

CADDRESS	CCOMMENT	CNAME	COMMENT_ID CSTATE
349 e paseo way	<p>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</p>	Greg downey	28093 AR
3620 SE Henderson S	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Allow the "œhousing options" provisions in all areas of the city to improve equity outcomes and encourage the creation of additional walking scale neighborhoods. - Allow internal conversion of existing houses into multiple homes in all areas, and provide additional incentives for housing preservation and reuse. - Incentivize more housing, accessible housing, and affordable housing, but ensure that requirements and bonuses are structured so that each may be more feasible. - Revise the affordable housing bonus to include an additional home as well as FAR increases for below-market rate, family-sized homes. - Create an accessible housing bonus, allowing an additional home as well as FAR increases for projects that are 100% fully accessible. - Allow small triplexes on mid-block lots. Also allow these projects to access the improved affordable and accessible housing bonuses. - Create a true cottage cluster code that encourages the development of smaller, more affordable homes. - 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. - Support a healthy urban tree canopy by designing flexible code provisions that incentivize saving trees and create less impervious surfaces. <p>- Eliminate minimum parking requirements for all housing types citywide.</p>	Liz Dexter	28094 OR

I OPPOSE RIP.

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.

RIP does nothing to address our near complete lack of 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 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.

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.

Our neglected infrastructure can't handle overwhelming developer-driven, market rate growth. Our combined-sewage system, our water problems, our schools, roads, and public-

5034 NE Rodney Ave services aren't being improved in ways that match either current or future growth.

Jacquie Walton

28095 OR

I firmly oppose RIP as currently proposed!

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?

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

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

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

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.

the same vintage.

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.

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.

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.

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

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

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?

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

I firmly oppose the RIP as currently proposed!

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.

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.

This plan helps no one but developers, and only exacerbates the current housing crisis.

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.

Thank you, Kristi Ana Byrd

7938 SE 35th Ave.

Kristi Ana Byrd

28098 OR

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.
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.

PO Box 13172	This 4-unit single family house coexists between two 1-unit single family houses.	Neil Heller	28099 OR
PO Box 13172	The 'a' Overlay should be applied broadly. Whole sections of neighborhoods should not be excluded based on demographics or income levels.	Neil Heller	28100 OR
6719 SE 29th Ave	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.	Mark Williams	28101 OR
PO Box 13172	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.	Neil Heller	28102 OR
4227 NE 10th Ave	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 Peterson	28103 OR

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.

3923 NE 9th

Eileen Schill

28104 OR

To Whom It May Concern:

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.

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.

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.

I demand the local city put this to a vote and hear what the people say. And be clear, no smoke and mirrors.

5044 NE Rodney

Dawn DelCastillo

28105 OR

To Whom It May Concern:

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

5044 NE Rodney ave

Joanne Scott

28106 OR

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.

Annie Meyer

2019 SE Cypress Ave

Annie Meyer

28107 OR

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.

Sincerely,
Kimberly Critelli

2027 SE Madison St

Kimberly Critelli

28108 OR

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.

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.

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.

Conversations with my neighbors confirm that we are all extremely unhappy with the Residential Infill Project currently before the Portland Planning and Sustainability

1624 SW Carson Street Commission. We want to retain our single family zones, we want to measure home

Linda Billings

28109 OR

Attn: Residential Infill Project
1900 SW 4th Ave, Suite 7100
Portland, OR 97201

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

Dear Mayor and Commissioners,

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).

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.

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

4130 NE 18th Avenue consumption and CO2 emissions differences are negligible between a duplex plus ADU

Paul Majkut

28110 OR

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.

4341 NE Glisan St

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.

Rick Briasco

28111 OR

Project.

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.

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.
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

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.

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 ADUs into and around existing homes should be sufficient for growth.

Additionally, the RIP ignores the Council's 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.

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

Consideration of building height, FAR, front door height adjustments in floodplain areas-

- 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.
- 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.
- 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

8642 SE Holgate Blvd flood plains.

1207 SW Broadway Type or paste your testimony in this box...

Cora Potter

Jerome Brooks

28114 OR

28115 OR

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

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

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

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

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

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

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.

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:

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

2905 NE 51st Avenue
456 SE 68th Ave

Over time, the replacement of single-family homes by duplexes and triplexes would reduce Letter attached.

Nancy Guitteau
Betsy Hayford

28117 OR
28118 OR

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

646 NE Hazelfern Pl. really trying to ruin Portland.

Dennis Lundahl

28120 OR

I am strongly opposed to the Residential Infill Project and the new proposed overlay on my property.

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.

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.

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.

3806 SE 26th Ave

Kristi Hauke

28121 OR

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.

10135 N Mohawk

Kelly Tadlock

28122 OR

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.

1. Over time, the acceptance of the proposal will increase property taxes and reduce the resale value of residential property.
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.
3. Some of the unintended consequences will involve exceeding the capacity of:
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.

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

Joe A. Baxter

5411 NE Broadway S Professional Engineer

Joe Baxter

28123 OR

Against RIP it is not a democratic process. This represents a Sea Change in Portland and so needs to be put to a vote

10135 N Mohawk

Kelly Tadlock

28124 OR

I oppose the proposed zoning change from R5 to R2.5 in Portland.

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.

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.

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.

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.

I would like to write in support of the Residential Infill Project including the Portland Small Developers proposal and the Portland for Everyone proposal.

More specifically, I support the following list of revisions:

Proposed revisions to Residential Infill Plan:

- Don't impose any FAR limits in single-family zones. Larger houses can house more people!
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- Increase height limits on standard lots to 40 feet if the house includes three or more units.
- 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.
- Allow triplexes and 4-plexes on all lots in all residential zones.
- Allow 6-plexes and 8-plexes on all corner lots in the R5 and R2.5 zones.
- Revise the cottage cluster code as recommended by Portland for Everyone.
- Eliminate minimum parking requirements for all housing types citywide.
- Expand the 'a' overlay citywide.
- Rezone all historically narrow lots from R5 to R2.5.
- 1250 E Burnside Ave --Rezone all R10 and R7 areas to R5.

Matt Stewart

28127 OR

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.

10135 N Mohawk

Kelly Tadlock

28128 OR

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.

3626 SE Woodward

I deserve a voice in this matter more than the Home Builders Assn does.

Karen Peinl

28129 OR

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 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.

7605 SE Lincoln St.

Jynx Houston

28130 OR

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.

7745 SE 18th Ave

Mary King

28131 OR

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.

7306 SE 28th Ave

Jeffrey Levy

28132 OR

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 "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. 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.

R607462

Shakeel Shafi

29129 OR

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 "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. 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.

R607463

Shakeel Shafi

29130 OR

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 "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. 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.

R274965

Shakeel Shafi

29131 OR

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 "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. 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.

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 "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. 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.

R607465

Shakeel Shafi

29133 OR

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.

4925 SW Miles St

Shakeel Shafi

29134 OR

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.

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.

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.

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.

1805 SE 58th Ave

Aaron Ilika

29135 OR

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.

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.

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

6506 NE Alameda St pedestrians and bicyclists who use these streets rather than the main one already.

Barbara Larrain

29136 OR

With the exception of ADUs, no increased density allowed on a lot until the following happen

All streets are paved with curbs within a two-block radius of the lot
Sidewalks (with provision for street trees) are built two blocks in all directions from the lot.
Utilities associated with any increase in density are undergrounded. (as in Western Europe and as in the Pearl district...how did that happen?)
Needed stormwater management is built.

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.

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

2115 SW Tyrol St.

Rick Seiferf

29137 OR

I firmly oppose RIP in its current form.

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

55 NE Meikle Pl

I would like to see RIP put to a citywide vote by its citizens.

Greg Lasher

29138 OR

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.

539 SE 59th Court

Tad Everhart

29139 OR

of a complex system, i.e., the City of Portland, without due regard for unintended consequences.

For example, my R5 "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?

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

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.

In addition,

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%.

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

Neighborhood character must be a factor in regulating building and remodeling. Therefore,

3) Developers MUST be required to automatically notify neighbors well in advance of any plans to demolish existing housing or install multiple dwelling structures.

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.

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.

2031 SE Harrison St. Thank you for your consideration.

Karen LaBonte

29141 OR

616 ne hazelfern pl I oppose the RIP when it involves buildings with no parking spots and if it allows apartment buildings in neighborhoods with single family homes.

Francis Schneider

29142 OR

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.

459 NE Hazelfern Pla Thank you for taking my concerns into consideration.

Jeanne Schapp

29143 OR

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

Dear Ms. Anderson:

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.

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

200 SW Market Street sanctuary.

Jim Mark

29144 OR

RIP need to go on a ballot so the tens of thousands of affected renters and homeowners get to vote on it.

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

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

Let the people decide! Democracy NOW!

2133 SE 32nd Ave

Brian Hochhalter

29145 OR

Hello,

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. Additionally, I think it would be helpful if the City provided sample plans, that have 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.

Thanks for all your work!

4619 NE 30th Ave

Megan Horst

29146 OR

Please allow higher density housing options, such as duplexes, triplexes, multiple ADU's, etc.

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.

3224 SE Alder Street Thank you.

Bill Stites

29147 OR

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 my voice was heard, but am a busy professional. Thank you for providing this convenient way to submit testimony!

1222 NE 58th Ave

Madeline Steele

29148 OR

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

1633 SE Sherrett St Thanks

Tim Kieltyka

29149 OR

To the Planning and Sustainability Commission:

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.

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.

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.

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.

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

1915 NE 59th Ave.	Thank you for your time.	Ariane Hopman	29150 OR
2640 SE Ankeny St	Please help reinstate more dense, multi housing in Portland for better, more affordable neighborhoods.	Keith Olenslager	29151 OR

3921 NE 81st Ave

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.

Greg Spencer

29152 OR

Sellwood.

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.

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.

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.

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

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

Is that the history these districts wish to preserve?

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

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.

And that future invokes a simple solution to our housing problem: build more housing.

That future gives people in all of our neighborhoods the freedom to convert or build duplexes, triplexes, and ADUs.

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

7105 SE 21st Ave

Let's make a choice today to build an inclusive, forward looking, and diverse city, to build a Devin Sills

29153 OR

Hi there, while I'm appreciative of the overall spirit of this project, there are a few areas that could use improvement.

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

Best regards,

4315 SE Glenwood St Howard Draper

Howard Draper

29154 OR

2333 SE Market St 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.

Philip Cox

29155 OR

2116 SE Salmon St I support residential infill projects. We need more housing so future generations of people can live here affordably.

Jesse Enlund

29156 OR

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.

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.

6042 NE 35th Place
1220 SW 12th Ave See attached PDF

susan remmers
Mary Vogel

29157 OR
29158 OR

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.

3115 NE 34th

Edward Doyle

29159 OR

I am writing as a homeowner at 6025 North Vancouver Ave in North Portland to express general support for the Residential Infill Project proposal (RIP). Generally I support this effort to increase housing choices for Portlanders in all neighborhoods. Allowing more smaller units within existing lot coverage limits makes sense. It helps preserve the character of our neighborhoods defined not just by the architectural integrity but also the people who can afford to live in them. Smaller units are more affordable.

I support, wherever possible, improving incentives within the RIP to increase affordability and accessibility of new dwelling units, and to preserve and plant trees. I also support adding flexibility to make tree preservation and planting easier and eliminating parking requirements to increase access to nature and homes for people.

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

Thank you for your consideration,

Sincerely,

Rita Sabler

6025 N. Vancouver 6025 N. Vancouver Unit A

Rita Sabler

29160 OR

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.

6025 N. Vancouver Sincerely, Jim Labbe

Jim Labbe

29161 OR

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.

8701 SE Yamhill

Greg Odell

29162 OR

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.

We must increase density and discourage these nonsense McMansions blooming in every
6971 NE Bellevue Av area. Multi-family is where it's at! Let's get our code in alignment! Beth Heins 29163 OR

I oppose this project and in particular the rezoning of my neighborhood from R5 to R2.5. Developers will target my neighborhood for development 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

3025 NE 35th Avenue increase in noise, more traffic, less parking and hotch potch of architecture. Robert Benson 29164 OR

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.

1416 SE 49th Ave. Tracy Burkholder 29167 OR

neighborhood in Portland. As a future resident of a close-in neighborhood, I have no qualms about parking availability or neighborhood densification.

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.

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.

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.

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

Dear Commission-

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.

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.

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.

Sincerely,

3014 NE 32nd Ave Jennifer Stolz

Jennifer Stolz

29169 OR

May 7, 2018

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".

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:

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:

"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"

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.

1017 NE 117th Ave.

Arlene Kimura

29170 OR

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.

3710 SE Kelly St.

Leslie Sharp

29171 OR

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.

4246 NE Hoyt St

Jennifer BALL

29172 OR

I'm very much in favor of the RIP plan with the following exceptions:

-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.

-Allow fourplexes.

-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 curbside access

9217 North Alleghen to front door.

Travis Parker

29173 OR

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.

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

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.

5014 NE Simpson St 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

Lynette Yetter

29174 OR

Goal 10 (<http://www.oregon.gov/lcd/docs/goals/goal10.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."

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

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

“... the net impact of the infill project on Portland’s housing count would be 86 extra homes for each of the next 20 years.”

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

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!

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:

- 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.
- 2.The least expensive housing is always existing housing.
- 3.You can't always get what you want.

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.

2026 SE 28th Place

Think about who is doing the "building": real estate developers. They are smart,

Doug Sweet

29176 OR

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.

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

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

Provide height and FAR bonuses for affordable housing.

Eliminate all off-street parking minimums, ban parking for new single family homes, and set strict parking maximums for multi-family homes.

Thanks!

2301 NE Rodney Ave

Monique Gaskins

29177 OR

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

2020 SW Miles Stree with twice the traffic on these residential streets.

Alison McAllister

29178 OR

currently under consideration

I am a 3rd generation Oregonian and Inner SE/NE Portland resident for Over 30 years. 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.

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.

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?

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.

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.

4315 SE Morrison st

Cathryn Heron

29179 OR

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.

1174 NE 76th Ave

Douglas Kelso

29180 OR

homeowner, regarding the proposed changes to our zoning code.

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.

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.

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.

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.

1303 NE Shaver St, Sabin, if nothing, is a FAMILY NEIGHBORHOOD. The proximity to schools and parks, a

Patrick Taylor

29181 OR

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.

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

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.

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.

3509 ne Alberta Ct And yet persons like myself are the ones who will be most affected by RIP. Your proposals Ervin Siverson

29182 OR

I live in Hillsdale, SW Portland, and I say "NO" to the Residential Infill Project. 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. 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. 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. 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 which is more expensive to build and not all homeowners can afford it. The "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. 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.

6435 SW Burlingame

Natalia Bronner

29183 OR

I Oppose RIP

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.

6221 NE 22nd Ave

Michael Johnson

29184 OR

2846 SE holgate

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.

Molly Hart

29185 OR

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.

9206 N. John

Dorothy Krahn

29186 OR

submitted as testimony. It coherently shares how flawed RIP is.

October 26, 2016

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

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. Subject: Comment on the October 2016 Residential Infill Project (RIP) Concept Report 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.

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

3509 NE Alberta Ct.

speculative justification is that such innovative housing is desired in Portland. ? Ownership Ervin Siverson

29187 OR

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.

5052 SE 33rd Pl

Joshua Cohen

29188 OR

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.

1935 NE Couch St.

Ryan Sullivan

29189 OR

Residential Infill Project
Remove the A Overlay!

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.

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.

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.

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.

3640 SW Nevada Ct Please add this to the record. Thank you.

Joanie Quinn

29190 OR

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.

3330 NE 38th Ave

Karen Siegle

29191 OR

This is a copy of the testimony I delivered orally on 5/8/18.

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.

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.

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. 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. 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.

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.

1736 SE 21st Ave

Gerson Robboy

29192 OR

6811 SE Mall St.

Please adopt this proposal and help increase housing density while preserving older, historic homes.

Wesley Stoller

29193 OR

(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.

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.

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.

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.

in this Residential Infill Project draft.

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.

LARGE FAMILY:

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.

MULTI-GENERATION:

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.

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.

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

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.

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.

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.

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

Dear Commissioners,

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.

Sincerely,

620 NE Ainsworth

Ben Hubbird

Ben Hubbird

29197 OR

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.

1309 s.e 57th ave.

jim pierce

29198 OR

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.

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.

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:

9426 N. Mohawk Ave I also own a 47.1'x100 lot, and about ten years ago, I designed a very large home (3,256 sq John Svob

29199 OR

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.

2207 SE 37th Ave

Emily Chenoweth

29200 OR

any, partner with a private landowner, a private architecture firm, and a non-profit partner trying to do something that is good for the community. 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.

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-bock 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.

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.

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

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.

3428 SE 9th Ave.

Stephen Bachhuber

29203 OR

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.

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!

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.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

2412 SE Tibbetts St

Robert Markle

29204 OR

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.

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.

0235 NW Whitaker S

Theresa Huang

29205 OR

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.

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.

Better to have more density in an affordable, convenient neighborhood. We support the proposed changes to zoning in Portland.

PO Box 715

Ellen Fallihee

29206 OR

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!

3114 NE 26th Ave

Mark Danielson

29207 OR

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

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

100 SE Littlepage Rd	person decide about this. Rules that force ADU's to be more visitable than normal houses	Julia Christopher	29209 OR
3416 NE 39th Avenue	Please see the attached report prepared by seven members of the RIPSAC.	Janet Baker	29210 OR

I am opposed to the RIP.

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.

RIP ignores the Comprehensive Plan which was actually crafted over time with real and thoughtful input from many stakeholders.

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.

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 incent development will not meet the immediate needs generated.

Puts no value on the nature of the history of neighborhood attributes. The zoning currently in effect already allows for ADUs 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.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

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

5816 ne 25th ave 27th in Concordia unless there are some controls to prevent a developer feeding frenzy.
2220 Prestwick Road Letter attached.
2228 SE Salmon St Letter attached.
4033 NE Hoyt Street Letter attached.

John Smith	29212 OR
Nick Johnson	29213 OR
Nancy Dale-Phelps	29217 OR
Bruce Newton	29218 OR

Residential Infill Testimony

1900 SW 4th Avenue

Portland, OR 97201

www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/infill/mapapp

503-823-0195

May 6, 2018

To Commission Members:

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.

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

3046 NE 33rd Ave

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

UVER

BECAUSE OF THE HIGH DEMAND. WHILE COST INCREASE INDICES CURRENTLY HOVER AROUND 5% FOR 2017 (HTTP://WWW.TURNERCONSTRUCTION.COM/COST-INDEX)

26.AS DEVELOPMENT

FOR EXAMPLE

27.JANE JACOBS HAS OF WHICH THEY WANT TO BE A PART. BUT AS THE CROWDING-IN OCCURS
THIS CAN VARY GREATLY DEPENDING UPON WHERE YOU WANT TO LIVE IN PORTLAND.

28.THE NATIONAL AV SO

SINCERELY
DR ROBERT AND DONNA KELLUM
3046 NE 33RD AVE
PORTLAND
503-331-7393
,healthbridge@integ

29220 OR

28:28.0

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.

7835 SW 11th Ave

Kelly Batte

29221 OR

Re: Residential Infill Project Proposal to the Eastmoreland Neighborhood

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

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.

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:

- â€¢ maintained the goal of livability

- â€¢ zoning districts, standards and guidelines

- â€¢ Clearly defined conditions for building additions, new construction and modifications

- â€¢ Requiring neighborhood interaction for proposed demolitions

- â€¢ Interaction with neighborhood committees

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.

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

3207 SE Crystal Sprin onsite parking. The additional on street parking has placed a significant burden on the

David Jones

29222 OR

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

6335 N Mississippi A is not only environmentally unsound but will also decrease the value of the current homes.

Lindsay Thurwachter

29223 OR

Project Director Morgan Tracy
Residential.infill@portlandoregon.gov

Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission
PSC@portlandoregon.gov
1900 SW Fourth Avenue, Suite 7100
Portland, Oregon 97204

Re: Residential Infill Project
Remove the A Overlay

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.

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.

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

8414 SW 10th Avenue radical concept were not implemented. The A Overlay is a flawed concept that I do not

Julia Porter

29224 OR

To the Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission:

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.

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

3216 N.E. Couch Stre

Kathryn Lillis

29225 OR

To the Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission:

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.

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

3216 N.E. Couch Stre

Robert James Lillis

29226 OR

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.

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.

Thank you,
Jason Motsko

7145 SW 36th Ave

Jason Motsko

29227 OR

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.

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. 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.

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

3136 NE Couch Stree

Patricia Rumer

29229 OR

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.

3105 SE 29th Avenue

Markus Mead

29233 OR

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

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

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.

311 NE Monroe St

Thank you again for keeping this process moving forward.

Alex Joyce

29234 OR

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

4949 NE 34th

3144 NE 17th Avenue Letter attached.

Kevin Burke

29235 OR

Eugene and Laurel Levert

29237 OR

3828 NE Alameda St. My testimony, previously pasted, attached as a PDF for greater legibility.

604 NW Marlborough Letter attached.

Jeffrey King

29238 OR

Judy and Jerry Sawyer

29240 OR

opposed to the proposed Residential Infill Project Zone Code and Map Change.

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!

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.

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.

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

1509 NE Siskiyou St

Susan and Ted Schneider

29243 OR

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.

5915 N Delaware Ave

Kimberlee Stafford

29244 OR

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 there 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.

2282 SE Spruce

Mary Slac

29245 OR

-
- 1) Despite planners' good intentions, it does not solve the issues it was designed to address: affordability, equitability, sustainability, livability.
 - 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.
 - 3) RIP is not equitable. Rather it destabilizes long-time residents and time-honored communities.
RIP's potential to tear existing neighborhoods apart does not support livability goals.
 - 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.
 - 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.
 - 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.
 - 7) The plan ignores the negative impact of mass upzoning in sister cities like Seattle.
 - 8) RIP will contribute to the loss of Portland's mature tree canopy, solar access and garden plots.
 - 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.
 - 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

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:

• Space for parking

• Crowded neighborhood with less privacy between lots

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

• It will raise the property prices, which will make it even more difficult for first time home buyers.

4226 NE 63rd Ave

Jessica Vollendorf

29248 OR

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:

• Space for parking

• Crowded neighborhood with less privacy between lots

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

• It will raise the property prices, which will make it even more difficult for first time home buyers.

4226 NE 63rd Ave

Jessica Vollendorf

29249 OR

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.

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?

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.

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

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?

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

I am adamantly opposed to RIP.
It does not provide opportunity for affordable housing.

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

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.

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

Don't take Portland away.

4016 NE Senate St

Thomas Schwenzer

29251 OR

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.

3509 ne Alberta Ct

Ervin Siverson

29252 OR

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

9515 N Lombard Stre families/homeowners in place. THIS is the answer to the short term fear of displacement.

Rachel Hill

29253 OR

City Of Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability
ATTN: Residential Infill Project
1900 SW 4th Avenue
Suite 7100
Portland, OR 97201

RE:Testimony on the Residential Infill Project

To the Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission:

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!

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."

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

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

3615 NE Hassalo St Sincerely,

Thea Parker

29254 OR

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.

1802 SE 48th Ave.

Cynthia Ramon

29259 OR

3828 NE Alameda Str Attached is a PDF of the testimony I submitted yesterday in a better format.

Jessie King

29260 OR

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 crumbling 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.

915 SE 33rd Ave B

Tiffany Conklin

29261 OR

From Portland Coalition for Historic Resources: OPPOSE RIP in current form. Request specific changes. Testimony attached as PDF document.

461 NE Mirimar Pl

John Liu

29262 OR

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

3437 SE Washington and remodels.

Regan Fisher

29265 OR

20156 SE Salmon St Letter attached.

Lonnie McCormick-Goodh

29266 OR

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

5114 NE Mallory Ave Resources.

Ursula Kienbaum

29267 OR

Dear Planning and Sustainability Commission,

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.

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.

2808 SE 18th Ave

Emily Platt

29268 OR

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.

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

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.

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.

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.

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.

5615 SW 42nd Ave.

Judge and Susan Schonfeld

29270 OR

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.

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.

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.

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

As a homeowner in the affected new "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

6528 N.E. Stanton St. it. Please do not destroy it.

James Mattimore

29272 OR

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.

3926 SE Pine Street Please reconsider this awful plan.

regina winkler

29274 OR

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.

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.

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.

2007 NE 61st Ave

Travis McHattie

29276 OR

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.

5716 NE Wygant St.

Rachel King

29277 OR

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..

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

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.

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.

--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.

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

3747 NE Milton Street require the delivery of goods or get a lot of FedEx deliveries. (Double parking interferes Frances Moore 29278 OR

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.

1388 SE 33rd Ave Kushal Dave 29279 OR

3136 n.e.Couch St	<p>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</p>	Connie Rumer	29280 OR
4219 SE Reedway	<p>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.</p>	Merrilee Spence	29281 OR

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.

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.

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

4945 N.E. 35th Avenue backbone of this city, not developers who will take the money and run to the next

Kathleen Concannon

29282 OR

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.

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.

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.

4945 N.E. 35th Avenue backbone of this city, not developers who will take the money and run to the next

Larry Hopkins

29283 OR

.....
this before. It is an affordable rental and will continue to be so.

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.

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.

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

4945 N.E. 35th Avenue sentiment. It's from a long-time resident who has worked hard to make Portland a nice Larry Hopkins

29284 OR

.....
this before. It is an affordable rental and will continue to be so.

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.

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.

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

4945 N.E. 35th Avenue sentiment. I'm from a long-time resident who has worked hard to make Portland a nice Kathleen Concannon

29285 OR

City Of Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability
ATTN: Residential Infill Project
1900 SW 4th Avenue
Suite 7100
Portland, OR 97201

RE:Testimony on the Residential Infill Project

To the Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission:

I oppose the Residential Infill Plan in its current form.

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.

Sincerely,

Robert and Lynn Trexler
4005 NE Laddington 4005 NE Laddington CT

Robert Trexler

29286 OR

To the Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission:

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. 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.

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

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

3924 NE LAURELHUR characteristics of the city I once loved .

1908 SE 35th Pl. See attached pdf re: Tuck-under garages and driveway widths.

MARY ANN ROGERS

Doug Klotz

29287 OR

29288 OR

Newly constructed homes in NE Portland must require off street parking. 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 is this area to tight, I received a notice saying an automobile I left parked on the street in front of my house would be towed. Homes in newer parts or 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. 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.

2729 NE 14 Ave.

Donald Kozicki

29289 OR

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 our of scale to existing homes here.

2124 SE Grant St.

Juanita Remien

29290 OR

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). 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.

North Portland has seen its fair share of construction. If you look solely at Williams

4427 N Gantenbein Avenue, spanning just nine blocks from Cook Street to Going Street, six mega apartment

Danielle Conroy

29291 OR

effect of allowing more residences on our and our neighbors' lots (to allow for higher density housing).

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.

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 overlook of neighboring properties, especially for properties that would be significantly more shaded as a result.

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.

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

3068 NE Regents Drive larger backyard, whereas houses on the south side of street should be free to align with

Brett Williams

29292 OR

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 Jorden 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.

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 feeing with a lot of day light exposure.

606 NE 72nd Ave

I hope Portland will consider this as an additional source of an ADU. If, I personally needed Ronald Dobrunick

29293 OR

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.

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.

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.

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

I submitted testimony, however all formatting was removed. I am resubmitting it here as a PDF so that it's easier to read.

1527 NE 65th Av

Terry Parker

29294 OR

11045 se 75th ct

Bradley Bondy

29296 OR

Silvia Larco
3315 NE 44th Ave.
Portland, OR 97213

To whom it may concern,

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

Thank you,
Silvia Larco

3315 NE 44th Ave. Sent from my iPhone

Silvia Larco

29297 OR

Hi,

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 and 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.

3144 NE 44th Ave.

Robert Bassett

29298 OR

Hi,

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 and 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.

3144 NE 44th Ave.

Robert Bassett

29299 OR

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.

6816 SE Belmont Str

Jason Siri

29300 OR

I write to ask you to amend the current Proposed Draft of the RIP.

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:

1. For every additional unit built on a property allow additional FAR and height.
2. Apply the new A-overlay to the entire area of Portland where it applies, not just already well off inner neighborhoods.
3. Do away with parking requirements completely or at least if more than one unit is built.
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).
5. Reduce front set back requirements to 10 feet.
6. Delete all arbitrary aesthetic requirements...these only serve to increase development costs and thus housing costs.
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.)

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!

4600 SE 33rd Pl.

Thank you for your excellent work thus far, and please, think of those without good

Eric Lindsay

29301 OR

ATTN: Residential Infill Project
1900 SW 4th Avenue
Suite 7100
Portland, OR 97201

RE: Testimony on the Residential Infill Project

To the Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission:

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.

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.

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

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.

4146 NE Flanders Str

Jeff Hanson

29302 OR

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 densitiesâ€”5â€”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

2632 SE Salmon St. two.

Jeffrey Yasskin

29303 OR

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

5117 NE Cesar Chave solar panels. Thanks.

Adam Crafts

29304 OR

May 13, 2018

To: Planning and Sustainability Commission
From: Marilyn Pitts
Re: the Residential Infill Project (RIP)

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.

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

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.

The proposed " 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.

906 SE 72nd Ave

Marilyn Pitts

29305 OR

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.

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.

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

5034 NE Rodney Ave will lead to blight and an over-costed soulless landscape like already exists in California's

John Kim

29306 OR

.....
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.

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

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.
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.

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.

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

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.

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.

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:

“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

2550 NE 36th Ave

Kerry Milne

29308 OR

834 NE 67th Ave

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!

Jodi Winters

29309 OR

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....

3344 ne 15th ave.

<https://restoreoregon.org/call-to-action-for-those-worried-about-demolitions/>

teresa mcgrath

29310 OR

Hello

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 itâ€™s not enough. This does isnâ€™t helping with affordable housing, it just gets more people in which raises property taxes, which I get is why the city like it.

Iâ€™d like to see more architectural consideration. Skinny houses are an eye sore, as are those monstrous new mc mansions.

And multi pieces with no parking are not acceptable!!! Itâ€™s making portland a nightmare. Why isnâ€™t this being addressed more seriously!

Thank you
Ashley

5124 be 35th pl

Ashley Vincent

29311 OR

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. See pdf re Keeping Front Setbacks at 10'

23 Yellow Wood Dr
1908 SE 35th Pl.

Blake Clark
Doug Klotz

29312 NH
29313 OR

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.

260 N Polk St

Ranei Nomura

29314 OR

2632 SE Salmon Street The attached testimony is submitted on behalf of Oregon Walks.

Claire Vlach

29315 OR

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.

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.

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

5262 NE 37TH AVENUE Thanks, and keep up the good work.

Leon Barrett

29316 OR

Type or paste your testimony in this box...Members of the Commission

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

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

Thank you,
Steve Dixon

1915 NE 59th Avenue

Steve Dixon

29317 OR

Please support Portland for Everyone's recommendations for the Residential Infill Project and, particularly, to recommend eliminating minimum parking requirements.

130 SE 53rd Ave

Build Housing, Not Parking

Adrienne Leverette

29318 OR

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.

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.

Thank you,

4757 N Lombard St
7207 se 71st Ave

Ben Birdsall
I am in favor of the proposed changes.

Ben Birdsall
Quinton Mattson

29319 OR
29320 OR

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.

419 ne hazelfern pl

There are NO conditions for developers but to overbuild. I am in favor of ADU's.

walter pozarycki

29321 OR

2928 NE Hoyt St

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.

Sara Rudolph

29322 OR

To the Portland Planning & Sustainability Commission:

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.

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.

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.

Sincerely,
Greg Buss

4217 NE DAVIS ST.

Greg Buss

29323 OR

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.

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.

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.

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.

I do not support this proposal at all and I will do everything in my power to make certain it is not enacted.

Thank you,

Charlotte Rains Dixon

1915 N.E. 59th Ave

Charlotte Dixon

29324 OR

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.

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.

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.

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.

I do not support this proposal at all and I will do everything in my power to make certain it is not enacted.

Thank you,

Charlotte Rains Dixon

1915 N.E. 59th Ave

Charlotte Dixon

29325 OR

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.

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.

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.

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.

I do not support this proposal at all and I will do everything in my power to make certain it is not enacted.

Thank you,

Charlotte Rains Dixon

1915 N.E. 59th Ave

Charlotte Dixon

29326 OR

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.

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.

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.

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.

I do not support this proposal at all and I will do everything in my power to make certain it is not enacted.

Thank you,

Charlotte Rains Dixon

1915 N.E. 59th Ave

Charlotte Dixon

29327 OR

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.

2226 NE Hancock

Fred Leeson

29328 OR

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

8017 N Washburne A life a lot poorer.

Bruce Hall

29329 OR

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.

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.

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.

Sincerely,

3131 SE Woodward S Susan Beal

Susan Beal

29330 OR

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

3145 NE 16th Avenue destroy neighborhood character.

Judith Trutt

29331 OR

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.

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.

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).

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.

To that end, I would like to see the following changes to the RIP draft:

11705 NE Prescott St

Danell Norby

29332 OR

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.

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.

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.

4247 SE PINE ST

Thank you,
Steven Cohen

Steven Cohen

29334 OR

I'm glad to see the examples of the new proposed FAR limitations. Gigantic houses holding single wealthy families are an eyesore.

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.

The rapid urbanization of our corner lots could quickly impact the look and feel of neighborhoods.

1824 N. Cramer St

For this reason I oppose the New 'A' overlay allowing triplexes on every corner.

Bjorn Van der Voo

29335 OR

3627 SE Cooper St 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/WiIf9> Meg Merrick 29336 OR

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.

2926 NE 46th Ave 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. Janice Flock 29337 OR

Bureau of Planning and Sustainability Commission
05/14/2018

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.

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.

524 NE Morgan Sincerely,
Kathy Fuerstenau Kathy Fuerstenau 29340 OR

5/14/2018

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.

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.

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.

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 ADUs, 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

4930 NE 73rd

Kathy Fuerstenau

29341 OR

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.

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.

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.

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.

Respectfully,

803 NE Laurelhurst P L. M. Eddleman, J.D., PhD.

L.M. Eddleman

29342 OR

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.

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.

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.

4063 NE 30th Ave

Martha Hunt

29343 OR

I am writing to ask that the Commission eliminate minimum parking requirements 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.

2240 SE 24th Ave

Alicia Cohen

29344 OR

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.

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!

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.

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!

3816 NE Glisan

Others have documented misguided details of the infill project. We are aware of this

Elizabeth Brenner Thomas

29345 OR

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.

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?

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.

I do not believe the idea of adding ADUs to some of our neighborhoods is the answer at this time.

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.

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.

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.

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.

Please add this to the record.

Thank you,

Rose Florek

3920 SW Nevada Ct. 3920 SW Nevada Ct.

Rose Florek

29348 OR

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.

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.

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.

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.

Please add this to the record.

Thank you,

Peter Borgwardt

3920 SW Nevada Ct. 3920 SW Nevada Ct.

Peter Borgwardt

29349 OR

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.

I support the Residential Infill Project because of the following:

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.
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.
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.
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.

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.

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.

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.
2. Create a true cottage cluster code that encourages the development of smaller, more affordable homes in the current R5 and R2.5 zones.
3. Allow triplexes and fourplexes on all residential lots. Also allow these projects to access the improved affordable and accessible housing bonuses.
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.
5. Allow internal conversion of existing houses into multiple homes in all areas, and provide additional incentives for housing preservation and reuse.

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

3054 NE Everett St	major concerns.	MIRIAM GARCIA	29352 OR
4415 NE 87th Ave	Letter attached.	Margaret Davis	29353 OR
4334 NE Davis St	Letter attached.	Ann Williamson	29354 OR
2747 SW Roswell Ave	Letter attached.	Aesha R. Lorenz Al-Saeed	29355 OR
1327 SE 32nd Place	Letter attached.	Carol Poliak	29356 OR
8233 SW 39th Ave	Letter attached.	Michele Bell	29357 OR
1822 NE Wasco St	Letter attached.	Leon Porter	29358 OR
4100 SE Woodward St	Letter attached.	JoAnne Knowles	29359 OR
1900 SW 4th Avenue	Please see attached memo.	Kimberly Tallant	29360 OR

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.

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.

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

2663 NW Westover F property. It would result in a scenario where the allowed size for construction would be James Purdy 29361 OR

3635 SE Tibbetts st I oppose these changes to the zoning of this property. Keeping the original character of our neighborhoods is the most important to me. Audrey Tollefson 29362 OR