

Summary of Planning and Sustainability Commissioners'
Goals for the Residential Infill Project

May 22, 2018

Generalized Project Goal	Commissioners Mentioned	
Equitable benefits and costs	7	13
Lower displacement	2	
Increased home ownership	4	
More housing options		
Increased range of types	6	24
More locations	6	
Internal conversions	5	
Age friendly options	5	
	2	
Less expensive options		
Smaller units	5	10
More supply	2	
Lower SDCs/costs	2	
	1	
Also mentioned:		
Urban canopy/open space	2	14
Flood/hazards protection	1	
Context	2	
Reduce 1:1 demolitions	3	
Infrastructure adequacy	1	
Public involvement/process	1	
Code simplicity	3	
Energy efficiency/climate goals	1	

Summary of Planning and Sustainability Commissioners' Goals for the Residential Infill Project

May 22, 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.

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).

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.

Summary of Planning and Sustainability Commissioners' Goals for the Residential Infill Project

May 22, 2018

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.

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 5-10 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.

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

Summary of Planning and Sustainability Commissioners' Goals for the Residential Infill Project

May 22, 2018

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.

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.

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.

Summary of Planning and Sustainability Commissioners' Goals for the Residential Infill Project

May 22, 2018

Kat

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)

Eli

Goals for RIP overall

- 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.

Summary of Planning and Sustainability Commissioners'

Goals for the Residential Infill Project

May 22, 2018

- 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."