

Parking Compliance Amendments Project

Recommended Draft Testimony

Ordinance #191310

Chrisse Roccaro

#332254 | May 24, 2023

Testimony to **Portland City Council** on the **Parking Compliance Amendments Project, Recommended Draft**

My concern, frankly, is that no new residential build, be they single or multi-family, be approved that does not have on site parking for at least 1 car per living unit. It is irresponsible to expect the rest of the community to bear the burden created by developers who are too cheap to do this, and planners who fail to take into account the transport needs of all of the citizens. While I applaud efforts to encourage alternative modes of transport, the fact is that a great number of residents in any given area will not be able to take advantage of bike lanes or bus routes for all their needs and will need to have - and safely park - a car at their residence. Chrisse Roccaro Crestwood

Testimony is presented without formatting.

Dave Peticolas

#332259 | May 27, 2023

Testimony to **Portland City Council** on the **Parking Compliance Amendments Project, Recommended Draft**

I support the amendments to the parking code from the PCAP project. Aside from bringing Portland into compliance with state rules, relaxing parking requirements will make it easier to build more housing in Portland at a time of critical housing shortage.

Testimony is presented without formatting.

Zachary Leshner

#332260 | May 28, 2023

Testimony to **Portland City Council** on the **Parking Compliance Amendments Project, Recommended Draft**

I fully support the proposed amendments to the city's parking code. This rule is crucial in meeting our housing goals and an important step in ending homelessness in our city, while also being in line with our environmental goals, and our transportation mode share goals. Please vote to adopt these amendments as is.

Testimony is presented without formatting.

Doug Klotz

#332263 | June 1, 2023

Testimony to **Portland City Council** on the **Parking Compliance Amendments Project, Recommended Draft**

I fully support the Parking Compliance Amendment Project recommended draft. These are minor changes, "cleaning up" the few outlying regulations, to make a shorter, more readable zoning code. It will effect very few lots. But even these changes are necessary to help reduce housing costs in all areas of the city, by removing requirements for parking. Staff and Planning Commission have endorsed this as the most direct way to comply with the state requirements, and I agree with this approach. Parking is still allowed, just not required. So, builders can still include parking in areas they think it is warranted, but are not required to. Please adopt these minor changes to allow more housing and reduce housing costs!

Testimony is presented without formatting.

Trisha Patterson

#332275 | June 5, 2023

Testimony to **Portland City Council** on the **Parking Compliance Amendments Project, Recommended Draft**

Please see attached support testimony from local housing nonprofit, Portland: Neighbors Welcome. We applaud the tight turnaround on these rules, and support the passage of PCAP.

Testimony is presented without formatting.

To the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability,

Portland: Neighbors Welcome is a grassroots housing advocacy nonprofit focused on advocating for policies that can deliver an abundant supply of homes at every income level, advance tenant power and protections, and house those in crisis.

Last summer, several of us testified in support of the statewide Climate Friendly and Equitable Communities (CFEC) ruling. We extend our support in the Parking Compliance Amendments Package (PCAP), which will allow the City to come into compliance with this ruling. There is an intrinsic connection between housing, environmental justice, and transportation. Eliminating auto parking mandates is a step in the right direction to creating a Portland that is sustainable, just, and climate-friendly. We support policies that encourage development that is walkable, bikeable, and mixed use. As the effects of climate change become more evident, land use policies that prioritize sustainable transportation and housing for people, not cars, must be enacted. We support the Planning Commission recommendations, and provide the following comments:

- 1) We support the decision to remove all parking mandates citywide. This is in-line with antecedent policy decisions, and simplifies zoning interpretation. While this only applies to minimal geography, this is a smart decision for policy continuity.
- 2) We support the decision to update and simplify parking maximums, and encourage the Bureau to consider prohibiting public funding of new parking structures in climate friendly areas, such as the Central Eastside or Northwest District. Land is precious, especially within a city. We should consider whether car storage is the highest and best use of land, and if other mixed uses could occur in areas designated for surface or structured parking.
- 3) Consider targeted heat island mitigation strategies for existing large surface parking lots. The goal would be to not develop more large surface parking lots. For those that currently exist, consider targeted mitigation to encourage these lots to adopt measures like tree shading, provision of solar panels, open space structures that provide pedestrian shading, or instituting green building codes in new structures.
- 4) Miscellaneous technical items: no comments.

We applaud the Bureau for the tight turnaround on this project, and support its passage. Bringing the City into compliance with statewide CFEC rules is just one step, among many, in the right direction towards achieving zero emissions by 2050, in order to avoid the most disastrous climate scenarios. We support long term planning policies that encourage development patterns that are climate and community friendly. We believe that dense, sustainable housing development can coexist with a robust tree canopy, providing critical shade during hotter summers. Eliminating auto parking mandates brings us closer to that goal.

Thank you for your consideration,

Trisha Patterson
Board secretary
Portland: Neighbors Welcome

scott gordanier

#332277 | June 5, 2023

Testimony to **Portland City Council** on the **Parking Compliance Amendments Project, Recommended Draft**

Hello and thank you for hearing my testimony, I am in complete agreement with Commissioner Gonzales that more needs to be done NOW to alleviate the Homeless/drug crisis we see on our streets everyday. Enough pandering to this group has been done over the past three years and it is well past the hour for unsanctioned camping to be allowed on the streets of Portland. We are a nation of laws and we need to enforce tough love to get these folks the drug treatment they need to clean up their messes and get off the sidewalks and parks we all used to use. I feel this is a start in the right direction. Thank you, Scott Gordanier

Testimony is presented without formatting.

Patty Nelson

#332278 | June 6, 2023

Testimony to **Portland City Council** on the **Parking Compliance Amendments Project, Recommended Draft**

Dear Mayor and Commissioner, I am writing to convey my disappointment in the City's lack of engagement of this item with neighborhood associations and neighborhood coalitions. I testified at the Planning Commission and have included that as testimony here. I discussed it with my neighborhood board but there did not appear to be any opportunity for us to affect change, given the state's deadline for June 30th and the late timing of this item before the city commission, listed as an "emergency item". While the staff report and findings document reference that they meet Goal 1 Citizen Involvement and under Goal 2 Communication Involvement they reference outreach, what is missing is engagement of the neighborhood coalitions the city has partnered with for years through its Civil Life (previously Office of Neighborhood Involvement). The coalitions along with their neighborhood associations provide a valuable resource to you as elected officials and staff, to not only listen to your citizen's but engage them in meaningful dialogue around policy issues, code changes, and development of plans and projects. I have served as a public employee for years always striving to complete my work to meet the needs of the community while meeting our requirements as an agency. I have found early engagement important not only to inform the public of our tasks at hand, but to engage them and seek their support, to inform policies, standards, plans and projects in such a way that they achieve their goals while minimizing impacts to the community while providing added benefits if possible. Parking decisions, such as these, have impacts on neighborhoods, businesses and livability of cities. While we transition away from fossil fuels, we must recognize that vehicles provide a type of transportation that will still be needed therefore we have a responsibility to plan for parking of those vehicles. Perhaps our assumptions on the minimum number of vehicles per household should adjust, based on data and realistic planning parameters - but to assume people will not drive because they have no place to park is not realistic. Parking requirements should be linked to proximity to available frequent transit - which is the state requirement. It should not be removed all together with no link to other options. I am disappointed staff did not pursue Option 2 or 3 provided by the state nor develop a document identifying where our existing parking requirements are out of compliance with the state requirements. If time permits - I would encourage you to have staff clearly identify where the city is out of compliance with the state requirement and what minimum changes are needed to comply, using Option 2 or 3. I would also like to challenge the finding stating Goal 1 for Citizen Involvement or Goal 2 for Community Involvement were met, given the vary organizations the city created years ago were not even engaged. Finally, I would request that staff and bureaus be directed to engage with the neighborhood

coalitions and neighborhood associations early and often on code, policy, planning and projects that affect the residents. Land Use notices are no longer issued unless required - leaving neighborhood associations to answer questions as to why 8 "cottage homes" are being built on a single lot with no parking. Outreach and engagement is needed. Please help. Thank you Patty Nelson, P.E.

Testimony is presented without formatting.

April 11, 2023

City of Portland

Planning Commission

Parking Compliance Amendments Project (PCAP)

Public Hearing Testimony 4-11-2023

Dear Planning Commission

I am writing in response to the proposed revised parking rules before you today. The project website states that these revisions will bring the city into compliance with the state's new rules – but incorrectly states that it requires removal of minimum parking requirements.

As acknowledged in the City's Parking Compliance Amendments Project document, page 42, the Climate Friendly and Equitable Communities (CFEC) ".mandated that jurisdictions choose one of the three options to remove or manage parking mandates."

The City's choice to eliminate mandates city wide was chosen because it "maintained the clarity and readability of our regulations." The choice does not consider the effects on residents and communities and should not be adopted as presented. Instead, Option 2 or 3 should be pursued.

While we work toward electrification of vehicles and the reduction of trips traveled by car, the city must acknowledge that implementation city wide will look different given its long history and varied developed areas. Code revisions should be developed to provide flexibility to accommodate the varied conditions and needs of the community while planning for the future.

As an example. some neighborhoods developed before cars were the primary mode of transportation, with little to no off-street parking and horse rings in the curb. The challenge in these neighborhoods is smaller lots with a reliance of on-street parking. These neighborhoods already struggle to find enough on-street parking or places to charge an electric vehicle. Other neighborhoods were developed with larger lots, wide streets, large garages, and driveways to accommodate the larger vehicles. These neighborhoods have more flexibility to accommodate changes in parking mandates without affecting the livability of the neighborhood.

The City of Portland has been the place people want to live. Livability characteristics that people site are its walkable neighborhoods. I am fortunate to live in Beaumont Wilshire neighborhood, where the neighborhood was developed around a business area which provides everyday conveniences within walking distance. The city's comprehensive plan had been developed around Town Centers, promoting higher density development around transit corridors and commercial development to support the needs of the community to promote a walkable neighborhood. These development models are consistent with the states CFEC strategies.

With the adoption of the city's revised parking standards as part of the Residential Infill Development Project (RIP), it too was leading the state in its goal to reduce parking mandates and promote non-motorized transportation.

What has not been answered is:

- Where does city code NOT meet state requirements?
- Can revisions be implemented to meet state requirements and minimize negative impacts on our neighborhood livability?

The ODLCD future vision states: "All Oregonians live in a safe, livable and healthy neighborhood." Our citizens and communities deserve to have code revisions developed that provide flexibility to meet intent of rule change while maintaining a safe, liable, and healthy neighborhood. Implementation of the code changes should strive to minimize negative impacts on the community while meeting the climate change initiatives. While we work to reduce the number of trips traveled by vehicles, people still own a vehicle to get to destinations. Transitioning to environmentally friendly vehicles will still require parking. Electric vehicles will require places to charge them.

I am asking the Planning Commission to NOT ADOPT the proposed revision eliminating parking mandates city-wide and direct Staff to pursue Option 2 or 3 outlined by the state for implementation. As a first step, request staff to identify where the city's existing code does not comply with the state mandate. Where revisions are required, pursue options that minimize negative impacts to the community and residents. I would also ask that neighborhood associations be engaged in the development of code revisions, including notification, presentations and input sought and considered in the final recommended code changes.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Patty Nelson", written over a horizontal line.

Patty Nelson

CITY OF PORTLAND CITY COMMISSION

JUNE 7, 2023 AGENDA

ITEM 472 Parking Code Changes

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Dear Mayor and Commissioner,

I am writing to convey my disappointment in the City's lack of engagement of this item with neighborhood associations and neighborhood coalitions. I testified at the Planning Commission and have included that as testimony here. I discussed it with my neighborhood board but there did not appear to be any opportunity for us to affect change, given the state's deadline for June 30th and the late timing of this item before the city commission, listed as an "emergency item".

While the staff report and findings document reference that they meet Goal 1 Citizen Involvement and under Goal 2 Communication Involvement they reference outreach, what is missing is engagement of the neighborhood coalitions the city has partnered with for years through its Civil Life (previously Office of Neighborhood Involvement).

The coalitions along with their neighborhood associations provide a valuable resource to you as elected officials and staff, to not only listen to your citizen's but engage them in meaningful dialogue around policy issues, code changes, and development of plans and projects. I have served as a public employee for years always striving to complete my work to meet the needs of the community while meeting our requirements as an agency. I have found early engagement important not only to inform the public of our tasks at hand, but to engage them and seek their support, to inform policies, standards, plans and projects in such a way that they achieve their goals while minimizing impacts to the community while providing added benefits if possible.

Parking decisions, such as these, have impacts on neighborhoods, businesses and livability of cities. While we transition away from fossil fuels, we must recognize that vehicles provide a type of transportation that will still be needed therefore we have a responsibility to plan for parking of those vehicles. Perhaps our assumptions on the minimum number of vehicles per household should adjust, based on data and realistic planning parameters - but to assume people will not drive because they have no place to park is not realistic. Parking requirements should be linked to proximity to available frequent transit - which is the state requirement. It should not be removed all together with no link to other options. I am disappointed staff did not pursue Option 2 or 3 provided by the state nor develop a document identifying where our existing parking requirements are out of compliance with the state requirements.

If time permits - I would encourage you to have staff clearly identify where the city is out of compliance with the state requirement and what minimum changes are needed to comply, using Option 2 or 3.

I would also like to challenge the finding stating Goal 1 for Citizen Involvement or Goal 2 for Community Involvement were met, given the vary organizations the city created years ago were not even engaged.

Finally, I would request that staff and bureaus be directed to engage with the neighborhood coalitions and neighborhood associations early and often on code, policy, planning and projects that affect the residents. Land Use notices are no longer issued unless required - leaving neighborhood associations to answer questions as to why 8 "cottage homes" are being built on a single lot with no parking. Outreach and engagement is needed. Please help.

Thank you

Patty Nelson, P.E.

K T Metzger

#332280 | June 6, 2023

Testimony to **Portland City Council** on the **Parking Compliance Amendments Project, Recommended Draft**

Please do not remove or reduce minimum parking requirements. Building projects without vehicle parking are hostile to local businesses and people who are not able to ride bicycles or walk to where they need or want to go (which can and should include a state park once in awhile so we all can be first-class Oregonians), and when they need to go (which could be on a very hot day made unbearable by the reckless elimination of street trees by the building department decision-makers who do not value their positive impact on the environment). Whenever a building has been built with no parking in the last decade there is a significant percentage of the new occupants and visitors to the building that must find parking that is in ever-diminishing supply. NWIM data published on portland.gov makes this clear by indicating that more than 86% of Portland residents own a vehicle. When a building does not have any or enough of its own parking, it cannot have electric charging for those vehicle-owners that use the building regularly. So, there will be more non-electric vehicles that have more environmental impact will be used than they would have been if there was parking. Additional negative environmental impact will occur when businesses close or move out of town, necessitating longer trips for the services needed by Portlanders, many who reside in the city just to avoid those trips. Please please please stop the war on cars being waged by a privileged few on the rest of us. Please look for co-existence so we can all have freedom of movement and a reasonable standard of living. Thank you for considering everyone in your decisions and give us an opportunity to thank you back.

Testimony is presented without formatting.

Terry Parker

#332281 | June 6, 2023

Testimony to **Portland City Council** on the **Parking Compliance Amendments Project, Recommended Draft**

Testimony to the Portland City Council on agenda item 472 related planning and zoning code parking reforms, June 7, 2023. To Members of the Portland City Council, A few months ago, a neighbor's car parked on the street overnight was crashed into in a hit and run. A couple of weeks later, a black minivan pulled up beside it, a man smashed out a driver's side window and attempted to steal the car. The combined damage cost paid by the insurance company was \$7,500.00. Shortly after the car was repaired and the final loan payment on the car itself was paid, two teenagers in a stolen Honda squirreling around crashed into it, this time totaling the car and shoving it into the car behind and damaging it. Then from the opposite direction, another car, also stolen, came speeding down the street, backed into the car that was shoved, and then sped off with the two from the stolen Honda that was now inoperable. And no, this was not the filming of another Fast and Furious movie. Additionally, last summer there was an attempt to steal a pickup parked across the street causing costly damage to the ignition and starter systems. After the owner had it repaired, somebody drilled a hole in the gas tank and drained it. By not requiring off-street parking with residential development, you are not only making residential streets full time parking lots, but you are also enabling crime which increases insurance rates. Pre pandemic, 59% of low income people drove to their place of employment. The two story Ellington Apartment complex built just after the second World War and purchased by the City a few years ago for low income housing has 244 units and six parking lots on a campus of about six city blocks. Without an actual count, the residents have approximately 150 cars. The new low income Hacienda apartments in the Cully Neighborhood has off-street parking as do many of the low income apartment complexes on Powell Boulevard and elsewhere. Yet, a large percentage of new market rate housing does not. A City of Portland study about ten years ago found that 72% of households in new apartment buildings without parking have one or more cars. A bicycle mechanic in Portland makes between 26k and 47k a year. Automotive technicians can make 100k or more a year. Guess who needs taxpayer funded rent subsidies in addition to not paying for the infrastructure they utilize. Nearly 10% of the jobs in Oregon are tied to the auto industry. There is an obvious political bias here against the automobile and how it's mobility keeps the economy humming. I am opposed to this zoning code change. Portland needs mandatory off street parking requirements. Respectfully submitted, Terry Parker Northeast Portland

Testimony is presented without formatting.

Portland City Council Meeting - Wednesday, June 7, 2023 2:00 p.m.

Agenda Item	First Name	Last Name
472-01	Catie	Gould