

Susan Millhauser

#103445 | February 26, 2020

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

Dear Mayor Hales and Commissioners Eudaly, Hardesty, and Fritz: I am in support of the overall proposed Residential Infill Project (RIP) zoning code amendments. I applaud the hard work of the Council, city staff, Planning and Sustainability Commission, and advisory committee over the past several years and look forward to the proposal being adopted. I have a few specific comments for the Council's consideration, which follow:

- I support the rezoning of this area and other similar areas with historically narrow lots from R5 to R2.5, and am glad to see provisions that ensure that historically narrow lots (lots of record) continue to be allowed to be developed with a detached house per 33.110.260.C.1, which states: "Attached houses are also not required when there are primary structures on all of the adjacent sites that share a side lot line with the development site."
- o Height Maximum: The R2.5 zones should maintain their 35-foot height limit and not experience a reduction to 30 feet.
- I support the addition of new standards for small flag lots, helping the City get closer to the goal of adding more housing without demolition of existing houses. Because of smaller lot sizes, the houses will inherently be smaller and more attainable to wider range of household incomes. However, I'd like the Council to consider amending the small flag lot standards to allow one house plus an ADU or a duplex, developed using the same floor area and height standards allowed in the underlying zone. As such, I offer the following amendments:
 - o Building Types on Small Flag Lots: Remove the prohibition of duplexes and accessory dwelling units on small flag lots. Allow the same building types as the underlying zoning.
 - o Floor Area on Small Flag Lots: Do not limit the floor area of the primary structure to 1,000 feet. Apply the same FAR and other development standards as allowed in the underlying zoning.
 - o Height Maximum on Flag Lots: Maintain the same height limits as all other allowed housing in the same zone; remove the reduce maximum height limit for houses built flag lots.

Thank you for your consideration.

Testimony is presented without formatting.



Home Builders Association
of Metropolitan Portland

February 12, 2020

Ted Wheeler, Mayor
Portland City Council
1221 SW 4th Ave, Room 340
Portland, OR 97204

Re: Support for the Residential Infill Project

Dear Mayor Wheeler,

The Home Builders Association of Metropolitan Portland (the “HBA”) represents over 800 businesses and tens of thousands of women and men who work in the residential building and remodeling industries throughout the greater Portland area. We are dedicated to maximizing housing choices for all who reside in the region while promoting housing access and availability for everyone.

The City of Portland (the “City”) is gripped in a housing affordability crisis. Recent reports from ECONorthwest clearly demonstrate the nexus between the underproduction of new homes, rising housing costs, and increases in those experiencing homelessness. Importantly, the Residential Infill Project (“RIP”) would help support the creation of new, diverse housing types that will serve those on all rungs of the economic ladder.

Over the past five years, HBA has served as an ally and RIP supporter and is heartened by the City’s efforts to permit elegant density in our neighborhoods. We appreciate the City’s efforts to bring RIP to fruition and believe that the following amendments will help ensure that builders are able to construct the greatest diversity of housing citywide.

Continue to Allow Garages for Narrow Lot Homes. The current design regulations for narrow lot homes were the result of lengthy, and at times contentious, discussions between the City, neighborhood advocates, and the residential development community. While no one received everything they wanted, the status quo, which allows for 11-foot-wide garages on the front façade of a house regardless of the width of the façade, represents a fair compromise that balances the need for some houses to have garages with concerns over articulation and design.

RIP seeks to prohibit these garages. However, as you know, not all of our neighborhoods are served by robust public transit, and not everyone can travel to work without a car. As such, it is inequitable to those who purchase homes on narrow lots to prohibit them from safely and securely storing a car on their property. Importantly, RIP already provides tools to limit the size of garage doors so they do not overwhelm façades. The City should apply these limits equally, without prohibitions that disadvantage certain home owners due to the lot their house sits on.

Allow for the Limited Purchase of Floor Area in Order to Fund Anti-Displacement Measures.

RIP will dramatically reduce the size of new homes that are built in the City. While smaller homes work for many, those with larger families, including religious households, will find it difficult to locate new housing that meets their needs. As such, the City should permit builders to purchase a limited amount of FAR when building new homes. This process, which operates successfully in a number of cities, including Los Angeles, could produce meaningful dollars to support new anti-displacement efforts.

An independent analysis by the Sightline Institute shows that had RIP been in place in 2015, the sale of FAR to 208 projects would have enabled the City to collect \$4,700,000 for anti-displacement programming. Importantly, the City can accomplish this through the most modest increase in housing size. By merely allowing duplexes to include one extra bedroom apiece, you can fully fund programs to support vulnerable displaced Portlanders across the City.

Enhance Opportunities for Fee-Simple Ownership. In order to ensure there is enough housing for all Portlanders, RIP encourages multiple small units on lots that previously only permitted a single dwelling. It makes no material difference to neighbors or the City whether the units are owned individually or rented. However, due to the current onerous and outdated processes associated with land division, it is highly unlikely that these units will be available in fee-simple ownership opportunities. This is extremely unfortunate because, as highlighted in Partners for Affordable Homeownership recent letter, builders, buyers and lenders all prefer fee-simple ownership.

While it is true that some builders have reluctantly started using condominium ownership as an end run to Portland's unwieldy and time-consuming land division processes, state construction defect law makes this a risky and costly proposition. Unfortunately, it is unlikely that for-sale housing will get much traction under RIP if condominiums are the only option. A streamlined land division simple option would result in more developers building and selling more units on infill lots priced for moderate income households. Fortunately, current code language already permits builders to insert property lines and create fee simple home ownership opportunities when building corner duplexes. The City can, and should, expand the universe of projects that are able to utilize this option.

HBA continues to stand with those who work to facilitate new, diverse housing options across the City. Thank you for considering our recommendations to enhance RIP and build a brighter future for all Portlanders.

Sincerely,

Ezra Hammer
Vice President of Policy and Government Affairs

Cc: Chloe Eudaly, Commissioner
Amanda Fritz, Commissioner
Jo Ann Hardesty, Commissioner

Ezra Hammer

#103459 | February 28, 2020

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

Please see our attached letter regarding the Residential Infill Project.

Testimony is presented without formatting.

Steve Dauenhauer

#103461 | February 29, 2020

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

I realize the residential infill project has been going on for years, but as it nears its finish, it seems changes have been made to the size of the structures allowed. Originally, I believe the project stated that duplexes would be allowed on interior lots, and 4-plexes would be allowed on corner lots. Now, I find the city is considering 6-plexes and 8-plexes in neighborhoods. I am strongly against the increase of structure sizes, and urge you to limit development to the original duplex and 4-plex standards. Parking is already bad in many areas, and an 8-plex would add a minimum of 8 cars to the block, and likely many more. If a citizen is unlucky enough to have more than one multi-plex on their street, that neighborhood would be transformed in a fundamental, negative way. I realize Portland needs housing, and I am in favor of addressing it to allow increased density. However, I feel current residents' quality of life be considered, and to maintain that quality, the size of developments in neighborhoods should be limited to no larger than a 4-plex. Thank you for your time. Steve Dauenhauer

Testimony is presented without formatting.

Caleb Boulier

#103462 | March 1, 2020

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

As a homeowner in Arbor Lodge we fully support the new RIP recommendations. I have been a proponent for smart density on residential lots since before moving to Arbor Lodge. If we want to create more diverse housing options I see RIP as a pathway while also reducing demolitions and keeping more existing structures. Allowing existing units to be structured in a way that allows multiple units will allow so much more flexibility and options for housing if implemented correctly. I am ready and eager to add another unit carved out of my existing 1920s home to provide another option for housing in the neighborhood (we already completed a detached ADU build). However, one item I think will be a large burden for the type of development I hope to see and that is the stipulation that above 2 units, one is required “visitable”. If you look at many existing houses in this neighborhood you see a very small percentage have zero step entry. If you want to encourage keeping existing homes and subdividing within those structures then this “visitable” stipulation is going to be a full stop for many buildings. I think this will just encourage more complete demolitions and new builds and put a huge hurdle on existing stock homes where individuals would love to sub-divide within the home with a demolition and without ground up new construction but they will have zero avenues to do so because of this stipulation. You can’t alter the elevation and site placement of many of these homes and I would hate to see these new options for housing really only cater to new ground up development. On that front I have less support for the RIP. If the RIP does not give smooth pathways to keep existing buildings and modify them for more housing options and units, then I feel like we missed the most important aspect of RIP.

Testimony is presented without formatting.

Gehl P. Babinec
3842 SW Dolph Court
Portland, Oregon 97219-3651

March 1, 2020

Portland City Council
1221 SW Fourth Avenue, Room 130
Portland, Oregon 97204
c/o Council Clerk
cctestimony@portlandoregon.gov
cputestimony@portlandoregon.gov

Re: Residential Infill Project (“Project”)

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Please do not adopt this proposed Residential Infill Project (“Project”) and its proposed Amendments.

Despite the city’s own studies showing adequate land for the next 20 years of growth, the Mayor, Commissioners and their representatives appear to be in league with developers to try to give a huge entitlement to build multifamily throughout the city, increasing density by 300%, with no requirement for affordable housing.

This Project will NOT provide affordable housing but will increase land prices and cause an increase in speculative building and demolitions.

The Project’s stated purpose is “To ensure that new or remodeled houses are well integrated and complement the fabric of neighborhoods.” Despite this purpose and the representations and promises made by the City, the City’s committee was dominated by builders, realtors, lobbyists and housing advocates. It is appalling that the City’s committee pushed through this self-serving agenda to rezone most of the city to allow multifamily housing in single family zones. This was borrowed from a failed Seattle initiative and falsely marketed as an answer to affordability.

The city’s own studies show that there is enough land already zoned to handle the next 20 years of growth. Every corner lot already is zoned for a duplex. The project has gone so far off the rails that it is almost unrecognizable. I don’t know the Who, the Why, but it has been given the bureau’s blessing.

We all want suitable and affordable housing, but this **Project would not create affordable housing**, but would cause widespread demolitions throughout the city. I object to the claims it would offer “affordable housing for everyone”, when there is no evidence, no analysis and no requirement for builders to build what we would consider affordable housing. It is a false promise, and we ask you not to accept it.

There was overwhelming opposition in public meetings, but the City’s staff largely ignored it. Of the 31 Neighborhood Associations who provided thoughtful comment, 27 were strongly opposed to widespread “middle housing”, with only 4 in support. Why not consider those 4 neighborhoods as “test sites” to evaluate the success of this unprecedented “overlay” in those 4 communities?

The proposed Project makes no attempt to respect neighborhood character, despite being a top priority voiced in public testimony; has no truth in zoning, making zoning designations meaningless. It would escalate land prices and encourage demolitions.

Southwest neighborhoods, would be devastated if this Project passes because as they are not well served by mass transit and sidewalks, are on steep hills, are in landslide zones, have traffic gridlock and overcrowded schools. If Council accepts this Project, you would be handing an entitlement for builders who would be allowed to increase density in R5 zoning by 800%, more density than R2.5. That would allow up to 16 units on the equivalent of 2 adjacent 5000 sq. ft. lots. This betrays the communities you serve!

We all love this city but the Project before you is a collection of hastily considered proposals that promote a density agenda, high jacked by the housing crisis, wrapped in the flag of affordability that it will not provide. It **does not** achieve the objective of having new housing which “complement the fabric of the neighborhood”.

Please add this to the record.

Thank you,

Gehl P. Babinec
3842 SW Dolph Court
Portland, OR 97219

cc: Mayor Ted Wheeler, Mayorwheeler@portlandoregon.gov
Commissioner Amanda Fritz, Amanda@portlandoregon.gov
Commissioner Chloe Eudaly, Chloe@portlandoregon.gov
Commissioner JoAnn Hardesty, JoAnn@portlandoregon.gov

City Auditor, Mary Hull Caballero, AuditorHullCaballero@portlandoregon.gov
City Council Clerk, karla.moore-love@portlandoregon.gov
Susan Anderson, Susan.Anderson@PortlandOregon.gov

Gehl Babinec

#103479 | March 1, 2020

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

Letter attached

Testimony is presented without formatting.



P.O. Box 11527
1478 NE Killingsworth Street
Portland, OR 97211
tel (503) 287-9529
habitatportlandmetro.org

To: Jessica Conner, Portland Housing Bureau
Morgan Tracy, Bureau of Planning and Sustainability

RE: RIP Deeper Affordable Housing Bonus

March 2, 2020

Habitat for Humanity enthusiastically supports the Deeper Affordable Housing Bonus Amendment to allow for additional FAR and six-plexes. Habitat provides first time homeownership opportunities to buyers earning under 60% AMI, with over 90% of the people we serve being households of color. Due to the rising costs of land and infrastructure, Habitat as moved to building attached unit townhomes, but it is difficult to find property that is zoned appropriately for this use.

If the Deeper Affordability Bonus is approved, I expect Habitat would look for larger double-sized lots (10-10,000-20,000 sq/ft) where this bonus would allow for four family-sized units on each lot. These 8-unit projects on infill properties would allow Habitat to build homes in more neighborhoods around the city, especially those that already have the amenities that our buyers value.

I expect Habitat would initially build 2 (approximately 16 units) of these projects annually, and grow this to 3-4 in the coming years. This would be in addition the larger 30-40 unit subdivisions of townhomes Habitat is building annually on RM1 parcels throughout the City.

Please don't hesitate to contact me if you have further questions about this.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Steve Messinetti". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Steve" and last name "Messinetti" clearly legible.

Steve Messinetti

Steve Messinetti

#123650 | March 2, 2020

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

Letter from Habitat for Humanity attached.

Testimony is presented without formatting.



March 4, 2020

Mayor Wheeler
Commissioner Eudaly
Commissioner Fritz
Commissioner Hardesty

Ref: Proposed amendment to Residential Infill Project re development on curbless streets

Dear Mayor and Commissioners:

The Brentwood-Darlington Neighborhood Association strongly opposes a proposed amendment to the Residential Infill Project that would allow three or more units only on lots having frontage on improved streets.

Our large neighborhood is home to a population widely diverse in ethnicity and income. It has provided a "landing place" for residents displaced by rising costs elsewhere in the city; however, that benefit to Portland (i.e., keeping vital work force members in the city) is diminishing as land values rise in response to demand for housing.

Why do we have this demand? The Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation (Freddie Mac) has just reported that America's housing market is undersupplied by 3.3 million units. The shortage is getting worse every year . . . and according to Freddie Mac, Oregon is the most under-supplied state in the nation.

We very much feel Oregon's housing shortage here in Brentwood-Darlington. The rate of parcel splitting for the purpose of building new single-unit housing is amazing . . . but still it produces additional housing slowly and gives rise to a good deal of what we do not need: overly large, expensive homes. We need more housing quickly, particularly middle housing; however, since Brentwood-Darlington is desperately short of curbed streets, we would have no hope of meeting our housing needs if construction were restricted as proposed.

We join the Cully Association of Neighbors, Habitat for Humanity/Metro East, Verde, NAYA, and Oregon Walks in requesting that multi-unit developments fronting on unimproved streets be accorded the same privilege that single-family and duplex developments enjoy: that of paying a Local Transportation Improvement Charge (LTIC) rather than bearing the full cost of infrastructure improvements. If LTIC yields are too low, increase the LTIC instead of forbidding needed housing construction.

Thank you for considering our request.

Sincerely,

Chelsea Powers
Chair, Brentwood-Darlington
Neighborhood Association (BDNA)

Stephenie Frederick
Chair, Land Use & Transportation Committee
BDNA

Stephenie Frederick

#103480 | March 4, 2020

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

PLEASE SEE ATTACHED FILE FOR FORMATTED FORMAL LETTER ON LETTERHEAD:

L-Council RIP Amendment 3-20.pdf March 4, 2020 Mayor Wheeler Commissioner Eudaly
 Commissioner Fritz Commissioner Hardesty Ref: Proposed amendment to Residential Infill Project
 re development on curbside streets Dear Mayor and Commissioners: The Brentwood-Darlington
 Neighborhood Association strongly opposes a proposed amendment to the Residential Infill Project
 that would allow three or more units only on lots having frontage on improved streets. Our large
 neighborhood is home to a population widely diverse in ethnicity and income. It has provided a
 “landing place” for residents displaced by rising costs elsewhere in the city; however, that benefit to
 Portland (i.e., keeping vital work force members in the city) is diminishing as land values rise in
 response to demand for housing. Why do we have this demand? The Federal Home Loan Mortgage
 Corporation (Freddie Mac) has just reported that America’s housing market is undersupplied by 3.3
 million units. The shortage is getting worse every year . . . and according to Freddie Mac, Oregon is
 the most under-supplied state in the nation. We very much feel Oregon’s housing shortage here in
 Brentwood-Darlington. The rate of parcel splitting for the purpose of building new single-unit
 housing is amazing . . . but still it produces additional housing slowly and gives rise to a good deal
 of what we do not need: overly large, expensive homes. We need more housing quickly, particularly
 middle housing; however, since Brentwood-Darlington is desperately short of curbed streets, we
 would have no hope of meeting our housing needs if construction were restricted as proposed. We
 join the Cully Association of Neighbors, Habitat for Humanity/Metro East, Verde, NAYA, and
 Oregon Walks in requesting that multi-unit developments fronting on unimproved streets be
 accorded the same privilege that single-family and duplex developments enjoy: that of paying a
 Local Transportation Improvement Charge (LTIC) rather than bearing the full cost of infrastructure
 improvements. If LTIC yields are too low, increase the LTIC instead of forbidding needed housing
 construction. Thank you for considering our request. Sincerely, Chelsea Powers Stephenie Frederick
 Chair, Brentwood-Darlington Chair, Land Use & Transportation Committee Neighborhood
 Association (BDNA) BDNA

Testimony is presented without formatting.