

# Residential Infill Project

## PSC Members' Comments and Goals

May 18, 2018

### Andrés

#### Goals

In 5-10 years, construction of 2+ unit sites outpaces single family homes in small residential zones. Homeownership opportunities are increased citywide, and reduced housing competition leads to a reduction in housing costs.

Increased housing choice leads to greater economic opportunity for households across neighborhoods.

#### Topics / Comments

- Affordable housing bonus
- Anti-displacement programming
- FAR

### Chris

#### Goals

I put this in the context of the overall Comp Plan growth strategy of 30% Central City, 50% Centers and Corridors, 20% Dispersed Development

I see this project as a vehicle for allowing some of the dispersed development to occur in high opportunity neighborhoods that would otherwise not see increases in housing. And of course, any contribution we can make to affordability is vital at this time. I see this as an improvement on the assumption that much of the dispersed development would occur in neighborhoods that are more remote from services/jobs and less dense. To this end, data about relative costs of unit development under RIP versus multi-family units in corridors could be helpful.

A secondary objective is to reduce demolitions resulting from 1:1 redevelopment to larger houses. I am not nearly as concerned about demolitions leading to increases in number of units, although even there I think there are improvements we might make. For example a number of people have cited the vulnerability of small (~1200 sq ft) homes. I'd love to see a provision that would allow a small home like this on a reasonably sized lot to remain, while adding another comparably sized house and an ADU (keeping roughly in the same total FAR range that we are contemplating). As I understand the current proposal, there's no way to get to the max FAR range without demolishing the small home (except perhaps adding a substantial addition to that home). We might also consider incentives for internal conversions in this spirit (it seems to me a case could be made that this kind of development should get similar SDC incentives to what ADUs get).

#### Topics / comments

- I'd like to see some analysis of economics in two different scenarios. I believe the "residual land value" approach primarily captures the scenario where a developer is going to acquire a property for redevelopment/enhancement. But it seems to me another potentially important scenario is a homeowner who wants to extract additional value from their property via one or two ADUs or an internal conversion. It seems to me the economic choices are very different if you already own the property and are perhaps considering financing via home equity?

- I'm concerned that "visitability" may not be enough to support our goals for aging in place, etc. I'd like to see us look at Universal Design as a standard. I'd like to understand the cost per unit to achieve visitability versus Universal Design (Alan DeLaTorre suggested he had such data). We should consider supporting the higher standard with bonus FAR.
- I'm not convinced yet that we have the balance on skinny lot zoning correct yet. I agree that rezoning to R2.5 is the correct transparent way to do this, but I'm not I'm fully convinced that the subset of lots where we've chosen to do this is correct.
- Let's keep it simple, particularly for home-owner driven redevelopment. Making ADUs more complex or restricted is not a good thing. I'm also concerned that BDS has concerns about their ability to enforce the FAR-driven approach.
- Preserving the street. I took the comments about tuck-under garages and wide curb cuts/driveways with 'wings' to heart. I'd like us to put a premium on minimizing curb cuts and preserving streetscapes.

## **Katie**

### *Goals*

- A gradual but definite change in Portland Neighborhoods toward more variety in housing type. I am not sure what that rate of change would be. Probably, it would be the rate that would cause a few people grousing, but overall most people hardly noticing.
- More people would be able to live closer to jobs and services. These neighborhoods would better serve more family sizes and incomes.
- A high percentage of the investment in new structures would come from homeowners, either using the new units to age in place, or just to stay in increasingly unaffordable neighborhoods. New investors would be locals who live in their new tiny complexes.
- I would like to see 20-50% of new units under RIP be affordable (at 80%).
- It should be economically feasible for non-profit's/the housing bureau to invest in single family housing using the overlay and therefore there would be an increase in affordable homeownership.

### *Topics / Comments*

- I want to understand the impact of not including parts of East Portland. Could you explain the two scenarios: including East Portland in A overlay ie what would be the (possible) negative consequences?; not including East Portland, what would be the possible negative consequences? I would really like the answer to this question to paint a picture understandable to everyone. Does the Cully Neighborhood letter make any difference in thinking about including all of Cully in the overlay? Is staff more inclined to add in parts of Cully, knowing that programs are already in place for that neighborhood.
- Neighborhood representatives came saying, not in my neighborhood. Some pointed to some objective reasons. Lack of transit in the West Hills and some other west-side neighborhoods. Why were they included in the A overlay with those limitations?
- I would like staff to go through the economics and likely impact of the non-profit requests for more density. Also many homeowners were claiming this would move us in the entire other direction. They were claiming demolition of modest homes to put two smaller houses that are high priced. They had some examples. Does the math work at all or are these unicorns? In some neighborhoods? Which neighborhoods?
- How does this fit with existing regulation of Air BB style rentals? What will keep these new units from becoming tourist rentals.
- This is a speculative question, probably not as important as my other questions. I am curious about it though.

- How sensitive are single family neighborhoods to the economics. Does the RIP have to get it just right? or is there slop. Economic conditions will change continually. What, in the economy, would need to change to make RIP ineffective. IE, very few people use it to build anything, or Everyone uses it to demolish and build everything. (I found it really interesting that a lot of homeowners were not even charging for their ADU's -- made me wonder how much economics is a driver)
- I don't like the present demolition model of small houses being replaced by McMansions and don't want us to be creating mostly new Air B & B's.

## Mike

### Goals

- There is significantly more housing that is affordable long-term, and permanently.
- There is a wide range of housing types, both affordable and market rate, that meets the needs of a growing population and specific subsets of the population: aging demographic, students, middle income residents, and low income residents
- Housing objectives of RIP are met through more flexibility, allowing for protection, and expansion of the city's urban forest canopy. There are more parks and greenspaces through additional park acquisition and use of green infrastructure projects (expanded forest canopy, bioswales, landscaping) that complement increased densities. "A House is Not Enough" People who live in added housing need access to nature and parks where they live, work, and play!
- Floodplains and other hazard lands are not compromised through increased density.
- Wealth Creation: Home ownership is the single most opportunity for wealth creation in my opinion. By providing more opportunities for entry into home ownership, aging in place through ADU's and other strategies, across the entire city RIP will have helped narrow economic disparities.
- Most existing housing will have been retained and retrofitted to meet needs of existing or new owners through internal conversions, not demolition.

### Topics / Comments

- FAR: I am having trouble understanding how what appears to be minor FAR adjustments/incentives can have the significant negative impacts or are insufficient to incent achieving RIP objectives.
- The Johnson Report details which pro and con argue will either doom RIP to failure or won't achieve what RIP purports to accomplish.
- Staff response to Portland For Everyone recommendations which were supported by numerous testifiers and organizations.
- Staff response to opponents to RIP assertion that demolitions will increase.

## Michelle

### Goals

- More efficient use of housing and land within the single family zones in a manner increasing access to these neighborhoods while avoiding involuntary displacement of current residents and continuing to allow a single family residence experience.
- Participants in the public process correctly believe that they were heard and their concerns honestly evaluated.

### What does success look like in 5 or 10 years?

- Project implementation has increased housing choice rather than diminished it.
- We haven't pushed the people renting single family homes out.
- Project implementation has facilitated aging in place as well as provided opportunities for new entrants to the market. Neighborhoods are enjoying the social benefits of greater interaction among

a greater variety of people. Cohousing or clusters provide housing as well as the social benefits shown to improve health.

*Addressing the potential pieces of success identified by staff:*

**More housing?** Yes. There have been multiple comments about the Comprehensive Plan Buildable Lands inventory showing we have enough zoning capacity for anticipated population growth. I do not believe that the zoning capacity identified in the Comprehensive Plan analysis is a reason for not pursuing infill in the single family neighborhoods. Even if we have enough capacity to put all new residents in multi-family condo or apartment structures, we should also provide opportunities for additional people to live in the low rise neighborhoods.

There is a balance to be achieved here between providing additional housing and preserving the opportunity to live in a house with a yard. Part of that benefit is societal. The ability to grow your own food, for example, potentially has both wallet and health implications. Locally sourced food also an important element of emergency preparedness.

**More affordable housing?** Yes. There were some public comments that not everyone has the right to live everywhere. The comments were along the lines that people that live in these neighborhoods have worked hard and saved their money and deserve to live there and that is basically a reality of capitalism. That is true to an extent but I believe it is important to add some other considerations.. One being that there are lots of people in our community whose work we value and need that work very hard and contribute hugely to society and our communities but don't make big paychecks and we want to be responsive to that and support them in doing that work. We also know that access to more neighborhoods means more access to school choice and the related opportunities placing your child in the right educational environment for them provides for them and everyone else down the line. Also, our relative affordability is a competitive advantage in attracting job growth. Last but not least, there is the reality is these neighborhoods were not always open to everyone and the ability to live there and gain equity and at some point transfer that equity to other people in the family is important.

**More variety?** Yes. there has been some debate in the testimony about whether RIP caters to potential future residents at the expense of current residents. Success to me means project implementation has facilitated aging in place as well as provided opportunities for new entrants to the market. A kid can return to Portland as an adult and buy an ADU and start building equity. An older couple can rent out the front house and choose to live in a smaller ADU in the rear of the property. In addition, however, we will have in fact made room for people to join us. We aren't closing the door behind us but recognizing that the talent and volunteerism that often follow in migration are an asset and important to Portland's economic health and therefore all of our prosperities.

**Fewer demolitions?** Probably. Theoretically I would like to see more internal conversions to provide additional housing when compared to demolition and replacement with multi-unit structures like new duplexes, preserving viable, architecturally interesting potentially historically significant housing. The caveat on this is I appreciate the presence of lead paint and asbestos and poor weatherization/insulation in some older homes and appreciate in some cases, new housing is preferable. I also appreciate that new construction may be better able to support small scale living. As we are asking people to accept smaller living units, new construction provides a blank sheet for designing efficient spaces, avoiding unnecessary hallways etc.

**Redevelopment that better fits the area?** Yes but neighborhoods are not cast in stone and I don't think everything has to look the same.

## Topics / Comments

- Can we simplify the code? I am concerned about the complexity of the code. I am particularly alarmed by the BDS comment concerning the increasing number of administrative rules necessary to implement the code. People don't go on line and look for administrative rules. They look for zoning code.
- I appreciated the map provided in the public testimony showing single family housing apparently occupied by renters. The zoning code defines a household to include up to 6 unrelated people living in a dwelling unit. I am very concerned about the potential of the RIP to displace these households. If you have multiple adults sharing a house and splitting the costs evenly, they can pool their resources to afford housing. In the example below, splitting the rent evenly, two unrelated people can get a bedroom and shared common areas for \$550/month. I would like to understand what the expectation is concerning the impact of allowing the duplexes/triplexes on this type of housing, particularly if the duplexes/triplexes don't have affordability provisions.

2218 SE Clinton St, Portland, OR 97202

[www.redfin.com/OR/Portland/2218-SE-Clinton-St-97202/home/25892442](http://www.redfin.com/OR/Portland/2218-SE-Clinton-St-97202/home/25892442)

For Rent

\$1,100/month

2 bed · 2 bath · 1,347 sq ft

2,520 sq ft lot · 1902 built

- If we implement RIP, where do we implement it? City-wide or as an overlay?
- What do we do about parking? I agree that over time fewer people will own cars but that we aren't there yet. My expectation of the missing middle was that we would look for opportunities to provide more units in the same "box" as the single family "box" we established was reasonable. I agree with staff that families were larger in the past so neighborhoods likely had more people than they do now with smaller households. I think we need to recognize, however, that as we add more adults to the neighborhood we are adding impacts as the additional adults are, for the foreseeable future likely to come with cars. I don't have a preliminary position on the issue of requiring parking but I wonder if this is an area where we need to advise the City to couple zoning changes with other tools. For example, I appreciate the undesirability of surface parking but could the City in some cases land bank property for future housing projects and in the interim allow the use of the land for remote parking, perhaps over green pavers? I have some personal experience in another state with buying housing without off street parking despite having a car and it worked because when there wasn't a place to park on the street, we had access to a remote lot.
- I know of instances where a job announcement has required the person have access to a car in order to get the job. Can the City somehow encourage entities that have this requirement provide the car and a place to park it to the employee?
- On the other hand, are garages today necessarily bad if they are coupled with a parking permit program? If they are adaptable to becoming studio apartments as ownership of cars decreases?
- If a house is large enough to accommodate multiple internal units and the only reason we are not allowing that is concern about triggering commercial building code standards, should we be lobbying the state to treat, for example, fourplexes as residential? How much open space would we reasonably retain on a 5000 sf lot if we allowed fourplexes outside the context of internal conversions?
- I am concerned about the testimony that the duplexes and triplexes that will be constructed will not be affordable. How are we defining affordable in this process? Is it some percentage of median house price in that neighborhood or is it the 60 or 80% of MFI metric? Is it a realistic goal to include a requirement that when non adus are added to a site, the units have to be affordable as we are defining affordable in this context? Are there tax abatement options to assist affordability? Does RIP need to be coupled with non zoning tools? Should we be exempting affordability of ADUs occupied by family member of primary dwelling occupant?

- If the economics study shows the RIP will not result in substantial amounts of additional housing, why adopt the provisions for additional duplexes, triplexes etc. rather than focusing on supporting internal conversions and external adus?
- I want to hear more about part of city testifiers have said City Council recently rejected rezoning.
- I am wondering about the comments that 2500 sf is huge in some neighborhoods and not unusual in others and would like to go back to how the RIP came up with 2500 sf.

## **Ben**

### *Goals*

- Allow and encourage a broader variety of housing choices than currently available in single-family zones, by means of existing and new housing stock
- Create simple and easy to use regulations
- Apply rules equitably and evenly across the City

### *Topics / Comments*

#### **Scale of Houses**

- FAR calculation.
  - Consider necessity of introducing FAR
  - Consider using setbacks/height/coverage instead of FAR
  - Provide more allowable buildable area for each housing type (ADU, SF, duplex, triplex etc.)
- Height calculation – consider averaging high/low point

#### **Housing Options**

- A overlay – wider application with fewer exceptions
- Allow additional bonus density for additional units created
- Prioritize multiple units creation within existing housing stock
- ADUs –allow for enough room and flexibility to allow viable and practicable configurations

#### **Narrow lots**

- Keep current R5 designation for historically narrow lots that are not adjacent to nodes & corridors

### *What does success look like in 5 or 10 years?*

- A wider variety of housing choices is available than today: housing for singles, starter homes, small families, larger families, retirees. Bridge the current gap between single-family and multi-family types.
- Housing choices are evenly distributed across the city.
- Regulations incentivize and promote increased variety.
- Availability of “middle housing” is evenly distributed between existing stock and new construction.

## **André**

### *Goals*

To ensure people of color and low income are not discriminated against directly or indirectly by RIP implementation

- Given low income, seniors and people of color income levels in Portland, I will be looking for evidence people of color, seniors and low-income renters and home owners have the same opportunity to rent and develop the wealth that middle and upper income have.
- My goal is to ensure renters in the new homes are regulated and there is concurrence from Housing they have a plan in place to regulate.
- To remove affordable from RIP

If the PSC passes a RIP that does legislate against, seniors, people of color and low income (all below 60% MFI) we do it with full knowledge of the discrimination and impact to which communities. And we have an open and honest discussion about who is benefiting.

#### *Topics / Comments*

- It appears BDS is in disagreement with BPS staff, BDS concerns do not raise a red flag but present a stop sign. I would like BDS staff to join us for exploration of the following issues:
  - RIP cost impact to 60% of permits (single family) indirect and unintended.
    - Are we increasing cost to our customers?
  - Are we increasing complexity to our customers?
  - Do they have concerns about lack of governance of “affordable units”
- BES and Water – it appears both agencies are willing to go with whatever we pass and make it work. My question is what are the cost implication of make it work? If they can have representatives at our discussion to ask question directly.
- A discussion of the methodology to remove unimproved streets and how it was applied. There appears to be areas which are included in the RIP that have unimproved streets according to testimony and the map app. Additionally understand PDOT understanding of improvement and what they would require of a home owner on a unimproved street that adds a unit or two because of RIP.

### **Jeff**

#### *Goals*

The fundamental objective is to allow more flexibility and in turn create greater opportunities to increase the number of housing units and diversity of housing types than would otherwise be built in the roughly 50% of the city land that is zoned single family.

Numerous parties - Portland for Everyone, nonprofit affordable housing advocates, various developer organizations, individual builders, both large and small – testified in support of the RIP concept but against the current draft. A common concern they voiced was that the quantity and complexity of the regulations undermine the purpose for RIP. The City Bureau of Development Services (BDS), in its memo to the PSC of May 14, concludes that it will be harder and more expensive to build under the proposed regulatory scheme.

If RIP is to move forward with the support of essential allies, then a package of amendments is needed to enable RIP to more efficiently and feasibly achieve its goal.

#### *Topics / Comments*

##### **Scale of Houses**

- Should the proposed maximum allowable size of a single family house - .5 FAR or 2,500 square feet - be increased to something closer to what is currently allowed? And should further increases in size be allowed for each additional housing unit?
- Should the size of the building be controlled through existing regulations - primarily height, as recommended by the Bureau of Development Services (BDS) - or through the new FAR standards proposed in the current draft?

The introduction of FAR to regulate house size is one of the chief concerns raised in the BDS memo. BDS contends that “measuring floor area ratio for all single dwelling zone proposals would be difficult to implement consistently and overly burdensome for applicants. We feel that changing the reference point for measuring height to lowest grade and reducing the height limit to 25 feet would accomplish the same objectives using existing tools. The building coverage standard already controls for bulk in a way that is calibrated more closely to lot size.

## **R2.5 Zone and Historically Platted Narrow Lots ("skinny lots")**

- Should all skinny lots in the R5 zone be rezoned to R2.5? The current draft proposes to rezone only about half of the approximately 14,000 skinny lots, and no development would then be allowed on the lots that were not rezoned.
- Should the proposed new restrictions on the development of skinny lots be removed in order to maintain flexibility and preserve opportunities for development? Some of the new restrictions that various parties have recommended for deletion include:
  - Changes to Property Line Adjustments;
  - The requirement that only attached housing is allowed; and,
  - Increases to the minimum lot size for development. (I'm not clear if the current draft would increase minimum lot sizes in the R-2.5 or other zones? Can staff address this concern?)
- Should the R2.5 zone and regulation of skinny lots be shifted to the upcoming BHBD process?

## **Affordability Requirements**

Is the requirement that each additional housing unit on a property must be rented or sold to someone earning less than 80% of MFI feasible? Will the affordability mandate undermine the goal of creating more units and diverse types of housing?

Several supporters of the RIP concept noted that, while increasing the supply of middle housing may not directly or immediately benefit lower income residents, it will increase the supply of housing affordable to middle income earners - teachers, nurses, etc. - which in turn helps bend the arc of affordability in a favorable direction for the continuum of housing throughout the city.

The affordability requirement was one of the chief concerns raised by BDS. The Bureau recommends using existing subsidy programs instead of introducing new requirements.

## **Historic Resource Regulations**

It would be helpful if staff would walk through and explain the intent of each of the code provisions affecting historic properties interspersed throughout Section 33.405.

Also, it would be helpful to get an explanation - perhaps from BDS - and have a discussion about BDS's concerns raised in the second bullet point on page 2 of its May 14 memo.

As pointed out by BDS, it is problematic to use the Historic Resource Inventory (HRI) as a regulatory tool because the inventory was adopted more than 20 years ago and was intended only to be informational.

## **Visitability**

BDS believes the proposed new visitability standards would be better placed in the building code rather than the zoning code. The BDS memo states: "These standards will be difficult for planners to implement and explain, since they are more closely aligned with Building Code requirements. We support efforts by BPS to change state regulations and include the requirements in Title 24."

## **Clarify, Simplify and Streamline; Maintain ADU Regulations As Is**

Numerous parties objected to the volume of new regulations being proposed. Many of the regulations are extraneous to RIP's core purpose. Scaling back the regulations will increase the likelihood that RIP will result in more density and more diverse housing types.

In particular, the BDS memo and Eli's proposed amendments include a list of regulations recommended for elimination. Perhaps as a starting point for PSC discussion, staff could explain which of the regulations proposed to be eliminated they believe is essential to RIP, and thus should be kept.



Also, numerous parties testified that the proposed changes to ADU standards are counterproductive. The program has been well-accepted and well-used. The city should be extremely cautious about imposing new or modified regulatory requirements on ADUs through the RIP process.

## **Teresa**

### *Goals*

- Homeowners and neighborhoods would have a diversity of housing types in amenity rich neighborhoods, homeowners could feel they have increased the usability of their property in ways that benefit both the individual and the community
- Allowing homes and properties to adapt over time to fit the needs, desires and wants of Portlanders. The development process is integrated with appropriate infrastructure maintenance/improvements and functions well with clear development standards that are accessible to homeowners.
- Streetscapes and neighborhoods include trees and historic homes alongside contextually sensitive new homes/ADUs. Historically significant homes are able to be re-purposed for homeowners use without demolition and can allow more people to reside in the close-in amenity rich neighborhoods.

### *Topics / Comments*

- Is using FAR too complicated for the average home owner to navigate and is this a conflict with the goal "provide clear rules for development" and is this an unintended tilt of the process towards professional development vs homeowners
- Do these housing types truly result in enhanced affordability & sustainability? I think that internal conversions would help with these two goals + neighborhood context, but not sure that new development will support affordability or resource efficient & environmentally sensitive goals.
- The RIP is not really an effective affordable housing tool without more significant support/policy modification in my opinion. I wonder if the goal of affordable housing development on existing properties might be better served with a more focused and funded program and that putting it into this project presents a bit of a false promise in light of item B above. I am concerned that we need to make meaningful strides in affordable housing. Pushing a program which will have minimal effect on the issue and that seems to have a large volume of dissenting homeowners might cripple further efforts on the next ask to create meaningful movement on affordable housing.
- Inclusion of East Portland areas that have been excluded for displacement risk needs to be seriously evaluated in light of public testimony on this subject.
- Concerns about integration with neighborhood infrastructure improvements per testimony comments, how to achieve the best match between current and future infrastructure needs with increased density or is this not a valid concern within this process?

## **Eli**

### *Topics / Comments*

- Regulating by FAR. It's a bit surprising to me to read of BDS's concern about regulating by FAR this late in the process. Clearly, doing so adds to permit review complexity. We learned during the RIP SAC process of other cities that regulate single family zones by FAR, and I've been assuming (mistakenly?) that BPS worked this out with BDS long ago – before baking FAR so deeply into the RIP (and, for that matter, Better Housing By Design) framework. If this is still an open topic, we should discuss it.
- Home sizes & heights; FAR bonuses for additional units
- Parking minimums
- Incentives to make it more likely that existing homes will be preserved
- Ways to continue supporting the creation of ADUs, in the context of FAR caps

- Visitability, Accessibility, and Universal Design
- In what portions of the city should additional housing choices be allowed?
- De-regulation and code simplification? (numbers of doors facing the street, porch roof covers)
- Climate benefits of smaller and attached homes (some findings from research by Oregon DEQ).  
More details here (in brief) and here (full reports):
  - Of 30 different material reduction and reuse practices evaluated, reducing home size and multi-family living achieved the largest greenhouse gas reductions along with significant reductions in other impact categories.
  - Reducing home size by 50 percent results in a projected 36 percent reduction in lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions.
  - Over 80 percent of greenhouse gas emissions over a home's 70-year life occur during occupancy and are attributed to electricity and fuel consumption. About 14 percent of greenhouse gas impacts are tied to producing the original and replacement building materials. Constructing and maintaining the home account for about 2 percent and transportation of building materials accounts for less than 1 percent. Oregon's existing material recycling and energy recovery system reduces greenhouse gas emissions by 5 percent over the typical 70-year life of a home.

### *Goals*

To lay the groundwork for Portland's coming generation of homes and neighborhoods that will have more variety, flexibility, accessibility, and affordability – and lower carbon impacts - than the increasingly large homes that have been created in our single family zones for the past 80 years. RIP should decrease the size and bulk of new homes, while simultaneously increasing the flexibility of what's allowed to happen inside them. This will better match the demographics (and income ranges) of who actually lives here. RIP should provide additional incentives & flexibility for preserving mature trees and older, existing homes. Collectively, these changes should increase equity and resilience within our neighborhoods. Finally, updated rules should be applied city-wide, such that any negative effects from Portland's population growth are disbursed and shared rather than concentrated and/or dodged.

### **What does success look like in 5-10 years?**

- There will be more opportunities for teachers, social service workers, retail workers, construction workers, and other essential members of our community to live in the neighborhood where they work and play.
- New homes will be smaller and less bulky than the ones getting built today.
- Climate gas impacts associated with residential homes will decrease as the market shifts to smaller and attached housing forms (See a few notes on this below, since it hasn't come up much in PSC discussions on RIP thus far)
- ADUs will be created in and alongside new and existing homes in all neighborhoods, providing smaller and less expensive housing options that match demographic trends towards smaller households.
- It will be financially feasible to build modest sized homes (~1,200 – 1,500 sq. ft.) in single dwelling zones, including visitable and accessible ones. To the extent they are owner-occupied, condo ownership will be an option – but not the only way to go.
- Although some older homes will continue to come down, they will be more often preserved through re-investment (e.g. internal conversions, adding ADU(s), building a small second home on the lot...) than is happening under current rules.
- Development patterns for large/deep lots will have more variety than what we've mostly seen from the 1950s to the present: Private dead-end streets lined on one or both sides by large homes on individual lots (with no shared open space).

- A higher proportion of mature trees will be preserved in single-family zones.
- There will be more opportunities for people to downsize and age in place within their own neighborhood.
- It will be possible for non-profits and for-profits focused on first time homebuyers to successfully compete for land with builders intent on maxing out home sizes.

*Testimony that rang particularly true for me:*

Tanner Boldus: "To me for a city to have character it needs to have lots of characters; to have soul it needs souls. And our housing monoculture is failing to provide for everyone.... Also the notion that Portland should be the exclusive domain of single family homes isn't even historic Portland! It's one of those things from the 1950s that aren't a good idea anymore, like meat jello."

**Kat**

*Topics / Comments*

It seems to me RIP most strongly responds to the Comp Plan goals associated with providing diverse housing opportunities and I support that as a main objective/goal with housing affordability as the second strongest goal of the proposal – but housing affordability within the lens of creating more housing as a piece of the puzzle that reduces the pressure on truly affordable units. While the 80%MFI requirement for an additional ADU is laudable, I am concerned that the current proposal will stifle the creation of multiple ADU's.

Reducing demolition under the lens of the climate Action Plan and Neighborhood Compatibility is a consideration, but I do not feel that it is a primary goal in and of itself. I would be interested in understanding what percentage of homes have been demolished since the recession and of those how many had true or potential historical importance. It seems to me that if avoiding demolition is a goal then we should allow more than one ADU within the primary residence – this would also better support the goals for allowing homes to adapt over time.

The proposal does decent job of addressing policies regarding the neighborhood context. I am not convinced that FAR is the correct vehicle for limiting homes to an appropriate size – I still need to read the appendix on this – but in general it seems like the concept could be greatly simplified through height and lot coverage. If we retain the FAR concept, then I am concerned that the proposal does not have the limits set correctly (too low)

I look forward to the presentation on the economics to better understand what adjustments could be made to the proposal to encourage more production.

I would like to understand the implications of opening up the ability to have group living units or coops allowed.

I am intrigued by the testimony to consider scale by the neighborhood context, but understand this would most likely add to much complexity.

I would like more information on City Councils decision that was repeatedly mentioned in testimony with regards to R5 and R2.5 lots.

Please clarify how many administrative rules will need to be created with this proposal. Testimony stated 3 new rules. Administrative rules are complex for professionals to track, let alone people trying to make changes to a home – so this is concerning.

R10 and R20 lots have more land capacity to support more than one ADU. Why were they not included in the proposal?

Some of the provisions in the proposal seem more like design guidelines – eg the front porch requirement. Was there consideration of having neighborhoods identify the design elements that make the most sense for their neighborhoods instead of making blanket requirements?

I am supportive of fourplex on corner lots (and maybe for internal lots as well). Adding a ADU to a triplex makes for a awkward neighborhood context form.

I am supportive of Chris' proposal to make the a overlay base code and eliminate the overlay.