

Ana Azizkhani

#93419 | February 16, 2020

Testimony to **Portland City Council** on the **Residential Infill Project, Recommended Draft**

Why is a public testimony hearing during the day when many people will be at work? Last time, City Council had one during the day and the second after 5. It should be that way again in March. Please change this so Portland residents can show up.

Testimony is presented without formatting.

David Robboy

#93351 | February 18, 2020

Testimony to **Portland City Council** on the **Residential Infill Project, Recommended Draft**

I wish to testify in favor of the amendments proposed by staff, to be considered by City Council on March 12. In particular, I favor the deeper affordability bonus option. I also believe that non-profit organizations such as churches should be allowed to build affordable units and exempted from street improvements such as traffic lights and curb improvements. We have a housing crisis, and these improvements are luxuries in comparison with the need for more housing.

Testimony is presented without formatting.



February 18, 2020

From: Partners for Affordable Homeownership (PAH)

Directors: Steve Messinetti, Habitat Portland Metro East; Ernesto Fonseca, Hacienda;
Peg Malloy, Portland Housing Center; Diane Linn, Proud Ground

Re: Allowing Fee-Simple Ownership As Part of Residential Infill Project (RIP)

Dear Portland Housing Bureau leadership and members of the Portland City Council,

We are writing to request modifications to the Residential Infill Project to make it work for a wider range of for-profit and non-profit builders. These housing types are ideal for first-time homebuyers, and RIP ensures that they will fit in well with existing neighborhoods. However, they will only be built if Portland's homebuilders can actually use these provisions. A few changes are in order for this to happen.

As currently proposed, RIP provisions do not support a fee simple ownership models. This is a major obstacle, since builders, buyers and lenders all prefer fee simple ownership. It is true that some builders have reluctantly started using condominium ownership as an end run to Portland's unwieldy and time-consuming subdivision processes. Even so, it is unlikely that for-sale versions of these alternative housing types will get much traction if condominium is the only possible option.

Habitat for Humanity has been predominately developing small condominium projects on current R1 and R2 sites, typically with 10-30 townhome style units. PCRI also has experience developing small condominiums, and Hacienda is planning to take on its first affordable homeownership development in the coming years.

While it is possible to develop smaller condo projects that RIP makes possible, affordability is more difficult (especially under 60% AMI). Condo expense issues include: condo process costs, small buildings raise buyer's monthly HOA fees, it's difficult for developers to get construction financing, more difficult for buyers to get mortgages, and condo management companies are reluctant to take on small projects.

We are confident a fee simple option would result in more nonprofit developers building and selling more units on infill lots priced for lower income buyers. Fortunately, code language to provide fee simple options has already been written. Portland's existing "corner duplex" code allows builders to insert property lines to create attached homes. This language can be adapted to other "alternative housing" situations.

It is beyond the scope of the RIP to reform Portland's subdivision process, but that's no reason to give up on the notion of small homes on their own small lots. In fact, this is *exactly* the kind of housing we should be supporting to meet the demands of low and moderate-income homebuyers who have been shut out from the new-home market. **Thank you for your consideration.**

Steve Messinetti

#93406 | February 18, 2020

Testimony to **Portland City Council** on the **Residential Infill Project, Recommended Draft**

Please see the attached recommendation from Partners for Affordable Homeownership in regard to creating a fee-simple ownership option as part of the Residential Infill Project.

Testimony is presented without formatting.

Mary Ann Schwab

#93407 | February 18, 2020

Testimony to **Portland City Council** on the **Residential Infill Project, Recommended Draft**

Whoops, on my part. Whenever the hurrier I go, the behind I get. This whoooooops proves it. Cities — my quick thinking meant [all Bureaus] propaganda. My error should be City's Propaganda (possessive). Next RIP Hearing with public testimony has been scheduled TIME CERTAIN 2:00 P.M. on Thursday, March 12, 2020. Thank you for saving the date. I apologize for any confusion or inconvenience my error has caused... .

***** Please keep the RIP Agenda open seven days so Portlander's can response to the RIP proposed amendments and testimony given today. Portlander's need time to do their homework, starting with watching three (3) links below: Starting with the following: 1. January 24, 2020, KBOO TRIPP-P sat down with a Data Analyst, Research Activist and Global Integrated Systems Engineer named MK. Here is that podcast link: <https://kboo.fm/media/78498-15-tripp-p-24jan2020> 2. Demand Affordability – Preserve, Protect, Prioritize Affordable Housing <http://www.demandaffordability.org/> 3. Demand Affordability - YouTube https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCFU87GOaMoHjbb7T6K_PTzA RIP Portland and The Affordable Housing Crisis - YouTube https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fTUn-phSeYA&list=PLdlmuScnZTE6GcrFDThawljwrtcQcxw_ The RIP is intended to make the Residential zones more affordable but there is no economic analysis to go with the cities city's propaganda. The affordable single family homes are currently being demolished and replaced with two unaffordable ones. The market rate units must increase to pay for the Subsidized and ADA units. Portlander's will find shocking economic analyst and unintended livability impacts if RIP is approved. Depending on the middle property lot size, RIP proposes up to eight (8) 1-2 bedroom Auxiliary Dwelling Units (ADU). Let's consider impacts when 4 ADUs, equals eight toilets, showers, and laundry flowing into turn of the century 12" terracotta sewer pipes. Who pays for new sewer lines the Developer's Systems Development Charges, or those of us living on the same street? ADU tenants adding 12 rolling Waste Management Containers, and 4 yellow tubs on the street? ... as street parking for tenant's 4 to 6 vehicles and/or commuter bicycles...? Nor does RIP address mid-day solar for vegetable gardens, fruit trees, sandboxes, dog houses, swings — safe fenced play area for children. In fact most ADU's are the size of a 400 sq. ft, two-car garage, without a second bedroom for children — worse no washer/dryer. For a family of 4 earning \$15.70 spends 30% gross income on rent — at MFI 30% — or — MFI 60%...? My fear RIPs unintended consequences for lack of 2-3 affordable units, Portland's inner-city work force has been moving out of Multnomah County. Only to compromise Climate Change by driving in

bumper-to-bumper traffic to and from work — thereby losing precious family time. As for RIP goals for walkable neighborhoods...? Have you noticed how many full-service grocery stores closed through the City in recent months? Please leave the RIP Record open seven days so that the public can response to the amendments and testimony given today. Let's keep Portland Neighborly, Respectfully, Mary Ann Schwab, Community Advocate Sunnyside Neighborhood Resident since 1971 If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell — City Council — what they do not want to hear. Yes, I tricked George Orwell statement.

Testimony is presented without formatting.

Milton Jones

#93389 | February 19, 2020

Testimony to **Portland City Council** on the **Residential Infill Project, Recommended Draft**

1) It seems like consideration of RIP requirement details is premature until the rules for the State requirements are finalized. Portland's RIP and HB2001 need to be considered together. 2) Multi-family housing should be built in Centers and on Corridors as contemplated by Portland's Comprehensive Plan. Doing otherwise fails to take advantage of our efforts to improve the use of public transportation. Looking at maps of Portland, and previous reports, it appears that there is plenty of such property that is under utilized and capable of fully serving expected growth.

Testimony is presented without formatting.

Milton Jones

#93390 | February 19, 2020

Testimony to **Portland City Council** on the **Residential Infill Project, Recommended Draft**

Missing from the information I have reviewed is any financial analysis of the economic impacts of this project on the City and its taxpayers. Question: Does this project pencil out for the City and its taxpayers? Almost assuredly, implementation of the Residential Infill Project will result in an increase in property tax receipts and fees paid by residents. But will the increase in taxes and fees offset the increased costs resulting from implementation? Those costs include those of necessary increased infrastructure (streets, sewer and clean water capacity, parks) and services including police, fire, health care and schools. I think the public is owed a balance sheet for this project before it is further considered for adoption. I may be wrong, but my instincts tell me that growth of this type does not pencil out and that it will lead to pleas for additional taxes to cover its unintended financial consequences. I would be pleased to be proven wrong.

Testimony is presented without formatting.

Potestio Testimony Regarding the Residential Infill Project
Presented to Council, Jan. 16, 2020

Page One

By Richard Potestio, Architect
2211 SW Park Place, no. 502
Portland, Oregon, 97205
rick@potestiostudio.com
503 381 9719

NOTE, this is the enhanced version. My testimony in person was abbreviated due to reduced time allowance.

I have advocated for multi-unit middle scale housing and denser neighborhoods since 1990 when I returned from Boston where I designed infill housing in historic, dense neighborhoods. That experience taught me that *well-designed* multi-unit housing, no matter its size, scale or configuration, may easily co-exist in densely packed neighborhoods and contribute to a very high degree of livability.

My criticism of the Residential Infill Project is two-fold.

First, it is based on a contradiction: it proposes to *decrease* the allowed size of a building on a lot while simultaneously *increasing* the allowed number of units. It therefore will pack more units into buildings that are smaller than what is currently allowed.

Second, it is based on a trend—that predicts an older and more singular population. This is a trend that is common in many cities and countries... and is shown to have an overall negative impact on the long-term health of society.

Regarding my first criticism, RIP replaces “*single-family housing*” with “*single-person housing*”. The RIP brief claims it will increase housing diversity. However, as it constrains building sizes it thereby necessitates correspondingly small unit sizes: studios, one- and two-bedroom apartments. These are the same units typical of new most new apartment buildings. Therefore, it does not add to diversity, but by replacing existing (or new) houses, it diminishes diversity in unit type and lifestyle. In simple math, RIP does not significantly change the number of bedrooms that may be built on the lot. A 3- to 4-bedroom house has as many or more bedrooms than 3 or 4 studios or one-bedroom units.

More importantly, the number of “heads in beds”—the actual number of persons that potentially or likely will be living on the lot may not change. As such on a lot by lot basis, RIP may be population neutral. RIP increases the density of utility connections and cars, but not necessarily people.

Regarding my second criticism— RIP serves the trend that Portland’s population will grow older, whiter, and more singular—at the same time our region is becoming more ethnically and culturally diverse—as Hillsboro exemplifies (1). RIP’s studio, one- and two-bedroom units are to be built for singles and childless couples. These small units are not suitable for families with kids nor all manner of roommate or group living arrangements. Hence the real outcome of RIP’s policies will be to reduce the opportunity for families with kids and persons in group living arrangements to find housing in the city. This is the un-anticipated tragedy of the ill-considered Residential Infill Project.

One hundred years ago, Portland's trend responsive developers built modest bungalows while cities like Cambridge and San Francisco built townhouses, triple-deckers and small apartment buildings. Cambridge and SF, despite their affordability challenges, have housing that is adaptable to changes in demographics and economics. Portland's bungalows have proven woefully un-adaptable to modification and hence un-responsive to change. The internal configuration of rooms and low basement and attic ceiling heights simply do not allow it. Hence our need to add dwelling units in our cherished back yards.

I believe that Portland's growing population should be as dynamic and dense as its suburbs. We need housing for our creative and working classes and communities of color and ethnicity. A diverse population needs diversity in housing. A population with immigrants not just from the Mid-west states, but from South American, Eastern European and Asian countries needs housing for families that are larger, and more extended than their average American counterpart. We need to house these families, not just yuppies and retirees.

To achieve this goal, the Residential Infill Project should be premised on the 100-year-old middle scale housing models found in neighborhoods such as Buckman, Kerns, Goose Hollow, Sullivan's Gulch and surprisingly, Portland Heights. These neighborhoods liberally mix single-family houses with duplexes -- but also have a wide range of six and eight plex's; as well as courtyard and small tower buildings. The heart of Portland Heights, around Ainsworth Grade School, is as dense as inner east-side neighborhoods. It has a very diverse housing stock including micro-houses and mansions with ADU's (formerly the servant or chauffeur's quarters) in addition to duplexes, triplexes and both apartment-courtyards and blocks.

Each of these 100-year-old neighborhoods juxtaposes buildings of radically differing scales on adjacent lots. Neighbors don't find this disconcerting because the buildings sensitively fit together sharing a common design language and scale. They are not the product of a planner's zoning regulations but result from the early 20th century's architects' and developers' consensus about design, quality, and community (2).

In summation, I do not believe that the regulations embodied in the Residential Infill Project will significantly increase the city's population, nor its diversity. It will reduce the opportunity for families with kids and in-laws to remain in or find suitable housing. It will reduce, without replacing, housing suited to group and roommate living arrangements. Given that students, artists, low wage workers, and most ethnic cultures are most likely to live in group or large family formats, RIP will ensure that Portland is unable to retain or attract these persons.

Portland needs to remove the building and unit size limitations of the Residential Infill Project to allow for more housing diversity including multi-unit buildings with family scaled units 3- and 4-bedroom units. Portland's planners are not serving our city with restrictive regulations. They should base their recommendations on the "middle scale" housing types and neighborhood configurations of 100 years ago. They should not prescribe dimension-based regulation but should promote high quality design principles and guidelines.

NOTES

(1) Statistics clearly show that Portland is less dense and diverse than its suburbs. It is the least dense of the 25 largest MSAs and is amongst the whitest. Gentrification and high real estate costs have driven out or served as a barricade to the working class and people of color.

(2) In my opinion, Early 20th century architecture was distinguished by a shared sense of appropriate style and quality in materials, detail and construction. Early 21st century architecture is distinguished by differentiation (so-called innovation) based in fad/fashion and a lack of quality in materials and detail and construction.

ABOUT THE TESTIFYER

Richard Potestio has a B.Arch from the Univ. of Oregon and an M.Arch from Syracuse University. He has a 40-year architectural career, beginning in Cambridge/Boston MA, where he designed infill housing in historic buildings and neighborhoods.

Since 1989 he has been an active and vocal advocate for densification and good design. As a life-long bike commuter and transit rider, he has also been a promoter of active transportation. Beginning in the early 1990's he worked with the Bureau of Planning on the Albina Plan. As a consultant, he has provided services to both the Bureaus of Planning and Transportation. He has served on many boards and committees dedicated to urban planning, transportation and the environment. He spearheaded the "City Life" show of homes—a not-for-profit affordable infill housing demonstration project of 32 units built in the Brooklyn neighborhood by Reach Development.

He has designed award winning infill housing in the city and is currently working on a 14-unit townhome project in NW Portland.

He is the recipient of the Van Evera Bailey Fellowship Grant from the Architectural Foundation of Oregon and the Oregon Community Foundation. His research project into "dynamic density" and a proposed strategy of "democratized densification" is under way now.

Richard Potestio

#93408 | February 21, 2020

Testimony to **Portland City Council** on the **Residential Infill Project, Recommended Draft**

See attached file

Testimony is presented without formatting.

craig koon

#93409 | February 22, 2020

Testimony to **Portland City Council** on the **Residential Infill Project, Recommended Draft**

I find it interesting that most of the smaller, AFFORDABLE homes in this area are marked as ripe for the plucking. Others - right next door - are delisted as being in an 'environmental zone;' some of the houses in the E-zone have fewer trees and vegetation than the ones excluded! Funny how RIP tilts the table towards removing affordable SFRs and replacing them with market-rate, studio and 1 BR multi-units. Infill is necessary, but the way the city is doing it is a gift to developers, and a net drain on affordability region-wide.

Testimony is presented without formatting.



Portland **Small Developer** Alliance

Feb. 22, 2020

Honorable Mayor and Commissioners:

Portland Small Developer Alliance wants to clarify that while we suggested most of what's below as revisions to Amendment 6, we also want to reiterate their relevance to **ALL MULTI-UNIT INFILL PROJECTS**. We had made these suggestions (and others) **in our first RIP testimony dated Jan. 16, 2020**. While we don't argue with the demographic data pointing to fewer occupants per unit on average, we are also highly aware that **Portland's immigrant population belays that data**—with larger family sizes that may include multigenerational living. We feel these changes will help to meet a greater set of residential needs.

- **FAR Calculation:** Exempt daylight basements and attics with the legal 6.8" of height for occupiable spaces from the FAR calculations, as neither of these types of spaces contribute negatively to the impact on neighbors.
 - With a 2.5 story height, this building would fit harmoniously within existing neighborhoods. Tucking a daylight basement under the structure would allow for ramps to access units on both the basement and first floor levels, providing for greater accessibility and affordability by design.
 - If a project meets the criteria of 50% of all units are either visitable and/or affordable, then the project should be eligible to build up to 1 FAR, 35 feet in height, and with a front setback of ten feet (to maximize the amount of private back yard area shared by residents).
- **Height Calculation:**
 - Measure height from midpoint, not low point, so as to encourage the efficient packaging of all of the elements that would make an infill structure a success for its residents within an efficient building envelope: a walk-out patio to provide light and easy access to the yard for the daylight basement; a porch that is accessible from the sidewalk without needing to climb too many stairs; and dormers that fit a full legal occupiable floor within what appears to be only half a story from the exterior, above two main floors.
 - Clarify that a two-and-a-half-story house will always be legal in all zones, atop a full-side, full-height daylight basement. Neither should count towards FAR.
 - R2.5 zones should maintain their 35-foot height limit and not experience a reduction to 30 feet.

- Houses built on flag lots should maintain the same height limits as all other allowed housing.

We believe that these adjustments to the RIP proposal will allow small developers to work with neighborhoods to provide some of the diversity of housing types that must be built in order for supply to come back into balance with the changing demographic demands of future generations.

Thanks so much for your time and attention to our thoughts,

Mary Vogel

Co-Founder, PSDA

Mary Vogel

#93410 | February 22, 2020

Testimony to **Portland City Council** on the **Residential Infill Project, Recommended Draft**

This testimony from Portland Small Developer Alliance reframes some of our suggestions for "small tweaks" to RIP language from our Jan. 16 and Feb. 24 testimonies. We also support the "fee simple" request submitted by Steve Messinetti on behalf of PAH. That was earlier suggested by Eli Spevak in his private testimony in January.

Testimony is presented without formatting.

Dave and Dixie Johnston

#93421 | February 22, 2020

Testimony to **Portland City Council** on the **Residential Infill Project, Recommended Draft**

We support the amendment as proposed on Feb.12, 2020 with the modifications below: -- We believe full street improvements and access to high frequency transit should be required before allowing triplexes, fourplexes ,etc. The requirement for curbs, however, is a considerable improvement over the original proposal. -- The wording "or an otherwise approved alternative street standard" should be deleted or defined. As written it seems to imply that someone could waive standards for allowing triplexes,fourplexes, etc.. This should only be done by action of City Council.

Testimony is presented without formatting.

190093



Brooke Hazard

#93412 | February 23, 2020

Testimony to **Portland City Council** on the **Residential Infill Project, Recommended Draft**

Dear City Council: It appears that the parking circumstances that exist in that part of University Park within a square mile of the university are being ignored relative to this project. I am resubmitting my testimony because it is imperative that you consider requiring parking spaces be provided (at least one per unit) with new duplex, triplex, fourplex and add-on units in this area. I have included a photograph of our car-packed street due to student parking. Our home is the green one in the photo. The issue we have with the Residential Infill Project draft is the deletion of minimum parking requirements, i.e. not "requiring" parking spaces/garages with these multi-unit constructions. All year long, except during holidays, there is not a parking space to be had from 7 AM - 9 PM in the area circumvented by N Portsmouth Ave - N Willamette Blvd - N Olin Ave - N Princeton Street due to students who travel to the school. There is insufficient parking on the school campus to accommodate them. Many of the homes in this area are older, like 6733 N Haven Ave across from our home, which is on a large corner lot. If the owner should sell, the home would definitely be raised. Should it be replaced by a fourplex without off-street parking, it would further exacerbate the problem, plus owners/tenants would not be able to find parking adjacent to their units. If there are two cars per family, that's eight additional vehicles needing parking on a "short" block that currently has five homes. While we understand that infill construction on alleys will need to accommodate parking off the alley, which is currently done in our area, not all blocks in this area have alleys and much depends on how the building forward faces. In a nutshell, we believe the Residential Infill Project should evaluate unique neighborhoods, such as ours, and that new constructions should be required to have off-street parking. Respectfully, Brooke Hazard and Mary E Nobriga

Testimony is presented without formatting.



Robert Ball

#103422 | February 25, 2020

Testimony to **Portland City Council** on the **Residential Infill Project, Recommended Draft**

I am writing to testify on the proposed new method to change the base reference point for height in Commerical Zones as part of the Residential Infill Project (RIP.) I understand that it is currently being revised and commented on at the Council level (not yet adopted). As part of the Residential Infill Project (RIP,) the proposed changes to base reference point for measuring allowed height in residential zones is is being carried over to commercial zones with disastrous un-intended consequences for multifamily and affordable housing projects. For example, the last building I completed at NW 21 and Kearny streets, our base height started at the highest point of the property at the sidewalk (reference point) on NW Kearney Street. It is 45' tall and consists of 27 apartments over ground floor retail. It is in a CM2 zone. This is a private market project and both construction and permanent financing were difficult to obtain due to cost of construction and potential market rents. Our height started at the sidewalk on NW Kearney street. If we would have been forced to start at the low point (by the Chevron Station) where the grade change was four or five feet, we would have lost one floor of housing and this project would not have happened. This building and others like it would be impossible to build. SEE ENCLOSED PHOTO added with attachments to the testimony. If I would have had to start from the low point, I would have had to take a floor off the building as you can easily see even under the current regulations, the retail on the corner up to the the parking entrance is already getting low. Pretty much, any site that would be between 5-10 feet differential will cause an entire floor to be taken off. This particular project has gotten countless accolades from neighbors and the Northwest District Neighborhood Association actually encourages taller ground floor housing. In my case, I built this project according to Community Design standards in the code and adhered strictly to the height limits. Most commercial zones don't have significant grade differentiations so practice has always been to measure from the highest point next to the sidewalk. Under the new rules, if there is less than 10 feet of differential, the reference point for height would move to the lower portion of the property. If there is just a few feet differential and it's measured from the low point, this will serve to eliminate a floor of housing! The logic for RIP is reasonable for residential lots where there are single family homes being contemplated and to help combat mischief (building of berms, etc...) But for commercial zones, this serves to eliminate entire floors of housing. SOLUTION Now that the good and careful thought has gone into the residential home portion of the change, the simple solution would be, in Commercial Zones, have the height reference point start at the highest part of the property at the existing sidewalk. It's essentially what we do now and is compatible with the goals. If not, the next best solution would be to keep the

existing guidelines for commercial zones (which is to start at the highest point as recommended above) with a ten foot maximum differential from the low point if the grade is more than 10ft. Now that residential lots are being more carefully differentiated, I believe the more elegant and simple solution for commercial lots (zones) is to just start from the high points (as sites with more than a 10' differential are rare and where they are higher by a foot or two, isn't going to negatively impact adjoining properties; especially with the new Better Housing by Design and the RIP.) Thank you for allowing this input. Robert Ball Robert Ball Companies LLC

Testimony is presented without formatting.