

Comprehensive Plan comment, **main points in bold**
Margaret E. Davis, 3617 NE 45th Ave, Portland, OR 97213

First, let me start with a little story about a recent event in our neighborhood, Beaumont-Wilshire. That's where the city permitted a 4-story 50-unit apartment building without parking on a block that's missing sidewalks on one side, creating traffic hazards and exacerbating an already difficult parking situation for neighborhood businesses and residents. Some years ago, we lost daily bus service, and the line no longer travels downtown. After two trips to the state Land Use Board of Appeals and \$10,000 spent by neighbors, this building still does not meet code. I tell you this story not to embarrass anyone or say "Poor me/us" but to illustrate some of the trust issues that neighbors have with city staff and leadership.

What's missing in the Comp Plan is engagement with original investors/stakeholders, as in neighbors and their associations. Good development comes about through collaboration, not stuffing exploitive buildings down neighbors' throats. **Make neighbor-developer dialogue a required part of growing this city**, and we will see more successful buildings. For example, check out the Marvel 29 project going up in St. Johns; neighbors were engaged from the get-go and everyone will benefit from the project, not just the developer.

What I've seen in my neighborhood and Hollywood is nonholistic consideration of context, and an inability or unwillingness to **provide infrastructure** to match the appetite for development. Neighbors in Hollywood, for example, are having to raise money themselves to pay for a traffic-safety measure necessitated by all the new residents there treating a neighborhood street (NE 37th) as a freeway on-ramp. It makes you wonder, **Where do the Systems Development Charges go?**

Finally, this commission should drop "sustainability" from its name and goals of Comp Plan as long as **demolitions** continue at the current pace. Portland will set a record for demolitions this year, and that number doesn't take into account all the "bulldozer remodels" that likely add 30 percent more to the demolition number. Losing hundreds of units of unique affordable housing—not to mention the mature urban tree canopy around it—impacts us all and only benefits mostly out-of-town developers (just 2 of the top 25 home builders in Portland are based in Portland).

I'm an infill developer myself and would do more if the staff at Bureau of Development Services wasn't so busy changing code for, and defending the lousy business practices of, these exploitive developers. With such a skewed playing field, the local homegrown players have few chances to participate.

Tossing hundreds of houses—at an average age of 87 years old—and their high-quality materials in Dumpsters is sad, irresponsible, and contrary to the goals of the Comp Plan. If we want a reputation as a "green" city, let's earn it, by **protecting the wide-ranging housing stock we already have, incentivizing real infill, and**

increasing the quality and diversity of developers plying Portland's finest resource.

The goals of the Comp Plan look great on paper, but where is the **verifiable commitment** to them now and in the future? The "mixed use" labels for development are just pretty names now, but planners have no specifics for them, say, allowable heights, setbacks, and so on. How can we get behind these labels if we don't know what they entail? I join other neighbors and neighborhood associations in demanding an extension of the comment period so that the Comp Plan planners can provide the detail necessary to back up the utopian visioning.

If we are supposed to trust the city to make the right choices without neighbor input, please reread the first paragraph of this letter.

Thank you,



Margaret Davis

503 233 2709

PERLEBERG & DAVIS
3617 N.E. 45th Ave.
Portland, OR 97213