housing crisis, not a
parking crisis.

723 Secondly, the affordable housing bonus HAS to be strengthened to make it possible to
build four units, and not only on corner lots. The residential zoning that we had on
most of the inner east side until the 1950s, allowed for multi-family plexes and
courtyard apartments in residential zones. In much of the Buckman and Sunnyside
neighborhoods, the majority of existing dwelling units are in 2, 3, or 4- plexes or
small apartment buildings.

724 These are classic old Portland neighborhoods. If we were to lose houses in these
neighborhoods due to fire, disaster, or neglect, there would be a significant decrease
in housing allowed under the draft RIP proposal.

725 I support the proposals of Portland for Everyone. We need a Residential Infill Project
that is serious about increasing the supply of housing in all our neighborhoods.

726 ", "uncleyascha@gmail.com", "Gerson Robboy", "29192", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-09
12:36:20.0", "97214", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Housing
types, Affordability, Parking", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""
727 "6811 SE Mall St.", "Portland", "Please adopt this proposal and help increase housing
density while preserving older, historic homes.", "wesleystoller@gmail.com", "Wesley
Stoller", "29193", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-09
12:42:51.0", "97206", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Housing
types", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

728 "1327 SE 32nd Place", "Portland", "I am a homeowner in Portland. I was able to hear a
couple of hours of testimony tonight (5/8/18), but had to leave before it was my turn
to speak. I am writing to express my strong opposition to the RIP and to the Portland
for Everyone call for even more density.

729

730 Listening to supporters of RIP made me feel like I was immersed in an alternate
reality. My interpretation: Developers have the most to gain from infill (better
known as refill). They have helped to found and fund Portland for Everyone (PFE). PFE
presentations were slick tonight. But I come away still convinced that they are
supporting (wittingly or not) a cynical land grab. Appeals to affordability and equity
sound great, but the reality is there is no assurance of any increase in affordability
or equity with either RIP or enhanced RIP. PFE speakers (and online statements) mock
and shame those who differ with them, and level charges of racism, outmoded thinking,
NIMBYism, valuing trees more than people, etc. But the logic of PFE and others
supporting RIP is flawed: More houses do not equal more affordable houses.

731

732 These are profound decisions with long-term consequences. The need for affordability
and equity is real and urgent. Neighborhoods will inevitably change. But what RIP
will bring us instead of affordability is gridlock, loss of tree canopy, overcrowded
schools, demolition of excellent houses, gentrification, and displacement.

733

734 All sides can find studies to support our stances. But I urge you, our decision
makers, to carefully analyze studies on infill, affordability, and unintended
consequences. Please be sure that you source these studies widely. It is incumbent on
you to know in advance if this massive social experiment will achieve positive
consequences --- not for the developers and the tax base only, but for the people of
Portland. Good people are in major disagreement. I heard them tonight. It is your
job to sort out truth from fiction, reality from wishful thinking.

735

736 Some suggestions in the meantime which are less draconian than the proposed RIP:

737 • The new base zones are already allowing a doubling of units on so many lots which have changed or are changing from R5 to R2.5, with ADUs allowed. This will provide for more than enough developer opportunity to tear down and mega-build. Why not let this play out, rather than also adding the radical 'a' overlay?

738 • Make it easier to build an ADU, to create a basement apartment, to rent out rooms in one's home.

739 • Hold a citywide ballot on the RIP. Then do a pilot project in a few neighborhoods in which the majority of the residents support it. Contextualize the size of the new construction allowed to the specific neighborhood.

740 • Some studies show that residential construction already underway, and building on empty lots, could provide housing to our growing population through the 2030s. Step back from RIP and PFE and give this more time.

741 • Monitor and restrict short-term rentals, which are reducing housing options for residents.

742

743 It catches my attention and raises all kinds of questions to see how the west side, where our wealthier citizens and most of our elected officials reside, is largely exempt from the refill.

744

745 My concerns extend way beyond my own back yard to the very soul and future of this city we love. If we let RIP happen, we lose much that can never be regained. Do you really want this to be your legacy?

746

747 Thank you for listening.

748 ", "cap823@hotmail.com", "C Poliak", "29194", "rip", "OR", "1S1E01BD
18700", "rip-R132915", "2018-05-09
13:29:12.0", "97214", "-13651332.262", "5702655.716", "Submitter", "Southeast", "Sunnyside", "Active", "False", "Scale,Housing types", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", ""
749 "2615 ne 36th ave", "Portland", "I am alarmed by the racist implications of the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) restrictions proposed in this Residential Infill Project draft.

750

751 The 2,500 square foot R5 FAR restriction effectively blocks two traditional forms of high-density housing: Large-family and multi-generation. This disproportionately harms families of color in both cases.

752

753 LARGE FAMILY:

754 The proposed FAR restriction discriminates against large families of color. Only 11 percent of white families have 4 or more children. By contrast, 18 percent of black families and 20 percent of Hispanic families do, according to Pew Research (1). The proposed FAR restriction would make it unlawful for growing large families to remodel or rebuild their homes to suit their legitimate needs.

755

756 MULTI-GENERATION:

757 The FAR restriction also discriminates against multi-generation housing, disproportionately impacting families of color. Only 11 percent of white Americans live in multi-generation households. But multi-generation living is at least twice as common among black (23%), Hispanic (24%), and Asian (26%) families. These families, too, would be blocked from renovating existing housing stock to meet their needs.

758

759 Under the proposed FAR limits, large and multi-generation families would be forced to compete for the purchase existing larger homes -- or be forced out of Portland. Ironically, large homes will grow far more expensive under the proposed plan, as the city would artificially limit supply. This again favors whiter, wealthier buyers.

760

761 Portland has a toxic history of racist housing covenants. This proposal risks perpetuating racism in city housing policy and ensuring the whitest big city in America grows only whiter. Do not go down this path.

762

763 I encourage you to abandon FAR standards -- they are arbitrary and capricious; a city employee admitted to me at the Hollywood Library listening session that there was "no science to it."

764

765 The proposed restrictions on roof height and home setbacks are laudable, and should discourage the construction of out-of-scale homes that so many find objectionable. The zoning overlay allowing new duplexes, triplexes, and ADU's has my strong support. (YIMBY.)

766
767 If the city is committed to FAR restrictions, a propose the new lower limits be applied only to corporate developers or flippers, offering owner-occupied homes a blanket exemption, or a FAR of at least 1:1.

768
769 Sincerely,
770 Tim Dickinson

771
772 Source:

773 (1) <http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2015/05/07/family-size-among-mothers/>
774 (2)
<http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2011/10/03/chapter-3-demographics-of-multi-generational-households/>,"415tim@gmail.com","Timothy Dickinson","29195","rip","OR","1N1E25AC18800","rip-R182919","2018-05-0914:07:20.0","97212","-13650703.119","5707205.452","Submitter","Northeast","Grant Park","Active","False","Scale,Housing types","","","","","Proposed","","","","","1527 NE 65th Avenue","Portland","Not unlike San Francisco and Seattle, Portland has a housing affordability crisis. Helping to drive this crisis in Portland is a property tax affordability crisis. Year after year property taxes in Portland are increased 7, 10 or even 20 percent. Rents are increased, senior homeowners are forced out, and housing for people on another rung of the income ladder becomes unaffordable. Some type of homestead property taxpayer protection is absolutely needed.

776
777 You can't destroy a village with the expectation of saving it. One of the things that makes Portland an enticing livable city is the preservation of older and established single family home neighborhoods where kids can learn about nature in their own yards under big mature trees. Anything such as placing density over the quality of life taints this through the lens image of our popular city. Some people will say this is NYMBY talk. So be it, but it is also about preserving a quality of life and the urban landscape for future generations.

778
779 Any expectation of housing affordability by building a new on the wreckage of demolished older, viable and often the most affordable homes is a pipe dream. Only big box structures pencil out. Instead of RIP referring to ripping apart desirable, diverse and livable neighborhoods with out of context refill development, a consideration to needs to be given to the concept of RIP and the A overlay only being applied to undeveloped lots and vacant parcels of land such as in East County. RIP could then be the catalyst for investments in complete neighborhoods that include jobs, community services and infrastructure upgrades.

780
781 Finally, with a growing population and a congestion crisis, Portland needs to make more room for cars. The reality is cars are going to be a primary form of transportation for the foreseeable future. So as not to create a city-wide parking crisis, any new residential development must include adequate off-street parking that has overnight charging connectivity for electric vehicles. 59 percent of low income people drive to their place of employment. It is utter fantasy to think bicycles will replace the freedoms and independence associated with owning a car. To establish equity, adult bicyclists need to start paying user fees that would totally fund 100 percent of the costs for the privilege of having specialized bicycle specific infrastructure.

782
783 ","parkert2012@gmail.com","Terry Parker","29196","rip","OR","","","rip-null","2018-05-0915:18:49.0","97213","0","0","Submitter","","","Active","False","","","","","Proposed","620 NE Ainsworth","Portland","Dear Commissioners,

784
785
786 As a Portlander who strongly believes in the values of smart growth and density, I'm appalled that our city considers itself progressive on these issues while maintaining building codes from last century that prevent residents from pursuing common-sense density-positive improvements to their own property. Please please please also consider removing parking requirements city-wide, as this will further encourage this kind of progressive, forward-thinking infill.

787
788 Sincerely,
789
790 Ben Hubbird","bhubbird@gmail.com","Ben Hubbird","29197","rip","OR","","","rip-null","2018-05-09

15:56:56.0","97211","0","0","Submitter","","","Active","False","Housing types,Parking","","","","","Proposed","","","","","",""

791 "1309 s.e 57th ave.,"portland","Allowing greater density will not provide more affordable housing. It will only allow more profitable development, and it will diminish the aesthetic integrity--the cohesiveness--of NEIGHBORHOODS, which are the heart of this city. The solution to affordable housing lies in better public transportation, so that people can live where they can afford and efficiently get to and from where they work and play. ", "clayfarm@msn.com", "jim pierce", "29198", "rip", "OR", "1S2E06AC 15800", "rip-R123245", "2018-05-09 16:12:59.0","97215","-13648320.717","5702680.919","Submitter","Southeast","Mt. Tabor","Active","False","Housing types","","","","","Proposed","","","","","" 792 "9426 N. Mohawk Ave.,"Portland","State ID#: 1N1W01DA 793 794

Hello, I am John Svob, resident and home-owner in North Portland since 2000- a transplant; but I share the spirit of these proposed modifications: we do need to keep some of the classic Portland neighborhood style and affordability while staying committed to infill and preservation of the urban-growth boundary. Tearing down completely good, average sized homes just to build more expensive homes is wasteful and does usually undermine affordability.

795 796 However, I speak against the apparent severity/ the formula of the modification as proposed. As I understand it, though this modification would decrease the rows of huge "skinny-houses" (that should just be townhomes with shared greenspaces) and though it might limit the "no-yard, no-parking duplexes and eventual cheap 8-plexes" (that don't seem to limit the number of cars parking on the streets and that influence more of the same in other zones), I do think that the limitations stop our neighborhood from positive development that helps retain the feel of our residential neighborhood while improving its livability and viability- the sq footage:lot size formula simply goes too far, and it is less important than the footprint of the structures in terms of residential feel. Some of the smaller, poorly designed single-family homes in my neighborhood could be replaced with much larger homes that actually improve the livability and keep St Johns from becoming an area dominated by big-money developers who are pushing for zones to be shifted so that larger apartment complexes can take over (not saying that it doesn't make better sense in some places). Yards could be retained. Trees could be retained.

797 798 I have more than my own perspective on what is a good balance of footprint/sq. ft. living space/natural yard/trees, I have a vested interest: 799

800 I also own a 47.1'x100 lot, and about ten years ago, I designed a very large home (3,256 sq ft) and accompanying garage and living space (800 sq ft)., and I already paid for the engineering. Life's difficulties interrupted my financial stability and my determination. Just last week, I visited the City Bureau of Planning and Development. Presently, with present lot-coverage limitations, I WOULD be able to construct both structures, which would house at least 8-10 persons very comfortably and affordably. The house would not take away from the residential feel of the neighborhood; it would enhance it. These proposed modifications would prevent the construction of the house I intend to build, a house I designed specifically for St Johns and for environmentally conscious existence.

801 802 I think the modifications need to be revisited, and that the calculation should be determined by footprint also, not square-footage alone.

803 804 -John Svob ", "svobby_8@hotmail.com", "John Svob", "29199", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-09 16:19:25.0","97203","0","0","Submitter","","","Active","False","Scale","","","","","Pr oposed","","","","","","" 805

"2207 SE 37th Ave","Portland","The kind of development we have seen in Portland lately--giant buildings turning narrow streets like Division into canyons of uninspired architecture--has not created affordable apartments or housing, and it won't. Instead, it takes a food cart lot and turns it into condos, or a solid single home that a middle class family could purchase and turns it into three homes that are well beyond their price range. It removes homes that are in good or excellent condition, that have a character specific to the neighborhood and replaces them with cookie-cutter developer-buildings or ugly faux Craftsman that cost one million dollars. We don't need thoughtless development like this. It will ruin the city we know and love.

806 ", "emilychenoweth@yahoo.com", "Emily
Chenoweth", "29200", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-09
16:44:25.0", "97214", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "Propose
d", "", "", "", "", "", "", ""

807 "5229 NE MLK Blvd. ", "Portland", "My partner owns a double lot in Cully neighborhood. We
have been talking with Living Cully to potentially partner on developing the vacant lot
under the RIP rules. However, the vacant lot will not be a corner and thus we would
only be able to build three units - even if one or more are affordable. With the cost
of land and construction, Living Cully and their non-profit development partners would
not be interested in the project with only 3-units. The numbers only work with having
one of the three units being able to be affordable with the other two units market
rate. This project isn't worth them pursuing as it just isn't impactful enough for
their limited time and resources. However, if we were able to build 4-units we could
definitely get 2 affordable units, and potentially get the other two to be priced for
families making less than the MFI.

808

809 This is a perfect example of how the RIP could directly lead to new affordable housing
requiring \$0 public subsidies by allowing 4-units on mid-block properties, or with the
current 3-unit limit no affordable homes at all. If we are limited to 3 units then most
likely this land would be purchased by one of the typical housing developers
(Renaissance, Everett, etc.) and a large McMansion style home will be built and sold
for a maximum value, while only providing one home.

810

811 This is a partnership between a private landowner, a private architecture firm, and a
non-profit partner trying to do something that is good for the community. The current
RIP rules (not allowing a bonus unit for affordable units) won't allow this property to
be developed with affordable housing. I strongly urge the Sustainability Commission,
Staff, and City Council to alter the RIP to give a bonus unit on all properties when at
least one of the units is affordable.

812

813 Further, to make this work, we need to have an FAR bonus for each unit above one. To
make units that are larger than one or two bedrooms, and are flexible for families,
multi-generational living, and co-housing we need to allow for extra area for duplexes,
triplexes and projects with Attached and detached ADUs. The current RIP draft is
cutting the allowable building area in the city by over 50%. For a growing city this is
crazy and only going to drive up costs of houses. We need to incentivize density and
allow larger structures when multiple new homes are being created.

814

815 Thanks.

816

817 Sincerely

818 Lucas Gray", "lucas@propelstudio.com", "Lucas
Gray", "29202", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-09
17:35:37.0", "97211", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Scale,Affordability", "", "
", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

819 "3428 SE 9th Ave.", "Portland", "The furor over the RIP is short term. The RIP looks 50
years into the future to set a direction for our city's growth, while the objections
are immediate- loss of parking, too much traffic, too many dwellings on too small lots,
too many old homes demolished, and so on. I consider the RIP to be an appropriate
guide to the future evolution of Portland housing. This comment was provoked by a
""stop demolishing Portland"" anti-RIP sign outside a 1950's duplex in a neighborhood
built originally in the first decade of 1900. The duplex exists because an obsolete
1900 home was destroyed. The city will evolve and change with or without RIP. With
the RIP it will, in time, change towards a higher density, more energy efficient, and
transit oriented community that preserves the natural setting that defines us. I
believe that is a goal most of us share. ", "srbachhuber1@gmail.com", "Stephen
Bachhuber", "29203", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-09
19:45:53.0", "97202", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Housing
types,Parking", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

820 "2412 SE Tibbetts St", "Portland", "I support urban growth management and increased
density within the UGB. In fact, there are many aspects of the new rules that I like.
For example, smaller structures that better fit the lots and neighborhoods, changes in
calculating structure height, and overhang allowances in the setbacks.

821

822 However, there are other aspects that worry me. For example, I am strongly opposed to
the allowances for corner lots within the new overlay. Under the new overlay R2.5

corner lots may go from one residence to six or even eight residences. This is because a corner lot can be partitioned into two lots, and in some cases three lots. The corner lot can be redeveloped with a triplex and an ADU with the inclusion of an affordable unit and each new non-corner lot can be developed with a duplex. The designed result will see an intersection currently containing four residences be converted to up to 32 residences. That's an 800% increase!

823

824 In general, I believe planning for more gradual and focused changes that don't make such wholesale alterations to entire neighborhoods would better serve the city and its residents.

825

826 Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

827 ", "rmarke0577@msn.com", "Robert Markle", "29204", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-09 20:06:43.0", "97202", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Scale,Housing types", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

828 "0235 NW Whitaker St.", "Portland", "I've lived in many apartments where during summer heat waves it gets extremely hot inside due to the poor design of building orientation and landscaping of the building structure. Over the last decade, I've seen an increase in air conditioners running during summertime, especially for houses that do not have any trees shading the roof. Increasing density means there will also be an increased effect of urban heat island effect because you're likely going to cut down trees to make space for more housing as people subdivide their lots.

829

830 In conclusion, residential infill projects should also be accompanied with conditional approval criteria where heat mitigation should also be imposed, whether that being a mandate to plant large form trees or building orientations or whatnot.", "htheresa@pdx.edu", "Theresa

Huang", "29205", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-09 23:29:15.0", "97239", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Housing types", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

831 "PO Box 715", "Clackamas", "We support the rezoning of Portland neighborhoods for increased sustainability. Our neighborhood is comprised of modest homes, its character unchanged for many years. It is walkable to shops, library and parks. Public transportation is very available. Such a neighborhood meets the needs and desires of many Portlanders.

832 Although we, like many our age, wish things we value could stay as they are now. We don't like the traffic, poor air quality and suburban sprawl which accompanies unplanned growth.

833 Better to have more density in an affordable, convenient neighborhood. We support the proposed changes to zoning in Portland.", "jlweaf@gmail.com", "Ellen Fallihee", "29206", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-10 07:14:39.0", "97015", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Housing types", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

834 "3114 NE 26th Ave", "Portland", "Thanks for the opportunity to comment. I would like to see a restriction on the number of units per lot to one house and one small accessory unit in this neighborhood. No triplexes. Also, I wonder what kind of ownership controls there will be going forward. What would prevent an entity from buying up several houses in a small area and converting them all in to rentals, thus changing the whole dynamic of the neighborhood? I would also request that onsite parking be a requirement for any new addition or new construction vs having street parking only.

Thanks!", "Markodan@earthlink.net", "Mark Danielson", "29207", "rip", "OR", "1N1E25BB 12100", "rip-R154276", "2018-05-10 08:11:01.0", "97212", "-13652086.705", "5707804.174", "Submitter", "Northeast", "Alameda", "Active", "False", "Housing types,Parking", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

835 "100 SE Littlepage Rd", "Corbett", "Thank you for letting me testify about the Residential Infill Project. I have been a real estate agent in Portland for 26 years and my wife and I own 5 rental properties in Portland. I have mostly worked with first time home buyers and I have seen Portland go from a place where almost anyone could buy a home or find a home to rent, to a place where housing anxiety is extreme. For example, In the 1990's, I was able to find homes to purchase for several employees of Powell's who made less than \$10 per hour. The main reason that housing is unaffordable is that there is a housing shortage. If there were not several people bidding to purchase every home or rent every apartment, prices would not be so high. Therefore I encourage the city to enact rules that encourage ADU's and other types of Missing Middle Housing choices such as cottage clusters. In the process of enacting new rules, it is important not to make burdensome rules that raise the price of building ADU's or

discourage their building. Firstly, please keep the present rule that allows most ADU's to be 800 square feet. I believe it is in the city's interest to limit the size of primary houses so they do not tower over the more modest houses typical of Portland, but ADU's should not be discouraged by including them in the overall FAR of a property. The rules that include a limiting FAR for ADU's would not allow many of the beautiful ADU's that have recently been built in Portland that are almost universally admired. We would like to build ADU's on some or all of our rental properties. We would likely move into one of them. But building ADU's are very expensive. One of the best ways to make ADU's less expensive is to make it so that building an ADU does not involve a custom plan every time. Therefore, I recommend that rules that require similar roof pitch to the main house, or that limit the height of ADU's to match or be similar to the main structure, be eliminated city-wide. All ADU's should be limited to 20 ft and the rooflines and other design standards should be dropped. This will allow the standardization of building and may foster the creation of more modular building of ADU's. I am also not in favor of rules that require detached ADU's to be

"visitable". I believe many people will make their ADU's "visitable" as many people building ADU's are thinking of retiring in them. But let each person decide about this. Rules that force ADU's to be more visitable than normal houses will only drive up the price of all ADU's and make it less likely that ADU's will be built. This is especially true because ADU's are small and to design for these spaces is already difficult. The goal of bringing a home to all Portlanders will be much easier if homes are less expensive to build. Thank you for hearing my thoughts.", "daviddefauw@yahoo.com", "David DeFauw", "29208", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-10 08:17:47.0", "97019", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Scale,Housing types,Visitability", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

836 "100 SE Littlepage Rd", "Corbett", "Thank you for letting me testify about the Residential Infill Project. I have been a real estate agent in Portland for 26 years and my wife and I own 5 rental properties in Portland. I have mostly worked with first time home buyers and I have seen Portland go from a place where almost anyone could buy a home or find a home to rent, to a place where housing anxiety is extreme. For example, In the 1990's, I was able to find homes to purchase for several employees of Powell's who made less than \$10 per hour. The main reason that housing is unaffordable is that there is a housing shortage. If there were not several people bidding to purchase every home or rent every apartment, prices would not be so high. Therefore I encourage the city to enact rules that encourage ADU's and other types of Missing Middle Housing choices such as cottage clusters. In the process of enacting new rules, it is important not to make burdensome rules that raise the price of building ADU's or discourage their building. Firstly, please keep the present rule that allows most ADU's to be 800 square feet. I believe it is in the city's interest to limit the size of primary houses so they do not tower over the more modest houses typical of Portland, but ADU's should not be discouraged by including them in the overall FAR of a property. The rules that include a limiting FAR for ADU's would not allow many of the beautiful ADU's that have recently been built in Portland that are almost universally admired. We would like to build ADU's on some or all of our rental properties. We would likely move into one of them. But building ADU's are very expensive. One of the best ways to make ADU's less expensive is to make it so that building an ADU does not involve a custom plan every time. Therefore, I recommend that rules that require similar roof pitch to the main house, or that limit the height of ADU's to match or be similar to the main structure, be eliminated city-wide. All ADU's should be limited to 20 ft and the rooflines and other design standards should be dropped. This will allow the standardization of building and may foster the creation of more modular building of ADU's. I am also not in favor of rules that require detached ADU's to be

"visitable". I believe many people will make their ADU's "visitable" as many people building ADU's are thinking of retiring in them. But let each person decide about this. Rules that force ADU's to be more visitable than normal houses will only drive up the price of all ADU's and make it less likely that ADU's will be built. This is especially true because ADU's are small and to design for these spaces is already difficult. The goal of bringing a home to all Portlanders will be much easier if homes are less expensive to build. Thank you for hearing my thoughts. (Above is my husband's testimony and I agree with it.)", "goatgrandma48@gmail.com", "Julia Christopher", "29209", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-10 08:20:49.0", "97019", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Scale,Housing types,Visitability", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

837 "3416 NE 39th Avenue", "Portland", "Please see the attached report prepared by seven members of the RIPSAC. ", "janbak@pacifier.com", "Janet

Baker", "29210", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-10
09:11:49.0", "97212", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Scale, Housing
types, Narrow lots, Mapping the "a"
overlay, Affordability, Displacement, Parking", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""
838 "3372 NE Holladay St", "Portland", "I am opposed to the RIP.
839
840 RIP doesn't apply city wide (Exempts the West Side) and the problem it is city wide.
All must participate in the solution. Lack of transportation is not a suitable excuse.
841 RIP ignores the Comprehensive Plan which was actually crafted over time with real and
thoughtful input from many stakeholders.
842 Market forces will always make close in neighborhoods more expensive due solely to
location. Those lots that have affordable (in our desirable market) homes torn down
and replaced with multiple dwellings create two more expensive dwellings in the same
space. (See SE 28th Ave just off Burnside.) The low cost argument just doesn't hold
water.
843 Waiving development fees to add housing overlooks the fact that an increase in
population will require more city services and you are undercutting that mechanism from
the get go. Where will the money come from to increase sewer capacity, road
maintenance, school capacity, etc.? Even modifications proposed to "entice
development" will not meet the immediate needs generated.
844 Puts no value on the nature of the history of neighborhood attributes. The zoning
currently in effect already allows for ADU's internally as well as free standing
units. If the market could generate a low cost rental/owner occupant opportunity it
would have done so by now. Do not sacrifice the few remaining old unique neighborhoods
for an unachievable goal.
845
846 Thank you for your time and consideration.
847
848
849 Jeffrey B. Welty", "raleighworld@earthlink.net", "Jeffrey
Welty", "29211", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-10
10:00:36.0", "97232", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Housing types, Mapping
the "a" overlay", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""
850 "5816 ne 25th ave", "Portland ", "There does not seem to be any mechanism to prevent the
mass tear down of call corner houses on my street. Why wouldn't developers come in and
pay top dollar for corner lots and build triplexes. What measures are in place to
protect the architectural character of the City as these zoning changes are
implemented. Please consider some provision to prefer that homes with no structural or
other serious problems are not simply torn down. What about old growth trees on these
subdivided lots. These changes seriously threaten our urbn forest. I am very much
against r2.5 zoning changes north of Jarrett and east of 27th in Concordia unless there
are some controls to prevent a developer feeding frenzy.
", "brooklynjohnsmith@gmail.com", "John Smith", "29212", "rip", "OR", "1N1E13CC
8200", "rip-R190045", "2018-05-10
10:01:09.0", "97211", "-13652218.882", "5710867.819", "Submitter", "Northeast", "Concordia", "Ac
tive", "False", "Housing types, Mapping R2.5
rezones", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""
851 "2220 Prestwick Road", "Lake Oswego", "Letter attached.", "", "Nick
Johnson", "29213", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-10
00:00:00.0", "97034", "0", "0", "Letter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Mapping the "a"
overlay", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""
852 "2228 SE Salmon St", "Portland", "Letter attached.", "", "Nancy
Dale-Phelps", "29217", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-08
00:00:00.0", "97214", "0", "0", "Email", "", "", "Active", "False", "Housing
types, Parking", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""
853 "4033 NE Hoyt Street", "Portland", "Letter attached.", "", "Bruce
Newton", "29218", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-08
00:00:00.0", "97232", "0", "0", "Letter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Scale, Housing
types", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""
854 "3046 NE 33rd Ave", "Portland", "Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission
855 Residential Infill Testimony
856 1900 SW 4th Avenue
857 Portland, OR 97201
858 www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/infill/mapapp
859 503-823-0195
860

861 To Commission Members:

862

863

Below are points of concern AGAINST the proposed zoning changes for Meadow Park, seeking to change the base zone for this area from its current R5 status to R2.5, but also making a case for the Beaumont Wilshire neighborhood in general? This is NOT an argument against residential infill carried out in a responsible, sustainable way, but rather a position against trying to squeeze infill at this level of density into an area ALREADY taxed by existing density, and ALREADY carrying its fair share of density in relation to the rest of the city. I ask that you read this argument in full before making a judgment.

864

865

1. CURRENT REZONING LANGUAGE SEEKS TO MAKE IT A REQUIREMENT, IN MEADOW PARK, THAT ANYONE DEMOLISHING A HOME IN THIS TRACT BE FORCED TO BUILD INDIVIDUAL HOUSING UNITS ON EACH 25 FOOT FRONTAL PROPERTY DIVISION—A ZONING CHANGE FROM A CURRENT R5 STATUS TO A 2.5 STATUS. IT SEEMS HIGHLY LIKELY IN THE CURRENT MARKET THAT IT WILL BE A DEVELOPER DEMOLISHING SUCH A HOME, AND THAT SITES ARE LIKELY ALREADY SET FOR DOING THIS IF SUCH A REZONING MEASURE IS ALLOWED, WITH DEVELOPERS ALREADY HAVING THIS INTEREST IN BUILDING SEVERAL HOMES IN PLACE OF ONE HOME ON THE SAME LOT. WE ALREADY KNOW FROM PEOPLE LIVING ON NE 33RD BELOW FREMONT, FOR EXAMPLE, THAT THERE HAS BEEN AN ATTEMPT TO BUY UP A ROW OF HOUSES TO RAZE AND REPLACE WITH AN APARTMENT COMPLEX, SUBSTANTIALLY CHANGING THE CHARACTER OF THIS ALAMEDA/BEAUMONT WILSHIRE NEIGHBORHOOD. SO THIS REZONING ATTEMPT WOULD NOT BE ABOUT "ALLOWING" SOMETHING LIKE THIS TO HAPPEN, IT WOULD RATHER BE ABOUT FORCING IT TO HAPPEN, IN A NEIGHBORHOOD THAT IS QUINTESENTIALLY PORTLAND, HAVING A LONG TRADITION OF CARRYING THE SPIRIT OF BEVERLY CLEARY'S RAMONA AND HENRY, MR HOLLAND'S OPUS, HORSE-RINGS ON THE CURBS, POETRY POSTS, LITTLE LENDING LIBRARIES, AND HUNDREDS OF NEIGHBORS WHO HAVE A PASSION FOR A BIT OF GROUND TO LANDSCAPE INTO THE FLORAL BEAUTY FOR WHICH THIS AREA IS KNOWN.

866

2. ONCE SUCH A ZONING CHANGE IS IN PLACE, THE DENSIFICATION OF OUR NEIGHBORHOOD BECOMES MUCH EASIER GROUND FOR DEVELOPERS TO CULTIVATE. IT DOES NOT THEN BECOME AN ACTION OF THE DEVELOPER THAT NEIGHBORHOODS CAN FIGHT—ONCE THE ZONING IS IN PLACE, THAT FIGHT IS ALREADY LOST. THE DEVELOPER IS NOW SIMPLY FOLLOWING THE ZONING LAWS OF THE CITY, AND THUS FREE OF BLAME. THIS IS VERY LIKELY THEN A ZONING CHANGE THAT DEVELOPERS ARE PUSHING FOR, AND PERHAPS THE CITY IS PUSHING FOR, TO INCREASE ITS TAX BASE, BUT NOT A BROAD-BASED GROUP OF "PORTLANDERS".

867

3. THE CONCERN LISTED IN THE PROPOSAL SPECIFICALLY STATES: "OVER THE LAST TWO YEARS PORTLANDERS HAVE EXPRESSED CONCERNS THAT [VIBRANT] RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS ARE BECOMING INACCESSIBLE TO MANY, AND HOUSING OPTIONS ARE LIMITED"...LEADING TO A PROPOSAL THAT MORE HOUSES BE ALLOWED IN THESE NEIGHBORHOODS. WHO ARE THESE PORTLANDERS? SOURCES I HAVE IN THE BUILDING TRADES CONFIRM THAT MANY OF THE INVESTORS WITH INTERESTS IN BUILDING IN PORTLAND ARE FOREIGN-BASED, FROM PLACES LIKE SWITZERLAND, EASTERN EUROPE AND ASIA

([HTTPS://WWW.WASHINGTONPOST.COM/REALESTATE/WEALTHY-CHINESE-BUYERS-ARE-A-GROWING-FORCE-IN-US-REAL-ESTATE-MARKETS/2016/10/13/15AB3CBA-7441-11E6-8149-B8D05321DB62_STORY.HTML?UTM_TERM=.21BD8C7DDCDB](https://www.washingtonpost.com/realestate/wealthy-chinese-buyers-are-a-growing-force-in-us-real-estate-markets/2016/10/13/15ab3cba-7441-11e6-8149-b8d05321db62_story.html?utm_term=.21bd8c7ddcdb)) INTERESTED IN FINDING SHELTERS FOR THEIR MONEY, BUT WITH LITTLE CONCERN FOR THE NEIGHBORHOODS IN WHICH THEY ARE BUILDING, OR THE QUALITY OF CONSTRUCTION. VANCOUVER, B.C., HAD BEEN A TOP DESTINATION FOR FOREIGN MONEY, BUT A 15 PERCENT TAX ON INTERNATIONAL HOMEBUYERS THERE, IMPLEMENTED LAST YEAR, HAS FOUND FOREIGN INVESTORS TURNING THEIR EYES MORE TOWARD SEATTLE AND PORTLAND

(<https://www.bizjournals.com/portland/news/2017/03/23/where-portlands-1m-homes-are-selling-in-2017.html>). CONSTRUCTION IS CURRENTLY THE FASTEST GROWING INDUSTRY IN OREGON, WITH A 46% INCREASE IN PRIVATE HOUSING PERMITS OVER THE PAST 5 YEARS. WITH THIS HAS COME LABOR SHORTAGES AND AN INFLUX OF LESS EXPERIENCED LABORERS—NOT UNCOMMONLY WITH LITTLE TO NO CONSTRUCTION EXPERIENCE, TO FILL THE GAP

([HTTPS://WWW.QUALITYINFO.ORG/-/NEW-ENTRANTS-INTO-OREGON-S-CONSTRUCTION-INDUSTRY-HELPING-TO-EASE-THE-LABOR-SHORTAGE](https://www.qualityinfo.org/-/new-entrants-into-oregon-s-construction-industry-helping-to-ease-the-labor-shortage))

868

4. THIS DOES NOT THEN APPEAR TO BE HAPPENING IN THE SPIRIT OF INCREASING ACCESSIBILITY TO "VIBRANT" NEIGHBORHOODS. IT RATHER APPEARS TO BE JUST THE OPPOSITE--THE DILUTION OF THIS VIBRANCY IN THE SHORT-SIGHTED INTEREST OF TURNING A PROFIT BY PEOPLE OFTEN NOT EVEN LIVING IN PORTLAND.

869

5. CURRENTLY THERE ARE MANY APARTMENT UNITS BUILT OR BEING BUILT ALL ALONG SANDY BOULEVARD, THREE LARGE UNITS OF GRANT PARK APARTMENTS ON 32ND AND BROADWAY, UNITS ALL ALONG FREMONT EAST OF NE 42ND, ANOTHER LARGE UNIT BEING BUILT ON NE21ST AND MULTNOMAH, AND PLANS FOR A HUGE APARTMENT COMPLEX HOUSING SOME 1200 PEOPLE AT THE CURRENT SITE OF THE LLOYD CINEMA. (MORE EXAMPLES COULD READILY BE MARSHALLED HERE TO STRENGTHEN THIS CASE EVEN FURTHER). THE TRUTH OF THE MATTER IS THAT POPULATION DENSITY IN THIS AREA IS ALREADY OVERCROWDED FOR THE LIMITS OF EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURE. HOW MUCH FURTHER

OBLIGATION DO WE HAVE THEN, TO PROVIDE MORE ACCESSIBILITY? FORCING CURRENT PROPERTY OWNERS TO CONCEDE TO THIS IN THE NAME OF BEING "GOOD NEIGHBORS" FOR GREATER ACCESSIBILITY IS NOT ONLY OVERLOOKING HOW MUCH OF THIS INCREASED ACCESSIBILITY ALREADY EXISTS, BUT ALSO DOING SO AT THE EXPENSE OF UNDERMINING OUR NEIGHBORHOOD INTEGRITY. "GOOD NEIGHBORS" HAVE A RESPONSIBILITY TO MAINTAIN THEIR NEIGHBORHOOD--RESIDENTIAL INFILL ON 25' FOOT LOTS, AS YOU ARE PROPOSING, WILL CONTRIBUTE TO DESTROYING IT. WE CAN MAKE A CASE FOR THIS.

870 6. IT IS IMPORTANT TO MAKE A DISTINCTION HERE REGARDING ACCESSIBLE HOUSING AND THE HOMELESS PROBLEM IN PORTLAND. NO AMOUNT OF RESIDENTIAL IN-FILL IS GOING TO SOLVE THE HOMELESS ISSUE IN PORTLAND, BECAUSE IT IS A SYSTEMIC ISSUE ARISING OUT OF THE POVERTY OF OUR NATION. BY RECENT COUNTS, THERE ARE OVER 680,000 HOMELESS IN THE UNITED STATES--NONE OF WHOM COUNT AS UNEMPLOYED IF THEY HAVE GIVEN UP AND ARE NOT SEEKING WORK IN LIGHT OF THE FACT THAT BASIC SURVIVAL NOW IS A DAILY "JOB" IN AND OF ITSELF. WE NEED TO MAKE NO MISTAKE ABOUT THIS. THESE ARE PEOPLE IN SEARCH OF REFUGE, AND AS SUCH VERY MUCH UNDER THE UMBRELLA OF THE WORLD REFUGEE PROBLEM. BY A LEGITIMATE RENDERING OF THE U.N. DEFINITION, A REFUGEE IS SOMEONE WHO IS FORCED TO LEAVE THEIR HOME BECAUSE OF VIOLENCE (IN THIS CASE THE VERY REAL VIOLENCE OF BEING EVICTED), AND WHO HAS A WELL-FOUNDED FEAR OF PERSECUTION FOR REASONS OF BEING A MEMBER OF A PARTICULAR SOCIAL GROUP (I.E., THE UNSHELTERED IMPOVERISHED). OF THE 65 MILLION AND GROWING NUMBER OF REFUGEES WORLDWIDE, A LOOK AT AI WEIWEI'S RECENT FILM "HUMAN FLOW" SHOWS THAT SURPRISINGLY MANY SUCH REFUGEES STILL HAVE THE SPARK OF HUMAN SPIRIT SHINING IN THEIR EYES--SOMETHING WE DON'T SEE WITH MANY OF OUR HOMELESS HERE IN PORTLAND.

871 7. PORTLAND'S HOMELESS PROBLEM FOR ITS SIZE IS MORE PRONOUNCED THAN SOME OTHER COMPARABLE CITIES IN THE U.S, BECAUSE OF OUR EFFORTS IN THE PAST TO PROVIDE SHELTER FOR AS MANY AS POSSIBLE, "TO TURN NO ONE AWAY"--A POLICY THAT HAS LED TO MANY HOMELESS NOW MIGRATING HERE FROM OTHER STATES IN GREATER NUMBERS IN CONSEQUENCE. WE CURRENTLY ARE AMONG THE TOP FIVE CITIES IN THE UNITED STATES FOR INCIDENCE OF HOMELESSNESS, WITH AN ESTIMATED RATE OF 5.86 HOMELESS PEOPLE PER 1,000 POPULATION (SEE: [HTTP://WWW.OREGONLIVE.COM/PORTLAND-HOMELESS/HCOUNT.HTML](http://www.oregonlive.com/portland-homeless/hcount.html)). ROWS OF MAKESHIFT TENTS NOW LINE MANY OF OUR STREETS, PEOPLE SLEEP IN DOORWAYS IN THEIR OWN URINE IN THE INNER CITY, THEY ROAM THE CITY WITH SHOPPING CARTS OF DEPOSIT BOTTLES AND/OR TATTERED POSSESSIONS BUNDLED IN PLASTIC BAGS, AND BEG ON MANY STREET CORNERS, SOMETIMES QUITE AGGRESSIVELY. IT IS A DEVASTATING TESTIMONY OF A DEEP STRUCTURAL PROBLEM IN AMERICA, AND OUR ATTEMPT AT A SOLUTION HAS SIMPLY EXACERBATED OUR LOCAL PROBLEM BY OUR TAKING ON MORE OF THE NATION'S PROBLEM THAN WE ARE ALREADY DEMONSTRATING AN INCAPABILITY FOR DOING.

872 8. THIS IS A HUMANITARIAN EFFORT FOR WHICH WE CAN BE PROUD IN SOME RESPECTS. YET IN GERMANY ALONE, WHICH IS ROUGHLY THE SIZE OF OREGON, THERE ARE OVER 1.2 MILLION REFUGEES, ALMOST TWICE WHAT WE HAVE HERE IN THE WHOLE COUNTRY. GERMANY NEVERTHELESS ABSORBS MANY OF THESE REFUGEES. BUT IT CERTAINLY HAS NOT TRIED TO SOLVE THE PROBLEM BY APPROACHES SUCH AS RESIDENTIAL INFILL. THEY BUILD LARGE HOUSING COMPLEXES IN SEMI-RURAL AREAS TO PROVIDE BASIC SHELTER, AND MANY COMMUNITY MEMBERS FURTHER VOLUNTEER THEIR TIME TO HELP THE REFUGEES IN A HOST OF OTHER HUMANITARIAN WAYS AS WELL--FROM PROVIDING TRANSPORTATION WHEN NEEDED, TO FOOD AND LEGAL NEEDS, ETC. IF THERE IS TRULY A CONCERN FOR ACCESSIBLE HOUSING IN PORTLAND, APARTMENT COMPLEXES AND MODEST HOMES COULD BE BUILT IN LESS DENSE, MASS-TRANSIT ACCESSIBLE NEIGHBORHOODS IN GATEWAY AND BEYOND, WITH MUCH GREATER EFFECT

([HTTP://WWW.OREGONLIVE.COM/PORTLAND/INDEX.SSF/2013/07/BROKEN_PROMISES_GATEWAYS_LOST.HTML](http://www.oregonlive.com/portland/index.ssf/2013/07/broken_promises_gateways_lost.html)) . BUT HISTORICALLY THERE HAS BEEN LITTLE MONEY FOR REVITALIZING GATEWAY, OR IN BUILDING COMPLEXES FOR THE HOMELESS, OR MODEST DWELLINGS FOR THE POOR. THE REALITY IS THAT THIS INFILL PROJECT ATTEMPTING TO LAUNCH ITSELF IN OUR NEIGHBORHOOD HAS VERY LITTLE TO DO WITH PROVIDING ACCESSIBLE HOUSING FOR THE POOR, AND VERY MUCH TO DO WITH DEVELOPERS INTERESTED IN REAPING MORE PROFITS BY SELLING MORE HOUSES AT CURRENT MARKET PRICES IN ALREADY ESTABLISHED DESIRABLE AREAS--"ACCESSIBLE" TO ONLY THOSE WHO CAN AFFORD PORTLAND'S SPIRALING REAL ESTATE MARKET.

873 9. SOCIALLY CONSCIOUS PLANNING WITH AUTHENTIC CONCERNS FOR ACCESSIBILITY MIGHT REQUIRE PROFIT-DRIVEN DEVELOPERS TO PROVIDE X AMOUNT OF TRULY LOW INCOME HOUSING, IN TRANSIT ACCESSIBLE OUTLYING AREAS OF PORTLAND, FOR EVERY SO MANY SQUARE FEET OF HIGH DENSITY APARTMENT COMPLEXES THEY BRING INTO PORTLAND. THIS WOULD CONSTITUTE A CONTROL ON RAMPANT GROWTH WHILE REQUIRING A SOCIAL CONSCIOUSNESS ON THE PART OF DEVELOPERS FOR GROWTH TO OCCUR. IF PORTLAND IS THE VALUABLE HOUSING MARKET EVERYONE SEEMS TO THINK IT IS, GROWTH MAY BE SLOWED BY THIS KIND OF "TAX", BUT THERE WILL STILL BE INTEREST.

874 10. IT IS IMPORTANT TO NOTE HERE TOO THAT MEADOWPARK LOTS ARE NOT ORIGINAL SUBSTANDARD LOTS OF RECORD. THE ORIGINAL LOTS WERE PLATTED IN 25' INCREMENTS AS PLATS OF CONSOLIDATION. NOW THIS ZONING LAW WOULD BE TRYING TO CHANGE THESE INTO PLATS OF SUBDIVISION, BUT THIS WAS NEVER THEIR ORIGINAL PARCELLIZATION.

875 10 IN A COMPARABLE ZONING AMENDMENT IN BOISE, IDAHO BETWEEN 1999-2002, EXPERIENCE

SHOWS THAT WITHOUT RESISTANCE ON THE PART OF NEIGHBORHOODS INVOLVED, CITY OFFICIALS THERE DID LITTLE TO REGULATE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN OR REQUIRE SERVICES/AMENITIES TO ACCOMPANY REDEVELOPMENT. AS IS THE CASE WITH THIS REZONING ATTEMPT HERE IN PORTLAND NOW AS WELL, THEY ALSO INITIATED THE REZONING AS AN ADMINISTRATIVE ACT, WITH LIMITED OPPORTUNITY FOR OPPOSITION (AS IN THE PORTLAND PLANNING COMMISSION CURRENTLY DICTATING A 2-MINUTE LIMIT ON TESTIMONY FROM CONCERNED NEIGHBORS), RATHER THAN BRINGING IT TO THE PEOPLE THEMSELVES FOR A VOTE. EFFECTIVE ARGUMENT WITH NO POWER TO BACK IT UP, HOWEVER WELL DOCUMENTED, SEEMS UNLIKELY TO SWAY THE PORTLAND PLANNING AND SUSTAINABILITY COMMISSION TO STRIKE DOWN THIS REZONING REQUEST. BY ADMINISTRATIVELY UNDERMINING HEALTHY RESISTANCE FROM PEOPLE CONCERNED ABOUT THEIR NEIGHBORHOODS IN BOISE, REDEVELOPMENT OF SMALLER LOTS DRAMATICALLY ESCALATED, IN THE NAME OF "ACCESSIBILITY", AS VACANT LAND SCARCITY AND RAPIDLY RISING LAND VALUES SPURRED DEVELOPERS ON. THIS TYPE OF REDEVELOPMENT BECAME WIDESPREAD, EXISTING HOUSES WERE DEMOLISHED, PARCELS SPLIT INTO SMALLER LOTS, AND NEW AND MORE NUMEROUS HOUSES WERE CONSTRUCTED IN INCREASING DENSIFICATION THAT NEGATIVELY CHANGED THE CHARACTER OF BOISE NEIGHBORHOODS TO THIS DAY. (SEE IDAHO SMART GROWTH'S "THE CONSEQUENCES OF RESIDENTIAL INFILL DEVELOPMENT ON EXISTING NEIGHBORHOODS IN THE TREASURE VALLEY"

[HTTP://WWW.IDAHOSMARTGROWTH.ORG/APP/UPLOADS/2014/04/ULIISG_INFILL_REPORT1.PDF](http://www.idahosmartgrowth.org/app/uploads/2014/04/ULIISG_INFILL_REPORT1.PDF) THE POSITIVE ANECDOTAL EXCEPTION IN THE STUDY WAS THE FAVORABLE SURVEY REPOSSES SPECIFICALLY FROM PEOPLE WHO BOUGHT THE NEW INFILL HOUSES) WE CAN LEARN SOMETHING FROM THIS. REZONING SHOULD NOT BE CHanneled AS SOLELY AN ADMINISTRATIVE ACT. GIVEN THE REALITY OF ALREADY EXISTENT OVERCROWDING IN THE BEAUMONT WILSHIRE NEIGHBORHOOD, IT IS SIMPLY IRRESPONSIBLE, AND TANTAMOUT TO THE FOX "REZONING" HOW CHICKEN COOPS WILL BE MADE.

876 11. OUR NEIGHBORHOOD HAS A LONG-ESTABLISHED PORTLAND "IDENTITY" THAT MAKES IT DESIRABLE TO LIVE HERE IN SO MANY WAYS. THAT IDENTITY, THE VIBRANCY THAT MAKES IT DESIRABLE, IS ALREADY BEING DRAMATICALLY UNDERMINED BY INCREASING DENSIFICATION. THERE ARE ALREADY MANY INDICATORS OF THIS:

877 12. WHILE SUSTAINABLE INFILL MAY HAVE A PLACE IN MEETING THE NEEDS OF URBAN GROWTH. INCREASED RESIDENTIAL IN-FILL IN ALREADY SATURATED NEIGHBORHOODS SUCH AS OURS IS BEING ACCOMMODATED BY HIGHER INCIDENCES OF CRIME, GREATER ALIENATION OF PEOPLE FROM THEIR ENVIRONMENT, AND REDUCTION IN REAL PROPERTY VALUES--IT IS ESSENTIALLY AN ASSAULT BY THE CITY IN CASHING IN WITH DEVELOPERS TO EXPLOIT THE PEOPLE WHO HAVE MADE THIS NEIGHBORHOOD NOW THE DESIRABLE COMMODITY THAT IT IS. THIS CAN BE DOCUMENTED.

878 13. ACCORDING TO AMANDA FRITZ, IN 2008, OREGON HAD LARGE DECREASES IN BOTH VIOLENT AND PROPERTY CRIME. WITH THE LARGEST DECREASE OF ANY STATE IN VIOLENT CRIME RATE (10.6%) AND THE 8TH LARGEST DECREASE IN THE PROPERTY CRIME RATE AT 6.9%. THE LAST TIME VIOLENT CRIME IN OREGON WAS LOWER WAS 1970, AND THE PROPERTY CRIME RATE HAD NOT BEEN LOWER SINCE 1966, MOVING OREGON DOWN TO THE 40TH HIGHEST VIOLENT CRIME RATE AND THE 23RD HIGHEST PROPERTY CRIME RATE--BOTH RECORD LOWS.

[HTTPS://WWW.PORTLANDONLINE.COM/FRITZ/INDEX.CFM?C=49233&A=272362](https://www.portlandonline.com/fritz/index.cfm?c=49233&a=272362). NOW IN 2018, HOWEVER, THE CRIME RATE IN PORTLAND IS HIGHER THAN IN 89.6% OF CITIES IN THE UNITED STATES [HTTP://WWW.CITY-DATA.COM/CRIME/CRIME-PORTLAND-OREGON.HTML](http://www.city-data.com/crime/crime-portland-oregon.html) THE CRIME INDEX FOR THE CITY IN 2016 WAS 409.9, COMPARED WITH A NATIONAL INDEX OF 236.5. THEFTS PER 100,000 IN PORTLAND IN 2009 HAD DROPPED DOWN TO 19,624, BUT SINCE THEN HAVE ONCE AGAIN BEEN CLIMBING SLOWLY TO 24,099 IN 2016

[HTTP://WWW.CITY-DATA.COM/CRIME/CRIME-PORTLAND-OREGON.HTML](http://www.city-data.com/crime/crime-portland-oregon.html). WHILE THE VAGUE CATEGORY OF "SERIOUS" CRIMES, USED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION IN MAKING ITS CASE, MAY HAVE DROPPED ([HTTP://WWW.PORTLANDONLINE.COM/PORTLANDPLAN/INDEX.CFM?C=45722&A=632343](http://www.portlandonline.com/portlandplan/index.cfm?c=45722&a=632343)), THE OVERALL INCIDENCE OF CRIME HAS RISEN SIGNIFICANTLY. THE STATISTICS ARE THERE--IT'S JUST A MATTER OF WHAT YOU WANT TO LOOK AT. FAR AND AWAY THE BULK OF THE CRIME IN PORTLAND OCCURS IN MULTNOMAH COUNTY (SEE CRIME STATISTICS FOR MULTNOMAH COUNTY IN THE APRIL 2018 "PORTLAND MONTHLY" MAGAZINE)

879 14. FROM A PURELY IMMEDIATE STANDPOINT, THE INCREASE OF CRIME IN MULTNOMAH COUNTY, AND A TESTAMENT TO THE EXTENT TO WHICH OUR POLICE FORCE IS OVERWHELMED BY IT IN CONSEQUENCE, CAN BE SEEN SIMPLY IN THE INCREASED RESPONSE TIMES TO CRIME WITH POLICE HAVING TO MORE CRITICALLY TRIAGE THEIR SERVICES. SO, FOR INSTANCE, WHEN WE HAD OUR CAR WINDOW SMASHED AND BROKEN INTO, IT TOOK THE POLICE LITERALLY HOURS TO COME OUT. OTHERS OF OUR NEIGHBORS HAVE SIMILAR EXAMPLES.

880 11. BY 2016 STATISTICS, THE AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD SIZE IN BEAUMONT WILSHIRE (BW) WAS 5.9 PEOPLE, AS COMPARED TO 2.4 PEOPLE FOR PORTLAND AS A WHOLE. THE PERCENTAGE OF FAMILY HOUSEHOLDS IN BW WAS 50.9%, AS COMPARED TO 40.4% OF PORTLAND AS A WHOLE. ADDITIONALLY, 73.6% OF THOSE BW HOUSEHOLDS HAVE MARRIED COUPLES WITH BOTH WORKING TO MAKE ENDS MEET, AS OPPOSED TO 72.6% FOR PORTLAND AS A WHOLE. OF THE 2852 HOUSES CURRENTLY IN BEAUMONT WILSHIRE, 1630 (57%) WERE BUILT BEFORE 1939. THESE STATISTICS ARE GOOD INDICATORS THAT AS A COMMUNITY OF HARD WORKING FAMILIES IN LOVINGLY TENDED HISTORIC HOMES, WE ARE DOING ALREADY MORE THAN OUR SHARE OF PROVIDING HOUSING FOR RESIDENTS OF OUR CITY.

881 12. PEOPLE WHO ARGUE FOR RESIDENTIAL INFILL TRY TO MAINTAIN THAT IT IS GOOD FOR A COMMUNITY BECAUSE PROPERTY VALUES ACTUALLY GO UP. HISTORICALLY, THE REALITY OF THIS IS A LITTLE DIFFERENT THAN THEY WOULD IMPLY. IT'S ALL A MATTER OF HOW YOU CHOOSE TO "SLICE THE PIE" IN MAKING YOUR CASE. RESIDENTIAL INFILL CAN EVEN LEAD TO LOWER SALES PRICES PER HOME, BUT AT HIGHER PRICES PER SQUARE FOOT AND THUS INCREASED PROPERTY VALUES--ESSENTIALLY AN INCREASE IN CITY PROPERTY TAX BASE AT HOMEOWNER'S EXPENSE. THE AFFECT THIS CAN HAVE ON NEIGHBORHOODS IS A HIDDEN TAX ABOVE AND BEYOND CURRENT PROPERTY TAXES, BROUGHT ABOUT BY ERODING NEIGHBORHOOD INTEGRITY. THINK OF IT THIS WAY: IF YOU TAKE A 50-FOOT-FRONT PROPERTY SELLING AT \$500,000.00, WHERE ONE FAMILY IS PAYING \$6,000.00 IN PROPERTY TAXES, AND DIVIDE IT INTO TWO 25-FOOT-FRONTAL PROPERTIES SELLING AT \$350,000 EACH, WITH PROPERTY TAXES NOW AT \$4,000.00 EACH, THE OVERALL PROPERTY VALUE OF THE PARCELS GOES UP BY \$200,000.00, AND THE CITY TAX BASE INCREASES BY \$2,000.00, SO YOU COULD INDEED SAY THAT PROPERTY VALUES ARE GOING UP, WHILE IT IS EQUALLY THE CASE THAT RESIDENTS ARE NOW GETTING LESS VALUE FOR MORE MONEY. WHO IS IT THAT WINS HERE IN THIS STATISTICAL GAME? IT IS NOT THE NEIGHBORHOODS. AS HOUSING COSTS RISE WE ARE WITNESSING SHARP DECREASES IN THE NUMBER OF ECONOMIC SELF-SUFFICIENT HOUSEHOLDS IN PORTLAND (HTTP://WWW.PORTLANDONLINE.COM/PORTLANDPLAN/INDEX.CFM?C=45722&A=632343

882 13. PEOPLE MAKE THE ARGUMENT THAT PORTLAND NEEDS AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND SO THESE SUBDIVISIONS ARE NECESSARY. WE CURRENTLY ARE SEEING INSTANCES OF 1 BEDROOM/STUDIO APARTMENTS BEING BUILT OVER GARAGES IN OUR NEIGHBORHOOD AND RENTING FOR \$2,000.00 OR MORE A MONTH. MY WIFE AND I MOVED TO PORTLAND IN 1998 AND TOOK A MORTGAGE ON OUR CURRENT 2 BEDROOM HOME FOR WHICH WE PAY ABOUT \$1300.00 PER MONTH (THIS INCLUDES HOMEOWNER'S INSURANCE AND CURRENT PROPERTY TAXES). IRONICALLY, WE WOULD BE UNABLE TO AFFORD A 1-BEDROOM APARTMENT OVER A GARAGE FOR \$2000.00 A MONTH TODAY. EVEN A "REDUCED" RATE OF \$1500.0 WOULD BE A CHALLENGE. THE ISSUE OF WHAT IS LABELLED AS PROVIDING AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN A HOUSING MARKET WITH RISING PRICES IS THEREFORE A PERPETUALLY RELATIVE TERM. A VERY GOOD CASE CAN BE MADE IN LIGHT OF RESIDENTS SUCH AS OURSELVES THAT PORTLAND IS ALREADY OFFERING MORE ACCESSIBLE HOUSING THEN WILL BE THE CASE WITH DEMOLITION AND NEW HIGHER MORTGAGED HOMES. REPLACING A 2-3 BEDROOM HOME WITH TWO MORE EXPENSIVE 1-2 BEDROOM HOMES, FOR INSTANCE, IS NOT NECESSARILY AN INCREASE IN ACCESSIBILITY.

883 14. THOSE OF US WHO LIVE ON NE 33RD ARE WELL AWARE OF THE DRAMATIC INCREASE IN TRAFFIC THERE AS OPPOSED TO ONLY A FEW YEARS AGO. THE INCREASE IS ACROSS ALL HOURS OF THE DAY, AND BUMPER TO BUMPER IN THE MORNING AND EVENINGS. INCREASING RESIDENTIAL INFILL IN THIS AREA IS ONLY GOING TO INCREASE THIS PROBLEM, AND BRING EVEN MORE TRAFFIC INTO TYPICALLY SUBSTANDARD SIDE STREETS AS WELL (WITH POTENTIALLY EVEN HIGHER TAXES TO PAY FOR UPGRADES, ABOVE AND BEYOND THE \$64 MILLION FUNDED BY MEASURE 26-173 IN 2016).

884 15. ALL OF US WHO LIVE IN THIS AREA ARE WITNESSING THIS INCREASED SIDE-STREET TRAFFIC AS WELL--IT BEING PART OF THE REASON FOR THE RECENT "TWENTY IS PLENTY" PUSH. THE REALITY OF MORE AND MORE PEOPLE TRAVELING THROUGH OUR NEIGHBORHOODS IN A HURRY TO GET SOMEWHERE ELSE, WITHOUT REGARD FOR THE RESIDENTS THEY SPEED PAST, IS ANOTHER EXAMPLE OF OUR NEIGHBORHOOD ALREADY BEING TAXED BY DENSITY. PORTAND DATA RELEASED IN MAY OF 2017, SHOWS INCREASES IN ALL CATEGORIES OF MOTOR VEHICLE ACCIDENTS, AS WELL AS INCREASED INCIDENCES INVOLVING PEDESTRIANS.

HTTP://WWW.OREGON.GOV/ODOT/DATA/DOCUMENTS/QUICKFACTS_2015.PDF

885 16. INCREASED ROAD TRAFFIC AND ACCIDENTS ALSO LEADS BIKERS, IN THE INTEREST OF THEIR SAFETY IN NOT WANTING TO BIKE ON HEAVILY TRAFFICKED NARROW NEIGHBORHOD ROADS, TO RIDE MORE NOW ON SIDEWALKS, ALREADY TOO NARROW TO ACCOMMODATE MORE THAN TWO ABREAST. BICYCLES ON SIDEWALKS ARE ILLEGAL AND CONSTITUTE ANOTHER HAZARD OF THEIR OWN, BUT AS TRAFFIC DENSITY INCREASES, THIS BECOMES ANOTHER REALITY REFLECTIVE OF THIS DENSITY.

886 17. WITH INCREASED TRAFFIC ALSO COMES INCREASED CARBON MONOXIDE AND OTHER POLLUTANTS (INCLUDING NOISE POLLUTION), ALREADY CERTAINLY A PROBLEM ON NE 33RDAVENUE, BUT ELSEWHERE IN BW AS WELL. EVEN AS CARBON EMMISIONS FOR PORTLAND AS A WHOLE HAVE DECLINED SINCE 1990

(HTTP://WWW.PORTLANDONLINE.COM/PORTLANDPLAN/INDEX.CFM?C=45722&A=632343), THEIR CONCENTRATION IN SELECT AREAS OF PORTLAND CAN BE SEEN TO BE INCREASING --WITH THE CARBON EMISSIONS ON NE 33RD, FREMONT, NE 39TH, AND NE 42ND ALONE, THE BEAUMONT WILSHIRE AREA IS ALREADY CARRYING MORE THAN ITS SHARE OF THIS LOAD.

887 18. AS TRAFFIC INCREASES, CRIME GOES UP ALIENATION FROM ONE'S COMMUNITY RISES, ETC., NEIGHBORHOOD INTEGRITY GETS FURTHER ERODED UNTIL DEVELOPERS, WITNESSING THE LOSS OF A NEIGHBORHOOD'S IDENTITY HAVING OCCURRED, BEGIN TO GET AN EYE FOR POTENTIALLY EVEN LARGER PROJECTS--PROJECTS FOR APARTMENT COMPLEXES, FOR EXAMPLE (AS IN THE ABOVE-MENTIONED RECENT ATTEMPT BEING MADE TO DO THIS ON NE 33RD BELOW FREMONT) THAT WOULDN'T DARE BE CONCEIVED BUT A FEW YEARS EARLIER. WHILE LARGE COMPLEXES MAY HAVE A CAREFULLY PLANNED PLACE ON WIDER AND MORE ACCESSIBLE STREETS (I.E., A GREATER ROADWAY

NETWORK LIKE SANDY BOULEVARD), THEY SHOULD NOT BE PERMITTED TO INVADE THE IDENTITY OF OUR ESTABLISHED RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS. AS A NEIGHBORHOOD LOSES ITS IDENTITY IT IS MORE SUSCEPTIBLE TO BEING INVADDED BY DEVELOPERS FEELING "THE FOOT IN THE DOOR" THAT LOSS OF DEFINED IDENTITY AND CORRESPONDING LOSS OF SOCIAL SPACE PROVIDES. THIS RESIDENTIAL INFILL REZONING WILL SERVE TO ALLOW JUST SUCH A FOOT IN A DOOR THAT IS ALREADY OPEN BEYOND HEALTHY LIMITS.

888 19. RESIDENTIAL INFILL CONSTITUTES A LOSS OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE NEIGHBORHOOD SPACE. GREATER LOSS OF MATURE TREES, CUT DOWN TO ACCOMMODATE MORE HOUSING, MEANS A GREATER CARBON FOOTPRINT, AND LESS SPACE BETWEEN YOU AND YOUR NEIGHBOR MEANS LESS ACCESSIBILITY TO SURROUNDING NATURE, WITH PEOPLE PUTTING UP MORE FENCES BETWEEN THEMSELVES AND THEIR NEIGHBORS TO GAIN NEEDED PRIVACY BROUGHT ON BY CLOSER PROXIMITY. AS HERBERT GANS AND OTHERS HAVE SHOWN (SEE, FOR EXAMPLE, THE URBAN VILLAGERS), INFILL AND THE CREATION OF TIGHTER SOCIAL SPACE INCULCATES GREATER SOCIAL DISTANCE AND A LOSS OF NEIGHBORHOOD INTEGRITY AS PEOPLE BEGIN TO DEFINE SOCIAL SPACE MORE INWARDLY—FINDING THEIR SOCIAL SPACE LESS OUTSIDE THEIR HOMES AND MORE WITHIN THEM. MORE HIGH FENCES, LESS GROUND UPON WHICH TO GARDEN AND ENJOY OUTSIDE, LESS SPACE OUTSIDE FOR CHILDREN TO PLAY, LESS TIME OUTSIDE OVERALL IN ONE'S NEIGHBORHOOD, ALSO MEANS LESS EYES REGULARLY OUTSIDE AND LOOKING OUT ONTO PUBLIC SPACES, AND SO CONSEQUENTLY A GREATER LOSS OF AN OTHERWISE BUILT-IN SOCIAL POLICING MECHANISM. MORE BUILDINGS, AND HIGHER BUILDINGS, ALSO BRINGS WITH IT LOSS OF NATURAL LIGHT AND LOSS OF VIEWS THAT DEFINE A MORE HUMAN SCALE (SEE CHRISTOPHER ALEXANDER ET. AL., A PATTERN LANGUAGE FOR EXPERIENTIALLY-BASED ARTICULATIONS OF THESE EXAMPLES)

889 20. IN HER BOOK, WELCOME TO YOUR WORLD, INTERNATIONALLY RECOGNIZED ARCHITECT AND AUTHOR SARAH WILLIAMS GOLDHAGEN MAKES THE POINT THAT WE NEED ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN AND PROPORTION THAT TAKES INTO ACCOUNT HOW OUR HUMAN FORMS AND SENSORY AND MOTOR FACULTIES DETERMINE WAYS IN WHICH WE OCCUPY AND ENGAGE WITH OUR PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENTS. THE MORE COMPREHENSIVE AND DEEPER THIS UNDERSTANDING IS REFLECTED IN URBAN PLANNING, THE LESS STRESSFUL AND MORE NOURISHING OUR ENVIRONMENTS ARE. INCORPORATIONS OF SOCIALLY ACCESSIBLE ELEMENTS, SUCH AS THESE EXAMPLES OF SURROUNDING NATURE, LIGHTING AND SOCIAL SPACE GIVEN ABOVE, ALL SERVE TO HUMANIZE BUILT ENVIRONMENTS AND ATTRACT PEOPLE TO WANT TO BE IN THEM—AND HAVE ALSO BEEN FOUND IN STUDIES TO SIGNIFICANTLY LOWER SUCH STRESS INDICATORS AS HEART RATES, BLOOD PRESSURE AND CORTISOL LEVELS. CONSCIOUSLY ENGINEERING THIS ACCESSIBLE SOCIALITY IS ULTIMATELY MORE IMPORTANT THAN PUSHING FOR "ACCESSIBLE HOUSING" AT ALL COSTS.

890 21. INFILL PROJECTS TAKE SPACE FROM THE NEIGHBORHOOD WHILE GIVING NOTHING PUBLICALLY BACK IN RETURN. SCHOOLS LIKE BEVERLY CLEARY AND GRANT HIGH ARE ALREADY BEYOND CAPACITY (SEE, FOR EXAMPLE, [HTTP://KATU.COM/NEWS/LOCAL/OVERCROWDING-PLAGUES-BEVERLY-CLEARY-SCHOOL](http://katu.com/news/local/overcrowding-plagues-beverly-cleary-school), AND [HTTPS://PDXEAN.WORDPRESS.COM/2014/02/05/OVERCROWDING-IN-THE-GRANT-CLUSTER-WHAT-CAN-BE-AND-IS-BEING-DONE-BY-KELSEY-ROBERTSON/](https://pdxean.wordpress.com/2014/02/05/overcrowding-in-the-grant-cluster-what-can-be-and-is-being-done-by-kelsey-robertson/)). DO WE REALLY SERVE THE INTEREST OF "ACCESSIBILITY" BY CRAMMING MORE PEOPLE INTO OUR NEIGHBORHOOD TO FLOOD THESE SCHOOLS EVEN MORE? HAVE YOU SEEN THE LONG LINES AT HOLLYWOOD THEATER OR KENNEDY SCHOOL LATELY? MORE OFTEN THAN NOT NOW IT IS THE CASE THAT IF YOU WANT TO GUARANTEE GETTING A SEAT FOR A FILM YOU NEED TO GO ONLINE AND PURCHASE IT IN ADVANCE. OUR NEIGHBORHOODS ARE BECOMING MORE CROWDED, AND THE PUBLIC FACILITIES FOR SERVING THESE NEIGHBORHOODS ARE IN TURN BECOMING MORE TAXED BY THE DEMANDS OF THESE CROWDS. IN CONSEQUENCE OUR NEIGHBORHOOD IS ALREADY BEING CHALLENGED IN TERMS OF ITS DESIRABILITY AS A PLACE TO LIVE.

891 22. THERE ARE MANY OLDER HISTORIC HOMES IN OUR NEIGHBORHOOD. THE FIRST OBJECTIVE IN ACCOMMODATING CHANGE IN OLDER NEIGHBORHOODS LIKE OURS SHOULD BE TO ENCOURAGE REGULATIONS AND LAND USES THAT ALLOW FOR DEVELOPMENT THAT BLENDS WITH EXISTING HOMES AND PRESERVES HISTORIC LANDMARKS AND THE NEIGHBORHOOD'S IDENTITY. THE MORE WE AS NEIGHBORS ALLOW THE CITY AND OUTSIDE DEVELOPERS TO ENGAGE IN DECONSTRUCTING OUR IDENTITY, THE LESS GROUND WE HAVE FOR HOLDING ONTO IT.

892 23. FROM WHERE DO PROJECTIONS COME REGARDING PORTLAND'S FUTURE POPULATION GROWTH? METRO CURRENTLY CALCULATES SUCH GROWTH VIA A DEMOGRAPHIC "METROSCOPE" EQUATION THAT ESTIMATES TOMORROW'S POPULATION BASED UPON TODAY'S POPULATION PLUS CHANGES IN BIRTHS, DEATHS AND NET MIGRATION IN THE ENTIRE METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREA. IN PORTLAND, WITH OVERALL LOWER BIRTH AND FERTILITY RATES, THE MAIN CONTRIBUTING VARIABLE IN THIS EQUATION IS NET MIGRATION. MIGRATION TOTALS IN PORTLAND ARE DEVELOPED USING AN ECONOMETRIC MODEL THAT PRODUCES A TREND MIGRATION-LEVEL FORECAST. THESE ASSUMPTIONS ARE PRODUCED USING A "SURVIVED POPULATION METHOD" BETWEEN THE LAST TWO DECENNIAL CENSUSES (I.E., 2000 AND 2010). BY DECOMPOSING THE COMPONENTS OF POPULATION CHANGE BETWEEN THE LAST TWO CENSUS YEARS, CHANGE IN GROWTH DUE TO BIRTHS, DEATHS AND NET MIGRATION IS COMPUTED AND RATIOS ARE EXTRAPOLATED TO PRODUCE MIGRATION DETAILS GOING FORWARD (<https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2016/07/01/FAQ-%20Metro-2060-Population-Forecast.pdf>) SIMPLY PUT THEN, FUTURE MIGRATION RATES ARE EXTRAPOLATED BASED UPON PAST

MIGRATION RATES. THIS IS THUS AN HISTORICALLY BASED PREDICTION THAT DOES NOT TAKE INTO ACCOUNT VARIABLES SUCH AS SATURATION, INFRASTRUCTURAL DEVELOPMENT, COST OF LIVING, EVER SHIFTING DESIRABILITY OF AN AREA IN RELATION TO OTHER AREAS, LOCALLY IMPOSED CONSTRAINTS ON GROWTH, CHANGES IN NATIONAL TRENDS, ETC.

893 24. OF COURSE EVERY CITY HAS AN INTEREST IN GROWTH, IN INCREASING ITS
INDUSTRY/BUSINESS, INCREASING ITS TAX BASE, ETC., AND THIS IS ESPECIALLY THE CASE UNDER
THE CURRENT FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION WHEN MUCH FEDERAL FUNDING IS BEING CUT BACK. SO
THERE IS ALWAYS AN UNDERLYING INTEREST IN SUCH PROJECTIONS TO PAINT A PICTURE, WHENEVER
POSSIBLE, OF A VIBRANT AND GROWING CITY. ON THE OTHER HAND, IN HIS WORK ON LIMITS TO
GROWTH, ANDREA KRISTINDOTTIR MAKES A CASE FOR SUSTAINABLE AND TRULY BENEFICIAL URBAN
GROWTH BEST ARISING BY INCORPORATING ASPECTS OF "DEGROWTH"—AN EQUITABLE DOWNSCALING OF
CONSUMPTION AND PRODUCTION IN ORDER TO LIVE WITHIN THE PACE OF A CITY'S ECOLOGICAL
LIMITS. THIS WAY OF THINKING IS RELEVANT TO URBAN PLANNING WHERE GROWTH IS MEASURED IN
URBAN STRUCTURES, AND THE CONSUMPTION WITHIN THEM, WHICH THEN LEAD TO EXTENSIVE SOCIAL
AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS. IT DOES NOT MEAN NEGATIVE GROWTH, BUT SIMPLY DIFFERENT
OBJECTIVES. AS A RESULT, THE GROWTH OF THE ECONOMY, AND ITS IMPACT IS TEMPERED, BECAUSE
REDUCING SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT WHILE CONTINUING TO SPIRAL ECONOMIC GROWTH IS
NOT POSSIBLE (SEE DEGROWTH: A VOCABULARY FOR A NEW ERA, BY D'ALISA, DEMARIA & KALLIS,
2015).

894 "FROM A SUSTAINABILITY POINT OF VIEW, THE MOST PROBLEMATIC TRAITS
895 OF DEVELOPMENT IN THE CITIES OF THE INDUSTRIALIZED COUNTRIES ARE
896 CLOSELY LINKED TO ECONOMIC GROWTH AND THE STRATEGIES OF
897 BUSINESSES AND AUTHORITIES TO STIMULATE THIS GROWTH" (SEE DESIGN
898 FOR A SUSTAINABLE CULTURE: PERSPECTIVES, PRACTICES AND EDUCATION,
899 BY HØYER & NÆSS, 2001, P. 181).
900 URBAN PLANNING HAS TRADITIONALLY BEEN A TOOL TO ACCOMMODATE GROWTH BY PLANNING FOR NEW
BUILDINGS AND INFRASTRUCTURE, BUT HAS NOT REALLY ATTEMPTED TO CONTROL GROWTH. PLANNERS
ARE OFTEN TECHNICAL PROFESSIONALS THAT ARE CLOSELY CONNECTED TO GROWTH RATIONALITIES,
WHERE THEY PRODUCE PHYSICAL SOLUTIONS FOR CONSTRUCTING BUILDINGS AND INFRASTRUCTURE FOR
CITIES WITH CONTINUOUSLY GROWING POPULATIONS THAT HAVE INCREASINGLY MORE SOCIAL AND
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (HØYER & NÆSS, 2001). TODAY, PLANNERS ARE FACED WITH CITIES AND
HUMAN HABITATS HAVING OUTGROWN ECOLOGICAL LIMITS, AND THIS NEEDS TO BE ADDRESSED NOT IN
CONTINUED RAMPANT GROWTH, BUT IN A MORE CONSCIOUS CREATION OF OUR SOCIAL
WORLD--CHANGING THE WAY WE THINK ABOUT AND IMPLEMENT URBAN DEVELOPMENT, CONSTRUCTION
AND CONSUMPTION, RESTRICTING WHAT HAS NEGATIVE SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT, AND
FURTHER LIVING OUR LIVES TO SCALE WITHIN OUR ECOLOGICAL BOUNDARIES. "WE HAVE TO
ESTABLISH ECOLOGICAL BOUNDS ON HUMAN ACTIVITY, FIX THE ILLITERATE ECONOMICS OF
RELENTLESS GROWTH, AND TRANSFORM THE DAMAGING SOCIAL LOGIC OF CONSUMERISM" (PROSPERITY
WITHOUT GROWTH; ECONOMICS FOR A FINITE PLANET, T. JACKSON, 2009, P. 204). FOR THIS,
BUILDING STOCK NEEDS TO BE CONSCIOUSLY TEMPERED TO KEEP WITHIN AN AREA'S ECOLOGICAL
LIMITS. URBAN PLANNING IS INFLUENTIAL WHEN IT COMES TO DETERMINING THE EXTENT OF
RESOURCE USE. IF URBAN PLANNING PROCEEDS WITH GROWTH ALONE AS AN OBJECTIVE AND
IMPLEMENTATION, THE NEGATIVE IMPACTS ARE LIKELY TO BE EXTENSIVE. IF "DEGROWTH" IS
EMPHASIZED, HOWEVER, SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL DEGRADATION IS LIKELY TO BE DECREASED.
THERE ARE DIFFERENT MINDSETS ABOUT HOW TO BEST GO ABOUT THIS, BUT ALL IN THIS FIELD
AGREE UPON THE NECESSITY OF A CONSCIOUSLY PLANNED DENSIFICATION, WHICH TAKES INTO
ACCOUNT SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS. ULTIMATELY, WHAT LIMITS THE GROWTH OF A CITY
IS NOT HOW FAST IT CAN CRANK OUT CONSTRUCTION OF MORE BUILDINGS. IN THEORY, THERE IS
NO LIMIT TO THE SIZE OF CITIES. IN PRACTICE, HOWEVER, GROWTH IS BOUND BY AN INABILITY
TO MANAGE SIZE IN A WAY THAT MAXIMIZES SCALE OPPORTUNITIES AND MINIMIZES COSTS. LARGE
URBAN CENTERS LIKE OURS REQUIRE LONG RANGE PLANNING THAT ASSESSES POLICY IMPACTS, AND
STRONG MANAGERIAL SKILLS IN WALKING THE OPTIMAL BALANCES. THERE ARE PLENTY OF
DYSFUNCTIONAL CITIES AROUND THE WORLD THAT HAVE NOT BEEN ABLE TO COPE WITH THE SPEED AT
WHICH THEIR POPULATIONS HAVE EXPANDED, BECAUSE THEIR GOVERNMENTS DID NOT RECOGNIZE THAT
THEY CAN EXERT CONTROL OVER THAT SPEED. PORTLAND HAS A STRONG HISTORY OF PROGRESSIVE
URBAN PLANNING--WHY NOT LEARN FROM THE PATTERNS OF DYSFUNCTIONAL GROWTH OF OTHERS AND
GET BEYOND THIS? WITHOUT SKILLFUL MANAGEMENT, CITIES BECOME CENTERS OF DECAY,
GRIDLOCK, CRIME, URBAN SPRAWL, SLUM HOUSING, AND POLLUTION. THE QUALITY OF LIFE
DETERIORATES AND ECONOMIC DYNAMISM FALTERS AS SCALE DISECONOMIES OUTWEIGH SCALE
BENEFITS. OVER THE NEXT 2 DECADES IT WILL BE MEDIUM SIZED CITIES LIKE PORTLAND THAT
WILL CARRY THE BULK OF THE POPULATION GROWTH OF TOMORROW, BUT THE POTENTIAL OF THIS
GROWTH WILL HAVE A LOT TO DO WITH THE HUMAN TERMS CONSIDERED IN THEIR PLANNING (SEE
RICHARD DOBBS AND JANNA REMES

<https://www.mckinsey.com/featured-insights/urbanization/whats-the-biggest-limit-on-city-growth>)

902 25. URBAN GROWTH ARISING FROM PRESSURE FROM OUTSIDE DEVELOPERS NOT INTERESTED IN
PLANNING, AND/OR FROM CITY CONCERNS FOR INCREASING THE TAX BASE WITHOUT A FARSIGHTED
VISION THAT WILL PREVENT A SHORT-TERM SOLUTION FROM BECOMING A GREATER LONG TERM
PROBLEM, WILL NOT ULTIMATELY SERVE PORTLAND'S BEST INTERESTS. HIGH DEMAND FOR HOUSING
MEANS RAPIDLY RISING LAND VALUES AND OPPORTUNITIES TO MAKE MONEY. I TRULY BELIEVE THE
PLANNING COMMISSION HAS THE INTEREST OF PORTLAND AT HEART. BUT HOW THIS WORKS OUT IN
PRACTICE, WITH PEOPLE WHO WANT TO MAKE MONEY WITHOUT LONG RANGE CONCERN FOR PORTLAND,
HAS TO BE CAREFULLY MEASURED. IF A PROPORTION OF PEOPLE FROM OUTSIDE PORTLAND WERE
CONFRONTED WITH THE PROSPECT THAT THEY COULD NOT MOVE HERE AT THE TIME THEY WANTED, NOT
BECAUSE HOUSING OR RENTAL PROPERTY ISN'T AVAILABLE, BUT BECAUSE THEY CAN'T FIND THE
HOUSE OR NEIGHBORHOOD THEY WANT TO LIVE IN--SOMETHING WHICH HAPPENS IN EVERY CITY--WHAT
WOULD HAPPEN TO OUR CITY WITH THIS KIND OF PACED GROWTH? WHAT WOULD HAPPEN IF, AS IN
VANCOUVER, B.C., PORTLAND SET A 15% TAX ON FOREIGN-BASED REAL ESTATE INVESTMENTS? DO WE
WANT TO MOVE TOWARD BECOMING SOME NIGHTMARISH VERSION OF PLACES LIKE GUTTENBERG OR
UNION CITY OR HOBOKEN, NEW JERSEY? ISN'T THE ABSENCE OF SUSTAINABLE GROWTH PART OF
THEIR PROBLEM TODAY?

([HTTPS://EN.WIKIPEDIA.ORG/WIKI/LIST_OF_UNITED_STATES_CITIES_BY_POPULATION_DENSITY](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_United_States_cities_by_population_density))
903 26. AS DEVELOPMENT EXPANDS, COSTS OF MATERIALS EXPAND ACCORDINGLY, BECAUSE OF THE HIGH
DEMAND. WHILE COST INCREASE INDICES CURRENTLY HOVER AROUND 5% FOR 2017
([HTTP://WWW.TURNERCONSTRUCTION.COM/COST-INDEX](http://www.turnerconstruction.com/cost-index)), IN REALITY THE TRANSLATION TO WHAT
DEVELOPERS THEN CHARGE IS MUCH HIGHER. SO, FOR EXAMPLE, THE ROOFING INDUSTRY RECORDED
ONE OF ITS MOST SUCCESSFUL YEARS EVER IN PORTLAND IN 2017. BASED UPON A RANDOM SURVEY
OF 3 DIFFERENT ROOFING COMPANIES IN PORTLAND, THEIR PRICES TODAY ARE NOW 33% OR MORE
ABOVE WHAT THEY WERE A YEAR AGO. IS THIS A MOVE TOWARD GREATER ACCESSIBILITY?

904 27. JANE JACOBS HAS SHOWN US THAT IN THE DEATH AND LIFE OF A CITY, THERE IS OFTEN THE
PHENOMENON OF PEOPLE WANTING TO GET INTO VITAL AREAS BECAUSE THERE IS A CULTURE AND
QUALITY OF LIFE THERE, OF WHICH THEY WANT TO BE A PART. BUT AS THE CROWDING-IN OCCURS,
THIS CULTURE AND QUALITY OF LIFE IS INCREASINGLY CROWDED OUT, UNTIL WHAT IT IS THAT
PEOPLE HAVE COME FOR, IS GONE. YOU CAN SEE THIS MICRO-ECONOMICALLY, FOR EXAMPLE, IN
MAJOR CITY INTERSECTIONS, WHERE BANKS AND OTHER LARGE INSTITUTIONS WITH BUYING POWER
PREFERENTIALLY MANUEVER TO OBTAIN DESIRABLE CORNER LOTS, UNTIL THERE IS ONLY ONE OR
EVEN NO CORNER LOTS LEFT FOR ANYTHING ELSE, AND THE INTERSECTION BECOMES "DEAD". WHAT
KIND OF LIFE DO WE WANT OUR BEAUMONT WILSHIRE NEIGHBORHOOD TO HAVE? WHAT KIND OF LIFE
DO WE WANT OUR CITY TO HAVE?

905 28. THE NATIONAL AVERAGE VACANCY RATE IN THE UNITED STATES AS OF 2015 WAS ABOUT 7%,
RANGING FROM ABOUT 20% IN PARTS OF ALABAMA TO JUST UNDER 3% IN VERMONT
([HTTPS://WWW.APARTMENTLIST.COM/RENTONOMICS/RENTAL-VACANCY-RATES/](https://www.apartmentlist.com/rentonomics/rental-vacancy-rates/)) WHILE THE U.S.
CENSUS BUREAU PLACES PORTLAND'S RENTAL HOUSING VACANCY RATE AT 3.4%
(<https://www.portlandoregon.gov/phb/article/468119>), THIS CAN VARY GREATLY DEPENDING
UPON WHERE YOU WANT TO LIVE IN PORTLAND. SO, FOR EXAMPLE, VACANCY RATES ARE CURRENTLY
GENERALLY HIGHER IN DOWNTOWN, NORTHWEST PORTLAND, AND CLOSE-IN NORTHEAST AND SOUTHEAST,
AND LOWEST IN OUTER NORTHEAST, BEAVERTON, ALOHA AND OREGON CITY. MANY EXISTING
APARTMENT COMPLEXES IN THE NORTHEAST ARE ACTUALLY OFFERING INCENTIVES TO TRY TO ATTRACT
RENTERS. WHILE THE PLANNING COMMISSION HAS AN UNDERSTANDABLE MISSION TO PLAN FOR
RESPONSIBLE GROWTH, WE ARE NOT THEN SUFFERING A CRISIS OF ACCESSIBILITY IN THIS AREA.
EVEN AS WE ARE ALREADY CARRYING MORE THAN OUR FAIR SHARE OF THIS GROWTH, THERE ARE
STILL GOOD OPPORTUNITIES FOR PORTLANDERS WHO WANT TO LIVE HERE.
(<http://www.hfore.com/concessions-and-submarket-vacancy-rates>) (WHILE WHAT CONSTITUTES
BEING "CLOSE-IN" IN NORTHEAST PORTLAND VARIES IN THE REAL ESTATE LITERATURE, BY ALL
ACCOUNTS THE BEAUMONT WILSHIRE NEIGHBORHOOD FITS WELL WITHIN THIS PARAMETER.) FOR ALL
THESE REASONS, WE ARE AGAINST THIS ZONING PROPOSAL, AND CALL UPON THE PLANNING
COMMISSION TO PROVIDE FOR A GROWTH, AT A PACE WE CAN ACCOMMODATE, WHILE GIVING PRIORITY
TO CONTINUING TO MAINTAIN OUR CITY AS THE JEWEL THAT MOTIVATES PEOPLE TO WANT TO MOVE
HERE IN THE FIRST PLACE.

906
907 SINCERELY,
908 DR ROBERT AND DONNA KELLUM
909 3046 NE 33RD AVE
910 PORTLAND, OR 97212
911 503-331-7393
912 ", "healthbridge@integra.net", "Robert
Kellum", "29220", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-10
11:28:28.0", "97212", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Housing types, Mapping
R2.5 rezones", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", ""
913 "7835 SW 11th Ave", "Portland", "The charm and historic value of Portland is under
attack. Homes that aren't even 100 years old are threatened by profit seeking builders

that churn out poor quality, gigantic homes that don't fit with the current charm and structure of the neighborhoods. I know this is not new information to you but I implore you to not make this someone else's issue. Don't just listen to the biased builders that seek money and don't want to live in these neighborhoods they are impacting. I grew up in California and lived many years in Arizona where the houses all look the same, the lots are square and the neighborhoods are bland and "cookie cutter". This is not what we want Portland to look like. It is not what attracts people to our great city and it is not a good plan for our neighborhoods. The answer to affordability is not building more homes for less money and overcrowding the neighborhoods that are "close in". It lies in building an economy that provides jobs where people can afford to live where they want. ", "kbatte@gmail.com", "Kelly Batte", "29221", "rip", "OR", "1S1E21DB 12200", "rip-R127781", "2018-05-10 11:42:41.0", "97219", "-13657811.62", "5695442.921", "Submitter", "West", "South Burlingame", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

914 "3207 SE Crystal Springs Blvd ", "Portland ", " Letter to City of Portland Planning and Sustainability

915 Re: Residential Infill Project Proposal to the Eastmoreland Neighborhood

916 My wife and I are residents of the Eastmoreland neighborhood and am absolutely opposed to the proposed RIP.

917 My wife and I decided to move from the East coast over 20 years ago. We chose to live in Portland due to the livability of the city and the charm, character and scale of the established neighborhoods.

918 Historically, the Bureau of Planning and the Bureau of Development Services have made a concerted effort to maintain the integrity, scale and character of each neighborhood by the following:

919 • maintained the goal of livability

920 • zoning districts, standards and guidelines

921 • Clearly defined conditions for building additions, new construction and

922 modifications

923 • Requiring neighborhood interaction for proposed demolitions

924 • Interaction with neighborhood committees

925 All of the above have been well thought out and have been developed over an extended period of time. The recent influx of people to the Portland Area has created a potential problem with the current housing inventory. BP & S has made modifications to address this issue that are not well thought out and seriously jeopardize the integrity and scale of the established neighborhoods.

926 Recently BP & S introduced a measure, approved by City Council, that eliminated parking requirements for new multifamily housing in residential districts in the city. The measure was based on the assumption, in the Westmoreland neighborhood, that the new units would be served by mass transit and additional Trimet light rail transit stops within the neighborhood. The additional transit stops were removed from Trimet's plans and will not be constructed. The multifamily housing project continue to be constructed with no onsite parking. The additional on street parking has placed a significant burden on the existing residents. This problem continues too get worse with each new development . This can be seen throughout other established neighborhoods throughout the City.

927 The BP&S proposal to change the zoning and increase the density in the existing established residential neighborhoods is a knee jerk reaction to resolve the issue in the short term and causes severe problems to the neighborhood in the long term. The increased density:

928 • Has a significant detrimental impact to the existing historic fabric • Will significantly increase vehicular traffic

929

930 • Is in direct conflict with the overall Bureau's goals

931 • Is in direct conflict of the long range goals of PBOT

932 • by increasing vehicular traffic and congestion

933 • increasing parking

934 • conflict with bicycle routes within the neighborhood •

935 The proposed zoning change to our neighborhood will do nothing but decimate the neighborhood, detrimentally impact the existing fabric, increase vehicular activity and impact the proposed bicycle routes within the neighborhood.

936 I am a licensed architect and have been practicing architecture for over 40 years. My practice has been broad and has included projects in multiple jurisdictions throughout the United States. Each jurisdiction has its own planning department and I have had positive interaction with each. I have lived and practiced architecture in Portland for 20 years. In all of my years of practice, I have not experienced such haphazard and

poorly thought out changes to the existing established neighborhoods.

937 D.L. Jones
938 ", "Sljones3207@me.com", "David Jones ", "29222", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-10
11:43:03.0", "97202", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Housing
types, Parking", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""
939 "6335 N Mississippi Ave", "Portland", "I may have a misunderstanding of what is being
proposed. But I am testifying this change because I do not want the homes on my street
taken down and replaced by duplexes. This is not only environmentally unsound but will
also decrease the value of the current homes. ", "lyndsea@gmail.com", "Lindsay
Thurwachter", "29223", "rip", "OR", "1N1E15CA 7900", "rip-R167362", "2018-05-10
11:54:56.0", "97217", "-13656252.242", "5711549.773", "Submitter", "North", "Piedmont", "Active"
, "False", "Housing types", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""
940 "8414 SW 10th Avenue", "Portland", "Residential Infill Project
941 Project Director Morgan Tracy
942 Residential.infill@portlandoregon.gov
943
944 Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission
945 PSC@portlandoregon.gov
946 1900 SW Fourth Avenue, Suite 7100
947 Portland, Oregon 97204
948
949 Re: Residential Infill Project
950 Remove the A Overlay
951
952 I recently received notice of the proposed A Overlay that would include my property and
that of my entire neighborhood. I have read the proposed Residential Infill Project
guidelines and that of the A Overlay.
953 I support the provisions of the Residential Infill Project that promote retaining
existing neighborhood character. Reducing the scale, measuring height from the lowest
point of the lot and averaging setbacks will allow infill to better blend into the
neighborhoods. A house was recently built in South Burlingame that is grossly out of
scale with the surrounding houses so I appreciate the effort to restrict this
construction in the future.
954
955 I am opposed to the A Overlay that is being applied broadly to properties in the City.
In the Draft of the 2035 Comprehensive Plan, it clearly stated there is more than
enough capacity under the current zoning for the growth that is projected to occur
through 2035. There is no need to add over 100,000 units of housing capacity
indiscriminately. The RIP staff has projected that within the A Overlay, even with all
the new code incentives, the number of new ADU's and the amount of corner lot
redevelopment would be the same as if this radical concept were not implemented. The
A Overlay is a flawed concept that I do not support.
956
957 If added capacity is needed, I support the best practices of land use planning that
require that the base zone be changed with community-based planning consistent with
Oregon's Land Use Goals.
958
959 Please add this to the record.
960 Thank you,
961 Julia Porter
962 8414 SW 10th Avenue
963 Portland, OR 97219
964 cc: Mayor Ted Wheeler, mayorwheeler@portlandoregon.gov
965 Commissioner Amanda Fritz, Amanda@portlandoregon.gov
966 Commissioner Nick Fish, Nick@portlandoregon.gov
967 Commissioner Chole Eudaly, chloe@portlandoregon.gov
968 Commissioner Dan Saltzman, dan@portlandoregon.gov
969 Susan Anderson, Susan.Anderson@PortlandOregon.gov
970 MNA Land Use Committee, mnaLandUseCommittee@gmail.com
971
972 ", "jpmi@me.com", "Julia Porter", "29224", "rip", "OR", "1S1E21DC
4300", "rip-R127896", "2018-05-10
12:26:49.0", "97219", "-13657590.788", "5694852.294", "Submitter", "West", "South
Burlingame", "Active", "False", "Scale, Housing
types", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""
973 "3216 N.E. Couch Street", "Portland", "To the Portland Planning and Sustainability

Commission:

974

975 I oppose the Residential Infill Plan in its current form. Three and four households on every lot is too dense for Portland's single family house neighborhoods. High density should be in city centers and on large corridor streets. The buildings allowed by RIP are too large and tall for most of Portland's neighborhoods. Our narrow neighborhood streets cannot accommodate the additional traffic and the safety concerns are far-reaching. Parking is already a problem for homeowners in so many of our neighborhoods. Infill size and height should be compatible with neighboring houses. Our smaller bungalows should not be redeveloped to large, expensive housing. RIP will increase demolitions, toxic contamination, and environmental waste.

976

977 I support accessory dwelling units. I support additional units sensitively added inside existing houses. I support reasonable density without demolition. I OPPOSE RIP.

978

979 ", "kathylillis@gmail.com", "Kathryn Lillis", "29225", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-10 13:02:06.0", "97232", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Housing types, Parking", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

980

"3216 N.E. Couch Street", "Portland", "To the Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission:

981

982 I oppose the Residential Infill Plan in its current form. Three and four households on every lot is too dense for Portland's single family house neighborhoods. High density should be in city centers and on large corridor streets. The buildings allowed by RIP are too large and tall for most of Portland's neighborhoods. Our narrow neighborhood streets cannot accommodate the additional traffic and the safety concerns are far-reaching. Parking is already a problem for homeowners in so many of our neighborhoods. Infill size and height should be compatible with neighboring houses. Our smaller bungalows should not be redeveloped to large, expensive housing. RIP will increase demolitions, toxic contamination, and environmental waste.

983

984 I support accessory dwelling units. I support additional units sensitively added inside existing houses. I support reasonable density without demolition. I OPPOSE RIP.

985

986 ", "jim.lillis@comcast.net", "Robert James Lillis", "29226", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-10 13:04:14.0", "97232", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Housing types, Parking", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

987

"7145 SW 36th Ave", "Portland", "While in general I support increasing housing density in Portland to improve housing accessibility, I strongly oppose the proposed zoning changes to many parts of the Multnomah neighborhood in SW Portland that would allow for multiple housing units on existing lots. Many of the side streets in our neighborhood are unimproved and in poor condition, with a number of these streets only as wide as a single car. They are inadequate for the existing population of the neighborhood, and certainly cannot handle a significant increase in traffic due to new housing units - particularly if these new units would not provide sufficient off-street parking and rely instead on having residents' cars parked on the street.

988

989 While on paper some of the blocks in Multnomah may look like appropriate areas for increasing density through zoning changes, an in-person assessment would provide a clearly different view. For example, most of the properties along SW Nevada Ct. between SW 35th and SW 37th are included in the "A" Overlay proposal. This is a single lane, unimproved street filled with potholes and abrupt transitions, as can be seen in the attached photo. There is little to no room for 2-way traffic on this stretch of road, even if the street was in perfect condition. Adding additional traffic through new housing units on blocks like this one without addressing road capacity and condition is irresponsible, and would degrade livability as well as property values for existing residents. This is just one example - there are numerous blocks within the relatively small area bounded by Capitol Hwy, Gabriel Park, and SW Vermont St. that share similar street characteristics and cannot support the proposed additional density. I urge you to revise the proposed zoning changes for the Multnomah neighborhood to better account for the ability (or lack thereof) to absorb additional housing.

990

991 Thank you,

992 Jason Motsko", "jmotsko@gmail.com", "Jason

Motsko", "29227", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-10
13:16:14.0", "97219", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Mapping the "a"
overlay", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

993 "3136 NE Couch Street", "Portland", "Dear Commission members. My sister Connie and I own
this duplex. We bought it in 1997 with the intent of retiring together and converting
our garage into a caregiver unit. In 2015 we explored the garage conversion to an ADU
only to learn that this was not possible under the current codes.

994 Since then I have sustained a back injury and must move to the lower unit. My sister
is unable to live or use the upper unit so it is imperative to convert our garage into
a studio accessible apartment for her. We will rent out the upper unit where I
currently reside.

995 I believe strongly that this kind of infill project is the most compatible with current
housing stock and many ADU's blend into the neighborhood and have less impact than the
boom in four or five story apartment houses without parking that seem to dominate the
central eastside.

996 I ask you to recommend the necessary zoning changes to permit duplexes to have a
detached ADU. Thank you, Patricia J. Rumer, PhD

997 ", "Tedad06@yahoo.com", "Patricia Rumer", "29229", "rip", "OR", "1N1E36CA
19300", "rip-R177733", "2018-05-10
13:45:42.0", "97232", "-13651364.168", "5704297.738", "Submitter", "Southeast", "Kerns", "Active
", "False", "Housing types", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

998 "3105 SE 29th Avenue", "Portland", "I am in full support of the RIP and its goals. One of
the outcomes of this would be that more people would be out in the neighborhood, in
public places. I've watched my inner SE neighborhood transition from lively to eerily
quiet; from pedestrian and bike-oriented to SOV commuting. I think this infill program
would bring more diversity to the city at large. If there's ever an opportunity to
remove parking minimums, I'm quite favorable to that as well.

999 ", "Markus@Markusmead.com", "Markus Mead", "29233", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-10
14:32:04.0", "97202", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Housing
types, Parking", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1000 "311 NE Monroe St", "Portland", "I commend the City for cracking open a discussion about
what homes are allowed and who can live in our single-family zoned neighborhoods.
Single-family zones have been exclusionary for too long, and are increasingly becoming
enclaves of the wealthy.

1001 In a housing crisis we must all do our part to expand housing options for everyone -
even the neighborhoods.

1002

1003 I would urge you to support but refine the current proposal to make it even more
inclusive.

1004 - The one size fits all 2,500 sf limit is too restrictive for 3 & 4 multi-unit houses -
which are really the most affordable "missing middle" housing types.

1005 - Examples of homes far larger than 2,500 sq ft are all around us. I walk through
Irvington with my son everyday. There are beautiful houses far larger than 2,500
square feet. No one would say those are too big. But you could easily fit 4 units in
that envelope. Density in a "house form" is what's important.

1006 - Consider a bonus program to expand FAR, height and lot coverage when smaller
workforce units are included. Be sure the bonuses are substantial enough to actually
accommodate multiple new units. Market-test the bonus system prior to finalizing.

1007 Thank you again for keeping this process moving forward.
", "alex@cascadia-partners.com", "Alex
Joyce", "29234", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-10
15:05:54.0", "97212", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Scale, Housing
types", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1008 "4949 NE 34th", "Portland", "I want the zoning on my property and surrounding property to
stay R5. Amendments approved by the Council in 2016 are not incorporated in RIP.

1009 RIP violates the purpose of the zoning code (stability and predictability).

1010 The recent increase in density in the neighbourhood is already bringing the associated
traffic and social problems. Further increasing the density can only be further
detrimental and jeopardise the well being of the neighbourhood and its residents.
Maintaining and preserving existing homes is more sound, philosophically,
environmentally and socially, than demolishing them to make way for further
overcrowding. ", "kevin@kevinburke.com", "Kevin Burke", "29235", "rip", "OR", "1N1E24AC
4100", "rip-R307273", "2018-05-10
15:09:57.0", "97211", "-13651105.195", "5709969.071", "Submitter", "Northeast", "Concordia", "Ac
tive", "False", "Housing types, Mapping R2.5
rezones, Parking", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1011 "3144 NE 17th Avenue","Portland","Letter attached.,",","Eugene and Laurel
Leverton","29237","rip","OR","","rip-null","2018-05-07
00:00:00.0","97212","0","0","Letter","","","Active","False","Housing
types,Parking","","","","","","Proposed","","","","","",""

1012 "3828 NE Alameda St.,"Portland,"My testimony, previously pasted, attached as a PDF
for greater legibility. ","JKingeca@gmail.com","Jeffrey
King","29238","rip","OR","","rip-null","2018-05-10
15:55:18.0","97212","0","0","Submitter","","","Active","False","Housing types,Mapping
the "a" overlay","","","","","","Proposed","","","","","",""

1013 "604 NW Marlborough Ave","Portland","Letter attached.,"","Judy and Jerry
Sawyer","29240","rip","OR","","rip-null","2018-05-07
00:00:00.0","97210","0","0","Letter","","","Active","False","Housing
types","","","","","","Proposed","","","","","",""

1014 "1509 NE Siskiyou St","Portland","We are Susan and Ted Schneider. We live at 1509 NE
Siskiyou St. in Portland. We are opposed to the proposed Residential Infill Project
Zone Code and Map Change.

1015

1016 Portland has serious problems with homelessness and housing for low and moderate
income households. The Residential Infill Project proposal does nothing to address
those issues. Rentals consisting \$450,000/1200 sq ft. unit (according to Planning
Bureau Economic consultant) does not match the need!

1017

1018 This proposal is being pushed politically at the local and state level by 1000 Friends
of Oregon whose organizing mission was the protection of Oregon's land use planning
process and the farmland of the state. Portland has more than met the anticipated need
for potential growth in its current zone code and 2035 comp plan. 1000 Friends seems
to have adopted the position that single family neighborhoods are a threat to UGBs
statewide.

1019

1020 My husband and I support the UGB and we want housing to be more affordable for
everyone. This proposal is not the way to do either of those. We are opposed to
Residential Infill Project zone code and map change which would be more accurately
described as the Eastside of Portland Redevelopment Project. We think the proposal
will break some of what actually works in Portland, real neighborhoods and good public
schools, without fixing any of our serious problems. Of course, the West side of
Portland will benefit from the dramatically increased scarcity of close in single
family neighborhoods in the city.

1021

1022 The Proposed Residential Infill Project zone code and map change would be the biggest
reversal of land use policy in this city in 50 years. It would reverse 50 years of
policy and investments, public and private, to support, conserve and stabilize close-in
residential single family neighborhoods in Portland. It would do this without providing
affordable housing or taking on the real threat to the UGB.

1023

1024 There are three major problems with the proposal and one huge issue with the process
that got us to this point.

1025

1026 First, in spite of what you have heard from the lobbying arm of 1000 Friends, Portland
for Everyone, you don't have to do this to protect the UGB for 2035 nor will it result
in affordable housing. Portland needs to be able to accommodate 123,000 new households
by 2035 and with current zoning we can accommodate 197,000, according to the Planning
Bureau. That is a 60% cushion. The Planning Bureau's economic consultant pegs units
from this zone and map proposal at a minimum of \$450,000, so it is not affordable
housing either.

1027

1028 Second, it will drive up the cost of single family homes in already dense
neighborhoods, especially houses that are the smallest and most affordable. The least
costly houses are the most attractive to developers for conversion to multifamily.
And, you will reduce the total supply of single family housing dramatically thereby
eliminating single family residential neighborhoods as an option for middle income
households. Single family neighborhoods will only be available to the very wealthiest
residents of Portland in R10 and R20 neighborhoods. The irony is that that is where
the land is. Those neighborhoods could be made more dense with single family without
affecting the fabric of the area. But, they are the only neighborhoods protected from
this proposal.

1029

1030 Third, the zone and map change would put at risk neighborhoods that over the last 50
odd years the city and the feds have succeeded in stabilizing! Please remember that
the desirability of most of the affected neighborhoods is a relatively recent
phenomenon. Not long ago federal funds were used to help make these neighborhoods
"safe, decent, and sanitary". These neighborhoods were in decline. They were full of
gun shots, drug houses and run down rentals. We know, we lived in two of those
neighborhood then. And, then there was the sweat equity that was required - 14 years
of DIY rehab weekends for my husband and I first in NE and then Ladd's Addition. These
were not considered desirable neighborhoods then. There is lot of research from the
1970's about the tipping point of a stable neighborhoods and neighborhood livability.
Lets learn from our history. We cannot afford to ignore those lessons. There has been
no discussion of of livability or historic preservation in this proposal. We need to
have those bench marks clearly in mind before we take the success resulting from the
last 50 years of effort and abandon it.

1031
1032 Finally, the public process, even though it will affect the majority of single family
neighborhoods in the city, has consisted of a few dozen neighborhood meetings (not
hundreds like the original Downtown plan), a nonscientific on line poll and some
hearings. This Commission did not even hold a hearing when you first considered this
proposal! This City knows how to do this better.

1033
1034
1035 In summary, several factors created Portland's housing supply situation. One, wages for
middle class jobs have not kept pace with the wealth being created in the economy.
Two, the federal government has essentially abandoned its role in meeting the housing
needs of the lowest income Americans. Three, construction of all types of new housing
in the Portland region was stifled for several years by the 2008 near financial
collapse of this nation. How soon we forget. That supply is finally beginning to pick
up. Four, Oregon's land use planning system means that developers cannot go out
further and further from city centers and develop cheap neighborhoods with few
requirements for utilities or other services as they once could. There is a cost to
that and there is not a simple fix.

1036
1037 None of these factors is within the sole control of the City of Portland. Yes, a good
economy here with decent jobs is important. Yes, a regional effort to subsidize the
development of housing for homeless and and lowest income people is essential. Yes,
development processes that are transparent and cost effective are essential. And yes,
the ongoing statewide conversation about the cost of UGB's, the carrying capacity of
land, population growth and the balancing of all our values must continue.

1038
1039 In the meantime, Portland should devote its time and resources to figure out what it
can actually do to address homelessness and low to moderate income housing
affordability in the region, not the destruction of existing neighborhoods. The
destruction may take 50 years, but it will happen. A proposal that debuted and is
being tried out in LA and British Columbia according to the NYTimes does not sound like
a automatic good fit for the City of Portland, however well intentioned.

1040
1041 We all support the UGB, care about our city and region, and want housing to be more
affordable for everyone. This process is a complete mismatch of goals, problems and
proposed solution.

1042
1043 There were goals when this started that are worth addressing -- make infill that does
occur fit into existing neighborhoods, make it work with historic preservation and
livability. We also want to encourage development of more affordable housing of the
types people need all over the region. There is a great deal of work to be done.
Sadly, the answers to the actual need are not in this proposal.

1044
1045 Current zoning, even before the 2035 comp plan changes already has more housing zoning
capacity than needed for the year 2035. Why do we need more capacity, especially in
single family zoning? The proposed zone change has no relationship to housing being
affordable, those with income under 100% median family income. That means that market
forces will cause all new units to be market rate and therefor unaffordable. The next
zoning project being considered by the city, Better Housing by Design, is a proposal
for more capacity in multi family zones, which is the best place to put more capacity,
if we needed it. That might actually result in more affordable units. There is no
need for more capacity which will result in the conversion of all moderately priced

single family areas being converted to multifamily. We do not now need more capacity and certainly not in single family zones, which already allow an ADU on every lot.

1046

1047

We think that if this proposal goes ahead as currently configured all of us and 1000 Friends will be remembered as the generation who did to Portland with this zoning and map change what many other cities did to themselves with freeways, urban renewal clearance projects, and ill conceived massive high rise public housing that wiped out the fabric of neighborhoods in so many cities in the 50's and 60's. All those things were done with the best of intentions and fine visions. They were simple answers to complex problems. Those projects, lacked data, research and an understanding about what makes neighborhoods work and last.

1048

","theschneiders2@hotmail.com","Susan and Ted
Schneider","29243","rip","OR","","","rip-null","2018-05-10
16:36:12.0","97212","0","0","Submitter","","","Active","False","Housing
types","","","","","Proposed","","","","","","",""

1049

"5915 N Delaware Ave","Portland","I support the City's efforts to increase density through the Residential Infill Project, but I fear that it will not adequately address our housing shortage unless it is modified to include the recommendations of Portland for Everyone.", "charbot76@yahoo.com", "Kimberlee
Stafford", "29244", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-10
17:09:38.0", "97217", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Housing
types", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1050

"2282 SE Spruce", "Portland", "Allowing our neighborhoods to be decimated and become overcrowded and without parking is a short sighted and devastating approach to the city housing issue. There is plenty of derelict housing and commercial space out beyond 82nd avenue that should be the target area for low income housing. Why is there an insistence that homeless and lower income people must live in the core of the city. This doesn't seem to cover the elderly on fixed incomes that you tax out of homes they have lived in for decades. Why is their no relief for them? Allowing developers to build multi units with no parking only adds to the lack of livability in former quiet and comfortable neighborhoods. Infill does not have to destroy the character of what has made Portland an attractive place to live.", "mmslac@outlook.com", "Mary
Slac", "29245", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-10
17:16:09.0", "97214", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Parking", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1051

"1309 SE 57th Ave.", "Portland", "I am opposed to the Residential Infill Project as proposed for multiple reasons:

1052

1) Despite planners' good intentions, it does not solve the issues it was designed to address: affordability, equitability, sustainability, livability.

1053

2) By not directly addressing affordability, it encourages demolition that drives up housing costs and rents. Development of market rate housing escalates costs in order for builders to break even or reap profits. Short-term gains will have long-range impacts.

1054

3) RIP is not equitable. Rather it destabilizes long-time residents and time-honored communities.

1055

RIP's potential to tear existing neighborhoods apart does not support livability goals.

1056

4) RIP does not address preservation sufficiently. Retaining and repurposing buildings are sustainable practices that should be priorities - not demolition and gutting. Demolition is not a green practice; retaining existing homes is.

1057

5) RIP ignores inventories that indicate sufficient buildable land exists to meet Portland's population needs for the next 20 years without changing zoning, allowable density or expansion of the Urban Growth Boundary.

1058

6) Densification without addressing infrastructure, transportation and education resources along with the needs of those already here is irresponsible and short-sighted. Witness growing traffic snarls, dangerous car-bike interactions, deteriorating roads - indications that you can't zone away single family homes and adequate parking in order to get people out of cars.

1059

7) The plan ignores the negative impact of mass upzoning in sister cities like Seattle.

1060

8) RIP will contribute to the loss of Portland's mature tree canopy, solar access and garden plots.

1061

9) The ever-changing, 11th hour process circumvented the 2035 Comprehensive Plan, running counter to fair and equitable goals of the Comp Plan that residents had worked on for years.

1062

10) The project is confusing at best and deceptive in actuality for most residents. The proposed a-overlay is especially opaque. The flier sent to residents paints a false, blue-sky picture of zoning that essentially eliminates single family neighborhoods in

the name of choice and what it calls "response to community concerns about demolitions..."

1063 11) Communications that focus primarily on the positive reductions in scale and mass of buildings ignore the project's negatives - above all its potential for wholesale ripping apart of neighborhoods and displacement of existing residents.

1064 12) Despite the spin from pro-RIP groups that are paid to lobby and support this proposal, most property owners are not greedy, NIMBY trust-fund babies. Rather, many have worked 70 hours weekly for decades to own a modest home and small garden with solar.

1065 Recommendations:

1066 1) Preservation and repurposing buildings should be priorities - not demolition and gutting neighborhoods.

1067 2) Instead of wholesale roll-out in areas like close-in Southeast, RIP needs to provide pilot projects in neighborhoods that are in need of City services and welcome transformation.

1068 3) RIP should focus on building new amenity-rich complete neighborhoods in outer East areas that have vast, open spaces and parking lots that could be transformed into compact, livable communities with adequate public transportation.

1069

1070 ", "midgepierce@gmail.com", "Mildred Pierce", "29246", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-10 18:25:24.0", "97215", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Housing types", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1071 "4226 NE 63rd Ave", "Portland", "I don't think that Overlay A will be good for my neighborhood. Part of the reason that I like Portland, and specifically, my neighborhood is because it has character and also large lot sizes with lots of yard space. If we allow up to 3 units to be on this property it will negatively impact many things:

1072 • Space for parking

1073 • Crowded neighborhood with less privacy between lots

1074 • Encourage developers to tear down well-crafted original houses and put in cheaply crafted new houses.

1075 • It will raise the property prices, which will make it even more difficult for first time home buyers.", "jessvollendorf@hotmail.com", "Jessica Vollendorf", "29248", "rip", "OR", "1N2E20CB 9400", "rip-R300633", "2018-05-10 20:46:53.0", "97218", "-13647547.078", "5709111.635", "Submitter", "Northeast", "Roseway", "Active", "False", "Mapping the "a" overlay, Parking", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1076 "4226 NE 63rd Ave", "Portland", "I don't think that Overlay A will be good for my neighborhood. Part of the reason that I like Portland, and specifically, my neighborhood is because it has character and also large lot sizes with lots of yard space. If we allow up to 3 units to be on this property it will negatively impact many things:

1077 • Space for parking

1078 • Crowded neighborhood with less privacy between lots

1079 • Encourage developers to tear down well-crafted original houses and put in cheaply crafted new houses.

1080 • It will raise the property prices, which will make it even more difficult for first time home buyers.", "jessvollendorf@hotmail.com", "Jessica Vollendorf", "29249", "rip", "OR", "1N2E20CB 9500", "rip-R300632", "2018-05-10 20:52:25.0", "97218", "-13647547.236", "5709084.153", "Submitter", "Northeast", "Roseway", "Active", "False", "Mapping the "a" overlay, Parking", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1081 "1930 SE 20th Avenue", "Portland", "I am completely opposed to this proposal.

1082

1083 Reason 1, All densification efforts are concentrate in the east side of Portland. Any new plan should encompass the entire city so as not to unduly concentrate development in only one portion of the city.

1084

1085 Reason 2, The city has long had a anti-demolition policy yet this proposals main outcome would be to massively increase demolitions to maximize economic outcomes. Developers love this plan because it maximized their outcome. Shouldn't the goal be to maximize the outcome for people of the city?

1086

1087 Reason 3, This is clearly an effort at social engineering and is attempting to increase affordable housing yet not one global example is cited to support the assertion that this will improve the affordable housing issue. It is likely that reducing

(artificially constraining) square footage will restrict supply which actually could further increase housing costs, simple economics that city planners seem unaware of.

1088

1089 Reason 4, Little or no thought seems to have been given to the impact these changes will have on the character of existing neighborhoods.

1090

1091 Reason 5, The proposal itself seems haphazard, who decided corner lots should be allowed triplex's but no other lots? What's the logic of this?

1092

1093 Reason 6, Most importantly a major change in the zoning which will massively impact property values, neighborhood character and the future of the city should be put to a vote so that the citizens can determine themselves if this is what they want for the future of Portland. As it is, it appears that this deal was fabricated in secret with too much control given to the developers who stand to reap the benefit and no real analysis done relative to housing cost impacts, livability and the incremental impacts placed on an already strained infrastructure.

1094

1095 Please cancel this ill thought out proposal and start a process that includes neighborhood associations, local businesses, city planners and yes even the developers to come up with a future blueprint for Portland that all constituents can buy into instead of the backroom deal we are now faced with.,"bradley.komenda@gmail.com","Bradley Komenda","29250","rip","OR","1S1E02DA 18300","rip-R138124","2018-05-11 06:42:57.0","97214",-13652758.619","5702055.165","Submitter","Southeast","Hosford-Aberne thy","Active","False","Scale,Housing types,Mapping the "a" overlay","","","Proposed","","","","",""4016 NE Senate St","Portland","I am adamantly opposed to RIP.

1096

1097 It does not provide opportunity for affordable housing.

1098

1099 Making the process of internal conversions of existing housing easier to be approved would do more to provide housing alternatives.

1100

1101

1102 In my 25 year career in realestate I have never heard of a developer backing out of project because they could not provide enough housing.

1103

1104 The measurement is always about profit and this is not any different.

1105

1106 Don't take Portland away.

1107

1108 ","ts4016@comcast.net","Thomas Schwenzer","29251","rip","OR","","rip-null","2018-05-11 07:13:20.0","97232","0","0","Submitter","","","Active","False","","","","","Propose d","","","",""

1109

"3509 ne Alberta Ct","Portland","I want to express my opposition to RIP and proposed zoning changes, especially changing some R5 to R2.5. I am also concerned by a severe conflict of interest, and bias, in the past public testimony on 5/8/18, and for the upcoming testimony on 5/15/18. Portland for Everyone, seemed to dominate the testimony. And to find out later they are owned by Eli Spevak, a member of the Planning and Sustainability Commission. I demand that Mr. Spevak recuse himself from participating in any vote related to RIP as he has too much of a financial interest in RIP passing. Additionally, I request that only one member of Portland for Everyone be allowed to testify on 5/15/18 in order to allow others to have a voice.

1110

","ervnancy@msn.com","Ervin Siverson","29252","rip","OR","1N1E24AC 2600","rip-R307305","2018-05-11 08:36:55.0","97211",-13650922.717","5709874.444","Submitter","Northeast","Concordia","Active","False","Mapping R2.5 rezones","","","","","Proposed","","","",""9515 N Lombard Street","Portland ","I was hoping to make it to the May 15th meeting but I can not now. I do feel it is important to hear the stories, from the mouths of people, who will be affected by the RIP (in both positive and negative ways). I believe the RIP, overall is a positive move and I am on board with the goals and generally on board with the way the City hopes to achieve them. However, it think it is clumsy in some of its roll-out, needs a better short and long term process and strategy, and needs refinement of the A overlay. This is especially true for the areas that are being taken out of the A overlay zones. They are hard geographic lines that erroneously say "this side of the street needs protection" and "this side doesn't". The spatial boundaries are not specific, arbitrary and make poor assumptions. But more importantly,

these zones that will not be part of the A overlay deserve the same opportunities. We believe (as a nbhd) very strongly in protecting our existing community members, stabilizing them in place, and having them participate in the positive economic and livability options open to the rest of the city. The way to do this is NOT to subtract them from opportunities in an effort to "protect them". That is paternalistic. Instead, GENERATE FUND STREAMS, USE SDCs, CREATE PROGRAMS THAT HELP PEOPLE PARTICIPATE (know-how, confidence, financial help). Instead of waiving SDCs as an incentive, USE the SDCs that are (esp in the short term) coming in from middle and upper income households building ADUs, to fund programs and help bolster and secure families/homeowners in place. THIS is the answer to the short term fear of displacement.

,"hill.rachel@gmail.com","Rachel Hill","29253","rip","OR","","","rip-null","2018-05-11 09:08:06.0","97203","0","0","Submitter","","","Active","False","Mapping the "a" overlay,Displacement","","","","","Proposed","","","","",""

1111 "3615 NE Hassalo St","Portland",
1112 City Of Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability
1113 ATTN: Residential Infill Project
1114 1900 SW 4th Avenue
1115 Suite 7100
1116 Portland, OR 97201

1117
1118 RE: Testimony on the Residential Infill Project

1119
1120 To the Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission:

1121
1122 I oppose the Residential Infill Plan in its current form. Three and four households on every lot is too dense for Portland's single family house neighborhoods. High density should be in city centers and on large corridor streets. The plan currently does not take into account other factors, for example: animal regulations. It is hard enough to live next to my neighbor's chickens; they are allowed to have 3. I cannot imagine tripling or quadrupling that!

1123 The buildings allowed by RIP are too large and tall for most of Portland's neighborhoods. Infill size and height should be compatible with neighboring houses. Our smaller bungalows should not be redeveloped to large, expensive housing, which is exactly what I am seeing happen. This is just another form of "McMansionism."

1124 RIP will increase demolitions, toxic contamination, and environmental waste. You should be working to encourage green practices, not adding to our environmental woes.

1125 I support accessory dwelling units. I support additional units sensitively added inside existing houses. I support reasonable density without demolition. I oppose RIP.

1126

1127

1128 Sincerely,

1129

1130 Thea Parker

1131 3615 NE Hassalo St.

1132 ","theamarise@comcast.net","Thea Parker","29254","rip","OR","","","rip-null","2018-05-11 09:11:26.0","97232","0","0","Submitter","","","Active","False","Scale,Housing types","","","","","Proposed","","","","",""

1133 "1802 SE 48th Ave. ","Portland ","As a homeowner, resident and tax payer who lives in SE Portland I am against RIP. Demolishing and destroying neighborhoods in this once livable, green and affordable city for the profit of the 'housing market' under the guise of a housing crisis that has been created by our corrupt city government and the developers/investors/realtors who are in cahoots is disgraceful. Most of the inner city neighborhoods are already dense. What your doing to this great city is turning it into an urban nightmare. Cutting down three redwood trees on Hawthorne in order to build yet another shoddily clad , toxic, monstrosity of an apartment building with retail space that is already falling apart and will sit largely unoccupied as it is not affordable is par for your course of wrecking Portland. I say no more. Enough is enough. These monstrosities are now offering free rent in order entice renters. "You know you want to live here" says the sign on 47th and Hawthorne. No I wouldn't live here if you paid me. As for the new plan of 4-8 plexes or ADU's to replace single dwellings under the guise of affordable housing forget about it. The cities plans are based on profit and endless growth are going to kill everything that made this city a desirable place to live. You should consider the fact that you are killing the golden goose that draws people here. ","ramoncynthia2@gmail.com","Cynthia

Ramon","29259","rip","OR","","","rip-null","2018-05-11

11:03:05.0","97215","0","0","Submitter","","","Active","False","Housing
types","","","Proposed","","",""
1134 "3828 NE Alameda Street","Portland","Attached is a PDF of the testimony I submitted
yesterday in a better format.,""jcjkking@msn.com","Jessie
King","29260","rip","OR","","rip-null","2018-05-11
12:23:36.0","97212","0","0","Submitter","","","Active","False","Housing
types","","","Proposed","","",""
1135 "915 SE 33rd Ave B","Portland","Please don't use safety as a guise for tearing down our
historical buildings. We live in an old city, there is of course a need for
retrofitting, but the city and state should providing funding and subsidies for
property owners to fix these buildings, not put in place a mandate that will result in
no choices but tearing down significant and important parts of our city. Greedy
developers are already ruining the sense of place in Portland and what makes Portland
special and a diserable place to live in the first place. You will kill tourism in this
city if you don't preserve our unique built enviornment. If and when this ""big""
earthquake hits, we are going to have a lot more trouble on our hands than a few old
crumbing buildings. People know the risks of being in these buildings, it is ok, slap a
""U"" on the front of it and apease the lawyers. How about the city focus on
retrofiting our bridges? How about the city focus on updating PWB's ancient water lines
so we have access to water to put out all the fires that will happen, and of course
have clean drinking water in the weeks following the shake up. There are so many other
things that the city could be working on to prepare us for this, rather than clearing
the way for developers to get rich quick and obliterate our cherished old buildings.
","tconklin@pdx.edu","Tiffany Conklin","29261","rip","OR","","rip-null","2018-05-11
13:29:39.0","97214","0","0","Submitter","","","Active","False","","","Propose
d","","",""
1136 "461 NE Mirimar Pl","Portland ","From Portland Coalition for Historic Resources: OPPOSE
RIP in current form. Request specific changes. Testimony attached as PDF document.
","johnyaoliu@gmail.com","John Liu","29262","rip","OR","","rip-null","2018-05-11
14:35:30.0","97232","0","0","Submitter","","","Active","False","Scale,Mapping the ""a""
overlay,Affordability,Displacement","","","Proposed","","",""
1137 "3437 SE Washington Street","Portland","I support the floor area ratio limits to keep
house sizes in proportion to lot sizes. One of the things I cherish most about Portland
is the character and consistency of our beautiful historic neighborhoods. And this
isn't just a personal preference of mine---this is a bit part of what has drawn so many
people to live here in the first place. Let's keep our city's charm and aesthetic
intact by limiting unwieldly and out-of-proportion new construction and remodels.
","mintchocchip584@hotmail.com","Regan
Fisher","29265","rip","OR","","rip-null","2018-05-11
14:44:23.0","97214","0","0","Submitter","","","Active","False","Scale","","","Pr
oposed","","",""
1138 "20156 SE Salmon St","Portland","Letter attached. ","","Lonnie
McCormick-Goodhart","29266","rip","OR","","rip-null","2018-05-08
00:00:00.0","97214","0","0","Letter","","","Active","False","Scale,Housing
types","","","Proposed","","",""
1139 "5114 NE Mallory Ave","Portland","As a Portland resident and someone who greatly
appreciates the character of Portland's historic neighborhoods, I OPPOSE the RIP as
currently proposed. Instead, I support the specific changes set forth in the testimony
submitted by the Portland Coalition for Historic Resources.
","ursulak@gmail.com","Ursula Kienbaum","29267","rip","OR","","rip-null","2018-05-11
14:56:17.0","97211","0","0","Submitter","","","Active","False","","","Propose
d","","",""
1140 "2808 SE 18th Ave","Portland","Dear Planning and Sustainability Commission,
1141 Overall, I like the Residential Infill Plan, especially limiting the size of
houses. In my neighborhood we are having an epidemic of demolitions in which
affordable houses are replaced by ugly unaffordable McMansions. I am hoping that
reduced house size makes demolitions less attractive to developers.
1142 One of my biggest concerns with regard to the RIP is solar access. Our house is
about 20 feet tall and we have a 3kW rooftop solar system, which covers about 90%
of our electricity needs. Even a 30 foot house built to the south of us would
likely impact our solar access, resulting in greater electricity bills for us. I
would like to see a zoning rule that protects rooftop solar; in that way the RIP
could be a supporter of renewable energy. In addition, the city of Portland has
committed to using electricity that is generated from 100% renewables by 2035. I
think roof-top solar could play a large part in achieving this goal. One of the
weaknesses of the RIP is that there is no mandatory requirement stating that new

residences should be solar-ready. California enacted such building standards in 2014. I think the Commission should seriously consider enacting such building regulations, along with stringent energy efficiency standards.", "emilyplatt93@yahoo.com", "Emily Platt", "29268", "rip", "OR", "1S1E11AB 14900", "rip-R287524", "2018-05-11 16:03:29.0", "97202", "-13653040.908", "5700987.345", "Submitter", "Southeast", "Hosford-Ab ernethy", "Active", "False", "Scale", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", ""

1143 "4427 N Gantenbein Ave", "Portland", "I strongly oppose the zoning code and overlay changes proposed in the Residential Infill Project under review by the Planning and Sustainability Commission and respectfully request that they be abandoned in their entirety. As a resident-owner of a single-family R2.5 property adjacent to an R2.5 lot already covertly structured as a "duplex plus a detached ADU," I have evidential concerns these proposed changes, in practice, will only further encourage the monetization and commercialization of single-family residential properties without improving accessibility through affordability—at least without extremely and unreasonably over-occupying these properties. Moreover, given the substantial number of vacancies in various multi-story apartment buildings and townhouses in the commercial zone just a few blocks away (with many more rental complexes presently being constructed), packing more units onto residential lots is unnecessary—even more so if the City's short-term rental situation were being better regulated—and it does nothing to address ballooning rental prices. Demonstrated by my family's and neighbors' experiences with the house next door, as properties become over-occupied by people with little long-term investment in the community—coupled with disengaged owners solely focused on commercial revenue streams—livability for everyone will be severely deteriorated, City resources will be overtaxed managing complaints and compliance, and the very families contributing to the vibrancy of these neighborhoods will be driven away.

1144
1145 Case in point. The house and property next door were purchased and renovated three years ago by a non-resident owner who created a main-house unit, an undeclared basement unit (with its own exclusively-used separate entrance), and a stand-alone ADU. After running illegally as a short-term vacation rental—diligent enforcement of which took the Bureau of Development Services ("BDS") approximately ten months, and two City Hearings, to resolve—the property now has nine long-term young-adult tenants residing across the three units paying combined rent in excess of \$8,000 per month to a new non-resident owner. They have eight vehicles—with only two dedicated parking spots—numerous pets (dogs loudly competing for attention), numerous guests coming and going (all with additional vehicles), and maintenance activity well above the norm. This is too many people and too much activity for a single-family residential property, and has a detrimental impact on neighbors and our community.

1146
1147 While it was a short-term rental, advertising accommodations for "16+" people nightly and serving as a party house, we and our neighbors experienced regular and recurring issues with trespassing, harassment, privacy, safety, excessive noise, overflowing disposal bins and exposed garbage, theft of utilities, and a loss of local street parking, among other things (you name it, we probably suffered it—this painful, drawn-out ordeal was, succinctly put, a waking nightmare). Trading the commercial hotel for a commercial apartment complex (admittedly a better situation, albeit slightly), over-occupancy of the property with long-term tenants continues to cause recurring issues for us and our neighbors with overflowing disposal bins and loose garbage on the sidewalk and street, over-saturation of street parking, driveways being blocked or used without permission, excessive late-night noise, loitering, property damage, and a perpetual lack of privacy. Many of these issues have frequently required a police or other City enforcement response, and continue to do so.

1148
1149 These issues are not being caused through ill intent by the tenants, who at the present time are fine people, but are the real-world results of having so many disparate groups of unrelated individuals residing on a single-family lot (for example, disposal is a constant issue because there is only one of each type of bin being jockeyed for by all three units, and no tenant or unit will, understandably, clean up after any other). Working with BDS, we understand our experiences with the neighboring short-term rental business and violations resulting from over-occupancy are not uncommon. These proposed zoning and overlay changes will only legitimize the difficult situation we and our neighbors are currently laboring to improve, expose other resident-homeowners and families to these same risks, and further burden City enforcement authorities, who will be called upon to help resolve inevitable conflicts.

1150
1151 These changes could even exacerbate our situation, should the owner decide to still not declare the basement unit and then build a second sanctioned ADU, adding even more people onto an already over-occupied property. Or should another adjacent neighbor decide to pop up a few ADUs and also cram as many people as possible in so they can collectively cover the exorbitant rent—assuming (in either scenario) they don't just short-term rent the units instead, which temptingly offers substantially higher profit. These are feasible scenarios under the proposed infill changes.

1152
1153 My wife and I worked for twenty years making financial sacrifices and lifestyle choices that allowed us to purchase a home for our family in this neighborhood, with livability being our primary aspiration. These proposed changes will ultimately penalize us, and those like us, by significantly reducing our quality of life and devaluing our property; and they will reward landlords and developers despite their key role in driving rent prices ever higher. For the almost \$7,500 we're paying Multnomah County in property tax—increasing every year—I expect better advocacy for resident-homeowners and their families. If you want to solve the housing crisis, focus on regulating rent, improving tenants' rights, and eliminating accessory short-term rentals. As the current proposal stands, in the effort to make my neighborhood accessible to others, you will simply be making it inaccessible to us, while causing a lot of angst in the process.", "micah.olson@gmail.com", "Micah Olson", "29269", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-11 16:48:50.0", "97217", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Housing types", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1154 "5615 SW 42nd Ave.", "Portland", " Everett Construction has built 4 McMansions in our neighborhood and plans at least 12 more. They are completely out of scale, towering and filling the entire lot and nearly on the street. Because of MANY natural springs in the area 2 of the 4 had to have very deep gravel layered foundations. The houses have 4 or 5 bedrooms and many cars associated with them. Parking is thus a major problem. The neighborhood does not have large streets or sidewalks. In fact, our street is not maintained by the city. The trucks cost us a lot in street damage.

1155 Secondly, recently the city put out a map of areas subject to slides. We are featured on the map and have had a slide from Cullen to Fairdale (destroying a house) and Fairdale to Beaverton-Hillsdale Highway (destroying an apartment complex). So along with the underground springs that we have, more infill seems like a bad idea. The land will not support the idea and the services in the area are already spread thin, whether street maintenance, police, utilities. I personally fill pot holes in our street. The city refuses to carry out any maintenance at all and has not filled one pot hole or repaved any damaged area in over 35 years while increasing taxes year after year.

1156 Undoubtedly more ADUs in the same area will increase road damage with no intent to repair it. These changes devalue our neighborhood and the original investment in an area always zoned only for single family dwellings.

1157 In the event that major landslides occur because of additional infill construction the city will face major financial liabilities and numerous lawsuits from the homeowners like ourselves who warned you of these problems.", "sslsunshine@yahoo.com", "Judge and Susan Schonfeld", "29270", "rip", "OR", "1S1E17CB 1100", "rip-R156007", "2018-05-11 16:53:28.0", "97221", "-13661229.633", "5697917.857", "Submitter", "West", "Hayhurst", "Active", "False", "Housing types, Mapping the 'a' overlay, Parking", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1158 "6528 NE Stanton St", "Portland", "I am against the proposed zoning code change to 'a' overlay zone in my Roseway neighborhood, and other neighborhoods as well. This proposal will not resolve the desired density needed to house our homeless, jobless or impoverished individuals. It is a drop in the bucket as for what is needed. Shoe-horning in ADU's or destroying homes to rebuild/slap up cheap duplex or triplex units will destroy our classic neighborhood that we worked, saved and sacrificed to purchase. A better solution, and one all large cities subscribe to, is to build large multi-story apartments or condo's close to their downtown areas.

1159
1160 While I understand that people would like to live here, much like I would have liked to purchase a lovely home in the SW hills, Irvington or Laurelhurst areas, but those homes were all too expensive so I realistically purchased what I could afford. I worked two minimum wage jobs, my husband worked full-time, we lived in the basement of his grandparents house and saved to afford the down payment. Now some planners that probably don't live here think it is okay to destroy and de-value my home and

neighborhood.

1161

1162

The ADU's and skinny in-fill homes we are seeing here now are too tall, block views, block the sun, create loss of privacy for neighbors and they don't fit in with the overall feel of the neighborhood. One nearby ADU was built to serve Air BnB visitors, not a permanent home for anyone.

1163

1164

There are many overlooked consequences of this density that no-one seems to address such as what about the existing power, water and sewer limitations? Since our standard lot sizes are 50 foot by 100 foot, adding an ADU would most likely replace an existing garage, causing more on-street parking. Years ago we learned the hard way to keep our car off the street due to spray painting, vandalism and theft. This adds case load for our law enforcement officers and courts. What about access on our narrow streets? When cars park on both sides of the street, only one car can get through at a time. What about emergency services? What about the weekly garbage services? Daily delivery vans and trucks, postal services? City services such as snow removal, leaf pickups, street sweeping? Can our schools and parks accommodate all these added residents?

1165

1166

Please do not approve this overlay. Keep our neighborhoods livable because that is why I purchased my home here. This proposed overlay encourages destruction of our historic and charming older homes in order to rebuild new duplex and triplex units. I hope this density overlay is not just an excuse to generate more tax dollars for the city at our expense.", "k8matti@msn.com", "Kathryn Mattimore", "29271", "rip", "OR", "1N2E29BC 12300", "rip-R113989", "2018-05-11 17:19:53.0", "97213", "-13647287.49", "5707495.609", "Submitter", "Northeast", "Roseway", "Active", "False", "Scale, Housing types, Parking", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", ""

1167

"6528 N.E. Stanton St.", "Portland", "As a homeowner in the affected new "A overlay" area, I respectfully object to the proposed changes listed in sections 5 thru 11 that will inevitably lead to significantly less livability in our Portland neighborhoods. I find the stated underlying reasons for these changes to be irrelevant. Convenience of location and affordability in housing, while desirable, is not a right. We bought our home and started our dream in the Roseway neighborhood because we couldn't afford Irvington or Alameda. It has been over 40 years of mortgage and property tax payments to make that dream and we don't regret it. Please do not destroy it.", "jjmatti@msn.com", "James Mattimore", "29272", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-11 17:34:39.0", "97213", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Housing types", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1168

"3926 SE Pine Street", "Portland ", "I was always very attracted to Portland in the way that it preserved its old theatres and other such buildings and was delighted I was able to move into a neighborhood like Laurelhurst which was a dream come true. And now with RIP the city council threatens to tear up everything that makes Portland such a desirable and liveable city. Demolishing our older homes will not create more low cost housing but give developers the opportunity to build even more expensive structures to displace the lovely bungalows they've destroyed and put in place designs incompatible with the community. It would seem the way to go would be to encourage the development of ADUs which will provide more low cost housing and keep in tact the design and structure of the neighborhood. Please reconsider this awful plan.", "winkler_regina@yahoo.com", "regina winkler", "29274", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-11 19:35:07.0", "97214", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Housing types", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1169

"2007 NE 61st Ave", "Portland", "I would like to object to these zoning code changes that are proposed to allow our neighborhood infill more than it has already. We have pretty large street width issues on 61st ave and parking and traffic is already hard to deal with on our tiny side streets. It is already a common practice of a flipper to buy homes that once had a larger desirable lot for a family to own outright but instead separate it into two and put more homes on it. From what I can tell when this is done the land is mostly all taken up. If you reduce it further I seriously can't imagine that there would need to be any land use at all besides the dwelling.

1170

1171

It also seems that this change could dovetail into other social programs that are being circulated about ADUs or added tiny houses to properties. It wasn't specifically stated in the plans but that seems like a potential next step for an infill project, myself and many of my neighbors also object to that idea as well.

1172

1173

At a high level I can see why this is being proposed, there are many neighborhoods with

larger lots and bigger/better kept streets. This area is not one of them and these changes if put into place could make the area less desirable for the people who already bought our homes and live here. ", "tjmchattie@gmail.com", "Travis McHattie", "29276", "rip", "OR", "1N2E30DD 1000", "rip-R176138", "2018-05-12 07:13:01.0", "97213", "-13647865.346", "5706498.12", "Submitter", "Northeast", "Rose City Park", "Active", "False", "Housing types, Parking", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1174 "5716 NE Wygant St.", "Portland", "I do not support the proposed zoning code and map changes. I believe it will limit my ability to remodel my home. I believe that the proposed changes will increase the cost of housing.", "lorene1976@gmail.com", "Rachel King", "29277", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-12 11:09:06.0", "97218", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Scale", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1175 "3747 NE Milton Street", "Portland", " I do not, in principle, oppose increasing density through the construction of multiple-unit housing in single-family areas, provided that their scale (volume and height) is compatible with that of the existing homes around them. An enormous single-family home that looms over its neighbors and cuts off their light is more intrusive than a several-lot multiplex that doesn't--and there are many older--and some newer--apartment complexes that fit in well with nearby single family dwellings..

1176 Still, I do have several serious concerns with your proposal.

1177 Most important is that a city NEEDS TO PROVIDE ADEQUATE INFRASTRUCTURE TO SUPPORT ZONING CHANGES! Increased density will create increased usage of streets, public transportation and storm sewers. In my neighborhood, Fremont Street and 33rd Avenue are already carrying substantially more traffic than they were designed for and have long lines of cars behind traffic signals, especially (but not only) at peak commuter hours.

1178 ADEQUATE OFF-STREET PARKING SHOULD BE PROVIDED. Even when people use bikes or public transit, they often want to keep a car for travel, bringing home larger purchases (groceries, yard or home repair supplies, etc.), doctor/veterinary appointments, or taking kids to after-school activities. Our neighborhood already has many narrow streets where current on-street parking often leaves only one traffic lane.

1179 --Believing that people shouldn't use cars doesn't make them stop, and trying to force them by limiting parking options makes them angry instead of co-operative. New economic realities have changed people's transportation needs. Two-job families usually work in two different locations, often far from convenient public transportation stops. They may need to drop off/pick up children at day-care facilities before/after work.

1180 Finally, THE SIZE OF COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS ON SECONDARY OR COLLECTOR STREETS SHOULD BE RELATED TO THE WIDTH OF THE STREET. Aesthetically, 4 or 5-story buildings on a narrow street make it seem like a dark canyon. If they don't provide off-street parking, they may also stress the street's carrying capacity--especially if the tenants require the delivery of goods or get a lot of FedEx deliveries. (Double parking interferes with bus routes, as well as auto traffic.)", "fmoore@frii.com", "Frances Moore", "29278", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-12 14:04:09.0", "97212", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Scale, Parking", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1181 "1388 SE 33rd Ave", "Portland", "I find the suggestions from Portland for Everyone pretty compelling. Although I understand the desire to limit expensive, overly large homes on lots like mine, it seems like there is a less restrictive middle ground that still permits greater overall density and flexibility, providing more opportunities for all people to find homes throughout Portland.", "me@kushaldave.com", "Kushal Dave", "29279", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-12 14:46:53.0", "97214", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Scale", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1182 "3136 n.e.Couch St", "Portland", "Thank you for asking for our input. About 20 years ago, my sister and I bought this duplex ,planning to retire there. As we came to know the neighborhood, we liked the many small housing units and decided to build one, knowing that we were aging and might need to house a caregiver. We were very disappointed to find that the city does not allow them for duplexes. Now that we really do physically need some help to stay in our home, we are extremely hopeful that this new proposal will pass and enable us to do just that. I look at all the new fairly large buildings permitted in our neighborhood and truly believe that an ADU is less intrusive and less damaging for the community and more helpful for current residents and future tenants.

Thank you, Connie Rumer", "Carshs@yahoo.com", "Connie Rumer", "29280", "rip", "OR", "1N1E36CA 19300", "rip-R177733", "2018-05-12 15:34:41.0", "97232", "-13651364.168", "5704297.738", "Submitter", "Southeast", "Kerns", "Active", "False", "Housing types", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1183 "4219 SE Reedway", "Portland", "I submitted testimony in this box previously, but did not realize that all formatting would be removed, so it is virtually unreadable. This "Feature" should be made clear before people submit testimony in this box. I have attached a pdf version here.", "merrilee.wna@gmail.com", "Merrilee Spence", "29281", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-12 16:55:45.0", "97206", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Scale, Housing types, Narrow lots, Mapping R2.5 rezones, Parking", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1184 "4945 N.E. 35th Avenue", "Portland", "I oppose the RIP. I oppose the Comprehensive Plan Map and base zone change on my parcel and the other parcels between NE 33rd and Killingsworth and NE Skidmore and 35th Place (see map). The 2035 Comprehensive Plan provides for over 250,000 additional units of housing using current zoning. RIP is not needed now, this zoning change is not needed now. In 2016, the City Council voted to keep R5 as R5. Residents fought long and hard for this and because the Council voted to keep it, we thought the Council would stand by its vote. But again, under the direction of Mayor Wheeler, the city has gone back on its word and now this area is slated to be upzoned to R2.5. Why? If we participated in the Comprehensive Plan, now we have to fight again. Over and over. Why here when the surrounding blocks aren't? Is it because these blocks have the smallest and most affordable houses for developers to tear down? Is it because the developers are salivating for all of us to die or move? This proposal appears to have been developed by people with an obvious conflict of interest, not residents.

1185 The RIP is so complicated the average resident can't understand it. Not all people can or want to ride bikes, and the streets are full of parked cars now. This zoning change, and RIP in general, will reduce green space to grow the gardens the city wants us to grow, the trees the city wants us to grow, the solar panels the city wants us to install (I've done all of this). The RIP has many other problems, noted in other comments. Bottomline, this zoning change will not sustain the "vibrant neighborhood" we have now, it will change it irreversibly. New homes will not have porches, driveways, gardens where neighbors connect with each other. Is this what you want? Won't that change the "brand" of Portland listening to its residents, practicing sustainability, etc.? Enough is enough. The greenest house is the one already built.

1186 Take care of existing residents. Do not pass the RIP. It has so many problems it will increase home demolitions and decrease livability and affordability. This is not a NIMBY sentiment. It's from a long-time resident who has worked hard to make Portland a nice place to live. Rethink the RIP. Do not upzone my house or my neighbors'. We are the backbone of this city, not developers who will take the money and run to the next "cool" place. ", "kacore@aol.com", "Kathleen Concannon", "29282", "rip", "OR", "1N1E24AC 3200", "rip-R307290", "2018-05-12 17:02:17.0", "97211", "-13650991.993", "5709946.33", "Submitter", "Northeast", "Concordia", "Active", "False", "Mapping R2.5 rezones, Parking", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1187 "4945 N.E. 35th Avenue", "Portland", "I oppose the RIP. I oppose the Comprehensive Plan Map and base zone change on my parcel and the other parcels between NE 33rd and Killingsworth and NE Skidmore and 35th Place (see map). The 2035 Comprehensive Plan provides for over 250,000 additional units of housing using current zoning. RIP is not needed now, this zoning change is not needed now. In 2016, the City Council voted to keep R5 as R5. Residents fought long and hard for this and because the Council voted to keep it, we thought the Council would stand by its vote. But again, under the direction of Mayor Wheeler, the city has gone back on its word and now this area is slated to be upzoned to R2.5. Why? If we participated in the Comprehensive Plan, now we have to fight again. Over and over. Why here when the surrounding blocks aren't? Is it because these blocks have the smallest and most affordable houses for developers to tear down? Is it because the developers are salivating for all of us to die or move? This proposal appears to have been developed by people with an obvious conflict of interest, not residents.

1188 The RIP is so complicated the average resident can't understand it. Not all people can or want to ride bikes, and the streets are full of parked cars now. This zoning change, and RIP in general, will reduce green space to grow the gardens the city wants us to grow, the trees the city wants us to grow, the solar panels the city wants us to install (I've done all of this). The RIP has many other problems, noted in other comments. Bottomline, this zoning change will not sustain the "vibrant neighborhood" we have now, it will change it irreversibly. New homes will not have porches,

driveways, gardens where neighbors connect with each other. Is this what you want? Won't that change the "brand" of Portland listening to its residents, practicing sustainability, etc.? Enough is enough. The greenest house is the one already built.

1189 Take care of existing residents. Do not pass the RIP. It has so many problems it will increase home demolitions and decrease livability and affordability. This is not a NIMBY sentiment. It's from a long-time resident who has worked hard to make Portland a nice place to live. Rethink the RIP. Do not upzone my house or my neighbors'. We are the backbone of this city, not developers who will take the money and run to the next "cool" place. ", "larry5573@gmail.com", "Larry Hopkins", "29283", "rip", "OR", "1N1E24AC 3200", "rip-R307290", "2018-05-12 17:04:25.0", "97211", "-13650991.993", "5709946.33", "Submitter", "Northeast", "Concordia", "Active", "False", "Mapping R2.5 rezones, Parking", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1190 "4945 N.E. 35th Avenue", "Portland", "I oppose the RIP. We saved this house from demolition in 2003. We've been through all of this before. It is an affordable rental and will continue to be so.

1191 I oppose the Comprehensive Plan Map and base zone change on my parcel and the other parcels between NE 33rd and Killingsworth and NE Skidmore and 35th Place (see map). The 2035 Comprehensive Plan provides for over 250,000 additional units of housing using current zoning. RIP is not needed now, this zoning change is not needed now. In 2016, the City Council voted to keep R5 as R5. Residents fought long and hard for this and because the Council voted to keep it, we thought the Council would stand by its vote. But again, under the direction of Mayor Wheeler, the city has gone back on its word and now this area is slated to be upzoned to R2.5. Why? If we participated in the Comprehensive Plan, now we have to fight again. Over and over. Why here when the surrounding blocks aren't? Is it because these blocks have the smallest and most affordable houses for developers to tear down? Is it because the developers are salivating for all of us to die or move? This proposal appears to have been developed by people with an obvious conflict of interest, not residents.

1192 The RIP is so complicated the average resident can't understand it. Not all people can or want to ride bikes, and the streets are full of parked cars now. This zoning change, and RIP in general, will reduce green space to grow the gardens the city wants us to grow, the trees the city wants us to grow, the solar panels the city wants us to install (I've done all of this). The RIP has many other problems, noted in other comments. Bottomline, this zoning change will not sustain the "vibrant neighborhood" we have now, it will change it irreversibly. New homes will not have porches, driveways, gardens where neighbors connect with each other. Is this what you want? Won't that change the "brand" of Portland listening to its residents, practicing sustainability, etc.? Enough is enough. The greenest house is the one already built.

1193 Take care of existing residents. Do not pass the RIP. It has so many problems it will increase home demolitions and decrease livability and affordability. This is not a NIMBY sentiment. It's from a long-time resident who has worked hard to make Portland a nice place to live. Rethink the RIP. Do not upzone my house or my neighbors'. We are the backbone of this city, not developers who will take the money and run to the next "cool" place. ", "larry5573@gmail.com", "Larry Hopkins", "29284", "rip", "OR", "1N1E24AB 19600", "rip-R307293", "2018-05-12 17:13:33.0", "97211", "-13650991.825", "5710022.67", "Submitter", "Northeast", "Concordia", "Active", "False", "Mapping R2.5 rezones, Parking", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1194 "4945 N.E. 35th Avenue", "Portland", "I oppose the RIP. We saved this house from demolition in 2003. We've been through all of this before. It is an affordable rental and will continue to be so.

1195 I oppose the Comprehensive Plan Map and base zone change on my parcel and the other parcels between NE 33rd and Killingsworth and NE Skidmore and 35th Place (see map). The 2035 Comprehensive Plan provides for over 250,000 additional units of housing using current zoning. RIP is not needed now, this zoning change is not needed now. In 2016, the City Council voted to keep R5 as R5. Residents fought long and hard for this and because the Council voted to keep it, we thought the Council would stand by its vote. But again, under the direction of Mayor Wheeler, the city has gone back on its word and now this area is slated to be upzoned to R2.5. Why? If we participated in the Comprehensive Plan, now we have to fight again. Over and over. Why here when the surrounding blocks aren't? Is it because these blocks have the smallest and most affordable houses for developers to tear down? Is it because the developers are salivating for all of us to die or move? This proposal appears to have been developed by people with an obvious conflict of interest, not residents.

1196 The RIP is so complicated the average resident can't understand it. Not all people can or want to ride bikes, and the streets are full of parked cars now. This zoning change, and RIP in general, will reduce green space to grow the gardens the city wants us to

grow, the trees the city wants us to grow, the solar panels the city wants us to install (I've done all of this). The RIP has many other problems, noted in other comments. Bottomline, this zoning change will not sustain the "vibrant neighborhood" we have now, it will change it irreversibly. New homes will not have porches, driveways, gardens where neighbors connect with each other. Is this what you want? Won't that change the "brand" of Portland listening to its residents, practicing sustainability, etc.? Enough is enough. The greenest house is the one already built.

1197 Take care of existing residents. Do not pass the RIP. It has so many problems it will increase home demolitions and decrease livability and affordability. This is not a NIMBY sentiment. It's from a long-time resident who has worked hard to make Portland a nice place to live. Rethink the RIP. Do not upzone my house or my neighbors'. We are the backbone of this city, not developers who will take the money and run to the next "cool" place. ", "kacore@aol.com", "Kathleen Concannon", "29285", "rip", "OR", "1N1E24AB 19600", "rip-R307293", "2018-05-12 17:14:23.0", "97211", "-13650991.825", "5710022.67", "Submitter", "Northeast", "Concordia", "Active", "False", "Mapping R2.5 rezones, Parking", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", "" "4005 NE Laddington Court", "Portland", "

1198 City Of Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability

1199 ATTN: Residential Infill Project

1200 1900 SW 4th Avenue

1201 Suite 7100

1202 Portland, OR 97201

1203

1204

1205 RE: Testimony on the Residential Infill Project

1206

1207 To the Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission:

1208

1209

1210 I oppose the Residential Infill Plan in its current form.

1211

1212 Three and four households on every lot is too dense for Laurelhurst. This is a neighborhood of bungalows and large 4-plexes would destroy the neighborhood look and feel.

1213

1214

1215 Sincerely,

1216

1217 Robert and Lynn Trexler

1218 4005 NE Laddington CT", "bob2trexler@gmail.com", "Robert Trexler", "29286", "rip", "OR", "1N1E36AD 6000", "rip-R203407", "2018-05-12 17:33:37.0", "97232", "-13650193.866", "5705052.764", "Submitter", "Southeast", "Laurelhurst", "Active", "False", "Housing types", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1219 "3924 NE LAURELHURST PLACE", "PORTLAND ", "To the Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission:

1220 I oppose the Residential Infill Plan in its current form.

1221 Three and four households on every lot is too dense for Portland's single family house neighborhoods. High density should be in city centers and on large corridor streets. The buildings allowed by RIP are too large and tall for most of Portland's neighborhoods. Infill size and height should be compatible with neighboring houses. Our smaller bungalows should not be redeveloped to large, expensive housing. RIP will increase demolitions, toxic contamination, and environmental waste.

1222

1223

1224

1225

1226

1227

1228

1229 I support accessory dwelling units. I support additional units sensitively added inside existing houses. I support reasonable density without demolition. I oppose RIP.

1230

1231

1232 PS. This has been my neighborhood since the 1960s. I came from a blue collar family with hard work, allowing us to live here and attended All Saints ,and Holy Child. Please allow this neighborhood to continue to be single family dwelling supporting the Portland dream my family was allowed to have when I was growing up. Please dont change all the simple characteristics of the city I once loved . ", "rogers3924@yahoo.com", "MARY ANN ROGERS", "29287", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-12 20:47:45.0", "97232", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Scale, Housing types", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1233 "1908 SE 35th Pl.", "Portland", "See attached pdf re: Tuck-under garages and driveway widths.", "dougurb@gmail.com", "Doug Klotz", "29288", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-12

22:09:28.0","97214","0","0","Submitter","","","Active","False","Parking","","","","","Proposed","","","","","","",""

1234 "2729 NE 14 Ave.,"Portland","Newly constructed homes in NE Portland must require off street parking.

1235 I live in the part of NE Portland developed before 1920. My house is 100 years old. The streets in this part of town do not support two-way traffic when automobiles are parked on both sides. The streets were acceptable 100 years ago because many of the houses have off street parking. Parking in this area is so tight, I received a notice saying an automobile I left parked on the street in front of my house would be towed.

1236 Homes in newer parts of NE Portland with smaller lot sizes do not have off street parking. In these areas the streets are wide enough to support two-way traffic with automobiles parked on both sides. In these parts of town, parking on the street in front of a house is limited to two automobiles. The on-street parking space used up by the current residents.

1237 It is my understanding Portland wants to increase the population density of NE Portland. The zoning changes I see in the 'Proposed Zoning Code and Map Changes' does not mention or plan for an increased population of automobiles the new residence will bring with them. A solution is: Newly constructed homes in NE Portland require off street parking.

1238 ","dkozicki@q.com","Donald Kozicki","29289","rip","OR","1N1E26BD 15200","rip-R188732","2018-05-13 09:58:39.0","97212","-13653531.987","5707347.017","Submitter","Northeast","Irvington","Active","False","Parking","","","","","","","Proposed","","","","","","",""

1239 "2124 SE Grant St.,"Portland","I am writing concerning proposed zoning code and map changes that affect the density of our neighborhood. I am strongly opposed to allowing more households in this area. I am not opposed to limiting construction of very large homes (ie. greater than 4000 sq ft) as I feel they are out of scale to existing homes here.,"jmremien@gmail.com","Juanita Remien","29290","rip","OR","","rip-null","2018-05-13 11:14:22.0","97214","0","0","Submitter","","","Active","False","Scale,Housing types","","","","","","","Proposed","","","","","","",""

1240 "4427 N Gantenbein Ave","Portland","Content pasted here, and attached as a PDF for ease of reading: I am opposed to the Zoning Code and Map changes proposed by the Planning and Sustainability Commission in its current form, with two primary reasons listed below. | First-hand (negative) experience with your proposed "duplex plus a detached ADU." | First, my husband and I own a single-family house in an R2.5 residential zone in North Portland and have first-hand experience living adjacent to an over-occupied home. Adjacent to our house is a property already operating as one of your proposed "duplex plus a detached ADU," and we can attest to how it detracts from the quality of life on our once-quiet street. | Said house was originally an unoccupied single-family dwelling that was purchased and renovated by Dozer Construction, LLC. Upon completion of construction, they turned the house into an illegal short-term rental business endeavor. Last year, the City of Portland – with the help of us and our neighbors – assessed a civil penalty in the amount of \$52,750.91 and won the case (see Case #2160021; City of Portland vs. Dozer Construction LLC). | Since Dozer lost the case, they converted the house (which is now owned by yet another property management agency with no representative living onsite) into a long-term rental property consisting of three units: the main house, an unpermitted basement apartment, and a large detached ADU. In total, there are nine adults, three dogs, one cat, and eight vehicles (with a parking pad available for only two) occupying the property. Their single-family garbage bin regularly overflows on the street (attracting vermin), guests come and go throughout the day (in addition to maintenance staff who work on the compound), and parking has become a point of contention (we have called PBOT Parking Enforcement at least a dozen times in the past six months because of cars blocking our driveway).

1241 Packing people into homes meant for single-family use – especially for the financial benefit of outside property management companies and developers – does not make for a sustainable neighborhood. We see it every day, and it stresses us every day. | Our neighborhood has no shortage of housing; it's affordability that's the problem.

1242 North Portland has seen its fair share of construction. If you look solely at Williams Avenue, spanning just nine blocks from Cook Street to Going Street, six mega apartment complexes have been built since 2015. | In only three short years, the below complexes have sprung up – none of which appear to be fully occupied, and all of which are positioned as "luxury apartments" (with price tags to match). With an average Portland household income of ~\$68K, these buildings will likely remain under-occupied. It's not that there is nowhere for people to live – it's a question of affordability. | The Wilmore [75 Units/5 Stories | Studio \$1,299-1,599 / 1 Bedroom \$1,549 – 1,899 / 2

Bedrooms \$2,099 - 2,399]; Peloton Apartments [265 Units/6 Stories | 1 Bedroom \$1,637-2,113 / 2 Bedrooms \$2,857-3,050]; Mason Williams [76 Units/4 Stories]; Cook Street Apartments [208 Units/6 Stories | Studio \$1,319 - 2,034 / 1 Bedroom \$1,621 - 2,526 / 2 Bedrooms \$2,326 - 3,163]; The Century [104 Units/5 Stories | Studio \$1,275 / 1 Bedroom \$1,295 - 1,465]; Carbon 12 [14 Units/8 Stories]. That's a total of 742 apartment units. Mind you - this doesn't capture the total number of apartment buildings on the avenue, or even those still under construction. It's a small snapshot.

1243 With the influx of new residents, public transportation is taxed, traffic has increased, and parking is cutthroat. Now you are proposing that regular homeowners jump in on the real estate boom, too? Over-occupancy, disengaged property owners/landlords, and illegal short-term rentals are already an issue. With this proposal, you are inviting the possibility of even more. | We pay nearly \$7,500 in taxes annually. With the influx of people, and the increased demand for resources, it will continue to rise until we, too, are priced out. This proposal, if passed, will make it incredibly difficult to justify continuing to live in Portland.", "cheboygen@hotmail.com", "Danielle Conroy", "29291", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-13 11:14:45.0", "97217", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Housing types", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", ""

1244 "3068 NE Regents Drive", "Portland", "My understanding is that an overlay is proposed for our zone (R5) which would have the effect of allowing more residences on our and our neighbors' lots (to allow for higher density housing).

1245

1246 The mailed notice indicates that zoning change would help reduce the likelihood of very large homes (presumably developers would be attracted to the profit of constructing albeit smaller houses). It is not clear if the overlay would in fact explicitly restrict or further encourage constructions of double McMansions on standard-sized lots.

1247

1248 As city ratepayers, while understanding the desire to support more infill housing so as to address housing needs for potential residents, we oppose any proposal that increases over-look of neighboring properties, especially for properties that would be significantly more shaded as a result.

1249

1250 The effect of the zoning, as is increasingly been seen and objected too (protests against tear-downs), is a decline of the livability quality of the inner-city neighborhoods, in terms of green-space, original architectural style, sunlight, proportion of development to space, and overlook / loss of privacy. In addition, some lots now look overbuilt, and others adjacent look very undeveloped, producing jarring differences and the impression of an application of discordant planning rules.

1251

1252 In particular, setbacks are a main area of concern, especially with respect to neighbors' backyard and neighbors' southern exposure. The preference indeed is to provide more latitude to allow houses to be closer to the street if that would allow neighbors to the south of a development to not be as overlooked by an otherwise close and imposing overlook from a development. That is to say, houses on the north side of an east-west oriented street should be permitted to build closer to the street and encouraged to have a larger backyard, whereas houses on the south side of street should be free to align with immediate neighbors to maximize east-west light for all.

1253

1254 This is a particular concern for our lot as we are next to two traditionally-developed corner lots, each arguably with a lot of 'potential'. Our lot is in fact slightly smaller than the standard minimum lot size, itself a product of a title split which lead to the neighboring corner lot. A re-development of the lot to our south would cast the little greens pace we have into a mossy sunless shade, and cast south-facing lower-level windows into more hours without sunshine (direct sunlight already somewhat absent in winter). On the other hand, a redevelopment to our north is inconsequential both to ourselves and to anyone else (any shade cast will likely be only to the street to the north of that lot).

1255

1256 In summary: Any proposal that increases setbacks with respect to properties to the south of a development would be supported, even if that mean more units would be allowed on that lot.

1257

1258 Thanks for providing the opportunity to provide input to the proposed change.", "brettactivity@gmail.com", "Brett Williams", "29292", "rip", "OR", "1N1E24CD 7400", "rip-R230283", "2018-05-13

11:31:14.0","97212","-13651558.19","5708647.259","Submitter","Northeast","Alameda","Active","False","Scale,Housing types","","","","","Proposed","","","","",""

1259 "606 NE 72nd Ave","Portland ","I attended a Portland's interactive Residential meeting at Hillsdale Library. Thursday, May 3, 2018. After conversation with a City Staff member, I was advised to contact PSC direct to perhaps include an overlooked condition in making the criterion proposal for ADU's. The brochure which was given to the attendees gave all the present proposals on what was allowed to add an ADU. I have a triplex which is not on a corner lot but, is situated in the middle of a block. The brochure (Residential Infill Project Summary, dated April 2018) on page 3, paragraph 7, second bullet; says "Allow a triplex and an ADU on corner lots when one unit is affordable". However, it doesn't address the possibility of a BASEMENT APPARTMENT, on a corner or middle of a block. I have a brochure issued by the State of Oregon call "Accessory Dwelling Units in Portland, Oregon" composed by Jordan Palmeri, dated 06/01/2014. On page 5, paragraph 3, it states; "An ADU is a small independent dwelling on the same grounds as an otherwise conventional single-family resident. Regardless of its architectural form (back yard cottage, BASEMENT APPARTMENT, etc.), etc.

1260

1261 I have a very nice basement unit which would work well for a single 420 sq.' unit, with a complete bathroom which includes a beautiful ceramic shower, a stained glass window, updated sink with cabinet, ceiling fan and installed toilet. It has a window which qualifies for fire egress plus two additional windows, separate sleeping area with a large size closet, carpeted floor, baseboard heat, a large area which would quality for a kitchen, it has cabinets in place, available hot and cold-water and connections for a drain for a sink. It has its own water heater and a separate electric panel. It would need a stove, refrigerator and connecting a sink for usage. It also, has its own entrance to the outside and in addition, an off-street parking area, if need be. According to my understanding form the literature which Portland has published this would qualify for a basement ADU. It has a very cozy feeling with a lot of day light exposure.

1262

1263 I hope Portland will consider this as an additional source of an ADU. If, I personally needed a place to sustain myself I certainly wouldn't object living here and as Portland says "As Portlanders, we have an opportunity to update the RULES that shape our residential neighbors so that more people can live in them, while LIMITING THE CONSTRUCTION, etc., etc."

1264

1265 Thank you for your time.

1266

1267 Ron Dobrunick

1268 (360) 772-1274

1269 ", "rdobrunick@msn.com", "Ronald Dobrunick", "29293", "rip", "OR", "1N2E32AC 18000", "rip-R119352", "2018-05-13 11:43:15.0","97213","-13646486.061","5704917.353","Submitter","Southeast","Montavilla","Active","False","Housing types,Affordability","","","","","Proposed","","","","",""

1270 "1527 NE 65th Av","Portland","Per TriMet's latest survey, reducing congestion and the need to increase motor vehicle capacity is the top transportation priority - more so than adding transit options or bicycle infrastructure. PBOT however has been going in the opposite direction by removing on-street parking on major streets and creating road diets with street designs that reduce motor vehicle capacity thereby adding more congestion, fuel consumption and emissions. With no proportional representative seats at the table for motorists on PBOT advisory committees, motorists have become one of largest unrepresented community groups in Portland.

1271

1272 The same deficiency of representation is also true with the RIP process as it applies to the need to require adequate off-street parking. Car owners have no specific representative seats at a table that are inequitably and unjustly filled with a stacked deck of anti-car people.

1273

1274 The RIP final draft proposal wrongly ignores the December 7, 2016 City Council amendment that allows front loading garages on narrow lots. Residential streets were never intended to be car storage lots. The city has a 24 hour rule that a vehicle can not be parked in the same place on the street for more than 24 hours. Cars stored on narrow residential streets to the degree that two vehicles can't pass each other give rise to a safety issue for everything from emergency vehicles to garbage trucks to bicyclists. Commuters utilizing alternative transport modes also have cars that need to be stored when not in use. Like taxpayer funded public art, the aesthetics of front

loading garages are purely subjective.

1275

1276

If the city expects people to transition from petroleum powered vehicles to electric vehicles, the city needs to require adequate off-street parking for all new residential development that includes adjacent electric connectivity for overnight charging. This is far better than running extension cords across sidewalks or down the block to cars stored on the street.

1277

1278

Not allowing front loading garages on skinny lots and not requiring off-street parking for affordable housing is a form of discrimination based on income. The absence of a requirement for off-street parking appears to be an attempt to "dictate" to renters they should not have a car. 59% of low income people drive to there place of employment. There has been a lot of conversation about housing types and neighborhood choice, but where is the conversation about the freedom of choice in transportation?

1279

1280

Curb cuts provide a positive benefit for residents and can have a positive impact for the pedestrian experience. This is a quality of life issue. Curb cuts allow access to homes for service and delivery vehicles, and create a space for roll carts. For mobility impaired people in wheelchairs and with walkers that don't drive, curb cuts make it easier for them to access the street to link up with TriMet Lift or other on-call specialized vehicles for hire. Bicyclists have access from the street instead of just from the pedestrian sidewalk. A single curb cut takes away less than a full parking place on the street, but can provide access to multiple car storage options.

1281

1282

Finally, it is unjust to the tax paying residents of neighboring properties that have driveways and off-street parking not to require off-street parking for nearby new development. The reality is cars are going to be around for the foreseeable future. The parking mayhem in Northwest Portland must not be duplicated elsewhere. Keeping the future in mind, development must also meet today's needs while keeping Portland as an enticing livable city that includes the preservation of diverse, older and established single family home neighborhoods - especially those neighborhoods where the homes have green yards and big mature trees. As part of doing just that, the city needs to stop turning a deaf ear and start listening to the motorists that pay the transportation taxes which fund the vast majority of TSP projects. With a growing population, the city needs to make more room for cars that includes allowing front loading garages on all properties and requiring adequate off-street parking for all new residential development!!!

1283

","parkert2012@gmail.com","Terry Parker","29294","rip","OR","","rip-null","2018-05-13 13:18:09.0","97213","0","0","Submitter","","","Active","False","Parking","","","","","Proposed","","","","",""

1284

"11045 se 75th ct","Portland","I submitted testimony, however all formatting was removed. I am resubmitting it here as a PDF so that it's easier to read.", "bradleybondy@bradleybondy.com","Bradley Bondy","29296","rip","OR","","rip-null","2018-05-13 13:39:05.0","97222","0","0","Submitter","","","Active","False","Scale,Housing types,Mapping the ""a"" overlay,Displacement,Parking","","","","","Proposed","","","","",""

1285

1286

"3315 NE 44th Ave. ","Portland","Silvia Larco

1287

3315 NE 44th Ave.
Portland, OR 97213

1288

1289

To whom it may concern,

1290

1291

Regarding proposed zoning changes, I favor the increase in density.

1292

I live in a bungalow whose garage has been modified by a previous owner. Two thirds of it are, at the moment, a multiple use room. And one third is storage. That portion could be turned into a three fourths bathroom and a kitchen and the whole structure become a rental unit. Which would be of interest to me if need for extra income arises.

1293

1294

Thank you,

1295

Silvia Larco

1296

1297

1298

Sent from my iPhone","silarco@earthlink.net","Silvia Larco","29297","rip","OR","1N1E25AA 600","rip-R112572","2018-05-13 16:19:09.0","97213","-13650049.739","5708114.051","Submitter","Northeast","Beaumont-Wilsh

1299 ire","Active","False","Housing types","","","","","Proposed","","","",""
1300 "3144 NE 44th Ave.,""Portland","Hi,
1301 Once I got the notification in the mail about the proposed changes, I couldn't sleep
and started writing a big, impassioned response. I'll spare you. To cut to the chase
... I'm against what I consider radical infill in my neighborhood. These are houses
and neighborhoods that have been around since the 1920s. To crowd more houses and
people in will lower the quality of life. I've seen it. At the end of 44th at
Fremont, developers put up an apartment complex with no parking. We tried to fight it,
but it was a done deal. Luckily I'm a block an a half away, but even so, the drive to
get up to Fremont to begin my morning commute is difficult because of all the cars on
the street which make visibility a big problem. People that live on 44th next to
Fremont have a daily frustration getting in and out of their own driveway. I repeat -
a daily frustration. Their quality of life took a big hit. Lest you think I'm
nostalgic for a past that never was, I grew up here (since 1961) and remember three gas
stations on the south side of Fremont from 44th to 41st. I am not against change, but
to think you can shoehorn more people and cars into a well-established, nice
neighborhood to ""give more people opportunities to live in these vibrant neighborhoods
..."" will destroy the very thing you describe as desirable. I applaud the effort to
get people to slow down on our streets, the 20 is enough campaign, but don't you see
that this is a symptom, a canary in the coal mine if you will, of too many people and
too many cars already. We don't need anymore duplexes and triplexes.
","bobjudy2@centurylink.net","Robert
Bassett","29298","rip","OR","","","rip-null","2018-05-13
19:16:14.0","97213","0","0","Submitter","","","Active","False","","","","","Propose
d","","","","",""
1302 "3144 NE 44th Ave.,""Portland","Hi,
1303
1304 Once I got the notification in the mail about the proposed changes, I couldn't sleep
and started writing a big, impassioned response. I'll spare you. To cut to the chase
... I'm against what I consider radical infill in my neighborhood. These are houses
and neighborhoods that have been around since the 1920s. To crowd more houses and
people in will lower the quality of life. I've seen it. At the end of 44th at
Fremont, developers put up an apartment complex with no parking. We tried to fight it,
but it was a done deal. Luckily I'm a block an a half away, but even so, the drive to
get up to Fremont to begin my morning commute is difficult because of all the cars on
the street which make visibility a big problem. People that live on 44th next to
Fremont have a daily frustration getting in and out of their own driveway. I repeat -
a daily frustration. Their quality of life took a big hit. Lest you think I'm
nostalgic for a past that never was, I grew up here (since 1961) and remember three gas
stations on the south side of Fremont from 44th to 41st. I am not against change, but
to think you can shoehorn more people and cars into a well-established, nice
neighborhood to ""give more people opportunities to live in these vibrant neighborhoods
..."" will destroy the very thing you describe as desirable. I applaud the effort to
get people to slow down on our streets, the 20 is enough campaign, but don't you see
that this is a symptom, a canary in the coal mine if you will, of too many people and
too many cars already. We don't need anymore duplexes and triplexes.
","bobjudy2@centurylink.net","Robert
Bassett","29299","rip","OR","","","rip-null","2018-05-13
19:16:13.0","97213","0","0","Submitter","","","Active","False","Housing
types,Parking","","","","","Proposed","","","",""
1305 "6816 SE Belmont Street","Portland","I don't support increasing the density of our
neighborhoods as proposed by RIPSAC. Not everyone wants to live cheek by jowl. The
character of our lovely older neighborhoods is worth preserving. Just my two
cents.,""jasonsiri@gmail.com","Jason Siri","29300","rip","OR","","","rip-null","2018-05-13
19:55:50.0","97215","0","0","Submitter","","","Active","False","","","","","Propose
d","","","","",""
1306 "4600 SE 33rd Pl.,""Portland","Dear Planning and sustainability board,
1307
1308 I write to ask you to amend the current Proposed Draft of the RIP.
1309
1310 First, I would ask you to make amendments to the proposed draft with the following
ethos: make new housing in amenity rich, desirable Portland neighborhoods more likely
to be abundant and affordable (or at least more so). I think you might improve the
likelihood of this outcome by doing the following:
1311

- 1312 1. For every additional unit built on a property allow additional FAR and height.
1313 2. Apply the new A-overlay to the entire area of Portland where it applies, not just
already well off inner neighborhoods.
1314 3. Do away with parking requirements completely or at least if more than one unit is
built.
1315 4. Allow tri-plexes and 4-plexes everywhere in the new overlay by right (once again
with a FAR and height bonus for each additional unit).
1316 5. Reduce front set back requirements to 10 feet.
1317 6. Delete all arbitrary aesthetic requirements...these only serve to increase
development costs and thus housing costs.
1318 7. Give some real affordable incentives. (e.g. No SDCs for the whole project if one
unit is affordable. 2 extra units and no SDCs if all units are affordable.)

1319
1320 While the RIP is not the only answer to our housing Emergency, it could clearly be one
important step, but, the 86 additional units per year foreseen by the Johnson report
under the current proposal are an almost meaningless drop in the bucket. As currently
written, the RIP is a sop to already wealthy, amenity rich neighborhoods, instead of a
meaningful encouragement for lots of new housing at a variety of price points across
the city!

1321
1322 Thank you for your excellent work thus far, and please, think of those without good
housing and of the future citizens of Portland that will need good places to live.

1323
1324 Sincerely,
1325 Eric Lindsay", "lindsay.eric@gmail.com", "Eric
Lindsay", "29301", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-13
21:09:08.0", "97202", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "Propose
d", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1326 "4146 NE Flanders Street st.", "Portland", "City Of Portland Bureau of Planning and
Sustainability
1327 ATTN: Residential Infill Project
1328 1900 SW 4th Avenue
1329 Suite 7100
1330 Portland, OR 97201

1331
1332 RE: Testimony on the Residential Infill Project
1333

1334 To the Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission:
1335

1336 I oppose the Residential Infill Plan in its current form. Three and four households on
every lot is too dense for Portland's single family house neighborhoods. It will
destroy neighborhoods that are currently family friendly and it will force families to
look outside of the city limits for family friendly communities.

1337
1338 High density should be in city centers and on large corridor streets. The buildings
allowed by RIP are too large and tall for most of Portland's neighborhoods.
1339 Infill size and height should be compatible with neighboring houses. Our smaller
bungalows should not be redeveloped to large, expensive housing.

1340
1341 RIP will increase demolitions, toxic contamination, and environmental waste.
1342

1343 I support accessory dwelling units for houses and duplexes. I support additional units
sensitively added inside existing houses. I support reasonable density without
demolition.

1344
1345 I oppose RIP. I sincerely hope you make the best choice for the future of Portland and
do not allow RIP in its current form to go forward.

1346
1347 Sincerely,
1348

1349 Jeff Hanson", "jeffhanson.email@gmail.com", "Jeff
Hanson", "29302", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-13
21:13:02.0", "97232", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "Propose
d", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1350 "2632 SE Salmon St.", "PORTLAND", "I support Portland For Everyone's testimony at
<http://portlandforeveryone.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/P4E-RIP-PD-Letter-05.07.18.pdf>,

but I think it doesn't go far enough. The city should legalize Paris-level densities—5-6-story buildings throughout the inner neighborhoods, perhaps everywhere with a 15 or 20-minute bike or bus ride to downtown. We should be trying to not just stop the recent increases in prices and sprawl but reverse them, which means providing enough places to live for most of the people who have been forced to the outlying neighborhoods and suburbs in the last decade or two.", "jyasskin@gmail.com", "Jeffrey Yasskin", "29303", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-13 21:18:44.0", "97214", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1351 "5117 NE Cesar Chavez blvd", "Portland", "I am writing to suggest that tri-plexes not be allowed on corner lots with the new A overlay. Allowing these will have negative impacts on the neighboring property by allowing a large structure be built out and dwarfing the adjacent house. Many lots, myself included, live between two corner lots so we would have two large structures on both sides of us. I am concerned that the structures will block the sun from my garden and solar panels. Thanks.", "adamcrafts@gmail.com", "Adam Crafts", "29304", "rip", "OR", "1N1E24AA 19100", "rip-R181060", "2018-05-13 21:38:26.0", "97211", "-13650354.337", "5710084.434", "Submitter", "Northeast", "Concordia", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1352 "906 SE 72nd Ave", "Portland", "May 13, 2018

1353
1354 To: Planning and Sustainability Commission
1355 From: Marilyn Pitts
1356 Re: the Residential Infill Project (RIP)
1357

1358 In 2000, I moved to 906 SE 72nd, which was built in 1950. From 1993- 2011, the Bureau of Environmental Services had a downspout disconnection program. When that program existed, my property - and much of Mt. Tabor - wasn't eligible to participate. It's my understanding this was primarily because of the soil type as well as the incline.

1359
1360 The proposed new 'a' overlay would create more impervious surfaces, which could mean more water. In much of the area around Mt. Tabor, this could have negative results.

1361
1362 When I bought my house in 2000, I saw a small crack in the foundation. Over the years, the crack has expanded, and I've had my house evaluated by a structural engineer. To slow the downhill movement, I've had the house re-attached to the foundation walls. Even so, I've seen evidence of continued movement in my front yard - specifically, the house separating from the front sidewalk.

1363
1364 The proposed 'a' overlay has the potential to negatively impact the land on which my house sits. Therefore, I want to encourage you to remove the lands on Mt. Tabor from this proposed change.

1365 ", "marilyn.s.pitts@gmail.com", "Marilyn Pitts", "29305", "rip", "OR", "1S2E05AB 17800", "rip-R271297", "2018-05-13 22:55:05.0", "97215", "-13646473.38", "5703245.087", "Submitter", "Southeast", "Mt. Tabor", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1366 "5034 NE Rodney Avenue", "Portland", "I attended a meeting run by the City regarding the Residential Infill Project and frankly was alarmed by some of the proposals. And I was not alone. The meeting hall was stuffed with people and I have to say, the mood was decidedly against RIP. Not one voice spoke up for it. and yet the City later categorized the meeting as very positive for RIP - the exact opposite of the impression I got. Those that spoke publicly were strongly and very heatedly against RIP, accompanied by vigorous applause in a packed meeting hall. The fact that this and other meetings were stated to be in favor of RIP shows a purposeful bias to just go through motions and not actually listen to constituents. We were told in this meeting that affordability and demolitions were "off the table," meaning to me and I think others, that the City understands that RIP will be counterproductive to the former and is meant to encourage the latter.

1367
1368 I believe RIP to be flawed in many of its major tenants. It seems a gift to developers, who I'm told, were over-represented on the advisory board, which makes sense as I'm told that many were appointed by former Mayor Hales. As written, the Residential Infill Project (RIP) will encourage demolitions of existing single-family homes, many of them viable and affordable starter homes, in favor of building expensive tall skinny homes that will increase density, but at the cost of destroying AFFORDABLE home stock, reducing shade, and green space for City wildlife (gardens and trees) , but without

accounting for any of the infrastructure load that such density will require: electricity, water, emergency services and police enforcement -- many of these already critically overtaxed.

1369
1370 RIP will create a severe degradation to the quality of Portland as a city and will lead to further displacement of working-class Portlanders who have grown up here and who are the ones who literally made Portland great and who put this City on the map for great places to be. These people will simply not be able to afford to live in the Portland that RIP intends to create and why would they want to? If RIP comes to pass, I truly believe that it will lead to blight and an over-costed soulless landscape like already exists in California's Silicon Valley / San Francisco Bay Area.

1371
1372 I am against RIP as written. Furthermore, I believe that such a proposal, with so profound an impact, but be decided on by citizens at the ballot, not by a selected committee of special interests or City proponents of
same.", "johnkim506@gmail.com", "John Kim", "29306", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-13
23:08:17.0", "97211", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "Propose
d", "", "", "", "", ""

1373 "824 NE 74th Ave", "Portland", "I am concerned about the proposed changes to the Zoning Code in my neighborhood which I understand, if passed, will prevent me from developing the 25' x 100' lot I own and that I have been planning to develop for many years under the existing R5a code.

1374
1375 My wife and I own 824 NE 74th Avenue, 97213. This street address currently encompasses two separate Property Tax lots:

1376 1. Tax Account Number R119434, Brainard, Block 8, Lot 8 & 9. On this 50' x 100' lot stands our 1909 single family residence and a recently built garage.

1377 2. Tax Account Number R119433, Brainard, Block 7. Nothing stands on this 25' x 100' lot and we have been planning to develop it for years while we gather finances to get a new single-family house built on it.

1378
1379 We are concerned that the new code will prevent us from developing the open lot. We have already invested \$60,00 in building a new garage on the south side of our house and demolishing an old garage on the narrow lot. We have to get return on our investment so far and activate the value of this land as part of our financial plans for retirement. If the new code prevents us from so doing we are ABSOLUTELY opposed to it.

1380 It will tangibly damage our financial well-being into the future.

1381
1382 As you know the blocks in the vicinity of our property were originally platted as 25'x100' lots back at the turn of the century and we bought the property in full expectation that we could develop the open lot. It has NOT been subdivided for development from a larger lot, it has ALWAYS been a narrow lot.

1383
1384 We strongly urge you to modify the proposed code language to enable development of our lot (and others like it) by grandfathering it in based on the original intent of the platting; or by simply NOT outlawing single family houses on 25' wide lots in the new code.

1385
1386 I want to reiterate that the proposed code will create real and significant financial detriment to my wife and I, effectively making our narrow lot worthless as a marketable entity. Please reconsider.

1387
1388 Let us know if we can offer more information.

1389 Thank you.
1390 ", "knightsc@pdx.edu", "Clive Knights", "29307", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-13
23:10:19.0", "97213", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "Propose
d", "", "", "", "", ""

1391 "2550 NE 36th Ave", "Portland", "I think there are good things in the RIP, but they are outweighed by the bad currently and believe the city is truly missing out on an opportunity to assure Portland will remain the great livable, neighborly city for which it has become known. The "one rule fits all neighborhoods" approach to the RIP rules will result in a hodgepodge of neighborhoods with non-harmonious homes that will destroy the character of our neighborhoods. These close-in neighborhoods ARE what makes this city great and livable. SAFE "livable" neighborhoods require space for front-facing neighborly interactions and activity where neighbors can gather, children

can play and where neighbors can monitor the activities in their neighborhood. It requires LONG-TERM neighbors who are INVESTED in their neighborhood. A few points:

1392 • The claim that "increasing" setbacks is disingenuous... i.e.: saying the current rule requires a 10 foot set back and increasing it to 15 feet. Well, the setbacks on my street in Grant Park are currently 20 - 25 feet, so any new houses with a 15 foot setback will stick out, block views, reduce the neighborly front yards to non-neighborly patches of barkdusted landscapes and IMPACT THE SAFETY of neighborhoods by reducing views and just generally reduce the cross INTERACTION and harmony of the neighborhood street. While a 15 foot setback would be normal in some older SE neighborhoods it would not be normal in most of the close-in SW/NE neighborhoods. Already a new house next to me, with a 15 foot front set back, blocks the view down the street from my house. I can no longer watch my neighbor's boys play in their yard, converse across the yards with neighbors, nor monitor activity down the street (e.g.: watch for someone stealing packages from a neighbors porch, or other such activity). I do not look forward to being hemmed in between two large houses that stick out 15 feet farther than my house. A somewhat easy fix would be to require any new house to be set back based on an average set-back for established homes in a neighborhood. My grandparents, parents and my family have lived in this neighborhood since the 1930's and throughout have old and current memories (and photos!) of neighbor and children activities stretching across front yards that just wouldn't be possible with 15 foot bark dusted yards (actually less with stairways included).

1393 • Allowing duplexes to be built on ALL lots... not just corners. Duplexes are rentals... at least 50%. The property can be owned only by one owner. They are more likely to be an investment which will be 100% filled with renters. If a provision was made that they need to be owner occupied then I'd not have as much opposition to the obvious increased car and people density, as it is presumed an owner will be more likely invested in the upkeep of the house and the neighborhood. Don't blame them, but renters just aren't as invested in the neighborhood. Even better would be to require any non-corner lot duplex to be in a condo/townhouse form so that there are MORE OPPORTUNITIES FOR OWNERSHIP for renters to buy into neighborhoods. Converting renters to owners should be Portland's goal. Keeping a high percentage of ownership is a goal the city should be aiming for for a "livable" city.

1394 • With the provisions of NOT counting the proposed higher above grade basements (i.e.: "basements" need only be 4 ft deep) and large "attics", the actual builds will be LARGER than most of the McMansion people complain about. Personally, the taller houses are less bothersome than the small front yards and the lack of OWNERSHIP goals.

1395 • If we tear down a scattered 6000 houses across the city to build duplexes that aren't REALLY focused where the zoning currently encourages transit-oriented density we will have displaced 12,000 people from moderately priced housing for a 1.5% increase in land use density overall scattered to places where it can't do the maximum good. Is that really worth the cost in neighborhood disruption and dislocation? Far more productive would be a similarly sized City project to explore how to incentivize build-out of greater density where it is already zoned. Why should we try to drive more density into Eliot and Boise when there are entire blocks along NE Broadway devoted to just two fast food drive-throughs which are zoned for high-rise mixed-use density?

1397 The lack of a true focus for properly placed density, lack of preservation of neighborhood interaction and safety, and lack of any foresight for providing more ownership opportunities in this plan is opening Portland up to destruction of our city's famed livability.

1399 ", "indah@teleport.com", "Kerry Milne", "29308", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-14 02:07:14.0", "97212", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "Propose d", "", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1400 "834 NE 67th Ave ", "Portland", "I love the idea of changing the zoning throughout the city! I think this would help infill big lots that have 1 small home and tons of land around it. I think the zoning could change a lot of things for a lot of people! ", "Jodisgermanshepherd@yahoo.com", "Jodi Winters", "29309", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-14 03:32:52.0", "97213", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "Propose d", "", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1401 "3344 ne 15th ave.", "portland", "oppose rip- the speculative and investor real estate industry allows escalation of single family homes to become even less affordable.....why allow hijacking of our 20 min neighborhoods, by these llcs?..if the goal is an affordability housing crisis, then curbing this will help...restore oregon tackles the thorny issues here, we agree with mostly...thx for

allowing me to comment...we must save portland before it's too late....
https://restoreoregon.org/call-to-action-for-those-worried-about-demolitions/
", "bone1953@msn.com", "teresa mcgrath", "29310", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-14
04:11:28.0", "97212", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "Propose
d", "", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1402 "5124 be 35th pl", "Portland", "Hello

1403

1404 I am against rezoning in this residential neighborhood, and the RIP proposals. Too many of our character bungalows are being torn down and giant shadow casting mc mansions pop up and line the pockets of developers. No consideration is given to surrounding neighborhood houses, no trees or garden requirements, zero parking requirements. Although this RiP proposal does address some of these it's not enough. This does isn't helping with affordable housing, it just gets more people in which raises property taxes, which I get is why the city like it.

1405

1406 I'd like to see more architectural consideration. Skinny houses are an eye sore, as are those monstrous new mc mansions.

1407

1408 And multi pieces with no parking are not acceptable!!! It's making portland a nightmare. Why isn't this being addressed more seriously!

1409

1410 Thank you

1411 Ashley ", "Ashstyley@hotmail.com", "Ashley Vincent ", "29311", "rip", "OR", "1N1E24AC
2400", "rip-R307307", "2018-05-14
05:07:44.0", "97211", "-13650879.112", "5709902.641", "Submitter", "Northeast", "Concordia", "Ac
tive", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1412 "23 Yellow Wood Dr", "Pelham", "My name is Blake Clark and together with my wife, Sabina Chen, we own the property at 7818 N Crawford St. I am in favor of the proposed zoning changes, including the "a" overlay. Having owned the property since 2005, it is clear the neighborhood is undergoing change at a rapid pace. In my view, this block meets the criteria used by the committee to select areas for proposed zoning changes. Should the new zoning and overlay take effect, it is likely we would invest in additional housing units on the property. I applaud the City of Portland for taking a comprehensive approach to finding solutions for affordable housing.", "fredricblake@yahoo.com", "Blake Clark", "29312", "rip", "NH", "1N1W12DB 2800", "rip-R100123", "2018-05-14
06:21:19.0", "3076", "-13664559.626", "5713803.275", "Submitter", "North", "Cathedral Park", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1413 "1908 SE 35th Pl.", "Portland", "See pdf re Keeping Front Setbacks at
10'", "dougurb@gmail.com", "Doug Klotz", "29313", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-14
06:54:51.0", "97214", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "Propose
d", "", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1414 "260 N Polk St", "Eugene", "I object to the FAR limitation on my R7 property. The city has no evidence that such a requirement will keep housing affordable in Portland. Rather than limit square footage, the city should focus on setbacks and height restrictions for R7 lots. These are less intrusive requirements when compared to how many square feet I'm allowed to have in my home. The city's argument that setbacks and height restrictions are not workable for R7 lots is not valid. If enforced by the city, such requirements do work. In addition, I object to the "A" overlay on my property and on SW Flower St. in my area. Page 43 of the city's Residential Infill Volume 1 states "Areas accessed by streets that have not been accepted by the City for maintenance are excluded from the 'a' overlay." While SW Flower St. is paved, it is not maintained by the city and pavement ends in front of my home. In addition, there is no stormwater drainage system and the area is sloped. While I am not opposed to accessory dwelling units, I do not believe the street could support extra parking and traffic. I request that the city remove the A overlay from my street as it does not meet the city's requirements for the A overlay to begin with. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on these proposals.", "nom5657@hotmail.com", "Ranei Nomura", "29314", "rip", "OR", "1S1E17CB 400", "rip-R156014", "2018-05-14
08:03:14.0", "97402", "-13660962.637", "5697919.12", "Submitter", "West", "Hayhurst", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1415 "2632 SE Salmon Street", "Portland", "The attached testimony is submitted on behalf of Oregon Walks.", "clvlach@gmail.com", "Claire Vlach", "29315", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-14
08:24:11.0", "97214", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "Propose
d", "", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1416 "5262 NE 37TH AVENUE", "Portland", "I support increased density, and I support the RIP. I

think that the arguments for keeping our neighborhoods the same forever are misguided and unhelpful.

1417

1418 That said, I think that adjusting the zoning policy to encourage prettier houses will reduce the amount of NIMBYism it's facing. I hear complaints about the aesthetics of "skinny houses" and "snout houses" (that have the garage in front of everything), and it's true they're ... not as pretty. Higher density with prettier houses might meet everyone's needs, though I'm not sure quite how to do that.

1419

1420 I don't have any answers, I just wanted to voice my support and my comment.

1421

1422 Thanks, and keep up the good work.,"leon@barrettnexus.com","Leon Barrett","29316","rip","OR","","rip-null","2018-05-14 08:29:57.0","97211","0","0","Submitter","","","Active","False","","","","","Proposed","","","","",""

1423 "1915 NE 59th Avenue","Portland","Type or paste your testimony in this box...Members of the Commission

1424 I would like to express deep concerns with the proposed rezoning of my property for the following reasons:

1425 I believe the designation of this district (NE 4) is arbitrary. It is based solely on the fact that the underlying homesites were platted as 25 foot wide lots almost a century ago. The rationale that the area is close to a school, a park and a bus line can be said of almost any area in inner northeast. The current proposal would create an island of R 2.5 surrounded by R 5 zoning and would not serve as a transition to more dense zoning.

1426 As has been noted by staff, there have been a number of corner lots redeveloped as two detached units. I fully support this trend. There have also been a few lots redeveloped that were a portion of three 25 foot lots under the same ownership. I support this as well.

1427 Under the current proposal, redeveloping this area as attached housing supposes that all parking will be on-street, as there are no platted alleys within the district.

1428 I would also like to express extreme concern with the recommendation that every home within this district that occupies two 2,500 sf lots would become a non-conforming use. This to me is too extreme and punishes those folks that have invested their time and money into improving and expanding their modestly-sized homes to accommodate growing families.

1429 I strongly believe in the goals of housing choice and affordability in my neighborhood and my district, to the point of increasing density. However, I feel that this laudable proposal is based on poor planning and questionable reasoning.

1430 Thank you,

1431 Steve Dixon

1432 ","stevepop923@gmail.com","Steve Dixon","29317","rip","OR","1N2E30DD 3300","rip-R282728","2018-05-14 08:32:34.0","97213","-13648094.934","5706435.878","Submitter","Northeast","Rose City Park","Active","False","","","","","Proposed","","","","",""

1433 "130 SE 53rd Ave","Portland","Please support Portland for Everyone's recommendations for the Residential Infill Project and, particularly, to recommend eliminating minimum parking requirements.

1434

1435 Build Housing, Not Parking","adyleverette@gmail.com","Adrienne Leverette","29318","rip","OR","","rip-null","2018-05-14 08:47:32.0","97215","0","0","Submitter","","","Active","False","","","","","Proposed","","","","",""

1436 "4757 N Lombard St","Portland","I support Portland for Everyone's recommendations and the RIP, but would ask you to also recommend eliminating all residential parking requirements. We need to move from the mindset that everyone of course drives (which has never been true) to the mindset that those who want to drive and park in the city should pay their fair share to do so. Parking requirements induce traffic, pollution, and congestion, while putting the cost for that parking on all, not just the drivers who use it.

1437

1438 Portland is trying to move towards housing affordability and climate action; eliminating parking requirements will keep more trees, public parking (because of curb cuts), and discourage sprawl and default driving. Off street parking is a personal amenity, and should be paid for as such, not subsidized by our building requirements. Our parking can be managed with permitting, encouraging non-car trips, and other

methods that don't require off-street parking.

1439

1440

Thank you,

1441

Ben Birdsall", "bwbirdsall@gmail.com", "Ben

Birdsall", "29319", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-14

09:31:40.0", "97203", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "Propose
d", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1442

"7207 se 71st Ave", "Portland ", "I am in favor of the proposed changes.

", "q_mattson@yahoo.com", "Quinton Mattson", "29320", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-14

09:37:09.0", "97206", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "Propose
d", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1443

"419 ne hazelfern pl", "Portland", "I am writing in opposition to the current proposed
draft. I myself am a small developer. I have been selling/rehabbing/developing

property close in Portland on the eastside since 1993. This plan will drastically
change the dynamics of our neighborhoods. Any plan of this magnitude requires a

comprehensive vision for infrastructure and transportation. There are NO conditions

for developers but to overbuild. I am in favor of ADU's.", "wpoz@comcast.net", "walter

pozarycki", "29321", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-14

09:44:21.0", "97232", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "Propose
d", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1444

"2928 NE Hoyt St", "Portland", "I am against the approval of the Residential Infill
Project as proposed. It will specifically target for gentrification any remaining

affordable neighborhoods. The fact that these areas overlay *nearly exactly* any

remaining communities of color in Central Portland should be cause enough for
hesitation, considering how these communities are continually targeted for removal by

freeway projects and wave after wave of gentrification. The RIP will necessarily make
it more difficult to address equity issues in neighborhoods that are already under

attack, and without renter protections and additional zoning regulations, will merely
expedite the viscous gentrification that has already been allowed in our city an which

has effected poor communities and communities of color

overwhelmingly.", "professorsnootypants@gmail.com", "Sara

Rudolph", "29322", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-14

09:54:25.0", "97232", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "Propose
d", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1445

"4217 NE DAVIS ST.", "PORTLAND", "To the Portland Planning & Sustainability Commission:

1446

1447

As someone who grew up in Laurelhurst and is now homeowner in the neighborhood, I
support the Residential Infill Plan. It is a modest and reasonable proposal that

addresses the urgent need for more housing in central neighborhoods.

1448

1449

The reality is that Portland is growing and we need to adapt to that reality. We should
be more concerned about housing people and developing our city for the future than

preserving small homes on large lots.

1450

1451

Since its founding, Laurelhurst has been marketed as an "exclusive" neighborhood.

That is not a legacy to be proud of. It is one of exclusion and it is one we should
work to correct by being a welcoming community that invites all people to enjoy the

parks and schools and streets we treasure.

1452

1453

Sincerely,

1454

Greg Buss", "gregcb@gmail.com", "Greg Buss", "29323", "rip", "OR", "1N2E31CB

7900", "rip-R204302", "2018-05-14

10:00:18.0", "97213", "-13649929.138", "5704583.678", "Submitter", "Southeast", "Laurelhurst", "

Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1455

1456

"1915 N.E. 59th Ave", "Portland", "Members of the Commission

I am writing to express my concerns about the proposed rezoning of my property in the
Rose City Park neighborhood, district NE 4.

1457

1458

I feel that this small area is being unfairly singled out for this particular zoning
change. While it is true that we are close to schools, a park, and bus lines, so too

are many other areas in northeast Portland. What about the zones just a few blocks
away? The same is true of them. This makes no sense.

1459

1460

These lots were originally platted as 25 feet wide nearly a century ago and are part of
what makes the neighborhood so liveable and desirable today. While it is lovely to

increase density by adding more dense housing, to have this be mandated as a

requirement will ultimately debase property values in the neighborhood, especially with the increase of on-street parking.

1461
1462

And designating all homes in the neighborhood as non-conforming uses is just plain unfair. I would highly recommend that some of your planners leave their offices in city hall and come walk the streets of my beautiful neighborhood to see how these recommendations will have a detrimental effect.

1463
1464

I do not support this proposal at all and I will do everything in my power to make certain it is not enacted.

1465
1466

Thank you,

1467
1468

Charlotte Rains Dixon

","chardixon@comcast.net","Charlotte Dixon","29324","rip","OR","","rip-null","2018-05-14 10:21:46.0","97213","0","0","Submitter","","","Active","False","","","","","Proposed","","","","",""

1469
1470

"1915 N.E. 59th Ave","Portland","Members of the Commission

I am writing to express my concerns about the proposed rezoning of my property in the Rose City Park neighborhood, district NE 4.

1471
1472

I feel that this small area is being unfairly singled out for this particular zoning change. While it is true that we are close to schools, a park, and bus lines, so too are many other areas in northeast Portland. What about the zones just a few blocks away? The same is true of them. This makes no sense.

1473
1474

These lots were originally platted as 25 feet wide nearly a century ago and are part of what makes the neighborhood so liveable and desirable today. While it is lovely to increase density by adding more dense housing, to have this be mandated as a requirement will ultimately debase property values in the neighborhood, especially with the increase of on-street parking.

1475
1476

And designating all homes in the neighborhood as non-conforming uses is just plain unfair. I would highly recommend that some of your planners leave their offices in city hall and come walk the streets of my beautiful neighborhood to see how these recommendations will have a detrimental effect.

1477
1478

I do not support this proposal at all and I will do everything in my power to make certain it is not enacted.

1479
1480

Thank you,

1481
1482

Charlotte Rains Dixon

","chardixon@comcast.net","Charlotte Dixon","29325","rip","OR","","rip-null","2018-05-14 10:21:58.0","97213","0","0","Submitter","","","Active","False","","","","","Proposed","","","","",""

1483
1484

"1915 N.E. 59th Ave","Portland","Members of the Commission

I am writing to express my concerns about the proposed rezoning of my property in the Rose City Park neighborhood, district NE 4.

1485
1486

I feel that this small area is being unfairly singled out for this particular zoning change. While it is true that we are close to schools, a park, and bus lines, so too are many other areas in northeast Portland. What about the zones just a few blocks away? The same is true of them. This makes no sense.

1487
1488

These lots were originally platted as 25 feet wide nearly a century ago and are part of what makes the neighborhood so liveable and desirable today. While it is lovely to increase density by adding more dense housing, to have this be mandated as a requirement will ultimately debase property values in the neighborhood, especially with the increase of on-street parking.

1489
1490

And designating all homes in the neighborhood as non-conforming uses is just plain unfair. I would highly recommend that some of your planners leave their offices in city hall and come walk the streets of my beautiful neighborhood to see how these recommendations will have a detrimental effect.

1491

1492 I do not support this proposal at all and I will do everything in my power to make
certain it is not enacted.

1493 Thank you,

1494

1495 Charlotte Rains Dixon

1496 ", "chardixon@comcast.net", "Charlotte
Dixon", "29326", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-14
10:22:00.0", "97213", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "Propose
d", "", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1497 "1915 N.E. 59th Ave", "Portland", "Members of the Commission

1498 I am writing to express my concerns about the proposed rezoning of my property in the
Rose City Park neighborhood, district NE 4.

1499

1500 I feel that this small area is being unfairly singled out for this particular zoning
change. While it is true that we are close to schools, a park, and bus lines, so too
are many other areas in northeast Portland. What about the zones just a few blocks
away? The same is true of them. This makes no sense.

1501

1502 These lots were originally platted as 25 feet wide nearly a century ago and are part of
what makes the neighborhood so liveable and desirable today. While it is lovely to
increase density by adding more dense housing, to have this be mandated as a
requirement will ultimately debase property values in the neighborhood, especially with
the increase of on-street parking.

1503

1504 And designating all homes in the neighborhood as non-conforming uses is just plain
unfair. I would highly recommend that some of your planners leave their offices in city
hall and come walk the streets of my beautiful neighborhood to see how these
recommendations will have a detrimental effect.

1505

1506 I do not support this proposal at all and I will do everything in my power to make
certain it is not enacted.

1507 Thank you,

1508

1509 Charlotte Rains Dixon

1510 ", "chardixon@comcast.net", "Charlotte
Dixon", "29327", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-14
10:22:42.0", "97213", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "Propose
d", "", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1511 "2226 NE Hancock", "Portland", "I believe that Eli Spevak should recuse himself on RIP.
I understand that he helped found PFE and he has been relentless in promoting his own
development efforts through this ill-conceived planning matter. This is an issue of
integrity and transparency. Our public officials should not be voting -- and promoting
-- self interest. I believe this is a test of his integrity and I hope he will respond
appropriately. ", "fredleeson@hotmail.com", "Fred
Leeson", "29328", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-14
10:24:41.0", "97212", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "Propose
d", "", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1512 "8017 N Washburne Ave", "Portland", "I don't really want my neighborhood to be available
to many more people. I moved into this neighborhood in 1973. Because it was a quiet
family, and affordable neighborhood. The city keeps infilling the neighborhood with
larger expensive homes and and ADU's They have made the streets busier and less
navigable, by making the parking along the streets bumper to bumper and the streets
just keep on deteriorating because of higher density and lack of maintenance. I feel
that these zoning changes would just make the quality of life a lot
poorer.", "vfwbruce@gmail.com", "Bruce Hall", "29329", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-14
11:08:10.0", "97217", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "Propose
d", "", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1513 "3131 SE Woodward St.", "Portland", "As a longtime Portland resident, homeowner, and an
elected board member of the Richmond Neighborhood Association (speaking for myself as a
concerned citizen, not the RNA as a whole), I oppose the Residential Infill Plan in its
current form and ask for urgently needed improvements to its terms. I agree with the
very reasonable Laurelhurst Neighborhood Association position that three and four
households on every lot is simply too dense for Portland's single-family house
neighborhoods and narrow streets, and will monetize existing homes as tear-downs rather
than to be restored and lived in. High density should be in city centers and on large
corridor streets. The buildings allowed by RIP are too large and tall for most of

Portland's neighborhoods. Infill size and height should be compatible with neighboring houses. Our smaller, older homes should not be redeveloped to large, expensive housing - without inclusive zoning, developers will not build units that median or below-median income earners can afford. RIP will also increase demolitions, toxic contamination, and environmental waste, as there are very few protections in place to keep demolitions regulated and safe.

1514

1515 I support accessory dwelling units (and was able to build one in 2016 for my mother to live in, adding housing in a way that fits seamlessly into our block, with full neighbor support, and without demolishing existing homes). I support additional units sensitively added inside existing houses. I support reasonable density without demolitions.

1516

1517 The current proposal is too risky and will not protect the elderly or other vulnerable homeowners or renters when the home (or rather lot) they live on becomes a six-figure incentive for a developer to take over for profit rather than common sense or true liveability. Please modify RIP to reflect these urgent concerns, and do not leave our most vulnerable residents behind.

1518

1519 Sincerely,

1520

Susan Beal", "susan.beal@gmail.com", "Susan Beal", "29330", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-14 11:14:03.0", "97202", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1521

"3145 NE 16th Avenue", "Portland", "My husband and I support the testimony submitted by Susan and Ted Schneider. We are concerned that the current plan will result in destroying the wonderful mix of neighborhoods and amenities that draws people to the East side. We don't want to live in a city where streets and buildings and parks are named for the things that used to exist there. Of course the city needs more affordable housing, but spread throughout all of the city and with the concern of having living spaces, not just large modern structures that destroy neighborhood character. ", "judithtrutt@gmail.com", "Judith Trutt", "29331", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-14 11:17:34.0", "97212", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1522

"11705 NE Prescott St", "Portland", "Thank you BPS staff, Planning and Sustainability Commission, and City Council for your time and attention to this issue. I would especially like to commend the BPS project staff for their work on this long and difficult project.

1523

1524

I am a resident of East Portland, and my home falls within a narrow geography of Parkrose where the RIP's additional housing options would be allowed. But my neighbors behind me and just down the street are excluded from the overlay, as is much of the rest of East Portland.

1525

1526

The overlay boundary only perpetuates the divide between Portland's "have" and "have-not" neighborhoods. It prioritizes investment in areas that have a lot of amenities, while denying outer neighborhoods the density needed to support more transit, services and retail. The proposal also provides no real leg up for nonprofit housing developers, because the infill options are not available in neighborhoods where they are more likely to be able to complete projects (due to land costs).

1527

1528

I very much appreciate the inclusion of a displacement analysis in this project, but the decision to prevent additional infill in neighborhoods with a higher share of vulnerable residents is misguided. I encourage BPS and other City bureaus to find a way to move forward with the anti-displacement programs called out in the report. But the City should NOT wait until those programs are in place to allow badly needed additional units to be developed everywhere in Portland. Every single parcel is important and has the potential to help us with our affordability crisis. Making the affordable housing bonus more flexible would also increase the likelihood that income-restricted units are created from the proposal.

1529

1530

1531

1532

To that end, I would like to see the following changes to the RIP draft:

*Allow the additional housing options in all single-family zoned areas of the city. At a minimum, help nonprofit housing developers by allowing the housing options outside of the overlay boundary as long as at least one unit is affordable.

1533 *Revise the affordable housing bonus to include the options of (1) FAR increases for
affordable family-sized homes or (2) an extra unit (available on both corner and
mid-block properties).

1534 *Rezone all historically narrow lots from R5 to R2.5 with design improvements.

1535 *Eliminate minimum parking requirements for all housing types citywide.

1536

1537 Again, thank you for your time and attention to this
issue.", "danellnorby2@gmail.com", "Danell
Norby", "29332", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-14
11:28:37.0", "97220", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "Propose
d", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1538 "4247 SE PINE ST", "PORTLAND", "The Residential Infill Project invites the demolition of
many valuable homes in Portland, reducing the diversity of housing stock and destroying
the character and livability of some of the city's important neighborhoods. If
development is allowed to remove so many of the places that make Portland such a great
place, what will be left will be indistinguishable from so many other cities.

1539 It is my view that RIP will do little to ease the current housing shortage; will
unfairly impact the East side of the city, which is already undergoing great
transformation; and will unnecessarily destroy current and future historic districts.

1540 The City of Portland can do a much better job of addressing housing challenges for
disadvantaged residents and finding ways of accommodating some amount of desired
growth. RIP is clearly not the way.

1541

1542 Thank you,

1543 Steven Cohen", "stevecohen@email.com", "Steven
Cohen", "29334", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-14
11:39:49.0", "97215", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "Propose
d", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1544 "1824 N. Cramer St", "Portland", "I'm glad to see the examples of the new proposed FAR
limitations. Gigantic houses holding single wealthy families are an eyesore.

1545

1546 However I'm concerned about the New 'A' overlay allowing triplexes on every corner. I
feel that this will encourage developers to focus on corner lots. For small blocks,
this could encourage a development pattern of acquiring corner lots, reaching out to
residences in-between, and creating a rapid urbanization of an entire block segment.

1547

1548 The rapid urbanization of our corner lots could quickly impact the look and feel of
neighborhoods.

1549

1550 For this reason I oppose the New 'A' overlay allowing triplexes on every
corner.", "north.portland@hotmail.com", "Bjorn Van der Voo", "29335", "rip", "OR", "1N1E16DA
15700", "rip-R172475", "2018-05-14
11:43:08.0", "97217", "-13657330.065", "5711205.145", "Submitter", "North", "Arbor
Lodge", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1551 "3627 SE Cooper St", "Portland", "The City isn't considering the impact of displacement
of current SFR renters. The policies under the 'a' overlay will have a huge negative
impact. See this interactive map: <https://arcg.is/WiTf9>", "meg.merrick@gmail.com", "Meg
Merrick", "29336", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-14
12:11:38.0", "97202", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "Propose
d", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1552 "2926 NE 46th Ave", "Portland", "While I understand the need to increase density, I
believe three units on one city lot would be too much. I appreciate the "cap" of
square footage. I suggest one main dwelling within max sq footage and one ADU with a
square footage limit as well OR one duplex with appropriate square footage limit also.

1553

1554 Prohibiting LARGE newly built homes that fill the entire lot and house only one family
would be desirable. They do not seem to be in the best interest of increased density
in regards to additional affordable housing.", "theflockbox@gmail.com", "Janice
Flock", "29337", "rip", "OR", "1N2E30BC 900", "rip-R260703", "2018-05-14
12:16:12.0", "97213", "-13649487.781", "5707600.721", "Submitter", "Northeast", "Beaumont-Wilsh
ire", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1555 "524 NE Morgan", "Portland", "Bureau of Planning and Sustainability Commission

1556 05/14/2018

1557

1558 My mother has owned her home at 524 NE Morgan for over 60 years. Currently, the base
zone for this property is R5 but a R2.5 zone is being proposed, whereas directly across

the street, the R5 zone will remain.

1559 The change to a R2.5 zone would, if redeveloped, require a minimum of 2 houses being built on the property and the option of building one nicer larger home is no longer available. Forcing future development of 2 homes on one side of a street/block would not fit in with the character of the neighborhood. Allowing the option to build 2 houses on the property could be a feasible option, but it should not be a requirement.

1560

1561 Sincerely,

1562 Kathy Fuerstenau", "zumi001@yahoo.com", "Kathy Fuerstenau", "29340", "rip", "OR", "1N1E14BB
13100", "rip-R155328", "2018-05-14
12:48:03.0", "97211", "-13654421.469", "5712379.182", "Submitter", "Northeast", "Woodlawn", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1563 "4930 NE 73rd", "Portland", "Bureau of Planning and Sustainability Commission

1564 5/14/2018

1565

1566 I have lived in the Cully neighborhood for over 39 years and live on a R7 size lot. Restricting the size and heights of new development is prudent when developers are creating homes that are significantly larger than neighboring homes. But limiting the size of building a new/remodeled home of a homeowner who has owned the property for many years is overstepping the government's authority. A homeowner has every right to expect being able to build a new home that is comparable in size to their current home and not be forced to build a home less than half the size it is currently as proposed in the Residential Infill Project. Creating a few smaller sized homes on a property is not going to have any significant impacts on Portland's housing crises.

1567 The overlay changes being proposed is a developers dream, but not a neighborhoods. Having more units being built that does not fit the existing character of the neighborhood with no to little parking requirements will create more neighborhood congestion.

1568 I appreciate that a section of Cully has been identified as a Displacement Risk Area and there is no new 'a' overlay zone being proposed. There are 6 mobile home parks in the Cully neighborhood and 3 within the risk area. Developers would love the opportunity to easily build apartments on this type of property that would not necessarily accommodate low income households, whereas displacing many families in the process. Even if there were some affordable units built in a new development, the mobile home owners/renters would still have to find somewhere else to live in the meantime.

1569 I understand that there is a housing crisis, but mandating city-wide changes is not equitable when it benefits only a few while restricting the options of existing homeowners. Making the options of having ADU's, detached or within an existing structure, cottage clusters and duplexes should be just that, an option that can be utilized, not a device that restricts building a larger single story home (within reasonable size restrictions) that would ultimately cost less for the average homebuilder than building separate units, from being available.

1570 Sincerely,

1571 Kathy Fuerstenau

1572 ", "zumi001@yahoo.com", "Kathy Fuerstenau", "29341", "rip", "OR", "1N2E20AC
10200", "rip-R318260", "2018-05-14
12:52:54.0", "97218", "-13646372.388", "5709969.158", "Submitter", "Northeast", "Cully", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1573 "803 NE Laurelhurst Pl", "Portland", "I am testifying to express my opposition to RIP. This is de-facto re-zoning of single-family neighborhoods, without adequate input from the residents who are actual stakeholders. Evidently the only input sought has been that of deep-pocketed developers.

1574

1575 RIP will do NOTHING to increase affordable housing in Portland. What it WILL do is enrich developers at the expense of the very historic and architectural character that draws both tourists and new residents to the city every year.

1576

1577 We expect our local legislators to be working to find EFFECTIVE solutions for Portland's housing crisis—such solutions will require actual commitment and investment by the City of Portland. RIP provides neither.

1578

1579 RIP will also open the City of Portland up to countless lawsuits, since the proposal is simply re-zoning by another name. Residents who bought homes in single-family zoned neighborhoods will absolutely have legal grounds to challenge RIP and to seek monetary damages from the city.

1580
1581 Respectfully,
1582
1583 L. M. Eddleman, J.D., PhD.,"transacte@gmail.com","L.M.
Eddleman","29342","rip","OR","","","rip-null","2018-05-14
13:40:02.0","97232","0","0","Submitter","","","Active","False","","","","","Propose
d","","","","","",""
1584 "4063 NE 30th Ave","Portland","I am opposed to the tearing down of existing homes and
the building of oversized and poorly designed new properties which do not blend in with
the surrounding old architecture.
1585
1586 I'm especially opposed to the building of duplexes or triplexes on corner lots. ADU's
in garages and basements will provide additional rental property to the community
without changing the character of the neighborhood.
1587
1588 I believe these zoning changes are more tax revenue driven and have and will continue
to negatively impact property values to surrounding homes. The overall character of
these older neighborhoods is being destroyed.,"martijohunt@gmail.com","Martha
Hunt","29343","rip","OR","1N1E24CA 21100","rip-R101119","2018-05-14
13:45:44.0","97212","-13651687.039","5708967.463","Submitter","Northeast","Alameda","Acti
ve","False","","","","","","","Proposed","","","","","",""
1589 "2240 SE 24th Ave","Portland","I am writing to ask that the Commission eliminate
minimum parking requirements
1590 for all housing types citywide. The research on this is clear—parking minimums
encourage driving, eat up public space and incur externalized costs upon those who can
least afford and least benefit from car infrastructure. The future we want for Portland
cannot be achieved following the car-based urban model and I feel this one change would
have the largest economic, environmental, and social benefit out of the suite of
possible changes.,"cohenalicia@gmail.com","Alicia
Cohen","29344","rip","OR","","","rip-null","2018-05-14
13:50:58.0","97214","0","0","Submitter","","","Active","False","","","","","Propose
d","","","","","",""
1591 "3816 NE Glisan","Portland","This we know:
1592
1593 Any living system has a Carrying Capacity, beyond which it dies. Portland needs to
determine our Livability Carrying Capacity and stop infill when and where development
threatens us.
1594
1595 Developers are destroying the character of the Portland that we love in direct
contradiction to the wishes of Portland voters. Now the city council is poised to
permit accelerated destruction of the remaining neighborhoods that we live in. This
undemocratic plan is an indication that the politics of greed rather than sustainable
land use planning is driving proposed changes. The most damning indication of
corruption is the exclusion of SW Portland from the new zoning proposals. Shame!
1596
1597 The building frenzy that has gripped Portland is driven by profit hungry developers,
who will not live in Portland or in the buildings that they construct. The city needs
affordable housing, and could under emergency action stop construction that is not
affordable and impose rent control. Residents' right to a livable city is more
important than developers' right to make a profit at all cost. We elect the mayor and
city council, so it is time for them to serve the needs of the population.
1598
1599 The promise of the infill project is affordable housing. The promise that excess
capacity will eventually lower housing cost is a fallacious appeal to the "market as
God." In our Laurelhurst neighborhood, current tear downs are replaced by million
dollar homes and two million dollar duplexes. With the Market in charge, housing
prices will come down only when Portland becomes an unlivable, ugly, overbuilt
monster. Yes, Portland could institute rent control and limit permits to affordable
housing. Do it!
1600
1601 Others have documented misguided details of the infill project. We are aware of this
documentation and support it.
1602 ","lbrenner@orcpr.org","Elizabeth Brenner Thomas
Stibolt","29345","rip","OR","","","rip-null","2018-05-14
14:12:15.0","97232","0","0","Submitter","","","Active","False","","","","","Propose
d","","","","","",""

1603 "9125 N Ivanhoe Street","Portland","I oppose the overlay allowing for multiple ADUs on properties on N Ivanhoe Street and surrounding blocks. Psychological and sociological studies related to high density and overcrowding are inconclusive. I do not trust that the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability has adequately anticipated or illustrated potential, additional stressors that common sense dictates are inherent to this plan. Adding people, cars, pets, and possessions to our already congested area will only heighten the likelihood of neighborhood problems.

1604

1605 Like most Portland neighborhoods, we have no official covenant or restrictions. We have only city code to protect our quality of life. Too often code violations are not addressed due to lack of city budget and / or personnel. If we are encouraging more stress on already congested areas, can we rely on city government to address the code violations?

1606

1607 My objections are specific to ADUs. I understand the need for more housing and more housing for lower income people. I am not opposed to FAR -- or to multiple-unit buildings, where some centralized management is more likely to be in place.

1608

1609 I do not believe the idea of adding ADUs to some of our neighborhoods is the answer at this time.

1610

1611 ","peggylingen02@hotmail.com","Peggy Lingen","29346","rip","OR","1N1W01CD
7000","rip-R133516","2018-05-14
14:15:51.0","97203","-13665409.021","5715360.71","Submitter","North","St.
Johns","Active","False","","","","","","","Proposed","","","","","",""
1612 "3920 SW Nevada Ct.,"Portland","
1613 I support the provisions of the Residential Infill Project that promote retaining existing neighborhood character. Reducing the scale, measuring height from the lowest point of the lot and averaging setbacks will allow infill to better blend into the neighborhoods. This will allow Portland to grow in a way that protects the great place it is today.

1614

1615 I am opposed to the A Overlay that is being applied to 87,324 properties in the City. In the Draft of the 2035 Comprehensive Plan, it clearly stated there is more than enough capacity under the current zoning for the growth that is projected to occur through 2035. There is no need to add over 100,000 units of housing capacity.

1616

1617 The Residential Infill Project is adding this unneeded capacity by changing the number of housing units allowed in the base zones. The single family zones will be turned into multifamily zones. The RIP staff has projected that within the A Overlay, even with all the new code incentives, the number of new ADU's and the amount of corner lot redevelopment would be the same as if this radical concept were not implemented. The A Overlay is a flawed concept that I do not support.

1618

1619 If added capacity is needed, I support the best practices of land use planning that require that the base zone be changed with community-based planning consistent with Oregon's Land Use Goals.

1620

1621 Please add this to the record.

1622

1623 Thank you,

1624

1625 Rose Florek
1626 3920 SW Nevada Ct.
1627 Portland, OR 97219
1628 ","roseflorek@comcast.net","Rose Florek","29348","rip","OR","","","rip-null","2018-05-14
14:46:56.0","97219","0","0","Submitter","","","","Active","False","","","","","Propose
d","","","","","",""
1629 "3920 SW Nevada Ct.,"Portland","
1630 I support the provisions of the Residential Infill Project that promote retaining existing neighborhood character. Reducing the scale, measuring height from the lowest point of the lot and averaging setbacks will allow infill to better blend into the neighborhoods. This will allow Portland to grow in a way that protects the great place it is today.

1631

1632 I am opposed to the A Overlay that is being applied to 87,324 properties in the City.

In the Draft of the 2035 Comprehensive Plan, it clearly stated there is more than enough capacity under the current zoning for the growth that is projected to occur through 2035. There is no need to add over 100,000 units of housing capacity.

1633

1634 The Residential Infill Project is adding this unneeded capacity by changing the number of housing units allowed in the base zones. The single family zones will be turned into multifamily zones. The RIP staff has projected that within the A Overlay, even with all the new code incentives, the number of new ADU's and the amount of corner lot redevelopment would be the same as if this radical concept were not implemented. The A Overlay is a flawed concept that I do not support.

1635

1636 If added capacity is needed, I support the best practices of land use planning that require that the base zone be changed with community-based planning consistent with Oregon's Land Use Goals.

1637

1638 Please add this to the record.

1639

1640 Thank you,

1641

1642 Peter Borgwardt

1643 3920 SW Nevada Ct.

1644 Portland, OR 97219

1645 ", "peterbgw@comcast.net", "Peter Borgwardt", "29349", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-14 14:47:49.0", "97219", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "Propose d", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1646 "1163 SW Florida Street", "Portland", "Dear Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission:

1647

1648 I am writing in support of the Residential Infill Project to provide options for more affordable varieties of housing in residential neighborhoods. I am a 28-year resident of Hillsdale Neighborhood and live in a 1200-square foot house suitable for my husband and me during our retirement years. We are lucky to be within walking distance of Hillsdale Town Center's shops, Burlingame Fred Meyer, Hillsdale Library, numerous restaurants and Terwilliger Parkway for exercise. Children can walk and bike to school from this neighborhood and volunteers build trails and have helped the growing town center for years.

1649

1650 I support the Residential Infill Project because of the following:

1651 1. Rising house prices will put this neighborhood out of financial reach for most families and provide no alternatives for seniors in large houses to downsize in their own neighborhood.

1652

1653 2. Density has kept our schools and library busy, but those facilities will not continue to exist without continuing affordability of housing after current children grow up.

1654

1655 3. I respect that people want to maintain the beauty, greenery, or quaintness of their neighborhoods as they are now. However, I also realize that too many people can't afford to retire because of outstanding balances on houses, and many people sell houses in this market to fund future retirement plans, and then move to less expensive communities.

1656

1657 4. We will lose families to cities such as Beaverton, Tigard and Washington State if we do not find a way to keep housing affordable here.

1658

1659 5. I'm not against green lawns where children can play or yards for children to run, but we need to share our abundant west-side green spaces to help low-income families and elders. Many people will opt to keep their homes as they are. However, if people maintain their properties but choose to add ADUs or remodel to create multiplex apartments, we'll all create a better world for future generations.

1660

1661 Please support the Residential Infill Project, which is a really ingenious way to solve multiple problems. Planners and their technical advisory committees deserve praise for this clever project.

1662

1663 Thank you for your time.

1664
1665 Sincerely,
1666
1667 Joan Hamilton
1668 ", "joanandtim@msn.com", "Joan Hamilton", "29350", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-14
00:00:00.0", "97219", "0", "0", "Email", "", "", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "
", "", "", "", "", ""
1669 "37 NW Trinity Pl.", "Portland", "Dear Commissioners of the Planning and Sustainability
Commission,

1670
1671 I am writing to ask you to make important changes to the currently proposed Residential
Infill Project to allow the proposal to achieve its potential to improve housing
availability and affordability. Because the Residential Infill Project in its current
form is, frankly, misguided and useless. We must fix the current proposal because the
status quo single family zoning has created exclusionary and discriminatory development
patterns the exacerbates racial segregation and wealth inequality.

1672
1673 The following eight changes are the recommendations from housing advocates, policy
experts, economists, and numerous Portlanders who love their community and want create
inclusive and non-discriminatory neighborhoods.

1674
1675 1. Eliminate minimum parking requirements for all housing types and discourage creating
new drive ways that will require a curb cut and reduce on-street parking.
1676
1677 2. Create a true cottage cluster code that encourages the development of smaller, more
affordable homes in the current R5 and R2.5 zones.
1678
1679 3. Allow triplexes and fourplexes on all residential lots. Also allow these projects
to access the improved affordable and accessible housing bonuses.
1680
1681 4. Rezone all historically narrow lots from R5 to R2.5, with design improvements, to
let more households share land costs and provide housing options that more families can
afford.
1682
1683 5. Allow internal conversion of existing houses into multiple homes in all areas, and
provide additional incentives for housing preservation and reuse.
1684
1685 6. Revise the affordable housing bonus to include an additional home as well as FAR
increases for below-market rate, family-sized homes. Exempt affordable housing projects
from additional requirements.
1686
1687 7. Allow the "housing options" provisions in all areas of the city to improve equity
outcomes and encourage the creation of additional walking scale neighborhoods.
1688
1689 8. Ensure no net loss in ADU allowances over current conditions, and actively
incentivize the provision of secondary ADUs. Oppose any conditional short-term rental
restriction on ADU allowances. ", "charlie.tso@gmail.com", "Charles
Tso", "29351", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-14
15:06:22.0", "97209", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "Propose
d", "", "", "", "", "", ""
1690 "3054 NE Everett St", "Portland", "RIP - put me down as AGAINST, at least for now. Of
course people need housing; people who live here - low income people - and yes,
newcomers. Portland must change. But from what I've read of it, the RIP is doesn't do
enough to protect the character of neighborhoods, architectural styles, or limit
developers from screwing up Portland's vaunted quality of life. I would like to see
more thoughtful planning for future density before proceeding. More thoughtful for the
well being of ALL groups including developers, landlords, low income, newcomers,
homeless and homeowners. Parking and traffic are major concerns.
", "miriam_g@me.com", "MIRIAM GARCIA", "29352", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-14
15:36:37.0", "97232", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "Propose
d", "", "", "", "", "", ""
1691 "4415 NE 87th Ave", "Portland", "Letter attached.", "", "Margaret
Davis", "29353", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-08
00:00:00.0", "97220", "0", "0", "Letter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Scale,Housing types,Narrow
lots,Mapping R2.5 rezones,Affordability", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""
1692 "4334 NE Davis St", "Portland", "Letter attached.", "", "Ann

Williamson", "29354", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-09
00:00:00.0", "97213", "0", "0", "Letter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Scale, Housing
types", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1693 "2747 SW Roswell Ave", "Portland", "Letter attached.", "", "Aesha R. Lorenz
Al-Saeed", "29355", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-14
00:00:00.0", "97201", "0", "0", "Letter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Scale, Housing
types", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1694 "1327 SE 32nd Place", "Portland", "Letter attached.", "", "Carol
Poliak", "29356", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-09
00:00:00.0", "97214", "0", "0", "Letter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Housing
types", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1695 "8233 SW 39th Ave", "Portland", "Letter attached.", "", "Michele
Bell", "29357", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-08
00:00:00.0", "97219", "0", "0", "Letter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Scale, Housing
types", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1696 "1822 NE Wasco St", "Portland", "Letter attached.", "", "Leon
Porter", "29358", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-14
00:00:00.0", "97232", "0", "0", "Letter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Scale, Housing
types, Mapping the "a" overlay, Mapping R2.5
rezones, Parking", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1697 "4100 SE Woodward St", "Portland", "Letter attached.", "", "JoAnne
Knowles", "29359", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-09
00:00:00.0", "97202", "0", "0", "Letter", "", "", "Active", "False", "Affordability, Parking", "", "",
, "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1698 "1900 SW 4th Avenue", "Portland", "Please see attached
memo.", "kimberly.tallant@portlandoregon.gov", "Kimberly
Tallant", "29360", "rip", "OR", "", "rip-null", "2018-05-14
16:51:44.0", "97201", "0", "0", "Submitter", "", "", "Active", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "Propose
d", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1699 "2663 NW Westover Rd.", "Portland", "Dear Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission:
1700
1701 Thank you for the opportunity to provide testimony regarding the proposed infill
rules. We applaud the effort to increase availability and affordability of housing in
Portland. With that said, we believe the one size fits all approach of the current
proposal fails to address the historical makeup of some Portland neighborhoods, as well
as presenting a fundamentally unfair approach to certain properties.

1702
1703 Neighborhoods such as the NW Heights and Laurelhurst have historically been developed
with large houses on small lots, and would be unduly impacted by proposed regulations.
The current proposal would require smaller homes out of character with the neighborhood
if a house were to be removed for new construction, or a vacant lot to be developed.
As an illustration, a group of 7 consecutive homes in our 1920s neighborhood have an
average lot size of 7729 square feet with an average house size of 3434 square feet
(per county records). This average includes the two smallest houses at 2160 and 2210
square feet, respectively. Without those, the average lot size would increase slightly
to 7840 and home size significantly to 3934. Parallel homes on the two adjacent
streets show a similar trend: 4 homes on NW Summit have an average lot size of 7458
square feet with an average home size of 3665, while 4 on NW Albemarle average 7275 and
4089. Under the new proposal any construction on the vacant 5,000 square foot lot
(zoned R7) next to us would be limited to 2,000 square feet—at 50-58% of their size it
would be out of character with the rest of the homes in the immediate area.

1704
1705 The proposed regulation does not take into account differences in individual parcels,
which can lead to unfair outcomes. For example, the lot at 2663 N NW Westover has a
flat surface for the West 50' of the lot, then a drop of 40' over the East 51' (a 65°
slope). This would preclude building the proposal offset of allowing an ADU on the
property. It would result in a scenario where the allowed size for construction would
be significantly lower than under current code, and the mitigating opportunity would
not be feasible. Other lots in the West Hills present similar challenges. The
proposal also does not distinguish between a lot with an existing structure and one
that is currently vacant. Our property that has sat vacant for 96 years for the
express use of building a home comparable to the neighborhood is treated the same as
one where an existing home is torn down for the purpose of building a large house. In
trying to avoid the latter the proposal unfairly restricts the former.

1706
1707 We would ask that a broad-brush approach not be used; that consideration be given to

the size of homes on comparable lots in the immediate area, to vacant land and to lots with geographical differences. This is a more fair and balanced approach, and more in keeping with the spirit and goal of the changes proposed.

1708

1709 Sincerely,

1710 James Purdy and Kimberly Bakken

1711 ", "purdyjim1@gmail.com", "James Purdy", "29361", "rip", "OR", "1N1E32AD

2500", "rip-R304612", "2018-05-14

16:53:49.0", "97210", "-13659623.687", "5705165.926", "Submitter", "West", "Hillside", "Active",

"False", "", "", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""

1712

"3635 SE Tibbetts st", "Portland", "I oppose these changes to the zoning of this property. Keeping the original character of our neighborhoods is the most important to me.

", "taudrey@comcast.net", "Audrey Tollefson", "29362", "rip", "OR", "1S1E12AC

800", "rip-R299245", "2018-05-14

17:01:58.0", "97202", "-13650599.762", "5700698.286", "Submitter", "Southeast", "Richmond", "Act

ive", "False", "", "", "", "", "", "", "", "Proposed", "", "", "", "", "", ""