

COMM ENT_I	CNAME	CADDRESS	CCITY	CSTATE	CCOMMENT
29333	Gina Morvay	2044 se 12th avenue	portland	OR	This is a horrible proposal to include parts of historic Ladds Addition (east of SE 12th) into an endless construction corridor so real estate developers can fill their pockets. What this is really about is a land grab to tear down historic housing, destroy available parking in our neighborhood, build unattractive and stylistically incongruous structures which completely shut off the light and views from their neighbors all to make a fast buck. Not to mention subjecting us to many years of
29338	Opher Nadler	2326 NW Hoyt St	Portland	OR	Opposed to current changes as they dont take into account the historic nature of the neighborhood and the need to preserve that feature; how a higher density with possible exceptions to current restrictions affects single homes next door and the ignoring the fact that there is already shortage of parking and allowing more
29339	Alan Carpenter	9136 SE 82 Ave	Clackamas	OR	You should include 1500-1520 SE 162 into the R2/R3 zone, RM1 zone. It is currently R7 but the owners would be amenable to including it in a muti zone . It is a fourplex in a SFR zone. Makes not sense not to include it in the proposed zone change.
29347	Peter Martin	7304 N. Concord Ave.	Portland	OR	I strongly DISAGREE to the proposed merger of current zoning R2 and R3 into the so-called RM1 zoning status. This proposal shows complete disregard for the quality of life to the current residents and their communities in said zones. Such a proposal is means to the destruction of neighborhoods property values and takes advantage of those who can ill afford to lose their homes. It is a gross display of greed and moral turpitude.
29366	Mary Clare Metscher	4914 N. Williams Ave.	Portland	OR	I do not think that these zoning changes should happen in this stretch of N. Williams. We have already seen a lot of development that has affecting our parking, our yard maintenance, and our general way of life. We have a nice neighborhood and allowing for more expansion is going to change that and change North Portland even further. I don't want to see that happen.
29369	Ryan Woodward	1728 SE Harney St.	Portland	OR	I just want to say that I am extremely happy to see the buffer zones addressed next to areas where large structure would have otherwise decreased the value of our investments.
29371	David Landrum	430 NE Morgan Street	Portland	OR	These questions remain unanswered: Why just my side (west side) of Grand Ave.? Why not on the east side of Grand? Why not the north side of Morgan? Why not the east side of MLK in the same block? Who profits from this change?
29381	Cole Poland	5295 NE 52nd Ave	Portland	OR	My wife and I are all for the planned zoning changes. This seems like it will limit confusion around how people can develop their land.
29399	Padraic Conway	1113 NE 59th Ave	Portland	OR	I'm protesting this rezoning proposal. This is a quiet street with single family homes. Parking is already a major challenge. Rezoning to multi family homes will only add to the parking problems. People using the Max leave their cars directly outside my house and it is a challenge to get in and out of my driveway
29400	Stephanie Crowell	1350 SE 80th Ave	portland	OR	We have lived in Portland since 1991. We own the home at 1350 SE 80th Ave. We bought this home and moved here because we LOVED this neighborhood. It feels entirely unfair for the city to arbitrarily change my home's zoning and to intentionally change the entire nature of this neighborhood for the sake of infill and
29411	Melissa Berube	852 NE Emerson St.	Portland	OR	I do not support the building of any apartment building on NE Emerson St, east of MLK, and west of 14th. The street is VERY narrow, and would not be up to the task of supporting parking and multiple tenants.
29435	Stephen Effros	1426 NE 58th Ave.	Portland	OR	As a family with young children, our support of the overall increase in future housing density in our neighborhood as well the development of additional mixed use developments nearby is tied to the City following through on long-planned pedestrian and bike access/safety improvements to NE 60th Ave in the vicinity of the 60th Ave MAX Station. NE 60th Ave between the station and NE Halsey has severely undersized sidewalks and no safe accommodations for bike riding; it is not safe for the current number of residents and commuters that use the 60th Ave MAX station, much less the planned additional residents that will come with these
29461	Jason Gottgetreu	4323 SE Division St	portland	OR	Hello, I support the proposed Comp Plan & Zone Change. Thank you. Jason Gottgetreu
29490	Ruth Haag	4657ne 97th ave	Portland	OR	There are no other 3 story buildings in this neighborhood and parking is terrible. Some of the plans I have seen for increased density do not have sufficient parking. There are no curbs so my neighbors park on the grass. This makes it difficult to mow. All of the houses in this area are single family dwellings.

29395	Adam Zielinski	6488 SW Capitol Hwy	Portland	OR	<p>Dear Planning &amp; Sustainability Commission,</p> <p>Over the past two decades, Portland has fallen way behind in building the amount of residential housing required to accommodate the population growth the city and region have experienced and is projected to experience. This has resulted in rapidly rising prices as well as the gentrification of formerly affordable neighborhoods and the displacement of many households in those communities.</p> <p>The reason for this is obvious: Too many people are chasing too few housing units, driving up prices and pricing people out of the city. The residential zoning code is too restrictive, outlawing too many residential housing types and sizes that used to be perfectly legal. This has locked in a status quo that may have been appropriate for the 70s and 80s but has no chance to accommodate the growth of the past couple decades, or the decades to come, while maintaining affordability, quality of life, and economic and environmental sustainability.</p> <p>Unfortunately the Residential Infill Project Proposed Draft is woefully inadequate to address this crisis of affordability, only scratching the surface of changes that should be made to actually fix and solve this problem.</p> <p>The question planners and economists should be asking is, "What would Portland's residential zoning code need to look like in order to accommodate all the new households that have formed here over the past two decades, as well as the new households that are projected to come here or be formed here in the next few decades, while maintaining housing affordability, and economic and environmental sustainability, including a vibrant growing economy and the parks, greenspaces, and forest and farmland outside the Urban Growth Boundary?"</p> <p>I think if you really analyzed and researched this question, it would quickly become apparent that Portland's existing zoning code is woefully inadequate and not up to the task, and the Residential Infill Project needs major changes.</p> <p>When people walk around older sections of Portland, such as close in neighborhoods in Northwest, Northeast and Southeast Portland, there are a lot of old residential housing buildings that people find attractive and charming, and they wonder why no one builds homes and apartments like these anymore. It's because they are illegal under Portland's zoning code; usually for no good reason. What we need to do is re-legalize old Portland and bring back the missing middle residential housing types such as duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, even six, seven and eightplexes, etc, as well as small apartment buildings. These should be allowed in all residential areas of the city, not just some areas as currently proposed. Homeowners and landowners in all parts of the city should have the same opportunities and should not be discriminated against based on geography. Limiting new housing options to only some areas of the city will only create negative unintended consequences over time.</p> <p>The focus on drastically limiting housing square footages is misguided in my opinion, and will only create a windfall for all existing homeowners with homes larger than the proposed new square footage maximum. Low maximum square footages also make multiplexes less economical to build as few people want to live in extremely tiny apartments.</p> <p>Housing affordability is determined mainly by supply and demand, not by square footage. Smaller homes are only more affordable on a relative basis to larger</p>
29505	Jeremy Henderson	3866 SE Taylor St	Portland	OR	<p>I'm for it. Density is a good thing, and people deserve to live in good neighborhoods like this without owning a large house.</p>
29526	Toby Welborn	614 NE 61st Ave	Portland	OR	<p>I am torn about this proposal. While densification would help with several of the area's growing pains, I do not believe that the plan as written provides a successful blueprint. Living near an area designated RM4 with insufficient resident parking and a max station, our neighborhood has parking issues, waste/discarded trash, petty crime, and high speed traffic. As it stands, the proposal would intensify these issues. I also am not finding anything to guarantee that the proposed housing will be affordable and/or what defines affordable. There is no proposed open space with higher density, no proposed transportation infrastructure, nor are there clear provisions on how utilities would be improved to deal with increased loads (and would this cost fall on the local neighborhood residents?). The street offsets and the construction code updates are a good step but why is relaxing off-street parking a good thing? Is the best use for our roads</p>
29531	Eric Schoenbrunn	1335 NE 77th Avenue	Portland	OR	<p>I wish to see no change to the zoning of my property or that of my neighbors. Do not destroy Portland character, homes, or homeowner property values for the sake of developers that do not have a long term vested interest in the wellbeing of Montavilla.</p>
29554	Kristie Williams	6103 NE Davis Street	Portland	OR	<p>I am STRONGLY asking that you please require ample parking for all the up zoning that is taking place in our neighborhoods... the recent zoning definition has now made it even easier for developers to increase the number of units with no accountability for the "lack of parking" mess they leave behind.</p> <p>In addition, the city isn't thinking around other areas they could be smarter... for instance as I am converting my garage to an ADU I am required to "curb" my driveway. No good explanation other than the car can no longer drive "thru" the front of the garage therefore at a time when parking is a shortage they are making it even more difficult for people to have parking. I could "appeal" it for a few thousand dollars but if isn't agreed to then I do not received my money back. Also, as developers are coming in with all these units, the requirements for permitting my ADU are so stringent I can't afford it. Portland is more in support of development</p>

29579	Nikolai Ursin	1605 N Sumner St	Portland	OR	I support the proposed changes to the comprehensive plan pertaining to R2 zones. The new RM1 zone will allow greater flexibility for developing more housing units, which will hopefully lead to more affordability.
29583	Matthew Christen	3614 NE Garfield Ave	Portland	OR	<p>Dear Chair Schultz and Members of the Commission,</p> <p>I am a property owner whose property (3614 NE Garfield Ave) will be subject to the proposed Comprehensive Plan Map and base and overlay zone changes. I fully support the proposed changes for my property from R1 to MD-C in the Comprehensive Plan Map and from R1ad to RM2d in the base and overlay zone designations.</p> <p>There are several reasons why the changes to my property are fully consistent with the intent of the adopted goals and policies of the 2035 Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>Chapter 5's intent, in part, is to "ensure adequate access to housing for a socially-and economically- diverse population" and "concentrate new housing in and around centers and corridors near transit and services to reduce the housing/transportation cost burden."</p> <p>Policy 5.4 "encourage[s] new and innovative housing types that meet the evolving needs of Portland households, and expand housing choices in all neighborhoods."</p> <p>Policy 5.5 requires the City to "Apply zoning in and around centers that allows for and supports a diversity of housing that can accommodate a broad range of households, including multi-dwelling and family-friendly housing options."</p> <p>Policy 5.6 requires the city to "enable and encourage development of middle housing. This includes multi-unit or clustered residential buildings that provide relatively smaller, less expensive units; more units; and a scale transition between the core of the mixed use center and surrounding single family areas. Where appropriate, apply zoning that would allow this within a quarter mile of designated centers, corridors with frequent service transit..."</p> <p>Before this proposed change to my property, I had been conducting my own due diligence to determine how to go about getting a zoning change to allow more density on my property with the goal of building a high-density, affordable multi-dwelling building (up to 36 studio/micro apartments) on my property. With this proposed change, this type of middle housing development on my property becomes more of a reality. I intend to provide this housing to those who have been priced out of a lot of the housing opportunities in the area. Further, my intended use of the property will concentrate new housing within 1/4 mile to "frequent service transit" corridors on NE MLK and NE Fremont and within 0.3 mile to similar corridors on N Vancouver and N Williams. In sum, this zoning change will have the effect of directly meeting Chapter 5 goals and policies.</p>
29585	Courtney Aronson	7114 N Mohawk Ave	Portland	OR	I feel that the zoning of R1 is sufficient for the side of the street my house is on. My back yard shares a fence with R5 neighborhood and most of the buildings on my side of the street are single family homes. I feel if the developers are allowed to build four story housing it would cause the standard of living to decline for those of us that live in our houses and for those who own R5 and share the property line. The city does nothing to address the parking issues it'll cause. Plus
29622	Gilbert Lissy	1905 NE 47th Ave	Portland	OR	People do not move to Portland to be in a New York or San Francisco. While they may bike or use mass transit for work, on the weekends they enjoy the outdoors and need a car. I have not seen bikes with ski racks nor families biking with young children on their way to the coast! Further reduction in off street parking
29625	AJ Hutchens	8804 SE Alder St	Portland	OR	ABSOLUTELY OPPOSED! I have lived in my homeowner residential neighborhood for 30+ years. The neighborhood will be destroyed with an infiltration of skinny squeeze box housing, a fight for parking on the street, and more foot and car traffic flow worse than it already is. Don't want the noise. Don't want more litter. Let this type of housing stay on the commercial main streets, city centers, but do not let it bleed over into nearby blocks on quiet streets out of desperation. We pay outrageous taxes to Multnomah Co to have what we have now. Homeowners have worked and paid darn hard to live where they chose to live based upon building and lot size and the appearance of the neighborhood. Don't want to see less green and more cement and smaller space. Don't want our property

29641	Steven Szigethy	1817 SE Insley St	Portland	OR	<p>Honorable Commissioners:</p> <p>I oppose the elimination of housing unit density maximums in the R1 and R2 zones, both citywide and in north Westmoreland.</p> <p>North Westmoreland just went through a protracted rezoning process as part of the Comp Plan and Map Refinement processes. Downzoning from RH to R2.5 was originally proposed during the Comp Plan update to account for the cancellation of the Harold Street MAX station and the presence of a combination of single-family homes, small duplexes and apartment courts. Later, through the Map Refinement process, staff decided that R1 would be more appropriate, so as to not create a handful of non-conforming apartment buildings. While concerning at first for some of us who thought R2.5 was the best compromise, most of us have since accepted the R1 proposal, which will go into effect on 5/24/18.</p> <p>Then came Better Housing by Design (BHBD). This proposal essentially brings north Westmoreland back to RH density, negating years of planning and outreach work and potentially bringing hundreds of more residential units to an area that has seen degraded transit service, zero supportive retail development, and continued harmful particulate emissions from the Union Pacific Brooklyn Yard and Oregon Highway 99E.</p> <p>Another negative is that the proposal increases the front setback line. This decreases options for existing homeowners wishing to expand their homes or build covered front porches, and will encourage developers to push buildings closer to the rear setback line, where most backyard privacy issues are experienced.</p> <p>Finally, I believe BHBD answers a question nobody is asking. On the design topic, most existing development I'm seeing in the R1 and R2 zones is well-designed and does not warrant a change to dimensional requirements. On the density side, there remains plenty of underutilized land in RH, RX, CM and CS zones where high-density residential development can occur to meet our city's demand for housing and to do so in transit-accessible, mixed-use locations. The R1 and R2 zones, as currently regulated, are less intense zones that provide opportunities for thoughtful, small and medium scale multifamily development, including the "missing middle" housing types activists are asking for.</p>
29665	David Kelso	21400 SW 65th Ave	Tualatin	OR	Please provide any details regarding any proposed changes with regard to waiving SDC's for development on this parcel as it is currently within an exempt zone given its close proximity to the 122nd & Burnside light rail station. Does this re-zoning classification affect this in any way?
29666	Aaron Schalon	2033 NE Couch Street	Portland	OR	Traffic control and traffic calming need to be addressed along this corridor. Cars are now frequently driving at high speeds down Couch St. in order to try to evade the traffic congestion on E. Burnside and 20th streets. It has created a very dangerous situation for pedestrians and cyclists. The intersection at E. Burnside and 20th needs improved signals, particularly it needs the addition of a left turn arrow on 20th. Currently as there is an almost constant flow of traffic along 20th, those trying to make a left turn onto Burnside (from either direction) have to wait until the signal turns red and then run it to make the left turn, usually several cars do this at a time. It is an extremely dangerous situation for cyclists and pedestrians as well as further congests Burnside as those vehicles cannot start on their green
29675	Tex Rankin	111 SW Columbia	Portland Oregon	OR	I am against this purposed change. This will not be beneficial for the neighborhood.
29676	Carl Allen	123 Main St	Portland	OR	Bad for the neighborhood! I urge you not to pass these purposed changes! THANK YOU
29678	Roger Kruse	2704 SE 52nd Ave	Portland	OR	Bad News! The last thing that we need is a zoning change! Waste of time and tax dollars.
29681	Dorothy Hester	3421 SE Main St	Portland	OR	It sounds like your proposed draft will limit development for smaller lots and would only help the owners of large lots. Not in favor
29779	Doug Klotz	1908 SE 35th Pl	Portland	OR	New comments on Proposed Draft, see PDF
29791	Doug Klotz	1908 SE 35th Pl	Portland	OR	Chair Schultz and Commissioners: I want to add that I appreciate a change from the Discussion Draft, that allows a zero front setback when the building has a significant front courtyard entry. This will help encourage this much-loved style of multifamily building.
29824	Ruth Kastner	701 NE 28th Ave. #35	Portland	OR	The address of this parcel is 701 NE 28th Ave and the State ID is 1N1E36BC 80033, according to the document sent to me. I oppose any increase in development density in this area, especially any increase in commercial development. I oppose new residential construction that does not provide its own on-site parking. It is already hard to find street parking here, and need for parking will only increase with higher density development. Parking

29825	Lesa Dixon-Gray	4307 SE Stark Street	Portland	OR	Our 1910 duplex sits on a very busy corner (Hawthorne and 23rd). It's on a tiny lot (2475 sq ft) and currently has a driveway that can fit two cars. I've often hoped (and once inquired) about the possibility for a retail shop on the bottom floor, with an apartment upstairs. For this particular property, that possibility is intriguing to me. I worry, though, that because the lot is so small, some of the opportunities that are gained for property owners of larger lots, wouldn't be bestowed on my property. And as a caregiver, who has had to retrofit my own home, I welcome the requirement for wheelchair and disability access. The concern is parking... At
29826	Sellwood Moreland Improvement League	8210 SE 13th AVENUE	Portland	OR	The Sellwood-Moreland Improvement League (SMILE) is pleased to offer the attached comments on the Better Housing by Design Project (BHD) Proposed Draft Report.
29827	Brandy Ascough	4345 NE 84th Ave	Portland	OR	It is with firm opposition that we reject this proposal to change the zoning of this property and region. This zoning change is in an encroachment on a defined area of stability. An increase of traffic and instability to the area is unwarranted. The area houses many stable families whom have established their property and continue to maintain and increase their unit values. It is important to note that the landowner has the right to govern the use of his or her own property. The
29828	Yvonne Rice	4622 NE 91st Ave	Portland	OR	As I have led to understand, property along I-205 is owned by ODOT and would not be developed in case they wanted to expand the freeway. Now I see that this has re-zoned for multi-use. We do not have any property in Sumner to have a park and this is the closed piece of land we have and now you want to take that
29829	Evan Burton	8957 NE Wygant St.	Portland	OR	Very concerned about rezoning the SAN Lot --NE 92 between Sandy Blvd. and Killingsworth Ave. This is the ONLY green space our neighborhood has. We have no parks or access to Helensview School. Evan Burton
29830	Jennifer Schmidt	4929 NE 92nd Ave.	Portland	OR	I live across from what is know as the SAN LOT. I enjoy the quiet and and green space that is provides not only local neighbors to walk dogs, fly kites and just generally enjoy a little bit of green space. I also enjoy my view of Mt. Hood from my home.
29845	Gregory Kullberg	2046 SE 12th	Portland	OR	Hi: I am the owner of a two story townhouse at 2046 SE 12th avenue at the western edge of Ladd's Addition. SE 12th Ave where my property is has mostly a low profile single family residential quality and feel - despite the busy street. There are a couple of three story apartment complexes nearby but street is mostly populated with single family homes. Encouraging the development of additional and even larger apartment complexes - which this zoning change would do - could
29846	Peter Mohling	4831 NE 91st Ave	Portland	OR	Please stop building things on every available open lot. The San Lot is very important to our neighborhood and a large reason why we bough a house in this neighborhood. Developing this would be disastrous. Traffic along Sandy is already a nightmare during peak hours and many people use 91st avenue as a 40 mph road. Developing this into apartments would only exacerbate the problem. Taking little strolls and playing with the dogs of the neighborhood brings everyone
29847	Christine Andersen	3806 N Borthwick Ave	Portland	OR	My primary and critical concern with any zoning code and plan map designation is parking. We have good public transit and bike access but this does not alleviate the need for additional parking when dwelling units are added to the neighborhood. Exempting off street parking for new units is a serious safety and livability problem for the neighborhood. Currently there is an ongoing problem of crosswalks and private driveways being blocked by parked cars" mostly because there is such an existing lack of parking. Even people who bike and bus when possible own vehicles and storing them on the street. Adding units in an already maxed out
29848	George Crawford	2234 ne 38th ave	Portland	OR	This makes sense to create more flexible affordable housing options. I think it makes most sense where parking needs are less and distance is walkable to main transit or central commercial locations. I know currently the multifamily zoning being based on # of units results in trying to optimize sale price or value for each
29850	Amy Marks	1824-1826 SW Main St.	Portland	OR	This house backs up to the Legends Condominium and fronts on the MAC parking garage. I have attached pictures of the views front and rear of this house. I think this was mistakenly zoned at RM3d and should be RM4d. It will be a half block from the new front entrance to the new Lincoln high school and is a block from a
29851	Amy Marks	1824-1826 SW Main St.	Portland	OR	This property will be directly across the street from the New entrance to Lincoln high school. It is one block from a MAX stop and fronts on the MAX line. It backs/sides to the Legends Condominiums. It was mistakenly zoned at RM3d and should be zoned at RM4d
29852	Cathy Stermer	1121 NE 84th Av	Portland	OR	Please reconsider relaxing required parking space regulations on new building in this area. The streets here are extremely narrow, even by Portland standards, and if cars are parked on both sides it is impossible for two cars to pass down the road simultaneously. Additional units without parking, will significantly increase
29853	Cathy Stermer	1121 NE 84th Av	Portland	OR	Please reconsider relaxing required parking space regulations on new building in this area. The streets here are extremely narrow, even by Portland standards, and if cars are parked on both sides it is impossible for two cars to pass down the road simultaneously. Additional units without parking, will significantly increase
29854	Cathy Stermer	1121 NE 84th Av	Portland	OR	Please reconsider relaxing required parking space regulations on new building in this area. The streets here are extremely narrow, even by Portland standards, and if cars are parked on both sides it is impossible for two cars to pass down the road simultaneously. Additional units without parking, will significantly increase
29859	richard omohundro	3247 se 120th ave	portland	OR	My only real issue with your new better housing by design is you are some times filling in areas such as this one with no thought on unimproved roadways. this example is going to add 12 more residences to an unimproved roadway so it will become impassable by the time construction is done. the power poles are located in the street seven feet in so unimproved road is 23 feet wide. put cars on both sides of road and it may become impassable for fire trucks endangering the whole

29861	Terry Parker	1527 NE 65th Avenue	Portland	OR	<p>One of the things that makes Portland an enticing livable city is the preservation of older and established single family home neighborhoods that green yards and big mature trees. Anything such as placing density over the quality of life taints this through the lens image of our popular city.</p> <p>The proposed setbacks and maximum building coverage limits in the Better Housing by Design Draft are pleasing and welcomed as are required outdoor green spaces. Transfers of development rights may be troublesome and create massive monolith structures that do not fit in context with their surroundings. The transfer of development rights that can create larger out of scale buildings needs to be reconsidered, tightly regulated and/or extremely limited.</p> <p>FAR bonuses also need to be significantly reduced. One size does not fit all neighborhoods. The FAR bonuses for affordable housing are too large and will create oversized buildings that can tower over existing homes and other neighborhood structures in adjacent lower density zoning. The length of time units must remain affordable is multi-generational, far and way too long, and in reality, may outlive the useful life the buildings themselves. On properties that border R5 zoning, FAR bonuses need to be eliminated. The properties on the North side of NE Halsey Street from 61st to 65th Avenues should remain R2.5 and not be rezoned to RM1. A larger overall scale of structures may be acceptable in downtown and the central city, but even with step down architecture, the large scale buildings will create negative quality of life impacts for residents nearby in adjacent lower density zoned and single family home areas.</p> <p>One of the negative quality of life impacts in the Better Housing by Design Draft is the absence of, or insufficient, off-street parking. This includes the non-requirement for off-street parking for smaller residential structures in areas where lower density zoning exists. Is this plan to not require adequate parking throughout the city also a plan to create the same type of on-street parking mayhem and crisis that already exists in Northwest Portland? Will households with electric cars have to run extension cords across the sidewalks or down the block for overnight and home charging? At some point, drivers of electric cars will need to start paying for the electricity they use to charge their vehicles instead of expecting utility ratepayers to continue footing the bill at free charging stations.</p> <p>Moreover, is the absence of adequate on-site parking an attempt to "dictate" to renters they should not have a car? 59% of low income people drive to there place of employment. There has been a lot of conversation about housing type and neighborhood choice, but what about choice in transportation? Is the elimination of parking with affordable housing a form of discrimination? This testifier thinks so!</p> <p>The city's own studies suggest that 72% of households in new large multi-unit buildings without parking have one or more cars. Filling up parking places on the streets with stored cars from the new residential developments that have inadequate off-street parking is already a hot button issue for the property tax paying</p>
29862	Juliana Cartwright	5920 SW Riveridge Ln	Portland	OR	<p>I am very concerned that any plan must address the lack of street parking available on streets in 'Johns Landing' and the too-fast, dense traffic on Macadam and Corbett.</p>
29863	SHAWN BLYTH	337 NE Morris St	Portland	OR	<p>If new building size expansions are allowed, there must be required off street parking for all units. Also please note that Macadam is a major commuter route and I am the homeowner on the lot with the proposed changes. While I do not necessarily believe the current proposed changes to Property ID# R673376 will have a dramatic effect, I do not believe that our area needs to be rezoned as we are already a fairly high density area (11 units located on the one lot). Additionally, there are concerns among residents regarding the 2 lots next to ours at 3007 NE MLK Blvd (R308753) and 3019 NE MLK Blvd (R308755) being rezoned and large 4+ story buildings being placed which would adversely effect our residents living situation. We understand that at present, it shows the the Map App website stated "There</p>
30156	Bruce Johnson	2323 NW Johnson Street	Portland	OR	<p>Letter attached.</p>
30157	Dennis Harper	221 NW 18th Avenue	Portland	OR	<p>Letter attached.</p>
30158	Annie Mengis	9034 NE Wygant	Portland	OR	<p>I live a block away from the SAN Lot that is set to be rezoned to multi-dwelling units. This is the only park-like area in the neighborhood as the other space is the Helensview school that is gated and not open. If developed it should be required that a substantial portion stayed available as a neighborhood public space for</p>
30159	Adam Meyer	2184 NW Kearney St.	Portland	OR	<p>Greater density is practical between 21st and 23rd ave. But DOES NOT work for the middle of neighborhoods like near 25th and Lovejoy. This area should be left for single family and low density residential. This is essential to keep the personality and feel of the neighborhood/Portland.</p>
30160	Christopher Browne	5905 NE Failing st	Portland	OR	<p>Thank you.</p> <p>The RM1 code seems to allow all R1, R2 and R3 to become R1 with a building size limit. If this is so then there is not step up to the residential areas. Please go back to R1, R2 and R3 zoning</p>

30161	Mark Hewitt	4816 N. Albina	Portland	OR	I have lived at 4816 N. Albina for nearly 20 years. It was once a relatively quiet street, but now we have a restaurant/bar across the street that is open until 2:30 in the morning with an outside patio that is very loud at night. There is a proposed 5 story building going up 2 lots to the south my property at 4732 N. Albina. This is
30163	Michelle Sprague	2534 SE 13th	Portland	OR	<p>Notice of Proposed Zoning Change 2534 SE 13th Portland OR 97202 Better Housing by Design</p> <p>My Zoning just changed from base zone R2 to base zone R1, now the May 11, 2018 proposal is to change current base and overlay zone R1 to proposed base and overlay zone RM2. The MapApp "testify" shows lot sizes of 5000 square feet: My house pre-dates building records, City Maps list it as Year Built 1900. The sidewalks and utilities (water, sewer, electricity, etc.) were all created after the house was built. The original 5000 square foot lot was split early in the last century into what was referred to as a "mother in law" house, the 2 houses had shared sewer line. My lot should be 50 feet width by 60 feet depth facing 13th and the other lot should be 40 feet width and 50 feet depth facing Ivon. There are many houses within the designated RM2 Zone change which have undersized lots. In my area, the most common house style being a foursquare, with an above ground basement, 2 floors of living space and an attic. These houses are very tall and are very close to the public sidewalk. The Development Standards do not address: Need for Sewer and other utility easements through private property. Converting existing houses on under 5000 square foot lots: "basement apartment with visitable accessible to people using wheel chairs." "Attic conversions into living space." "Grandfathered Set Back Allowance." "Grandfathered open space/outdoor area."</p>
30164	Mark Humpal	5104 SE Cesar E Chavez Blvd	Portland	OR	We live in a 2000 square foot home built in 1915. The block we live on years ago was comprised of double lots stretching back to 40th Avenue. Over past 15 years, the last double lots have been parceled off and now have homes. Between the short stretch of Cesar E Chavez Blvd and Steele, we already have 6 duplexes. These units blend in well with the neighborhood. The proposed zoning change would disrupt this and my wife, Diane Zuhl, and I strenuously object to the change. We've
30171	Michael J Kane	1234 NW 25th Ave	Portland	OR	Letter attached.
30172	Martha Richards	7516 NE Halsey	Portland	OR	I am concerned about the proposed changes to the neighborhood b/w Halsey and I-84. There is very limited parking now, and the proposed changes seem to make parking even more competitive. Please reconsider the limitations on parking for residents, in their own homes, in this area with the proposed zoning change.
30174	Lee Sim Suey	5031 SE Cesar E. Chavez Blvd	Portland	OR	The rezoning to any new zones for business or multi dwelling plans is unwanted here. This is a neighborhood of Reed, and always will be. This is a family oriented neighborhood. This stretch of property will not be changed to be gentrified. This is our property, and no trespassing on our property by stepping on it. Random lady walks up on to my property to look at my backyard. Seriously!!! This is Reed Neighborhood, and it's very much the same as Eastmoreland. We don't want the same, greedy, money hungry, ugly monstrosities constructed identically like all the others in peaceful neighborhoods. DO NOT CHANGE MY ZONING or in any
30175	Kathy Shepstone	7409 SE 82nd Ave	Portland	OR	So we just turn our homes over to you with a pat on the head and say ok, have you looked at what you have done to this city. I work at Joanns on 82nd everyday I chase people that are shoplifting around the store thousands of dollars a year walk out the door because of your housing. They cant afford your housing projects and I cant afford it with my job that I have been at 14years at \$12.00 AN HOUR. What are you just going to give us all new place's your just going to make a few more homeless How do you people sleep at Night. You just keep digging a bigger hole why not through us all in and turn on the gas like the Germans did your all
30177	Lucas Gray	5229 NE MLK Blvd.	Portland	OR	<p>Regarding Better Housing By Design: Increasing setbacks is a terrible idea. It is against everything that makes safe active streets. We don't need more lawns and dead space, we need active street edges that engage pedestrians.</p> <p>If you want more space for wider sidewalks, plantings, street trees, etc. you should make roads and lanes narrower. Take public owned land to make our city more green, which will have the positive side effects of reducing traffic speed, putting trees in places they will shade sidewalks and asphalt, plantings that will separate</p>
30179	Doug Klotz	1908 SE 35th Pl	Portland	OR	See attached PDF of Comments & photos

30181 Connie Levine PO Box 529 Eugene OR G Group, LLC manages the property located at 2330 NW Flanders St., Portland, Oregon. The property is being operated as a medical building.

The 2/3 west side of this property is proposed to be modified from an RH Zone; CM2m to a RM3d; CM2m. We understand that the RM3d zoning will disallow future commercial uses at the property. For this reason we object. We object to the zoning change to the extent it will not allow for any commercial uses. We encourage you to continue to allow a mix of residential and commercial at this property.

Thank you.

30182 Glenn Esler 9124 SE Alder Street Portland OR Greetings,

I am all for increased density outside the central city core. However, I would submit for consideration, that apartments be limited to the main arterial roads (e.g., in my area; SE 82nd, SE 92nd, SE Stark, and SE Washington) and only townhouses and condos be allowed on residential streets.

I think apartments in neighborhood streets might alter the character of the community on these streets too much. Apartment renters aren't as well invested in a community as a condo or townhouse owner. Also, there's always a turnover of apartment dwellers. I think this would destabilize a residential street.

In addition, I fear if one apartment complex goes in on a residential street then other home owners may consider moving out. I myself would give it serious thought.

30183 L Tom 5608 ne davis portland OR If it was a condo complex or several townhouses, I would welcome that more on my street than apartments.

Will my comments have any impact? Have you already decided and are just going through the motions. Why would you listen now? You want to make changes in the name of "affordable housing" by cramming as much as you can I the least amount of space.

What about the people who have lived here for decades. Paying taxes, building Portland into a place people want to be. Developers have been allowed to call the shots. Destroying neighborhoods without regard to the impact they leave behind. They cram as many units as they can on a lot with no parking. This is done with the blessing of the city.

Here is an example. Recently a developer bought a 3 bdrm house for a little over \$300,000. He left a small bit of the old house so it could be "remodeled." This way he didn't have to be transparent about what he was doing. It is now a McMansion that is going to sell for close to 1 Million. It dwarfs the houses on both sides which impacts the homes that had vegetable gardens. and the privacy they used to have.

My point here is the continued destruction for no benefit expect the developer. In this case it is still 1 house in the place of 1 house. The city needs to recognize their part in the homeless/affordable housing crisis.

This brings me to the zoning change. What exactly is the purpose? It seems to me this will only encourage more overbuilding. Single homes won't stand a chance. I don't want to live surrounded by apartment buildings with no parking. Is this to make it easier for developers? It isn't for the homeowners. Neighborhoods are being squeezed and you aren't listening. You are taking away the livability factor everyday.

You need to fix the zoning so more parking is required for new buildings. There is an 84 unit apartment going up on Sandy. There will be 21 parking spaces. That means at least 50-70+ cars will be invading existing neighborhoods.

I find it hypocritical that you don't like parking spaces because it takes away "green." What about all the trees that are being removed daily by developers. Wake up, people have cars. You are so worried about places for all these "new" people to live but you aren't doing anything about the crowded roads.

It feels like you are just rubber stamping what developers want. It would be great to see the city say no once in awhile.



30185 Louise Pender 1514 NE 76th Avenue Portland OR

Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission  
Better Housing Testimony  
1900 SW 4th Avenue, Suite 7100  
Portland, Oregon 97201

June 7, 2018

From: Owner of Property at 1514 NE 76th Avenue, Portland 97213

Dear Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Your zoning proposal is not possible for my neighborhood. The area north of Halsey Street, south of freeway 84 and between 72nd to 77th Avenues is 100% surrounded by concrete walls or no-parking streets. There is zero space for additional cars.

I am a member of an increasingly organized neighborhood group brought together by our severe concern about the proposed property zoning change. Our neighborhood is entirely constrained by the borders of freeway 84 to our north, west, and east and by Halsey Street to our south. It is an area north of Halsey between NE 72nd Avenue and NE 77th. Most, or almost all, of us are house owners living in our own houses. We cherish our neighborhood and have worked together for decades to improve it and to maintain harmony and cooperation among ourselves. Aren't we exactly the kind of neighborhood that the City of Portland wants to foster?

We are confused and dismayed that notices, or some of them, regarding a zoning change that would severely impact the quality of life in our neighborhood were not received until less than one month prior to the June 12th hearing. Why was the notice not sent months before the hearing? Some of us seriously wonder whether the decision to delay notifying citizens raises worrisome credibility issues about the City management.

We are extremely concerned about your inadvisable proposal to rezone our area from R2 to MD-N, a multi-dwelling, higher living density zone. The crime rate in our area has rapidly increased recently, and statistics clearly show that a change to multi-dwelling, higher density units predicts more crime. However, the reason unique to our neighborhood that makes such a change an impossibility is that our parking is already 100% constrained by physical limits. All of our streets dead

30186 Louise Pender 1514 NE 76th Avenue Portland OR

Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission  
Better Housing Testimony  
1900 SW 4th Avenue, Suite 7100  
Portland, Oregon 97201

June 7, 2018

From: Owner of Property at 1514 NE 76th Avenue, Portland 97213

Dear Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Your zoning proposal is not possible for my neighborhood. The area north of Halsey Street, south of freeway 84 and between 72nd to 77th Avenues is 100% surrounded by concrete walls or no-parking streets. There is zero space for additional cars.

I am a member of an increasingly organized neighborhood group brought together by our severe concern about the proposed property zoning change. Our neighborhood is entirely constrained by the borders of freeway 84 to our north, west, and east and by Halsey Street to our south. It is an area north of Halsey between NE 72nd Avenue and NE 77th. Most, or almost all, of us are house owners living in our own houses. We cherish our neighborhood and have worked together for decades to improve it and to maintain harmony and cooperation among ourselves. Aren't we exactly the kind of neighborhood that the City of Portland wants to foster?

We are confused and dismayed that notices, or some of them, regarding a zoning change that would severely impact the quality of life in our neighborhood were not received until less than one month prior to the June 12th hearing. Why was the notice not sent months before the hearing? Some of us seriously wonder whether the decision to delay notifying citizens raises worrisome credibility issues about the City management.

We are extremely concerned about your inadvisable proposal to rezone our area from R2 to MD-N, a multi-dwelling, higher living density zone. The crime rate in our area has rapidly increased recently, and statistics clearly show that a change to multi-dwelling, higher density units predicts more crime. However, the reason unique to our neighborhood that makes such a change an impossibility is that our parking is already 100% constrained by physical limits. All of our streets dead

30187 Louise Pender 1514 NE 76th Avenue Portland OR

Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission  
Better Housing Testimony  
1900 SW 4th Avenue, Suite 7100  
Portland, Oregon 97201

June 7, 2018

From: Owner of Property at 1514 NE 76th Avenue, Portland 97213

Dear Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Your zoning proposal is not possible for my neighborhood. The area north of Halsey Street, south of freeway 84 and between 72nd to 77th Avenues is 100% surrounded by concrete walls or no-parking streets. There is zero space for additional cars.

I am a member of an increasingly organized neighborhood group brought together by our severe concern about the proposed property zoning change. Our neighborhood is entirely constrained by the borders of freeway 84 to our north, west, and east and by Halsey Street to our south. It is an area north of Halsey between NE 72nd Avenue and NE 77th. Most, or almost all, of us are house owners living in our own houses. We cherish our neighborhood and have worked together for decades to improve it and to maintain harmony and cooperation among ourselves. Aren't we exactly the kind of neighborhood that the City of Portland wants to foster?

We are confused and dismayed that notices, or some of them, regarding a zoning change that would severely impact the quality of life in our neighborhood were not received until less than one month prior to the June 12th hearing. Why was the notice not sent months before the hearing? Some of us seriously wonder whether the decision to delay notifying citizens raises worrisome credibility issues about the City management.

We are extremely concerned about your inadvisable proposal to rezone our area from R2 to MD-N, a multi-dwelling, higher living density zone. The crime rate in our area has rapidly increased recently, and statistics clearly show that a change to multi-dwelling, higher density units predicts more crime. However, the reason unique to our neighborhood that makes such a change an impossibility is that our parking is already 100% constrained by physical limits. All of our streets dead

30188 Leon Porter 1822 NE Wasco St. Portland OR

Dear Planning and Sustainability Commission,

My testimony on the Better Housing by Design, Proposed Draft is attached. I also generally support the additional recommendations made by Portland for Everyone.

Best wishes,

30189 Angela Abadjian 12606-12620 E. Burnside Portland OR

Dear Planning and Sustainability commission. The changes are fine except for one point that it does not take into consideration the individual property owner who is not a developer or have deep pockets/rich to do a mega development to build 24 units per the minimum. The present changes does not work for the common home owner who might in time just want to add a unit or two and can not afford to demolition their property and build a big building. Please create a exception for the small home owner who has the dream of expanding their property but not at the scale that would be the minimum allowed by the new proposal. Please allow for a loophole that can be for the common property owner who is not rich and has the desire and dream off adding few more units to their property. Please don't just help the big companies and developers but give the opportunity for the common home owner who has worked hard and has the desire to be better.

30190 Mary Carr 6184 SW Capitol Hwy Portland OR I'm writing concerning the proposed zoning changes adjacent to my property. I'm very concerned about increasing the density in this area. Burlingame ave. is adjacent to a school and therefore has a lot of car and pedestrian traffic. There is already extremely limited off street parking, increased density would only make that worse. Hillsdale business area routinely has vacancies for commercial property so additional commercial space is not needed, and there is not space for adequate parking to support additional commercial property. Traffic congestion on Capitol hwy has also increased in the last few years and since there are limited options for access it often takes 15 minutes just to get out of the driveway. Additionally I'm concerned that changes be proportionate to additional structures with adequate space between structures and respect for privacy, livability and property value of existing residents. I have seen examples of such development in other neighborhoods and hope that is not what is planned for Hillsdale.  
Thank you for your consideration.  
Respectfully,  
Mary Carr

30191 Dennis M. Harper 221 NW 18th Ave Portland OR Letter attached.

30192 Dawn Peterson 5121 SE 79th Ave Portland OR I agree that it's a good idea to provide more housing for people near transportation. But I think that Portlanders and those who are new arrivals will need continuing education on how to live close by without making a nuisance of yourself in everyday life. This applies to renters and homeowners alike.

30193 Richard U'Ren 1735 NW Irving Street Portland OR June 11, 2018

Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission  
Better Housing by Design Testimony  
1900 SW 4th, Suite 7100  
Portland, Oregon 97201

RE: Better Housing by Design Proposed Changes to RH Zone in Northwest Portland Historic Alphabet District

Dear Commissioners:

We received the May 11, 2018

NOTICE OF PROPOSED ZONING CODE, ZONING MAP AND COMPREHENSIVE PLAN MAP CHANGES THAT MAY AFFECT THE PERMISSIBLE USES OF YOUR PROPERTY AND OTHER PROPERTIES

Our State ID#: 1N1E33AC 4900

Current Comprehensive Plan Map designation: RH

Proposed Comprehensive Plan Map designation: MD-U

Current Based and overlay zone: RH

Proposed base and overlay zone: RM4d

According to the mailing, our property at 1735 NW Irving Street may be affected by the proposed changes.

We consulted [www.portlandmaps.com/bps/mapapp](http://www.portlandmaps.com/bps/mapapp) and found no mention of the Historic Alphabet District (HAD). This Portland zoning designation (as noted on official street signs) directly affects our property, which is listed on the National Register of Historic Places and as such is subject to provisions to which Northwest Portland properties outside the Alphabet Historic District are not.

We have lived at the above residence since 1993 and supported the area's designation as an historic district in 2000 with the full understanding of the attendant restrictions. We also understood that in maintaining the then new HAD we accepted the responsibility of maintaining our Couch Family Investment House, which was built in 1884, with the expectation that future development would follow guidelines related to compatibility and design.

The proposed zoning changes, as best as we can tell, fail to take into consideration the Northwest District Plan and the associated Historic Resource Protection Overlay.

30194	William & Nicki Meyers	33045 SE Dodge Park Blvd	Gresham	OR	<p>To the Planning and Sustainability Commission:</p> <p>This letter is our response to the City's notice of a proposed zone change affecting property we own in the Montavilla neighborhood.</p> <p>My wife, Nicki Fischer-Meyers and I are the owners of 1036 NE 80th Ave. we recommend that the commission not approve the proposed zone change as written because is not in the spirit of Portland's housing goals of healthy homes, trees and green areas for children and adults and safer streets. It will have severe effects on the continuance of North Montavilla as an affordable neighborhood of family homes and chase away the families who live there, and it will flood the neighborhood with untold number of cars whose owners have only street parking provided with their high rise apartments/condos. It will provide buildings full of units which will probably sell for about the same price as the home originally sited there. We see no mention of safety plans for 82nd Ave, which is a major issue if you are placing hundreds more people along it.</p> <p>Our two bedroom, one bath house has been home to four generations of the Fischer and Meyers family, Nicki's parents, brother, us and now our son and his family. Nicki's grandmothers, aunts, uncles and cousins all lived in Montavilla. We mention this only to illustrate how important a stable neighborhood of single family homes is to the continued health of our city. As you know, the city's housing goals emphasize mitigating gentrification, maintaining housing for a diverse population and maintaining a supply of affordable housing for vulnerable populations. Right now, We suggest that our son, a PPS teacher with 10 years experience, with a wife and young children at home is a vulnerable population. Families like his find it increasingly difficult to purchase a home within Portland.</p> <p>Because the house is listed as owned by our family trust, we receive two or more solicitations each week from developers who want to buy the house, usually for cash. Should the proposed changes allowing up to four story apartment buildings come to pass, I expect increased pressure on owners to sell. The effect on property values if a 40 foot high building is next to or just down the street from your home might be severe. We've watched this neighborhood go through normal transitions, the WWII generation passed on, several of the homes became rentals for a while, then families moved in at started purchasing the homes. The cycle begins again. It is our opinion that the entire north portion of Montavilla will be destroyed as a single family neighborhood and many people will be searching for new homes. Example, a beautiful home about four houses up from ours on 80th, where Mrs. Carlson lived for many years and grew gorgeous roses, was recently purchased, torn down and now sits vacant waiting, we suspect, for the approval of this proposal. This neighborhood is exactly what Portland wants and needs, smaller, single family homes with yards for gardens and children, trees in the yards for all the good things trees do for a city, driveways and garages to help keep the street less congested and porches and front lawns from which neighbors greet neighbors. We see this happening in other neighborhoods. Acquaintances of ours in Lents, artists whose work is in several of Portland's finer homes and businesses, recently lost the lease on their home-studio which is on a street</p>
30195	Brittney Hall	8827 N Edison St.	Portland	OR	Formatted testimony voicing support and listing three main areas of concern is included in the file attached to this submittal. The three areas of concern discussed in our testimony cover historic preservation, equitable application of zoning, and transportation needs. Please see the attachment for our complete testimony.
30196	Dennis B Smith	827 NW 25th Ave	Portland	OR	Letter attached.
30197	Steve Connolly	1917 NW Hoyt	Portland	OR	Letter attached.
30198	Laurie Hall	10259 NW Edgewood Drive	Portland	OR	I bought my property in June 2001 with the understanding that the green belt below my lot was protected by a grandfather clause. I paid \$10,000 more for my dwelling due to it's location. If changes are made in the land use I expect to be compensated for the loss in property value by the City of Portland.
30199	Carolee Paugh	6140 SE 128th Ave	Portland	OR	Letter attached.
30200	Kristine Quintana	10721 E Burnside	Portland	OR	10703 E Burnside slopes down drastically to the north. A townhouse or apartment block style building built as mandated to the proposed MD-N height would dwarf the surrounding homes to the north and east. A lower height building spread more evenly over the lot would be preferred. In addition this home is at the
30201	Kristine Quintana	10721 E Burnside	Portland	OR	10721 E Burnside is a large garden lot and would be appropriate for a cottage pod/adu etc rather than a large MD-N block-style development. A tall building would dwarf the surrounding homes to the north, east and west and block out valuable southern light, and be harmful to indoor and outdoor privacy of the surrounding

30202	Kristine Quintana	10721 E Burnside	Portland	OR	<p>109 NE 108th is at the lowest point of a valley and surrounded to the north and south by one story homes. The proposed MD-N with or without a FAR bonus would be wrong for the location.</p> <p>The density is not so much the issue as the height. It would be more appropriate for a cottage pod style of development, or even a duplex.</p> <p>A taller apartment block would be: not compatible with the neighborhood character and would be harmful to other residents by way of: overlooking (harmful to indoor and outdoor privacy), and overshadowing and loss of daylight (harmful to potential solar energy array and gardening as well as natural light in homes.)</p>
30203	Kristine Quintana	10721 E Burnside	Portland	OR	<p>121 NE 108th is at the lowest point of a valley and surrounded to the north and south by one story homes. The proposed MD-N with or without a FAR bonus would be wrong for the location.</p> <p>The density is not so much the issue as the height. It would be more appropriate for a cottage pod style of development, or even a duplex.</p> <p>A taller apartment block would be: not compatible with the neighborhood character and would be harmful to other residents by way of: overlooking (harmful to indoor and outdoor privacy), and overshadowing and loss of daylight (harmful to potential solar energy array and gardening as well as natural light in homes.)</p>
30204	Bob Johnson	1545 SW Terwilliger Blvd.	Portland	OR	Letter attached.
30218	Greg Theisen	2257 NW Raleigh St	Portland	OR	<p>The NWDA and our neighbors support the objectives of the Better Housing By Design proposal, and many of the elements in the Proposed Draft. For over a century NW Portland development has been characterized by the types of housing explored in BHBD, enabling our neighborhood to serve an economically diverse mix of housing needs. Our current zoning patterns include considerable RH, R1 and R2 zones that provide equitable access to more affordable housing units. Yet this pattern of zoning and development is fragile: in particular the threat of higher land values associated with BHBD may affect the long-term presence of older, smaller, lower-unit count structures. We currently see this impact playing out in RH and R1 areas of the neighborhood, with higher priced units replacing more affordable units.</p> <p>Broadly, we support most of the major changes proposed in BHBD, but we have concerns about how the changes will be implemented.</p> <p>In particular, we support these major changes summarized on pages 4 and 5 of the Proposed Draft.</p> <p>“Provide a revised set of zones that relate to different types of places.”</p> <p>During work that led to the Portland Plan and the update Comprehensive Plan, the concept of “many Portlands” was discussed: There are different characteristics in different areas of the city, and the Zoning Code should respond to those differences rather than applying a broad brush approach. Clearly, the special regulations for East Portland come from that concept, but it should be applied more broadly. Our neighborhood has a distinct character of mixed uses and mixed housing types, including many multi-dwelling buildings and many single-dwelling houses (some of which have been converted to multi-dwelling). This is particularly the case in the Alphabet Historic District, but also in areas to the north and west. Applying the RM-4 zone everywhere the current zoning is RH does nothing to continue the existing character of our neighborhood or the historic district. It is particularly problematic within the historic district.</p> <p>Within the RH zone, some portions have an FAR of 2:1 and some have an FAR of 4:1. The 4:1 FAR was applied to many parts of Northwest in 1980, in large part reflecting development potential. The development and redevelopment potential was assessed by considering the existing floor area on a site as a ratio to the area of the site. When the Alphabet Historic District was created in 2000, no evaluation of the base zoning was made. Since that time, we, along with several other neighborhoods, have called for “right-zoning” in historic districts. Base zones which allow much more height and mass than would be approved through Historic Resource Review set the stage for continuing conflict between neighbors and developers and require the Landmarks Commission and City Council to repeatedly make decisions about balancing historic preservation (which are Goal 5 resources) against other goals. Without “truth in zoning,” this conflict and repeated decision-making continue, and all parties are damaged. The neighborhood repeatedly expends energy fighting development that should not be proposed in the first place; developers pay too much for land because they expect a higher development potential, and then incur the costs and frustrations of a battle with</p>
30219	J Hopkins	4101 NE Killingsworth St	Portland	OR	This is not a step forward for our neighborhood. This proposal will not benefit the neighborhood or our properties in a positive way.
30220	J Hopkins	4102 SE Belmont St	Portland	OR	This is not a step forward for our neighborhood. This proposal will not benefit the neighborhood or our properties in a positive way. Think of the long term ramifications.

30221	J Hopkins	5226 SE Clinton Street	Portland	OR	This is not a step forward for our neighborhood. This proposal will not benefit the neighborhood or our properties in a positive way. Think of the long term ramifications.
30222	J Hopkins	4073 SE Holgate blvd	Portland	OR	This is not a step forward for our neighborhood. This proposal will not benefit the neighborhood or our properties in a positive way. Think of the long term ramifications.
30223	Erika Hanson	3035 SW Vermont Street	Portland	OR	I do NOT want the zoning to change on my house! I bought a single family house in this area years ago and do not want it to change to a MD-4. It would most likely reduce the value of my house - which I have worked hard to maintain all the time I have lived here. I'd not want to live next to multi units that would likely loom over my house, have increased density, more people, more noise, more trash and not enough parking! I'm sure who ever came up with this plan would
30224	Mark Hanson	3035 Sw Vermont Street	Portland	OR	I am TOTALLY opposed to the zoning change. We DO NOT want our property to lose value by the proposed zoning change. We work very hard to keep our home and land in great shape in order to keep its potential value. If the zoning changes, it will be more difficult to sell our home to a potential single family home buyer because of the potential negative development next door of a towering multiplex on a 5,000 square foot lot. Think about it, would any city council person vote to
30226	JASON TAND	2128 SE 12th Avenue	Portland	OR	<p>I am Jason Tand, property owner at 2128 SE 12th Avenue in Ladd's Addition. I received a notice of zoning changes that will directly affect my property and the surrounding area. This includes both sides of 12th avenue adjacent to Ladd's Addition between Division and Hawthorne. As a resident of a nationally recognized historic district I am concerned that the proposed revisions make no attempt to preserve the integrity of Ladd's Addition. Along with other property owners and concerned members within the district, I request these proposed revisions be either further revised to allow for consideration of the historic nature of the district or that the proposed revisions be eliminated from within and surrounding Ladd's Addition in their entirety.</p> <p>Proposed increased density negatively impacts the fabric of a neighborhood that is intended to be preserved, not changed over time. By attempting to make dense development easier to achieve, the scale and character of Ladd's Addition is not only being compromised, it is being dismissed. This can also be said for the transitional zone between 11th and 12th avenues on the west side of 12th. This dividing line is the only separation between the Central Eastside Industrial District and residences to the east. This zone should be treated sensitively and respectfully for any added volume of residents. Already we are beginning to see increased density without the addition of any parking or open space for added apartment residents. Because there is no room to grow west into the industrial district, overflow is already being experienced within Ladd's Addition. The impacts are real and already present.</p>
30227	Kristin Tand	2128 SE 12th Avenue	Portland	OR	<p>Hello, my name is Kristin Tand and I am a property owner at 2128 SE 12th Ave. which is part of the Ladds Addition neighborhood and also one of the properties that would be included in rezoning changes.</p> <p>One of my main concerns about the rezoning of this area is how densification will negatively impact a historic district which already addresses the goals that the Better Housing by Design Project is trying to achieve. Examples of this can be seen in Ladd's already established multi-family housing properties, community green spaces, how traffic patterns alleviate congestion throughout the district, and overall livability. Ladd's is a unique asset to the City of Portland. It encompasses open spaces, a walkable neighborhood, and green elements such as tree canopy and rose gardens. All of this contributes to the overall wellbeing of the City, not just Ladd's Addition. I am concerned that if rezoning in and around Ladd's moves forward, many of these built in components will be destroyed.</p>
30228	David Kube	4013 SE Cora St	Portland	OR	<p>Additionally, the traffic on SE 12th has become extremely congested since the Light-rail/Train crossing modifications, causing much heavier traffic through and around Ladd's neighborhood. As housing density increases this will further exacerbate the situation, creating grid-lock and pedestrian/bicycle safety issues in</p> <p>Our home was built in 2013 as an infill project. It occupies the the bulk of the lot with minimal wasted space, but still with green areas. The lot is graded so that there is minimal run off for rain water. The house is built to current earthquake standards and is certified energy efficient. I presume all of these are what is desired by PSC for any new construction. The house was built in the Old PDX style to fit in with the neighborhood. The other homes constructed in this neighborhood are in zones that still include single home dwellings. There would be no good reason to rezone this property for a multiple home dwelling or</p>

30229	Linda Engels	636 NE 61st Avenue	Portland	OR	<p>I would like to preface my comments by saying that I am a LEED Green Associate and I do understand the need for more housing and its importance to mass transportation.</p> <p>Having said that, our block on 61st Ave. between Hoyt and Oregon and some of the surrounding streets are not a viable location for increased density. It is one thing to look at a map and discern a location for more density, it is another to actually live there.</p> <p>Because of our proximity to the MAX station at 60th Ave. we have people who go away for the weekend or on vacation and use our street for free parking. Also, the apartments on the other side of 60th have insufficient parking, and those inhabitants park here as well. We never have our streets cleaned as there are always cars parked both sides of the street. The street is narrow, and if cars are badly parked, the WM trucks cannot pass in order to pick up trash and recycling.</p> <p>We have one car that we park in our garage, and use public transport. We would love to host a party, except only one car can fit in our driveway and there is never any street parking. Often, we have difficulty getting out of our driveway.</p>
30230	Susan Haywood	2146 NW Everett St	Portland	OR	<p>I see that these changes include new development standards, including REDUCED requirements for off-street parking. That you are allowing large buildings to be built without parking is really unwise and unfair in this area. Although where I live is mainly residential, we now need to pay for parking on the street, and my understanding is that not all tenants in these older buildings will be guaranteed a parking pass. When I have a new tenants move into my building, they expect to be able to park near their home. With the new buildings being built, the population density has increased so that there just isn't any parking. All new buildings should be able to provide parking for the tenants so that the rest of us can find a parking space.</p> <p>Although more green space is mentioned, so is the development standard of changes to building setbacks. What does this mean? Sidewalk up against the front entry? I would also beg you to keep greenspace in front of new buildings so the Alphabet District does not lose its charm. I object to 7-story buildings</p>
30231	David Beck	636 NE 61st Avenue	Portland	OR	<p>Although I see the need for increased density as a means of providing more housing, I don't trust that it will be done well.</p> <p>A case in point is the development at 1739 NE 45th Ave, in which two SFRs have been replaced by two multi-family condo(?) units. The new buildings are totally out of character and scale of the surrounding buildings. Did anyone in the city planning department look at what was being proposed? And also went to the site to see the surroundings?</p> <p>Buildings such as these make sense lining a major street, but to plop one down in the midst of a mature neighborhood is a disaster. What were they thinking? It's the antithesis of 'Better Housing by Design'.</p>
30232	Richard Shoemaker	211 Boas Rd	Duxbury	MA	<p>I object to the proposals for reduced parking as outlined in items 10 and 11. Despite Portland's public transportation options, most people still own cars, sometimes more than one. Reducing parking requirements, particularly when increasing density clogs our already crowded streets and denigrates our neighborhoods. Streets like Tenino are only 3 lanes wide curb to curb, with parking on both sides due to overflow from existing buildings on adjacent commercially</p>
30235	E. Delafield Spurgeon	1520 SW Montgomery St	Portland	OR	<p>I support the proposal on reducing the parking requirement in the new MD-C zone.</p> <p>The proposed changes would allow me greater development flexibility and maximize the site's potential.</p>



30238	Rebecca Robbins	7333 N Greenwich Ave	Portland	OR	<p>I'm EXTREMELY concerned over the proposal. As a homeowner of over 12 years, I'm already trying to navigate the current multi-housing that is allowed on my street.</p> <p>Current issues:</p> <p>*Parking. I'm SICK of the city jamming bikes down my throat. Not everyone can have a bike. I run a shelter, I have to have a car. I currently live on the most narrow street of the 4 that run parallel in my neighborhood. There is an 11 unit complex across from me with multiple cars that currently park in NO PARKING ZONES as well as hinder my ability to get out of my driveway. I've had my driveway aprons painted yellow. They do not follow the paing and when I call the city for enforcement no one ever comes.</p> <p>Guests to my home:</p> <p>* I save 18 years to buy a home and now the street is so filled with multi-family parking, visitors refuse to visit my home. It's too much of a hassle for them or too far to walk for my elderly parents.</p> <p>*Visability/Aesthics</p> <p>I purchased a home in an established neighborhood for a reason- trees, views, sunlight. With more of these multi units going up, groups are cutting the trees down and building so high that sun doesn't reach the backyard anymore.</p> <p>Overall I'm really concerned the city doesn't care about the home owner. I feel there is a greater concern to cram as many units in the city as possible . As a tax payer/homeowner, I feel completely ignored and forgotten. I tell people - DON'T move here. The city has no regard for livability. It's a daily concern for me as I try to pull out of my driveway, clean up trash in my yard from the renters (who don't give a crap since they don't own).</p>
30240	Jean Spangler	10721 E Burnside St	Portland	OR	Letter attached.
30242	madeline edwards	4215 sw kelly ave	portland	OR	<p>This is of great concern for a number of reasons:</p> <p>â€”There only appears to be a small window of time in which to evaluate how this will impact the value of oneâ€™s home. The â€œsingleâ€ notice sent in the post can easily be overlooked for something else. As is the case of our neighborhood which thought it was a reminder about the proposed address changes. (The same â€œblueâ€ notice has a bit of a conspiratorial quality to it, you could have gotten more attention if it were a different color than the previous notice.) This lack of attention makes me wonder about the intent. The less feedback you receive from the people would imply that we are all â€œokayâ€ with the proposed changed, we are not.</p> <p>â€”Having the hearing in one location at 5:00pm across town is not feasible. Many of us work until 5, and it is no longer possible to â€œget anywhere in Portland in 10 minutesâ€. Multiple locations adjacent to your neighborhood would make for a better turnout of concerned neighbors. Again, was this intentional?</p> <p>â€”When I finally reached a person at the city number I was told that we actually have until the 25th to respond by posting at the website, but your notice says tomorrow is the deadline. Which is more accurate?</p> <p>â€”This proposal concerns me because:</p> <p>Many of us purchased our homes with plans for the future (retirement) and now we are being challenged with the potential for it to be of less value. Not long after purchasing my home â€œdiscoveredâ€ that mine and the adjacent properties are currently zoned for high-density (those ramifications where conveniently not disclosed by the seller or realtor), but now your proposal will increase the density even more and decrease our property value. I realize that this density is what makes it more marketable to a developer and hence the city makes money. But now you will be obliterating the small people and their single unit homes. These are the same people that have cherished and supported Portland for a very long time. These small homes of character are what has attracted the very people that are now moving to the city that you are attempting to accommodate??</p>

30244	John J. Crooks and Bernadette M. Rilatt-Crooks	1524 NE 76th Ave	Portland	OR	Letter attached.
30245	Vicki Skryha and Allen Buller	1728 NW Hoyt St	Portland	OR	Letter attached.
30246	Laura DeGrace	9221 N Lombard St	Portland	OR	Hi, I feel like I am constantly having to defend myself and my property against the City of Portland. I did this a couple of years ago in a similar situation. What I don't understand most of all is the disconnect the City of Portland seems to have about my building and ones near it in the sense that it is ALREADY low income housing. I make \$56,000 (a new great recent increase) and I am on my own. Others in my building have similar situations. Tell me please if someone tears down my building where in Portland will I find housing for the \$119,600 that I originally paid. I know the answer - nowhere in the City of Portland, and I work in Portland for PSU. Yes
30247	Laura DeGrace	9221 N Lombard St	Portland	OR	Resending in case I made an error. My property is 9221 N Lombard St #15. Hi, I feel like I am constantly having to defend myself and my property against the City of Portland. I did this a couple of years ago in a similar situation. What I don't understand most of all is the disconnect the City of Portland seems to have about my building and ones near it in the sense that it is ALREADY low income housing. I make \$56,000 (a new great recent increase) and I am on my own. Others in my building have similar situations. Tell me please if someone tears down my building where in Portland will I find housing for the \$119,600 that I originally paid. I know the answer - nowhere in the City of Portland, and I work in Portland for PSU. Yes
30248	Neil Heller	PO Box 13172	Portland	OR	I support the proposal put forth by Staff for the Better Housing by Design project. I think it does an excellent job of responding to current and future needs of residents.
30250	Neil Heller	PO Box 13172	Portland	OR	I support the BHD project. I agree with combining the R3 & R2 zones into one along with the associated new FAR allowances.
30251	Tamara DeRidder, A.I.C.P.	1707 NE 52nd Ave.	Portland	OR	Please see the attached Rose City Park Neighborhood Association testimony on this matter. Thank you!
30255	Heidi Froemke	6529 S.E. 128th	Portland	OR	We have multiple unit dwelling on the east, south and west (3 deep). The lot north of us is wanting to build a multi-unit dwelling. Our residential property will be boxed in. We have lived on this property for 70 years and it has come down to living on an island surrounded by high density housing - or selling. This seems unfair. Please also understand the plan to have limited parking for the multi unit dwellings will be disastrous. S.E. 128th avenue has so many cars now it can be gridlocked. Foster cannot absorb anymore vehicles yet that is where cars for these dwellings will be parked. Residents of apartments blocks away down Foster

30256 Soren Impey 4815 NE 7th Ave Portland OR The Portland metro area has a deficit of ~60,000 lower income housing units and this chronic housing shortage has led to waves of displacement of people of color, poor people, and other marginalized folk from their homes. A major goal of the "Better Housing by Design" multi-dwelling zoning code update was to address this continuing affordable housing shortage. As acknowledged by BPS staff, density limits in current multi-dwelling zoning code "often result[s] in the construction of townhouse units" instead of rental units. Portland Tenants United calls on the City to live up to its "Goal 10" and "Comprehensive Plan" commitments by emphasize code changes that encourage construction of needed affordable rental housing:

- (1) Disincentivize detached or row housing in RM2, RM3, and RM4 zones.
- (2) Create minimum density requirement for all multi-dwelling zones.

Multi-dwelling zones represent a small reservoir of land that allows for rental housing without also allowing or requiring expensive commercial floor space. It's unacceptable that multi-dwelling zones have lower density limits than equivalent mixed-use commercial zones.

RM1, RM2, and RM3 zones should have the same base floor area ratio as the equivalent mixed use zones (CM1, CM2, and CM3 zones).

Portland Tenants United strongly supports proposed inclusionary housing bonuses and especially the "deeply affordable" housing bonus. However, we are very concerned that proposed FAR bonuses alone may not be sufficient to incentivize construction of IH and family housing so we ask that:

- (1) 3+ BR FAR bonus be increased to 50% and that it be additive with any IH bonuses (e.g. no FAR limit).
- (2) the City create additional incentives for "deeply affordable" and "3+ BR" housing, including fee, SDC, and tax abatements. (Where preempted by state law these incentives could be voluntary.)

30257 Ellen Vanderslice 2951 NW Raleigh St Portland OR I am concerned that the 25% setback from the rear lot line in the Eastern pattern area creates a sharp jump in required setback between properties less than 100' deep and those 100' deep or more. A property 99' deep would have a 5' setback while a property 100' deep would have a 25' setback. Please consider creating a softer transition.

30259 Julia Blackburn 3725 N Kerby Ave Portland OR We are home owners that have enjoyed living in the mississippi neighborhood for 12 years. We love the historic homes and diligently update our 1904 farmhouse. We hope you have taken time to speak with members of the community face to face, and measured the impact on a beautiful, culturally rich, historic neighborhood. It is important to note that this is a largely black neighborhood, in part because of the exclusion clauses in portland's racist housing laws. It's very interesting that the predominantly white neighborhoods throughout our city: Irvington, Alameda, Laurelhurst, etc don't have these density zones the way

30260	Teresa / Michael Kruse / Fisk	5220 SW 49th Drive	Portland	OR	<p>Properties along 49th Drive do not front along Beaverton Hillsdale Highway, therefore are unlikely to benefit or be developed to align with the new zoning goals.</p> <p>If the zoning change is adopted, then there are several considerations to be resolved, including but not limited to the following:</p> <p>The 50' wide lots are too narrow for new street connections along 49th Drive. We suggest the city consider re-instating the historic property frontage, via driveway and sidewalk, access to Beaverton Hillsdale Hwy.</p> <p>Re-instating the frontage access would also allow for future retail sales and service opportunities along Beaverton Hillsdale Hwy as identified in Table 120-1.</p> <p>Future retail and multi-dwelling housing could connect to the existing bus stops located along and across from 50th and Shattuck however pedestrian safety is questionable.</p> <p>Currently the houses near 50th do not face Beaverton Hillsdale Hwy. Increasing traffic and parking along 49th drive would severely destroy the already failing pavement ridden with potholes and ruts.</p> <p>Please recall that 49th drive was closed off over 10 years ago at the west end because it was unsafe. Increasing traffic along 49th Drive is a detriment to neighborhood safety.</p> <p>The city is likely to pass the burden of infrastructure improvements to current residents and future developers.</p>
30262	Lucas Gray	5229 NE MLK Blvd.	Portland	OR	<p>I support the overall goals of BHxD but strongly encourage you to reduce or eliminate setbacks. I'd also encourage increasing the FAR limits and name each zone according to the FAR (for instance RM1 should be 1 FAR, RM2 = 2 FAR etc.)</p>
30263	Mark Falls	4057 N. Albina Ave.	Portland	OR	<p>I'm personally in favor of the new zoning RM1 option. Thanks</p>
30264	Jeff Henderson	2201 4th Avenue	Seattle	WA	<p>In light of my property, located at 4049 N. Albina Avenue, Portland, OR 97227, being on the same block as higher density zoning immediately to the west (across the alley) and which fronts N. Mississippi Ave, the proposed zoning for this property is too low of density and a short cited solution to the larger problem of imminent high population increases and short cited zoning policies that restrict housing supply and lead to a continued rental affordability crisis, especially in a core neighborhood where only public transportation is required. Since permanent structure last for 100 years or more, building such low density is another missed opportunity to help alleviate pressure on renters. I propose the zoning should be increased to what is currently known as CM3, the same as Tupelo Alley bounded by N. Albina Ave. to the East and N. Mississippi Ave to the West.</p> <p>Please note you may receive testimony from adjacent property owners to my property who may also testify as to the same conclusion and in support of doing what we can to help our community alleviate pressure on the renting community by taking a much longer view than 2035.</p>
30265	Thomas Metzger	2720 NW Upshur St.	Portland	OR	<p>Respectfully,</p> <p>We believe that the 2700 block of NW Upshur is an existing and nearly-ideal example of the BHD goals for RM2 zoning, as well as being one of the favorite blocks for many Portland residents and visitors on their way to and from Forest Park or Wallace Park.</p> <p>If there are zoning changes as proposed, we would like to sincerely request that the 2700 block of NW Upshur share the RM2 zoning intended for the 2800-2900 blocks of NW Upshur. It is completely inappropriate to perpetuate a high-density zoning in this area (currently RH, proposed to be RM3). The building heights, open spaces, seasonal shade trees, and bike/pedestrian friendliness are a loved part of Portland and should continue to be.</p> <p>On either side of NW Upshur, the Vaughn St. corridor ends at Montgomery Park on 27th street, and the Thurman St. corridor ends at its intersection with NW 25th (there is no outlet for any street in this area that is west of 25th!).</p> <p>If this immediate area is replaced with the kind of density that RM3 allows, it will surely eliminate the affordable, rental housing available in the 2600 block and north side of the 2700 block of NW Upshur.</p>

30266	Thomas Metzger	2720 NW Upshur St.	Portland	OR	<p>We believe that the 2700 block of NW Upshur is an existing and nearly-ideal example of the BHD goals for RM2 zoning, as well as being one of the favorite blocks for many Portland residents and visitors on their way to and from Forest Park or Wallace Park.</p> <p>If there are zoning changes as proposed, we would like to sincerely request that the 2700 block of NW Upshur share the RM2 zoning intended for the 2800-2900 blocks of NW Upshur. It is completely inappropriate to perpetuate a high-density zoning in this area (currently RH, proposed to be RM3). The building heights, open spaces, seasonal shade trees, and bike/pedestrian friendliness are a loved part of Portland and should continue to be.</p> <p>On either side of NW Upshur, the Vaughn St. corridor ends at Montgomery Park on 27th street, and the Thurman St. corridor ends at its intersection with NW 25th (there is no outlet for any street in this area that is west of 25th! ).</p> <p>If this immediate area is replaced with the kind of density that RM3 allows, it will surely eliminate the affordable, rental housing available in the 2600 block and north side of the 2700 block of NW Upshur.</p>
30267	Shawn Oâ€™Handley	6601 N.Omaha Ave.	Portland	OR	<p>The proposed zoning change for this area will diminish the quality of life for the surrounding residents. Given that the city keeps repeating the same mistakes in regards to retail space and parking I have little hope my input makes any difference.</p>
30271	Zoe L. Powers	111 SW Columbia Street	Portland	OR	<p>Letter attached.</p>
30272	Alan Kessler	2725 SE 36th Ave	Portland	OR	<p>This project is an opportunity to advance Fair Housing throughout the city. Portland is deeply segregated as a result of its exclusionary zoning. Neighborhoods such as Eastmoreland have been racially-homogeneous enclaves for at least a century. A recent article from the Sightline Institute analyzes this phenomenon well. <a href="http://www.sightline.org/2018/01/18/every-month-portlands-infill-rules-arent-changed-the-city-looks-more-like-this/">http://www.sightline.org/2018/01/18/every-month-portlands-infill-rules-arent-changed-the-city-looks-more-like-this/</a></p> <p>The failure of this project and other recent rezoning projects to create opportunities to build dense affordable housing in our most segregated neighborhoods is violation of the Fair Housing Act (e.g. perpetuating segregated housing patterns), and is morally unconscionable.</p>
30273	Terry Parker	1527 NE 65th Ave	Portland	OR	<p>Letter attached.</p>
30275	Marie McKim	8832 N Syracuse	Portland	OR	<p>Efforts to gentrify St. Johns will never really take off until a new route for the massive semi-trucks that cross the bridge is established. Not too many people with big money want to live on a truck route and essentially, N. Ivanhoe has huge trucks barreling down the street at all hours and we have two traffic signals from the bridge to St. Louis, which then turn into Fessenden and getting across the street is treacherous at times not mention how the trucks and vehicles towing boats jump the curb where the only other traffic signal is, making it dangerous to stand on the corner waiting for the light to change...this does not lend itself to</p>
30276	Christine Alexander	9122 n Kellogg st	Portland	OR	<p>No one near the intersection of Kellogg and st Louis has driveways. We are in competition with the apartment dwellers as it is for street parking. Creating more tall apartment buildings is going to make that even worse. Please provide parking for new projects.</p>
30279	Matt Ferris-Smith	411 SE 14th Ave.	Portland	OR	<p>Thank you for your work to help new homes meet Portland's goals for livability, affordability, and climate change.</p> <p>I strongly recommend revising the proposed draft to allow for more homes, and more types of homes, in our neighborhoods. Allowing for more new homes with flexible requirements will help address our affordability crisis while providing more people with the opportunity to walk, bike, and use transit to access destinations.</p> <p>Specifically, I urge you to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase the base FAR and bonuses in the RM1, RM2, and RM3 zones to allow for more new homes in the relatively few areas where these zones apply.</li> <li>2. Eliminate minimum parking requirements in the RM1, RM2, and RM3 zones. Parking requirements significantly increase housing costs and undercut Portland's goals for climate change and transportation mode share. Meters and permits represent better options to address incumbent residents' concerns about storing private vehicles on public streets.</li> <li>2. Reduce front setbacks to zero as the general standard in RM1, RM2, and RM3 zones to allow for more flexibility in building types and to support street activation. Privacy concerns can be addressed in other ways, and Portland already has loads of suburban-style housing options for people who desire a setback.</li> <li>3. Reduce or eliminate private outdoor space requirements to allow for more flexibility in building types and to support more affordable housing. If the City of Portland is concerned about access to outdoor space, please meet this goal by increasing access to high-quality public parks rather than by forcing people to pay</li> </ol>

30283	Jenny Rudolph	6006 N. Depauw St	Portland	OR	<p>Good Afternoon,</p> <p>I have been a resident of University Park Neighborhood for 8 years and am a homeowner. I am extremely concerned about the proposed zoning changes to the Water Bureau Property. This particular parcel immediately to the NW of 6702 Syracuse contains a designated heritage tree. My own children attend the University Park Preschool right next door and this area provides a wonderful natural playground for the neighborhood children and others of all ages to enjoy our natural environment and trees that are over 100 years old. I urge you to maintain this property as a natural area with NO DEVELOPMENT in the area around the heritage tree. Thank you for your consideration.</p>
30284	Laura Lehman	1900 SW 4th Ave	Portland	OR	<p>Please find a memo summarizing the Bureau of Development Services' comments attached. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.</p>
30285	Zachery Eberhardt	5710 NW Deschutes Dr	Portland	OR	<p>I sincerely ask the city not to allow development of this piece of land and to instead maintain it as a natural area. It is a beautiful green space and also contains a heritage tree. Thank you.</p>
30286	Ovid Boyd	1104 SW Columbia St	Portland	OR	<p>Please eliminate the size of building (FAR) restrictions and the parking requirements so housing for people can be built as the city needs.</p>
30288	Kurt Nordback	777 Dellwood Ave	Boulder	CO	<p>This testimony is in reference to the property at 7816 N Portsmouth Ave. This is zoned R5 but has an existing legal nonconforming 8-unit apartment building. It is adjacent to the existing R1 zone. I'd like to suggest that it be included in the proposed RM2 zone district, as this would be much more appropriate than R5 to the current and historic use. Thank you.</p>
30289	Aaron Brown	8016 N Ivanhoe Street	Portland	OR	<p>I currently rent this house from our landlord with two friends. We all *love* living in St Johns - it's an amazing, diverse community with a plethora of lovely restaurants, coffee shops, bus lines, schools, and bars all within walking distance. The three of us are each worried that with Portland's continued housing crisis, we will be unable to someday buy or indefinitely rent a place to live in this neighborhood. Moving forward with the recommendations provided by Portland for Everyone to encourage the creation of more abundant housing in this neighborhood is a crucial and necessary step towards providing the housing stock that will allow everyone in this neighborhood to age in place. Please consider what the mismatch between supply and demand means for new generations of Portlanders</p>
30290	Sally Donahue	10342 NE Fargo St	PORTLAND	OR	<p>I assume there will be nothing for us to do in our Rowhouse complex. Improvements in the neighborhood are welcome.</p>
30291	Sally Donahue	10342 NE Fargo St	PORTLAND	OR	<p>I assume there will be nothing for us to do in our Rowhouse complex. Improvements in the neighborhood are welcome.</p>
30297	Mark Velky	1000 SW Vista Ave	Portland	OR	<p>I oppose the proposed re-zoning of the Alphabet and King's Hill historic districts currently zoned RH to RM4. I request that those areas be re-zoned to RM3 and that FAR remain as is today.</p>
30298	Elizabeth Cooksey	1132 SW 19th Ave.	Portland	OR	<p>Please reconsider the proposed rezoning of the Alphabet and King's Hill historic districts from RH to RM4. I am opposed to it, and hope that the zoning of those areas is changed to RM3. I request that the FAR remain in its current status.</p>
30299	Sherry Salomon	2393 SW Park Place #204	Portland	OR	<p>I strongly oppose the rezoning of the Alphabet and Kings Hill historic districts. This is a giveaway to greedy developers and those politicians that take their money. Destroying historic districts will not create affordable housing. It will be license to building monstrosities that will forever damage the livability of our beautiful neighborhood. Market rate housing, which does not accept section 8, is not affordable housing.</p>

30300 Robert Hemphill 77 NE Graham St Portland OR

Hello,

I am writing broadly in support of the BHD proposed draft. I support the views put forward by Portland For Everyone and hope you will take them into consideration.

Their letter can be found here: <http://portlandforeveryone.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/BHD-DD-P4E-Final-Letter-.pdf>

Portland For Everyone argues (and I agree ) for the following changes:

Increase maximum Floor Area Ratios (FARs) and bonuses in RM1, RM2, and RM3 so that there is a discernible difference between standards currently being proposed for Portland's neighborhood residential zones and denser multi-dwelling zones.

Increase minimum densities so that truly multi-dwelling developments will occur in the relatively little amount of space where these zones are mapped.

Increase height allowances in many zones to give greater flexibility across projects, including bonus utilization, layout, tree preservation, and other factors.

Reduce standard front setbacks to 0' and side setbacks to 5' across all multi-dwelling zones. If building code and window standards are still met, allow side setbacks to be reduced to 3' in RM1 and RM2, and to 0' in RM4 and RM4.

Reduce minimum requirements for sites 7,500 square feet or less, including landscaping.

Adjust open space requirements to yield more desirable building forms, site layouts, and more use-able shared spaces.

Consider where maximum heights, FAR limits and/or step-down requirements may unintentionally render affordable housing bonuses unusable, counter to the proposal's intentions.

Ensure that affordable housing development is feasible in East Portland: Don't layer on so many conditions in pursuit of perfect urban form that affordable housing development is stymied. Also, consider spending increased staff time, attention, and resources on how to encourage affordable housing development and beautiful urban form appropriate for East Portland over spending additional resources on Inner Ring neighborhoods.

30301 Stephen Salomon 2393 SW PARK PLACE PORTLAND OR

I oppose the change in zoning for the King's Hill Historic District and the Alphabet District.

Such a change will adversely impact the livability of these two districts that make Portland such a livable city which has achieved nationwide recognition. Also, I have not seen a credible projection that so many people will come to Portland in the future when the very draw will be degraded. This is supply economics which has been proven to be incorrect.

30302 Daniel Salomon 1701 SW Columbia St. PORTLAND OR

I am writing to oppose the Better Housing by Design as a disabled adult who is in the Section 8 Voucher program because it would incentivize environmentally wasteful demolitions, destroy community, history, culture, open space, the urban forest and public common areas, increase individualism, consumerism, homogenization and loss of diversity and still not solve the affordable housing crisis.

Market rate housing which does not take Section 8 vouchers is not affordable housing.

Urban liveability, an element of human dignity, is necessary to make urban ecological and socially responsible lifestyles accessible to most people in search of affordable housing.

Not only would the so-called Better Housing by Design unnecessarily undermine the unique liveability of Portland. Once the liveability of Portland is undermined, it would make ecologically and socially responsible lifestyles less accessible, tenable, comfortable and attractive to most low income peoples needing affordable housing.

As a devout Roman Catholic, I concur with my Pope, Pope Francis, that human beings need three things to live with dignity: 1) shelter, 2) a rich environment and 3) meaningful employment. Human beings cannot live with dignity, even if they have a place to live, if they are not living and working in a rich natural, social and built environment.

I also agree with Pope Francis that each community needs at least one stable landmark in their community and to be developed in such a way to support a sense of community and belonging.

Low income and disabled peoples in search of affordable housing need a rich environment to survive, heal, thrive, cope and live with dignity and develop a better life and future.

Also, having access to a rich natural, social and built environment also helps to encourage and sustain, climate and environmental commitment.

Mountaining evidience is supporting these claims.

30303 Elizabeth Perris 1132 SW 19th Ave. Portland OR

I oppose the proposed re-zoning of the Alphabet and King's Hill historic districts currently zoned RH to RM4. I request that those areas be re-zoned to RM3 and that FAR remain as is today.Â In the RM4 zone, an inclusionary housing bonus can increase the FAR to a maximum of 7 : 1 (Table 120-5), almost doubling the density

30305 Joe Recker 1016 NE 58th Ave Portland OR

Hi, I support the changes proposed by the Better Housing by Design project. In particular, I support the change from a maximum density limitation to an FAR with more flexible density. This form-based residential zoning will provide the flexibility to more organically grow much-needed housing in multi-family districts close to

30306 Joe Recker 1016 NE 58th Ave Portland OR

Hi, I support the changes proposed by the Better Housing by Design project. In particular, I support the change from a maximum density limitation to an FAR with more flexible density. This form-based residential zoning will provide the flexibility to more organically grow much-needed housing in multi-family districts close to

30310 Jason Etzel 2023 NE 21st Ave Portland OR

I understand the need for increased density to address housing supply in Portland. I do not understand how the city reconciles this with the Irvington historic district. I am not allowed to replace my front door or replace my windows for energy efficiency, all in the name of historic integrity. However, under the new proposal both lots adjacent to my house could be replaced with dense four-story housing units that would be completely out of the historic character of the neighborhood. I would hope that if the city decides to proceed with these zoning changes, it at least has the good will to remove the affected portions of Irvington from the historic district so that I can freely modify my house while new development occurs around it, or if I see fit allow me to sell my property to a developer for



30318 Ross Kelley 5216 se 17th ave. Portland OR

Dear Planning and Sustainability Commission,

I am the owner of 5216 SE 17th Ave. (Parcel R181784). I am in support of Parcel R181790 (5205 SE 18th Ave.) converting to RM4. I write to the Commission to request that my property (516 SE 17th Ave.), along with my neighbor to the north (5206-5208 SE 17th Ave.), converts to RM4 to match the property abutting the east side of our lots for several reasons.

Reason #1: Busy Street and Access to Public Transportation

My house sits near the corner of the busy intersection of SE McLoughlin Blvd. and SE 17th Ave. SE 17th Ave. is a main service street for this neighborhood, and serves as a major road for public and private transportation. There is a bus stop on SE 17th Ave. (including the bus line #70 that runs along SE 17th, and including the bus line #19 that runs along SE Milwaukie) that is a little over 100 ft. from my doorstep, and there is a MAX station just over 0.3 miles from my doorstep at SE 17th and Holgate.

Reason #2: Abutted by RM4 and Commercial Zones

Looking at the layout in other parts of the City, the natural flow appears to be a flow from commercially zoned lots to high residential lots to single family lots. The lots to the north of me on either side of 17th or 18th Ave. are zoned CE, which permits a range of uses and allows a height of 45 ft. Parcel R181790 that abuts my eastern property line is converting to RM4, which allows a 75 ft. structure. Currently, there is an active permit in place on Parcel R181790 to build a 59 unit 6 story building. During an early assistance meeting with a City Planner last year (when my property was still zoned RH), the City showed solid approval of an 18-unit project on my property; that design would only be possible now in the RM4 zone (and not the RM2 zone).

Suggestion: Change zoning on my property (5216 SE 17th Ave.) and property to the north (5206-5208 SE 17th Ave.) to RM4

Similar to what is seen on the lots directly to the East of my property (Parcel R181790), I suggest that my property and the property to my north change to RM4.

30319 Ross Kelley 5216 se 17th ave. Portland OR

Dear Planning and Sustainability Commission,

I am the owner of 5216 SE 17th Ave. (Parcel R181784). I am in support of Parcel R181790 (5205 SE 18th Ave.) converting to RM4. I write to the Commission to request that my property (516 SE 17th Ave.), along with my neighbor to the north (5206-5208 SE 17th Ave.), converts to RM4 to match the property abutting the east side of our lots for several reasons.

Reason #1: Busy Street and Access to Public Transportation

My house sits near the corner of the busy intersection of SE McLoughlin Blvd. and SE 17th Ave. SE 17th Ave. is a main service street for this neighborhood, and serves as a major road for public and private transportation. There is a bus stop on SE 17th Ave. (including the bus line #70 that runs along SE 17th, and including the bus line #19 that runs along SE Milwaukie) that is a little over 100 ft. from my doorstep, and there is a MAX station just over 0.3 miles from my doorstep at SE 17th and Holgate.

Reason #2: Abutted by RM4 and Commercial Zones

Looking at the layout in other parts of the City, the natural flow appears to be a flow from commercially zoned lots to high residential lots to single family lots. The lots to the north of me on either side of 17th or 18th Ave. are zoned CE, which permits a range of uses and allows a height of 45 ft. Parcel R181790 that abuts my eastern property line is converting to RM4, which allows a 75 ft. structure. Currently, there is an active permit in place on Parcel R181790 to build a 59 unit 6 story building. During an early assistance meeting with a City Planner last year (when my property was still zoned RH), the City showed solid approval of an 18-unit project on my property; that design would only be possible now in the RM4 zone (and not the RM2 zone).

Suggestion: Change zoning on my property (5216 SE 17th Ave.) and property to the north (5206-5208 SE 17th Ave.) to RM4

30320 Mary Hunt 7535 N Fowler Ave Portland OR

Although it is not perfectly clear how many stories or units will be allowed or whether parking will be provided for tenants, my husband and I have strong concerns with any housing opportunities that increase traffic and competition for parking on Fowler. The street is narrow. There are already rental homes with many cars and little or no parking on the street. The church has limited parking and overflows for services and events. There is a bus stop but it runs infrequently and we are a mile from the Max line. Not many people without cars will find this attractive. I can walk to work faster than use public transit. Traffic: The street does not have a

30322	Gerson Robboy	1736 SE 21st Ave	Portland	OR	The Hosford Abernethy N. A. board approved a letter to the PSC requesting that the blocks on the east side of 12th Ave within the Ladd's Addition be down-zoned from RM2 to RM1. I am a home owner in the HAND neighborhood, and I disagree with the neighborhood association. Down-zoning will not protect any historic buildings, and will not accomplish anything, resulting only in fewer dwelling units in whatever properties are eventually re-developed. Historic buildings already have other protections, outside of the zoning.
30561	Yesika Arevalo		Portland	OR	Overall, I approve of the Better Housing by Design project, my objections being that it decreases the height already allowed by the existing zoning, and increases See video
30562	Bob Johnson	2545 Terwilliger Blvd	Portland	OR	See video
30563	Sarah Iannarone	15075 SE Powell Blvd	Portland	OR	See video
30564	Terry Parker	1527 NE 65th Ave	Portland	OR	See video
30565	Leon Porter	1822 NE Wasco St	Portland	OR	See video
30566	Phil Norman	1234 NE 118th Ave	Portland	OR	See video
30567	David Hollenshead	3339 SW Barbur Blvd	Portland	OR	See video
30568	Doug Klotz	1908 SE 35th Pl	Portland	OR	See video
30569	Zoe Lynn Powers	111 SW Columbia St	Portland	OR	See video
30570	JoZell Johnson	533 NW 18th Ave	Portland	OR	See video
30571	Jessica Richman	1911 NW Hoyt St	Portland	OR	See video
30572	Aaron Parecki	3226 N Michigan Ave	Portland	OR	See video
30573	Tamara DeRidder	1707 NE 52nd Ave	Portland	OR	See video
30574	Mark Wyman	2209 N Schoefield St	Portland	OR	See video
30575	Bradley Bondy	7820 SE Stephanie Ct	Portland	OR	See video
30576	Allen Hines	4975 SE Division St	Portland	OR	See video
30577	Miles Sisk	1331 SW 12th Ave	Portland	OR	See video

30578	David Schoellhamer	8210 SE 13th Ave	Portland	OR	See video
30579	Mike Beamer	3012 SE Franklin St	Portland	OR	See video
30580	Sandra Ward	1511 N McClellan St	Portland	OR	See video
30581	Larry Cross	7407 SE Glenwood St	Portland	OR	See video
30582	Dani Zeghibib	8803 SE Rhone St	Portland	OR	See video
30583	Harold Carlston	14621 NE Everett St	Portland	OR	See video
30584	Anthony Bencivengo	4815 NE 7th Ave	Portland	OR	See video
30585	Grace Jacobs	12330 SE Carlton St	Portland	OR	See video
30586	Cindy Hurley	24 NE 16th Ave	Portland	OR	See video
30587	Jenka Soderberg	228 SE 127th Ave	Portland	OR	See video
30588	Claud Gilbert	2110 SE 12th Ave	Portland	OR	See video
30589	Steve Maxen	8780 SE Flavel St	Portland	OR	See video
30590	Rick Michaelson	906 NW 23rd Ave	Portland	OR	See video
30591	Aida K	NE	Portland	OR	See video
30592	Mary Ann Schwab	605 SE 38th Ave	Portland	OR	See video
30677	Jessica Engelman	2012 SE 10th	Portland	OR	I am fully supportive of these efforts to increase housing options and density. Please ensure that bonuses are economically enticing, and pencil out sufficiently for developers to eagerly take advantage of them, in order to increase affordable housing and 2-3 bedroom units. Also, any requirements or recommendations for
30678	Gail Simmons	2216 NE Everett St	Portland	OR	
30681	Milt Jones	425 SW Bancroft	Portland	OR	There are several good pieces to like about this proposal. But the project will be a failure if it does not deal with, and effectively manage, automobile parking and traffic congestion. Send our planners back to the drawing board to do this.

30682	Blaine Palmer	215 SE 24th Ave	Portland	OR	June 21, 2018
					Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission Better Housing by Design Testimony
					Blaine Palmer?
					Dear Members of the Commission,
					It is time for Portland to dismantle the segregationist land use patterns adopted decades ago, meaningfully and sustainably. We must recognize that past zoning policies benefited white, able-bodied people like myself, at the cost of people of color and those with disabilities, and not by chance. It is long past time for change.
					Increasing the availability of affordable housing throughout Portland must be the primary objective of Better Housing by Design. The draft under consideration takes steps to house more Portlanders more affordably, especially those measures meant to simplify and clarify regulations and make building homes more cost-effective.
					I agree with the assessment by the Portland for Everyone coalition of the strengths of the current draft, and with their suggestions for needed changes in order to meet the stated goal of expanding housing options and increase affordability for Portlanders.
					Portland is facing an acute housing shortage. Please incorporate the recommendations by Portland for Everyone to revise the current draft to encourage the building of housing options that are available to lower- and middle-income households.
					Yours truly,
30684	Mark Wyman	2209 N. Schofield	Portland	OR	Please see attached testimony.
30685	Jynx Houston	7605 SE Lincoln St.	Portland	OR	I LIVE AT 7605 SE LINCOLN ST., & THE INCREASE IN CONSTRUCTION OF NEW HOMES IN MY LARGER NEIGHBORHOOD & HENCE THE DESTRUCTION OF GREEN SPACES IS HONESTLY HORRIFIC. YOUR RIP & DEVELOPMENT PLANS IN GENERAL FOR PORTLAND ARE REPREHENSIBLE EVIDENCE OF HOW YOU HAVE CAVED TO DEVELOPERS--ESP. ON THE EAST SIDE. THIS IS BECOMING APPARENT TO RAPIDLY INCREASING #'S OF PORTLANDERS. YOU HAVE IN SHORT BECOME A
30693	Jacquie Walton	5034 NE Rodney Avenue	Portland	OR	As a member of the King neighborhood, I strongly oppose the Northeast Coalition of Neighborhood's (NECN's) recommended changes to the Better Housing by Design proposed draft.
					The King Neighborhood Association (KNA) board has not had a rep to the NECN for three years and had no input into the NECN's recommendations.
					The NECN's recommended changes -- which include eliminating or reducing setbacks, exempting outdoor requirements, removing parking minimums, and increasing FAR/maximum building coverage/base and bonus height -- would have a profoundly negative impact on the livability of our NE neighborhoods.
					The NECN seems to believe that the only way to increase affordability is to decrease livability. I suppose in a way they are right -- if implemented, their recommendations will encourage people to leave Portland, discourage people from moving here, and property values will naturally decrease!
30694	Hillary Adam	1900 SW 4th Ave, Suite 5000	Portland	OR	I am submitting this testimony on behalf of the Portland Design Commission.
30695	Robert Greene	6535 n fenwick ave	pdx	OR	From the example provided for this zone, what is encouraged is a maximum build out and eliminates most greenery. this proposal is not low or medium density it is high density. This density, while it may have an effect on carbon emissions, does not take into account run off, heat created by paving over green space, light since some units will be required to be lit 24 hours a day, and noise. The overall effect is to have a negative effect on the human body. Nor do I see this new construction as providing affordable housing. Wealth will be concentrated as there will be fewer property owners and more landlords. This new high density zone

30696	Matvey Rezanov	6336 N Detroit Avenue	Portland	OR	<p>I strongly support for requirements to include outdoor space for multifamily housing</p> <p>I strongly support for requirements for landlords to subsidize public transportation for multifamily housing tenants (AKA "transportation demand management, TDM, measures)</p>
30700	David Ashman	8075 SE 8th Avenue	Portland	OR	<p>We support the Better Housing by Design comments submitted by the Sellwood-Moreland neighborhood association (SMILE) dated May 20, 2018 (attached for reference). Specific and additional comments are included below.</p> <p>The Sellwood-Moreland neighborhood is experiencing phenomenal growth with about 1,600 residential units in the development pipeline or completed since 2015, a 27% increase. We have 2.8 miles of mixed use corridor that has the zoned capacity to add thousands of additional housing units. We are VERY concerned about preserving livability with the proposed zoning changes.</p> <p>Overall, the Commission should consider, evaluate, and plan for the cumulative impacts of proposed increased density and ongoing development throughout our entire neighborhood. The Commission should consider and advance the Residential Infill and Better Housing by Design Projects together.</p> <p>Specific to "Proposal 1: Scale-based housing" from the Planning and Sustainability Commission Proposed Draft Staff Report: The number of units allowed in RM1 should be limited; as it is presently in R2 zoning. With deep bonuses, proposed RM1 zoning could see 4-story 28 unit structures. This is too dense, and quite frankly not fair to existing R2 homeowners many of who have smaller 2-story historic homes. Massive multi-unit structures could negatively impact existing homes' access to solar and proper air flow.</p> <p>Accurately portray possible development under the proposed zoning rules. The maximum number of units should be provided using fire and building standards. If BHD assumes there is a practical limit to the number of units built in a zone (such as the fourplex shown for RM1), it should be codified as the maximum allowed density, similar to what the Residential Infill Project has done.</p> <p>The Residential Infill Project adopted a 0.5:1 FAR limit for detached homes on R2.5 lots to prevent oversized single-family homes. Add a 0.5:1 FAR limit for detached homes in multi-dwelling zones.</p> <p>Agree with 35-foot height limit for the RM1 zone. Personally, I feel the height limit should be capped at 35 feet even with bonuses/deep bonuses.</p> <p>Strongly opposed to increasing the FAR limits stated in the Proposed Draft Report.</p> <p>Specific to "Proposal 8: Allow alternatives to conventional landscaping" from the Planning and Sustainability Commission Proposed Draft Staff Report:</p>
30705	James Muggenburg	8003 North Crawford Street	Portland	OR	<p>Please see attached letter to the Planning and Sustainability Commission 21 June 2018...Thank you.</p>
30706	Michael James	1930 NW Irving Street	Portland	OR	<p>Please read my attached letter in opposition to this proposal to increase the FAR.</p>
30707	Rex Burkholder	2824 SE Yamhill	Portland	OR	<p>I regret I will be out of the City and unable to testify Tuesday.</p> <p>I am very supportive of increasing housing options in every neighborhood in Portland. I also support the recommendations from Portland for Everyone. I have built 2 ADU's and own a duplex in Irvington that adds value to the neighborhood as well as provides more affordable housing . More housing flexibility is beneficial to our city.</p>
30708	Laura Becker	4815 NE 7th Avenue	Portland	OR	<p>Please see the attached letter from Northeast Coalition of Neighborhoods. Thank you.</p>
30709	Jessica Conner	421 SW 6th Ave	Portland	OR	<p>Attached is the letter from the Portland Housing Bureau to the Planning and Sustainability Commission on the Better Housing by Design Proposed Draft.</p>

30710	Brad Hochhalter and Siri Shetty	1721 NW Glisan St	Portland	OR	We have lived in the historic neighborhood since 2010 and have owned a home in the Alphabet District since 2005. We have reviewed the plans to re-zone areas west of NW 21st to limit the FAR to retain the character of the neighborhood. In that vein, we oppose the proposal to apply the RM4 zone to some areas of the Alphabet Historic District now zoned RH. The new zone would allow FARs of 4:1 (and more with bonuses). It is nearly impossible for development designed at 4:1 FAR to meet the approval criteria for historic design review. The RM3 zone, with a maximum FAR of 2:1, would be a much better fit, and result in development that is more compatible with the Historic District.
30712	Michael Mehaffy	742 SW Vista Ave Apt 42	Portland	OR	<p>June 22, 2018</p> <p>Planning and Sustainability Commission City of Portland 1221 SW 4th Avenue, Room 110 Portland, OR 97204</p> <p>Dear Commissioners,</p> <p>RE: Better Housing By Design “ Draft May 2018</p> <p>The Board of Goose Hollow Foothills League has instructed me by unanimous vote to send the following letter.</p> <p>We strongly oppose the proposed re-zoning of the areas of the King's Hill historic district currently zoned RH to RM4. We hereby request that this area be re-zoned to RM3.</p> <p>In addition, we believe the same issues apply to the Alphabet District and support the request by other affected parties to re-zone this area to RM3 as well. Our Board understand and supports the need to respond to Portland's demographic and economic pressures, reflected in the Better Housing by Design proposals. We join with the Bosco-Milligan Foundation and Architectural Heritage Center in supporting the additional protections given to properties with historic resource designations within the proposed modifications of multi- dwelling zone specifications. For example, we support the continued exemption of properties with historic resources (individual landmarks and contributing structures in Historic or Conservation districts) from minimum density requirements for any development of additional residential units (33.445.610.C.6). Moreover, we support the provision that the FAR (floor to area ratios) may be transferred from a site that contains a Historic or Conservation landmark, or contains a contributing resource in a Historic District or Conservation District, but the receiving site excludes multi-dwelling zones in Historic or Conservation districts (33.120.210).</p> <p>However, we oppose the King's Hill Historic District re-zoning to RM4, rather than RM3. “The RM3 zone is characterized as “medium to high density” with “mid-rise” buildings “up to six stories tall.” In contrast, the RM4 zone is described as “high density,” “an intensely urban zone...with buildings located close to sidewalks”...“a mid-rise to high-rise zone with buildings of up to seven or more stories” (33.120.030). Moreover, in the RM4 zone, a Deeper Housing Affordability bonus can increase the FAR to a maximum of 7 : 1 (Table 120-5), almost doubling the density from the current RH zone base maximum FAR of 4 : 1. Attached is a copy of one of the building prototypes that reflects a deeper affordability bonus with a FAR of 6.84 : 1, eight stories tall with a height of 80 feet (RM4 maximum height is 100 feet). Such a building would be out of place on the residential streets in either of the historic districts.</p>
30714	Zoe Lynn Powers	111 SW Columbia Street	Portland	OR	<p>In researching code changes to the the RH (now RM3) zone under the proposed Better Housing code, it came to my attention that there is an issue with the applicability of the BHD 33.120.100 in the Central City Plan District.</p> <p>RSS and Office uses would appear to be prohibited on the property (and other similarly situated properties) because it is not along a Civic or Neighborhood Corridor. BHD 33.120.100.B.2.a(1). However, the applicable Map 120-1 does not cover this property, because it is in the Central City. CC2035 does not have use regulations that apply in this situation that would preempt the base zoning, so it is unclear if the BHD program intends to allow or not allow RSS and Office uses. Previously, in the RH zone, RSS and Office uses were a conditional use in new multi-dwelling developments up to 20% of the net building area when within 1,000</p>
30719	Terrie Burdette	6603 N Bank St	Portland	OR	It is my belief that affordable housing units should be a requirement for new housing in St Johns, not an option rewarded with bonus FAR.
30720	Doug Klotz	1908 SE 35th Pl	Portland	OR	See attached pdf re NA and BDS letters

30721 Michael Mehaffy 742 SW Vista Ave Portland OR

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Opposition to proposed re-zoning of King's Hill to RM4; request rezone to RM3

I am writing to offer this testimony on the above-referenced topic (part of the Better Housing by Design proposal) as a resident of King's Hill. For the record, I am also president of the Goose Hollow Foothills League, a business owner in sustainable development consulting with an international practice, and president of a non-profit think tank in sustainable urban development, called Sustasis Foundation ([www.sustasis.net](http://www.sustasis.net)). However, I wish to make it clear that in this letter, I speak as a citizen on my own behalf.

My residence is at 742 SW Vista Avenue, Apartment 42. My six-story apartment building has a net density of 196 units per acre (45 units on a 10,000 SF parcel). My neighborhood of King's Hill, as well as the surrounding areas of Goose Hollow and the Alphabet District, are among the densest in all of Oregon (approx. 22 units per acre gross). As my Ph.D. dissertation research has shown, this density and mix is optimal for reducing greenhouse gas emissions and providing other valuable benefits of sustainable urban development. Indeed, I have published books and lectured extensively about this area and its remarkable urban characteristics. It is featured in the book *Cities Alive* and in the class I teach in the School of Sustainability and School of Geographical Sciences and Urban Planning at Arizona State University, among others. (I have also taught at U of O and elsewhere.)

Large parts of our region, including areas within the City of Portland, are very low-density, sprawling and high-emissions. They desperately need new and more livable forms of development that are more sustainable. This was a major effort in my own career when I became project manager for the master developer of Orenco Station in Hillsboro, taking an extremely low-density area (<1 unit per acre gross) with no walkable amenities, and building a "complete community" that offered a much more compact, walkable neighborhood (density >12 units per acre, plus extensive mixed use).

Through the best of intentions, we could all too easily destroy the priceless urban asset represented by King's Hill, the Alphabet District and Goose Hollow. In my research and consultancy in other cities around the world, I have seen exactly this tragic result. In fact, the momentous changes in development practices in the 1950s and 1960s left us with sad remnants of once great cities, and horrific damage committed by very well-meaning people for the best of reasons "economic growth, opportunity, better living conditions, modernization" and so on. The past is a warning to the present.

Today I believe there is also a well-meaning but terribly misguided approach that has come to dominate in Portland, which may be reflected in the current proposal

30722 Amelia Cohn 10036 N Willamette Blvd Portland OR

The only way this development is acceptable is if 50% of the housing it creates is affordable for minimum wage workers, and if it is 100% green. By green it MUST collect rain water, have a green roof, solar panels, and garden space. Our planet and society can no longer afford to scrimp on regenerative building practices. We are in the eye of the storm currently with earth changes and must prepare for super hot and dry summers, scarce food supply, and electric grid malfunctioning.

30723 Eric Lara 2448 NW Westover Rd. Portland OR

As a homeowner across the street from the Alphabet historic district, I very strongly object to the proposed zoning change in most of the historic district to RM4. It is, of course, a neighborhood with some of the most irreplaceable historic residential architecture in all of Portland, and has one of the highest levels of density already. I think it is generally accepted that the NW 21st and 23rd Ave. commercial corridors could be permitted relatively large building allowances, but the plan to have a very extreme increase in the height and bulk of buildings in the historic residential areas is certainly not something that I (or most other area

30724 Tobin Weaver 1983 NW Flanders St Portland OR

For the Alphabet District below NW 21st, I strongly urge you update the current RH zone to new zone RM3 rather than RM4 as proposed. The 10-foot maximum height difference between RM3 and RM4 is important. What makes Portland's most dense existing residential neighborhood attractive and livable are the many trees, the many historic structures, and the consistent fabric of 5-story apartment buildings. I feel strongly that 5 stories is the limit for a feeling of human scale and for good sunlight access. I also feel strongly that new development should respect the character of mature and very functional neighborhood fabric by fitting with neighbors rather than overshadowing them. Design review only goes so far "size matters. The scattered taller buildings in the neighborhood may

30725 Tobin Weaver 1983 NW Flanders St Portland OR

I spent an hour trying to figure out how to navigate this website, and only after submitting testimony did I discover the Summary of Multi-Dwelling Zones document. I would like to add an addendum to my previous testimony urging new zone RM3 rather than RM4 for my neighborhood, the Alphabet District below NW 21st. Now that I understand that new zone RM4 allows "high-rise" scale of "up to seven or more stories," I more emphatically urge you to keep all

30726 erik matthews 3534 SE Main Street Portland OR June 24, 2018

To: betterhousing@portlandoregon.gov  
Mayor Wheeler

RE: Better Housing by Design Project  
Dear Mr. Cunningham, Mayor Wheeler”

The RNA would like to thank Bill Cunningham and his team at BPS for having clear materials that are easy to follow. Such clear, simple, and well-defined documents, images, and renderings were a boon to our community’s ability to review, process, and agree to support of the following points.

The RNA Supports the following recommendations as-written..

1. Regulate development intensity by the size of the building, instead of numbers of units.
2. Require higher-density development to include visitable units.
4. Provide incentives for preserving existing affordable housing and trees through transfers of development rights.
5. Allow small-scale commercial uses on major corridors and near transit stations
8. Allow alternatives to conventional landscaping.
9. Limit large surface parking lots and asphalt paving.
11. Limit garages to no more than 50 percent of building street frontages.
12. Require building entrances to be oriented to streets or to courtyards.
15. Require building height transitions to single-dwelling zones.
20. Strengthen minimum density requirements.

The RNA Supports the following with changes...

6. Require residential outdoor areas in high density zones. (?20,000 sqft)

We request that outdoor or green space requirements be the larger 48 sqft for all sizes of properties.

7. Require shared common areas, such as courtyards, for large sites more than 20,000 square feet.

We request that common areas be an element be for all sizes of properties

10. Reduce parking requirements.



30727 Nancy Hedrick 6902 N Villard Ave Portland OR

Re Multifamily housing:

Too many large developments without parking by stores & schools: I would like there to be more disabled spots placed near grocery stores and schools. Right now, with my chronically injured right foot, I often have to walk 2 blocks from Interstate New Seasons. I've stopped going to some places in Portland because of no parking. (I also have bus diesel allergy, & not impaired enough to justify really Trimet Lift.) In my mother's last years of life, we had to stop eating out in SE Ptl, because we couldn't find parking within walker range. When so many multi-family units go in by New Seasons and the nearby school, it just gets worse & worse. Also, it will become more difficult to park on R Parks to use the Max, as more multi-family units crowd in. The thinking has to be re-thought about multi-use areas (larger store, school, Max) all crowding into same place. It's not like I could get home on the bike from the store with my typical groceries or the age that I can ride my bike that well.

Please don't make N Portland into Division St., where there is no parking, and so many large bldgs., without parking. Please require parking with the multi-family units more often.

I would like there to be support for outdoor space as a requirement for multi-family units, especially larger ones.

I would like there be a requirement for subsidizing for public transportation with multi-family units, especially where near public transit lines.

I would like there to be strong incentives or support included in regulations such as there as transitional measures between high & medium density zones that are unique to the North Interstate Planning District.

Tree preservation, existing affordable housing preservation, & inclusion of affordable housing in new housing should be a goal of new guidelines.

Please don't reduce design review periods further: this means neighbors have even less power, and the developers have more.

I like most of the elements I read on the BPS document:

30728 Catherine Mushel 6319 SE 34th Avenue Portland OR

Dear BHBD Planners:

Thank you so much for extending the comment period. Thank you so much for this huge effort to see into the future and to keep what is good and life-giving in our city.

Please continue to make sure that city bureaus work together to make this design initiative focussed on housing the best that it can be because you have made green space large enough for large-form trees that mature over 50 feet in height, while preserving existing large-form trees for the sake of everyone's safety, health, and well-being. Also, improving planting strip widths for medium- and small-form trees is necessary in this collaborate effort. Ideally, for example, the planning for Streets 2035 should be parallel to the BHBD efforts.

Please preserve groves of trees wherever possible in over-sized blocks,

1. either work with the county to place a covenant on the land where the trees are growing to preserve not only the trees but the space for them in perpetuity;
2. or work with PP&R to create small pocket parks that serve the whole block.

Please keep the proposal to make sure that at the very least 50% of green space must be devoted to trees in the ground.

Please work with Urban Forestry and PBOT when looking at the housing-to-street interface, and look for innovative solutions for designing space for street trees (especially large-form trees) which we all know reduce traffic speeds, mitigate for the heat-island effect, sequester carbon, and shade walkers and cyclists alike,

1. either by creating sidewalks that bend around large-form trees with a carriage walk for car passenger entries and exits, especially where front courtyards make space for a large-form tree in relation to the building frontage, but recognizing that the greatest benefit from that tree will arise when it shade both the street and the courtyard. (Already, 30 years on, we take up sidewalks and make the re-installed concrete bend around large-form trees: why not start by bending the walk around the tree because the tree is so necessary to everyone's safety, health, and well-being?)
2. or by changing the configuration of the street because you are paying attention to Urban Forestry planting requirements--strip width and overhead high voltage wires utilities generally, and traffic controls.
  - a. making the street one-way to allow for a wider planting strip and large form trees on the non-wire side of the street;
  - b. making planting spaces for large-form trees on the non-sire side of the street that allow for bike passage in a lane along the street, but carve out a planting space with cure on all sides for a large-form tree.

30729 LC Hansen 1924 NW 29th AV PORTLAND OR

Comments on proposed zoning code changes.

Height and timing of this proposal:

This expanded map is too permissive of 45' height development for now. Sub-divide the city areas and target where these new height allowances should start. Then set timelines every couple years for expansion of the areas where the greater height will be permitted. Property owners could make plans to sell and move when their neighborhood becomes scheduled for multi family towers. Make this process less willy-nilly.

I have personally participated in an appeal by neighbors to confront unreasonable density in the Brooklyn neighborhood. The scorn and disdain in the body language and the words of both the developer and the city planning representative were apparent and offensive. I have lived in Portland my entire adult life, participated in political campaigns and have hope that this is one part of the world that will not be destroyed through supine backbones of elected officials. This legislation will be your legacy and you shouldn't compromise to destroy our public areas. For example: why in the world would you permit big trees to be cut down? Unless there is strong defensible reason, just say no. If there is a genuinely good reason, then permit it. Force our professional city planners to enforce real restrictions on any development that doesn't meet long term livability goals. Those goals should include green spaces, gardens, trees, taller apartments with 2 or 3 bedrooms with parking off the street, and enforced height and style restrictions in areas filled with smaller homes now. Expand the area of density every few years as part of this plan.

FAR

Multi units should be required, no monster mansions permitted:

The FAR should have proportional restrictions that limit the ability of developers to create four story single family houses of immense size. For example a 5000 ft.<sup>2</sup> lot should not be permitted to have 7500 ft.<sup>2</sup> of living space unless reasonably sized multiple units are included in the design. A terrible example is the ugly monster building on 25th Av across from Wallace Park where rich people bought an old house and are covering the ground with a huge single family building.

The bonus FAR is unnecessary, all regulations should forbid destruction of old trees and green spaces unless individually approved by planning commission employees who must be given guidelines for their work performance and held accountable for permitting violations of the intent of the rules. Seriously! Some identified City employee should have to sign their name, be reviewed, and have their individual job prospects on the line for adhering to livability standards. Perhaps create a Citizen Oversight Committee? Don't worry about developers complaining about Portland City being unfriendly to profit making lousy construction designs. The builders build and then leave town, that is their only goal.

30730 John Flack 8780 SE Flavel Street Portland OR

It is fair and reasonable to calculate development allowances prior to street dedication to facilitate street connections. The property I own at 8780 SE Flavel has been severely impacted because the dedication of 3.5 feet to allow for sidewalk improvements. This dedication dropped the square footage below 6000 thus disallowing 3 units in this R-2 zone. I am providing affordable housing for seniors and people with disabilities. By only allowing 2 units on this property the city has not only reduced options for affordable housing, the city has increased the cost of said housing to seniors and people with disabilities. The unnecessary dedication has disallowed this property to be developed to its best and highest use. Sidewalk improvements were recently made on both sides of the street for 10 blocks.

30731 Kathleen Carter 1930 NW Irving St Portland OR

I oppose the application of a new RM4 zone to the portion of the Alphabet Historic District below NW 21st. I live and own property at 1930 NW Irving St and would be directly impacted by your proposal. Over 20 years ago I moved to this portion of the Alphabet District because of its historic character of Victorian homes and small scale apartment complexes. And I thought that the historic district designation would ensure that the district remained that way. Your proposal to double the allowable FAR ratio to 4:1 in the portion of the District is totally incompatible with its historic scale and its historic designation. We have welcomed new

30732	dean gisvold	2225 NE 15th Ave	Portland	OR	<p>Additional comments on BHD from Dean Gisvold, Irvington resident.</p> <p>The renter analysis prepared by Meg Hanson, raises real issues regarding the lack of anti-displacement regulations for renters in multi-family housing that will be at greater risk of displacement once it pencils out to demolish their vintage apartment buildings to be replaced by market rate units, either under current zoning or under BHD. Renters will suffer from BHD-vintage multi family units, including non contributing resources in the Irvington Historic District will be subject to market pressures to demolish the auto centric 50s and 60s apartment buildings for denser, smaller, no parking buildings. If the City is serious about demolitions and renter displacement, the City should subject demolition of sound, habitable housing to reasonable restrictions before a demolition permit is issued.</p> <p>I think a design review overlay to be applied to the two new RH zones, RM 3 and RM 4, when they are not in an historic district, is a good idea.</p> <p>Beginning on page 14, the proposed draft describes the changes from the Discussion Draft, 13 in number. I support items 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10 if a compatibility standard is added, 11, amd 13 if the 10 unit exemption is deleted.</p>
30733	dean gisvold	2225 NE 15th Ave	Portland	OR	<p>Memorandum</p> <p>To:PSC</p> <p>From:Dean Gisvold</p> <p>Date:June 25, 2018 - Map App Testimony for Irvington Community Association</p> <p>Re:Better Housing By Design (BHD) - Comments on Proposed Draft -- ICA</p> <p>BHD represents the efforts of Bureau of Planning and Sustainability (BPS) to address issues regarding the so-called "missing middle housing" in multifamily dwelling (MFD) zones. The Mixed Use project addressed the missing middle issues, in mixed use zones, and RIP is trying to deal with missing middle housing in single family zones. BHD focuses on the MFD zones of which the Irvington Historic District (IHD) has three, currently R-1, R-2, and RH. BHD will change the nomenclature to RM1, RM2, RM3, and RM4.</p> <p>Context: BHD is the most significant rewriting of the zoning code for multifamily zones for many years. Ten percent of the City's land area is in MFD zones. The IHD has approximately 7 blocks of RM1, 20 blocks of RM2, 8 blocks of RM3, and 5 half blocks of RM4. All of the MFD zones are located within, and covered by the IHD regulations and historic review. BHD does not seek to make changes to the historic review criteria, which has been in effect in the IHD since October, 2010, or to the areas covered by MFD zones.</p> <p>IHD has 193 buildings in the R1 zone, RM2 under BHD (118 contributing), 60 in the R2 zone, RM1 under BHD (48 contributing), and 59 in the RH zone, RM3 and RM4 under BHD (44 contributing). This means IHD has 102 multifamily zoned sites where demolition is allowed for potential replacement with larger, denser construction. See Attachment A for the locations of the proposed four multifamily zones in Irvington.</p> <p>A pro argument is that BHD may provide economic incentives for replacing some of the low-density parking-centric housing units built in the 1960s and 1970s in the RM2 zone. However, by providing such incentives, BHD may increase demolition of presently "affordable" housing, labeled noncontributing, for those folks</p>
30734	Hillary Adam	1900 SW 4th Ave	Portland	OR	<p>Please accept this testimony on behalf of the Portland Historic Landmarks Commission.</p>

30735	Travis Phillips	6329 NE MLK Blvd	Portland	OR	<p>Dear Members of the Portland Planning &amp; Sustainability Commission,</p> <p>Attached, please find Portland Community Reinvestment Initiatives' (PCRI) letter regarding the Better Housing by Design Proposed Draft. Thank you for your time and your thoughtfulness in this process.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>
30736	rick Michaelson	906 NW 23rd Ave	Portland	OR	<p>See attached file for my testimony. Graphics would not copy to here</p> <p>Rick Michaelson</p>
30737	Iain MacKenzie	915 SE 35th Ave	Portland	OR	<p>See attached PDF</p>
30742	Ted Reid	600 NE Grand AVE	Portland	OR	<p>Thank you for considering the Metro Planning and Development department's comments.</p> <p>Based on the city's economic modeling, Metro Planning staff are concerned about the viability of additional housing development under the proposal. However, this appears to us to be a challenge related to the city's Inclusionary Zoning program rather than being an issue specific to the Better Housing by Design proposal.</p> <p>The revenue from the additional units that would be allowed under the proposal does not appear to be enough to balance out the cost of additional affordable housing units required under Inclusionary Zoning. The Floor Area Ratio bonus appears to allow a project currently capped at below 20 units to build more units (which we support). However, that bonus triggers Inclusionary Zoning requirements, wiping out residual land value and making the bonus units less financially viable.</p>
30744	Jack Carter	1930 NW Irving Street	Portland	OR	<p>I am writing to oppose the creation and application of a new RM4 zone to the portion of the Alphabet District below NW 21st Avenue. I have lived in this area for twenty years and my wife and I own two properties in the area. The area is known and loved for its mixed urban use and combination of large older houses, many of them victorian townhouses, and moderately sized apartment buildings. The blend creates an environment that supports a vibrant, thriving urban neighborhood and a compatible home for the many historic properties in the area. High density development such as that envisioned in an RM4 zone would be visually incompatible with the rest of the neighborhood and would isolate and render contextually incoherent the valuable historic buildings. I hope you will hear my strong opposition, and that of others in the neighborhood, and protect this vital urban and historic neighborhood.</p> <p>Sincerely,  Jack Carter  1930 NW Irving Street, Apt 604</p>
30745	John Gibbon	9822 SW Quail Post Rd.	Portland	OR	<p>I have attached BHBD testimony submitted to provide the PSC a context for the impact of this project on one of SW Portland's 17 neighborhoods. Even in an neighborhood more welcoming than many toward both this and the RIP project, the challenges produced by getting the density cart ahead of the transportation and storm water infrastructure horse raised significant questions that the commission should give attention to.</p>
30746	Holly Balcom	2158 NE Halsey St	Portland	OR	<p>I'm writing in support of the Better Housing By Design project. I'm especially happy to hear that much of the NW Alphabet district will be kept at 4:1 FAR (RM4) as that allows more homes in this popular neighborhood. I would encourage you to expand RM4 to the whole current RH zone. I live in Sullivan's Gulch and many of the old, historic apartment buildings are no longer code-compliant due to downzoning. Our neighborhood association is worried we will loose these naturally affordable homes if they ever need to be rebuilt or re-developed as a result. Let alone build new homes at comparable density!</p> <p>I don't think the deep, suburban setbacks are compatible with the stated goal of promoting missing middle homes. The traditional courtyard developments in</p>
30747	Gregory Theisen	2257 NW Raleigh St	Portland	OR	<p>Testimony attached.</p>
30748	Svetlana Fursova	12246 SE Tibbetts ST	Portland	OR	<p>I oppose the new zoning codes.</p>

30749	Tanner Baldus	4505 N Haight Ave	Portland	OR	<p>We need to do everything we can to alleviate our housing crisis so I heartily endorse the amendments proposed in the Portland For Everyone Coalition letter.</p> <p>Again that is to</p> <p>Increase maximum Floor Area Ratios (FARs) and bonuses in RM1, RM2, and RM3</p> <p>Increase densities so that truly multi-dwelling developments will occur in the relatively little amount of space where these zones are mapped.</p> <p>Increase height allowances in many zones</p> <p>Reduce standard front and side setbacks to 0 feet across all multi-dwelling zones.</p> <p>Reduce minimum requirements for sites 7,500 square feet or less, including landscaping.</p> <p>Ensure that affordable housing development is feasible in East Portland</p> <p>Map more higher-density multi-dwelling zones along key corridors</p> <p>Ensure that more rental housing will be provided, not just for-sale</p>
30750	Braden Bernards	8600 SW White Pine Lane	Portland	OR	<p>Hi Planning and Sustainability Commission--</p> <p>I'll keep this brief! Setbacks have never made for a good city, let alone a great one. People want to be cuddled by gorgeous buildings, not awash in seas of parking and value-landscaping (a shrub here, a shrub there!).</p> <p>Let's allow for real density--FAR up to 5:1, etc. Let's let more people live and love this city, and push them all closer together to watch their ideas mingle. The benefits of urban agglomeration only take hold if people are, say, encouraged to agglomerate.</p>
30751	Doug Klotz	1908 SE 35th Pl	Portland	OR	<p>Attached are my comments on Side Setbacks, including zero setback building examples.</p>
30752	Doug Klotz	1901 SE 35th Pl	Portland	OR	<p>Attached are some suggestions for minor upzoning from RM1 to RM2 along several busy corridors.</p>

30753 Eun-Sun Lee 1916 NW 29th Ave Portland OR

Comments on proposed zoning code changes:

Multi units should be required, no monster mansions:

The FAR should have proportional restrictions that limit the ability of developers to create four story single family houses of immense size. For example a 5000 ft.<sup>2</sup> lot should not be permitted to have 7500 ft.<sup>2</sup> of living space unless less reasonably sized multiple units are included in the design.

Parking

The city should outlaw any development that does not include off-street parking for all multi-unit developments. I am against reducing requirements for off-street parking. Double-size, or larger, garages should be limited to one single curb cut per 50 feet of curb space. It is genuinely ludicrous to imagine that residents within the next generation (15 years) will cease having cars because it becomes more difficult to park. Is the city creating public transportation infrastructure as part of these zoning changes? No, and there is nothing but pie-in-the-sky thinking to imagine that private capital will provide any transportation solutions to address this giveaway of the common areas of the street. Off-street parking once built, can later be created to other uses for reasonably predictable density issues. For example: parking areas can become small bespoke workshops. But housing will not be converted to parking. This is an opportunity to deal in reality and protect poor people from limitations on transportation options.

Information disclosure indicates a violation of public trust:

We have submitted these comments with a belief that this is a done-deal process benefiting developers. We do not believe that the information provided to regular citizens is clear or transparent. An example is the front page of the website which says that wheelchair use will be affected. This is announced without describing whether that effect is to require more wheelchair use, or to eliminate the requirement that buildings be visited by wheelchairs. Have any of the people reading these comments attempted to discern that answer using the information provided?

The website information presentation should include click through menus so that citizens may better understand these proposals. The fact that there are no such click through opportunities for easy access to this information is an indicator that the elites proposing it have no interest in changing anything based on any opinions of anyone other than themselves.

Height

We live in a house that is approximately 18 feet tall with a basement. The changes would permit a 45 foot height on our property and on adjacent properties. 45 feet is so high that it would eliminate all privacy in adjoining back yards or patios for a significant distance on each block. A quality of life of Portlanders who like to

30754 erik matthews 3534 SE Main Street Portland OR

PLEASE DISREGARD PREVIOUS TESTIMONY AND USE THIS:

June 24, 2018

To: betterhousing@portlandoregon.gov  
Mayor Wheeler

RE: Better Housing by Design Project  
Dear Mr. Cunningham, Mayor Wheeler”

The RNA would like to thank Bill Cunningham and his team at BPS for having clear materials that are easy to follow. Such clear, simple, and well-defined documents, images, and renderings were a boon to our community’s ability to review, process, and agree to support of the following points.

The RNA Supports the following recommendations as-written...

2. Require higher-density development to include visitable units.
4. Provide incentives for preserving existing affordable housing and trees through transfers of development rights.
5. Allow small-scale commercial uses on major corridors and near transit stations
8. Allow alternatives to conventional landscaping.
9. Limit large surface parking lots and asphalt paving.
11. Limit garages to no more than 50 percent of building street frontages.
12. Require building entrances to be oriented to streets or to courtyards.
15. Require building height transitions to single-dwelling zones.
20. Strengthen minimum density requirements.

The RNA Supports the following with changes...

6. Require residential outdoor areas in high density zones. (?20,000 sqft)

We request that outdoor or green space requirements be the larger 48 sqft for all sizes of properties.

7. Require shared common areas, such as courtyards, for large sites more than 20,000 square feet.



30755 Paul Frazier 7226 N Greenwich Ave Portland OR

Hello,

We need more housing, density, transit and greenspace. And we need to do this while finding room for more and more people. How can we solve this puzzle?

Get rid of single family housing zones. Get rid of parking.

Create amazing bike/alternative transit infrastructure.

Crete density of all kinds!

I support Portland for everyones recommendations and encourage us to think big and bold to help solve this housing emergency. Just today another report came out of Seattle that rents are stabilizing and even falling in response to their building spree! Lets do the same!

Increase maximum Floor Area Ratios (FARs) and bonuses in RM1, RM2, and RM3 so that there is a discernible difference between standards currently being proposed for Portland's neighborhood residential zones and denser multi-dwelling zones.

Increase densities so that truly multi-dwelling developments will occur in the relatively little amount of space where these zones are mapped.

Increase height allowances in many zones to give greater flexibility across projects, benefiting bonus utilization, layouts, tree preservation, and other factors.

Reduce standard front and side setbacks to 0 feet across all multi-dwelling zones.

Reduce minimum requirements for sites 7,500 square feet or less, including landscaping.

Adjust open space requirements to yield more desirable building forms, site layouts, and more useable open spaces.

Consider where maximum heights, FAR limits and/or step-down requirements may unintentionally render affordable housing bonuses unusable, counter to the proposal's intentions.

Ensure that affordable housing development is feasible in East Portland: Don't layer on so many conditions in pursuit of perfect urban form that affordable

30756 Beth Hyams 1924 NW 29th Ave. Portland OR

I am concerned about trends in Portland that diminish the very features that attract people here to live and visit. Among those attributes are the older and historic homes, quiet neighborhoods and tree-lined streets. These proposed zoning changes would encourage demolition of older homes, destruction of trees and green spaces, and would crowd the streets further with parked cars.

^

This proposal says that it would include "reduced requirements for off-street parking." Portland already has many neighborhoods, especially in the densely-populated NW quadrant, where parking is nearly impossible, due to the lack of spaces provided in apartment buildings. Too many developments have already been allowed with insufficient parking. The theory that buildings without parking will attract people without cars is flawed; new residents will instead add to the competition for parking spaces on the street.

^

30757 Emily Guise 7005 NE Broadway Portland OR

Dear Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Thank you very much for the opportunity to weigh in on the Better Housing by Design Draft. As a person who rents and who lives in an apartment, I agree wholeheartedly with the recommendations proposed by Portland for Everyone, including:

Increase maximum Floor Area Ratios (FARs) and bonuses in RM1, RM2, and RM3 so that there is a discernible difference between standards currently being proposed for Portland's neighborhood residential zones and denser multi-dwelling zones.

Increase densities so that truly multi-dwelling developments will occur in the relatively little amount of space where these zones are mapped.

Increase height allowances in many zones to give greater flexibility across projects, benefiting bonus utilization, layouts, tree preservation, and other factors.

Reduce standard front and side setbacks to 0 feet across all multi-dwelling zones.

Reduce minimum requirements for sites 7,500 square feet or less, including landscaping.

Adjust open space requirements to yield more desirable building forms, site layouts, and more useable open spaces.

Consider where maximum heights, FAR limits and/or step-down requirements may unintentionally render affordable housing bonuses unusable, counter to the proposal's intentions.

Ensure that affordable housing development is feasible in East Portland: Don't layer on so many conditions in pursuit of perfect urban form that affordable housing development is stymied. Also, consider spending increased staff time, attention, and resources on how to encourage affordable housing development and form appropriate for East Portland over spending additional resources on Inner Ring neighborhoods.

Map more higher-density multi-dwelling zones along key corridors. There are a few places in particular where up-zoning would help implement the Comprehensive

30758 Daniel Newberry 13338 SE Cora Portland OR

Monday, June 25, 2018

Catherine Schultz, Chair

Portland Planning & Sustainability Commission

VIA EMAIL at [psc@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:psc@portlandoregon.gov)

Dear Commissioner Schultz and the Planning & Sustainability Commission,

On behalf of Portland's Urban Forestry Commission, please accept this letter as public comment on the Better Housing By Design discussion draft. I am authorized by the UFC to submit this letter.

First, we are grateful to Bill Cunningham, Bureau of Planning and Sustainability (BPS) planner, for presenting the changes since the last draft and for answering our many questions, at our monthly meeting last Thursday, June 21, 2018.

We support and recognize the careful work of BPS in adding features to BHBD to preserve greenspace in proposed multifamily housing developments. As affordable housing is a major goal of this plan, it is important that low income residents enjoy the health and heat island reduction benefits trees provide at their place of residence, as do the Portland's wealthier residents, many of whom live in tree-rich neighborhoods. Please do not approve additional exemptions from tree planting and preservation requirements for affordable housing, and consider addressing current exemptions in Title 11, Trees. Title 11 exempts affordable housing projects from the tree preservation and planting standards that most other development projects must meet. These exemptions further exacerbate the inequities associated with tree deficient neighborhoods. The more that the City of Portland can do to promote economic and racial equity in this context, the better.

We strongly support the proposed maximum of 30% of the site for parking, and no more than 15% of the site area in asphalt. Any incentive for developers to use materials for paving with a higher reflectivity than asphalt would be desirable, as that will likely reduce the heat island effect.

Limiting impervious area in development situations is important for preserving future space for large form trees and for protecting existing trees. The UFC submitted comments to this effect in the recent Residential Infill Project draft. This concept is just as important for BHBD as for RIP. We urge you to consider further limits on impervious areas beyond those numbers referenced in the previous paragraph, and to urge the City Council to enact impervious surface

30759 Beth Hyams 2122 NW Everett Portland OR

I am concerned about trends in Portland that diminish the very features that attract people here to live and visit. Among those attributes are the older and historic homes, quiet neighborhoods and tree-lined streets. These proposed zoning changes would encourage demolition of older homes, destruction of trees and green spaces, and would crowd the streets further with parked cars.Â

Â

The Alphabet District has many houses that date back to the 19th century. Visitors to the neighborhood can be seen gawking at the architecture, and enjoying a taste of an earlier time. These buildings give Portland its flavor and character. Many would be lost to this zoning change.

This proposal says that it would include "reduced requirements for off-street parking." Portland already has many neighborhoods, especially in the densely-populated NW quadrant, where parking is nearly impossible, due to the lack of spaces provided in apartment buildings. Too many developments have already been  
June 25, 2018

30760 Matthew Serres 511 SW 10th Avenue Portland OR

Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission  
Better Housing Testimony  
1900 SW 4th Ave, Suite 7100  
Portland, OR 97201

Dear Commissioners,

The following comments are in response to the current Better Housing by Design Proposed Draft (May 2018). These comments are prepared by Disability Rights Oregon staff attorney, Matthew Serres. The Better Housing by Design proposal is an opportunity to expand the ability of individuals with disabilities to have greater freedom in terms of where and how they live by increasing the availability of affordable and accessible housing. Disability Rights Oregon supports the inclusion of visitability standards contained in the Better Housing by Design proposal and hopes that testimony from developers and other community stakeholders does not degrade the visitability provisions in the current draft. In fact, those provisions should be strengthened and additional enforcement provisions included.

Because far too little of the housing built today in Portland is accessible to persons with disabilities, the visitability provisions are critically important and represent a starting point for future efforts to increase the stock of accessible housing units. We encourage the commission to continue to explore ways to enforce accessibility standards and incentivize universally-designed housing and environments. Many design elements such as zero-step entries are undeniably necessary for providing access for persons with disabilities and are a benefit for everyone.

In terms of potential improvements to the proposal, we suggest eliminating the option for developers to access smaller setbacks by opting to raise the ground floor 2 feet to limit privacy impacts. (See Volume 1, p 41.) Two feet does not accomplish the stated goal of limiting privacy impacts, yet provides an unnecessary barrier to many individuals with a disability. A developer accessing smaller setbacks by raising the ground floor 2 feet would have to construct a 20-foot walkway to meet the maximum allowed slope of for visitability (10 percent). A 20-foot walkway is a burden on persons with disabilities. In order to reduce setbacks, developers would most likely abandon accessibility altogether. We recommend eliminating that incentive for reduced setbacks.

We suggest increasing the requirement for visitable units to at least 40 percent of units (two out of every five) for projects with unit densities exceeding 2000

30761 Meryl Redisch 1918 SW Pendleton St Portland OR

Dear Chair Shultz and Commissioners,

I am writing to share my views and provide comments regarding the Better Housing and Design Project that is well underway.

Although i completed my terms on the Urban Forestry Commission in February, i attended their last meeting to hear Bill Cunningham present the proposed draft summary to the Commission and to answer questions that were raised from a March 19th letter to the PSC. Bill did an excellent job responding to the UFC's list of concerns and encouraged the Commission and others to submit comments. The following are points worth emphasizing as you take into account the perspectives from a wide array of stakeholders.

1. I support the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability implementing a more flexible approach to street design. However, its critical that Title 11 tree density standards are upheld by the preservation and planting of trees rather than a fee in lieu of tree planting.

2. I support the program that Transfers System Development Rights and pleased to learn that the geographic threshold will not be limited to within 2 miles. However, i continue to question how developers, particularly small businesses that may not have additional properties, will take advantage of this option. How will this option and additional help for interested developers occur and be tracked?

3. I support the flexible building setbacks for ground floor privacy and neighborhood aesthetic. There needs to be attention paid to ensure that sufficient space is allocated to street trees. In situations where new projects require sidewalks, please allow below ground space for trees to expand their roots and thrive. Protocols need to be developed so that cables, utilities and other under- ground infrastructure does not take up the entire planting strip and therefore prevent a large-form tree from being planted.

4. I support limiting impervious surfaces and requiring wherever possible, either concrete or pavers to be used. This is an important next step for the City to undertake and consistent with the UFC and community's comments on the Residential Infill Project. I support the UFC's recommendation that the PSC request the City Council to limit impervious surfaces citywide.

5. The images of East Portland's long, linear blocks showing conifer and other trees is really positive. I credit the bureau's community outreach work which resulted in understanding what is important to residents including; space for children to play, space for cars, safety corridors, trees,shade and more. I appreciate the priority balancing act that has be considered. That said, East Portland still retains many large conifers and small groves. I strongly urge you to think creatively

30762 Mary Vogel 1220 SW 12th Ave. Portland OR

Commissioners:

Please see my attached comments in overall support of Better Housing by Design with some suggested modifications. I've tried to format them to make them easier to read. In response to the Design Commission's comment about limiting the percentage of landscaping devoted to green infrastructure, I would invite them to see some of the best that nature has to offer with me.

Thanks,

Mary Vogel, CNU-A

30763 Christopher Mommsen 2715 SE 17th Ave Portland OR

I support the letter submitted by Portland for Everyone.

30764 Madeline Kovacs 133 SW 2nd Ave Portland OR

Dear members of the Portland Planning & Sustainability Commission,

Attached please find Portland for Everyone's coalition letter on the Proposed Draft of the Better by Design zoning project. We want to stress that Portlanders seeking housing desperately need a plan that will deliver more housing, and ensure that affordable housing projects are feasible and competitive.

We would also like to thank staff for their time and care in crafting these proposals.

Sincerely,

Madeline Kovacs

30765	Tony Jordan	4540 SE Yamhill St.	Portland	OR	<p>I encourage the PSC to support the changes recommended in the Portland for Everyone letter regarding BHD.</p> <p>Particularly, PSC should recommend eliminating minimum parking requirements for all residential uses. The BHD policy is forward thinking in requiring open space and "green" features like permeable surfaces and restricting paved lot coverage, but these are hollow sentiments if parking is required in the first place. There is no such thing as "green" required parking, eliminate the requirements and THEN require the parking to be more environmentally friendly. Anything else will simply increase the cost of housing and reduce the amount of housing built.</p>
30766	Doug Klotz	1908 SE 35th Pl	Portland	OR	<p>Chair Schultz and Commissioners: Regarding the letter from Matthew Serres, of Disability Rights Oregon: Mr. Serres argues for not allowing buildings closer to the sidewalk if the first floor is raised two feet. I would agree that there should not be the requirement for the first floor to be raised. But, there shouldn't be a 10' or 5' front setback requirement, either, as these also increase the distance those using mobility devices have to travel from the sidewalk, and give the</p>
30767	Thomas Karwaki	7139 N. Macrum Ave	Portland	OR	<p>The University Park Neighborhood Association's Board and its Land Use &amp; Transportation Committee suggest that the minimum setback requirements be reduced for the sides of buildings to zero so as to promote flexible developments such as town homes. The UPNA Board and Land Use Committee request that the proposed draft include incentives for Universal Design, and that visitable units be defined as having 36 inch doors and hallways. UPNA supports eliminating auto servicing as a use. The proposed draft should be amended to require TDM plans for all development over 5 units and without geographic limits as to the proximity to transit. Parking requirements for RM1 and RM2 are adequate if PBOT will do what Seattle has done and limit most residential streets to parking on one side and if the City requires on-street parking permits. Otherwise, a 1 car per 1 unit rule seems appropriate for non-central city areas. ODOT vehicle registrations suggest that most residences in Portland have 2 or more vehicles, suggesting that anything less than 1 unit 1 car on-site will result in significantly increased on-street parking demand. Almost 50% of the residences in UPNA have over 3 vehicles. UPNA's Board would also request that additional incentives for the preservation of</p>
30768	Shane Boland	4134 N. Colonial Ave	Portland	OR	<p>Please increase FAR on sites in R1-R3 zones when existing structures are preserved or re-purposed to encourage creative and affordable in-fill projects. Developers and builders should be incentivized to expand upon the existing framework of neighborhoods, not ignore it.</p>
30769	Doug Klotz	1908 SE 35th Pl	Portland	OR	<p>I support the thorough and forward-thinking letter from Portland For Everyone. I agree with all of their points, including the need to raise the FARs and other allowances to ensure that more housing can and will be built, and especially raising allowance even further on well-served Corridors and Transit Streets.</p>
30770	Jesse Lopez	2250 NE Flanders St.	Portland	OR	<p>Thank you for reading through all these comments. You're almost near the end!</p> <p>Dear Commissioners,</p> <p>I am writing in general support of the Better Housing by Design project, but believe that it could be improved with some general enhancements to ensure the city policies enable development that facilitates increased affordable housing and walkable areas.</p> <p>Generally, I'd ask that the commission allow for increased density, height allowances, FAR bonuses, and the elimination of parking requirements across the entire city.</p> <p>A couple of specific points, I'm opposed to any downzoning in Goose Hollow or Alphabet District because it would prohibit the exact building types that make those neighborhoods so walkable and desirable. I would also suggest upzoning RM2 to RM3 along Sandy and in Kerns because that would be consistent with many of the oldest multi-family buildings such as the one I live in.</p> <p>Thanks for your time and work on these important issues.</p>
30771	Jonathan Korman	5226 SE 67th Ave	Portland	OR	<p>More density. More rental properties. More transit. More local services. More mixed use.</p> <p>YES IN MY BACKYARD</p>

30772	Dani Zeghib	8803 SE Rhone St	Portland	OR	<p>Dear PSC and city staff:</p> <p>I am an architectural designer, property owner, and Portland resident since 2008. I am also a small developer--a member of the Portland Small Developer Alliance--though I am representing myself with this testimony.Â Â</p> <p>While the intentions of the Better Housing by Design proposal are good, and I support many aspects (e.g. reducing parking requirements, moving towards a form based code rather than density maximums), I'm compelled to write due to other aspects that will ultimately result in more housing unaffordability and a decrease in the quality of life for many current and future Portlanders.Â Â</p> <p>Because 3 of the 4 properties I own are in the current R2 zone, I will limit my testimony to certain aspects of the proposal that pertain to that zone in particular. Specifically, there are serious implications to proposed changes in building height, Floor Area Ratio, and "affordability bonuses."Â Â</p> <p>FAR</p> <p>Current lot coverage and building height in the R2 zone (the most abundant multifamily zone in the city) is 50% and 40 feet maximum. For a 10,000 sqft lot, this would mean 4 stories and 20,000 sqft total, or what would amount to a 2:1 FAR. If divided into 5 (or 6, with amenity bonuses) lots, this could lead to six attached or detached family sized houses plus six 800 sqft ADUs, housing 12 families. The houses might also serve as intergenerational housing and/or shared housing for roommates.</p> <p>The BHD proposes merging the current R3 and R2 zones into one zone, RM1. Staff proposes a FAR of just 1:1, meaning that on a 10,000 sqft lot at 50% lot coverage, 2 stories and 10,000 sqft would be allowed. While the city proposes to remove density maximums, allowing an infinite number of units, it is also cutting in half the allowable floor area on any given R2 lot.</p> <p>The likely result of this would be many very small units and very little, if any family sized units built. Further, though there may be more individual units, fewer individual humans will be able to live there. Taking the 10,000 sqft lot example, the likeliest scenario is for 19 units of approximately 500 sqft per unit, meaning studios or 1 bedroom units. Assuming 1.5 people on average live in each unit, this would house about 28 people--none of them families or children.</p>
30773	Esme Miller	6520 SE Duke St	Portland	OR	<p>I have only a few requests of the city in planning new rules for multi-dwelling zones:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.) Please please please allow for enough housing to be built for everyone who currently lives in the city, and everyone who is expected to arrive in coming years. This is not pie in the sky. It is the basics of a humane society.</li> <li>2.) Please be aware of the history of zoning as an instrument of segregation and the vested interest current homeowners have in housing scarcity.</li> </ol>
30774	Jill Warren	607 NW 18th Ave	Portland	OR	<p>Please include my testimony regarding proposed zone changes in the Alphabet Historic District.</p>
30775	David Alberti	6804 N Maryland Ave	Portland	OR	<p>After reviewing the information you sent, my concerns are around not having adequate parking for the new development. Additionally an alternate proposal would be that all new housing developments, would have a required percentage be affordable housing. Also that new developments should have 2 and 3 bedroom apartments vs studios and 1 bedrooms units. Lastly, It would be suggested to have tax incentives for developers who implement the affordable housing described</p>
30776	Dave Brook	1300 NE 16th Ave	Portland	OR	<p>Letter attached.</p>
30777	Gwenn A. Baldwin	1020 SW Taylor St, Suite 770	Portland	OR	<p>On behalf of Executive Director Mike Kingsella, Oregon LOCUS appreciates the opportunity to submit written testimony on the Proposed Draft Report for Better Housing by Design, and we look forward to working with you, the Commission and bureau staff going forward.</p>
30779	Lawrence K. Kojaku	2448 NW Westover Rd #502	Portland	OR	<p>Letter attached.</p>

30780	James Muggenburg	8003 N Crawford St	Portland	OR	Letter attached
30781	Monica McGee-Stopper	225 NE Lombard St	Portland	OR	Letter attached.
30782	Louise Pender	1514 NE 76th Ave	Portland	OR	Letter attached.
30783	Jill Arnel	2114 NE Everett St	Portland	OR	Letter attached.
30784	Cindy Hurley	24 NE 16th Ave	Portland	OR	Letter attached.
30785	Stephanie Whitlock	701 SE Grand Ave	Portland	OR	Letter attached.
30786	Chris Eykamp	3534 SE Main St	Portland	OR	Letter attached.
30787	Michael Leis	1840 SW Main St	Portland	OR	<p>Thank you for having this medium to voice our concerns and opinions. I am impressed by the activity as well, which means it is a very important process overall. Writing on behalf of 1840 SW Main St, as well as in the midst of a project to increase the density of my property from a single family structure to a 3 unit, 4 story building, I wanted to weigh in. I understand the concern by many that quiet, low density neighborhoods are going to be missed, but I would argue that the growth of Portland is not merely a product of those moving to Portland, but also internal growth based on a previous generations' tendency to have more children than that of the current. It is a bit selfish and short-sighted to prohibit expansion in order to maintain current desires, while wanting or thinking there is an increased value of one's own property at the same time. Value is a byproduct of functionality and service, not merely one's own regard. I am also against massive, profit driven commercial buildings that do not account for societal needs.</p> <p>I am for a very simplified approach that is open and non-cumbersome, but offers incentives for moderate building activity to stymie accelerated, unkempt growth and one that incentivizes moderate growth. I think if home owners take on the responsibility of increasing density on their own properties rather than relying on continuous large-scale commercial entities, a more appropriate growth rate would ensue and allow for an increased density without overbearing buildings.</p> <p>I was a bit concerned with the delineation between RM3 and RM4 zones and could not figure how the zones were selected other than maybe due to existing structures already on the property. I think pushing for RM4 for most areas and then incentivizing smaller scale buildings with more open spaces surrounding would give Portland better characteristics during this growth cycle. As it stands and although some argue for or against the RM3 and RM4 classification, it is a bit unfair to either side to arbitrarily select this classification. Being classified as RM3 for my property, I would have wanted the option for RM4 classification in order to</p>
30788	Alan DeLaTorre	Post Office Box 751	Portland	OR	I understand that this testimony is late, but am hoping to get it on the record. Even if it is not officially on the record, it is important to note that the aging and disability communities can and should be involved in supporting a request for an exemption to the build code, as detailed at the end of the testimony.
30789	Mark Wyman	2209 N Schoefield St	Portland	OR	Letter attached.