

Hi Commissioner Novick: Thank you for your comments. The RNA's vote expressly left open the issue of allowing extra stories through amenity or performance bonuses. Since the Mixed Use Zones Project has not finalized the performance bonus framework or the menu of performance bonus elements, it was not ripe for us to address that. We reserved that for next month's meeting when Barry Manning will present on the Mixed Use Zones Project.

You should interpret the RNA's vote as analogous to a statement that, of the three alternative approaches for the Performance Bonus framework (see p. 11 of the [Mixed Use Zoning Project: Draft Revised Zoning Concept Information Sessions, February 25-26, 2015](#)), the RNA prefers the framework that sets a base height level with allowable bonuses up to the current height allowance which is 4 stories on Division with the Division Green St/Main St Plan Overlay established in 2006. So, if next month we recommend the performance bonus model, then our position would be to request the base height level to be 3 stories and allow a 4th story, or maybe even a 5th story, if certain performance bonuses are provided.

As my letter explains, the RNA's vote was informed by the significant community backlash we've felt at our meetings (I will invite you to attend the next RNA meeting where a developer presents on another new 4-story apartment building for Division) and that has been expressed in the Division Perceptions Survey, where 83% of respondents prefer 3 story buildings and 90% generally stated they want smaller buildings.

As Mayor Hales has stated, there needs to be a balance between density and livability, and as Commissioner Fritz has stated, it shouldn't be density at all cost. The new development on SE Division St., particularly the stretch between SE 29th and Cesar Chavez Blvd, has tipped the balance to where livability is being seriously impacted for the community, especially those living within 2 blocks of Division.

Having grown up in LA and drawn to Portland by college and all that is not-LA here, density brings with it a variety of social costs/livability costs, such as parking shortages, trash, noise, crime, etc. As the recent email you received from Kent Tylman (and the photo of his blocked driveway, attached) shows, these livability impacts effect neighbors on a weekly and daily basis. The problem is that the city has allowed developers to externalize all of the social costs of density onto neighbors. On Division, the situation has grown beyond the breaking point for many neighbors, such as Kent. This Sunday, the Oregonian is doing an editorial on the impacts on livability from this intense development which stems from an ugly encounter an Oregonian reporter had with resident on SE Caruthers over parking issues.

The city needs to do more to fix the balance between density and livability, and it has started to go down that path, such as the minimum parking requirements established a few years ago. Other things the city could do are:

- require Transportation Demand Management analyses and plans for mixed-use and multi-family buildings to encourage or require lessen the parking demand

associated with their projects. PBOT is considering this but it's not certain they will do it.

- Revisit the minimum parking requirements to consider implementing a cumulative impact measure for the parking requirements. Parking wise, five 30-unit apartment buildings within 2 blocks is the same as a 150-unit building. Commissioner Fish was curious about this idea during the parking council hearing and hoped this idea could be explored in the Comp Plan Update process, but that hasn't happened. Also, Commissioner Fritz stated back then that she saw the minimum parking requirements as a stopgap measure so that the issue could be reassessed during the Comp Plan process, but that isn't happening either. I'm on the Centers & Corridors Parking Study SAC and PBOT's position is that the minimum parking requirement discussion is over and done.
- Do an assessment of available but unused on-street parking.
- Revise the Mini APP Program to allow blocks of neighbors to get parking permit system and make it cheaper than \$65/car/year. The Parking Study SAC will likely recommend this, but it will likely be one the most expensive permits in the country.
- Improve parking enforcement so that the problem of people blocking or parking in neighbors' driveways can be sufficiently addressed.
- Implement incentives for developers to do more to pro-actively attract car-free tenants. Through rent rebates/discounts, free bus passes and car-share membership, luxury bike storage and accommodations shared parking arrangements with businesses, building owners can maybe achieve a .2 parking ratio or less, not the .9 parking ratio that the city's study revealed (it also revealed that, because of the LTE program, the 2 buildings with the cheapest rent have onsite parking).
- Require buildings to have sufficient trash receptacles for tenants, which 1/2 or more have dogs, and whose poop bags are going into neighbors yard waste and recycling rollcarts.
- Encourage building owners to enter into GNAs with neighbors to work together to solve some of these issues. With the help of Kim Malek, Salt & Straw, we'll finally have the UD+P Developer coming to the table to discuss a GNA and to follow through on promises made to neighbors 2 years ago.

A final note is that, even if the height limit is 3 stories on Division or remains at 4-stories, the city's zoning capacity for the next 20 years is more than sufficient to accommodate the projected population growth. No one is going to be unable to move to or work in Portland if Division's height limit within the Main St Overlay is 3 or 4 stories, and there will be little to no impact to climate disruption in the grand scheme of things.

I really appreciate the chance to discuss this with you via your email.

Best regards,
Allen

>
>

> From: "Novick, Steve" <Steve.Novick@portlandoregon.gov>
> To: 'Allen F' <allen_field@yahoo.com>; Planning and Sustainability Commission
> <psc@portlandoregon.gov>; "Manning, Barry" <Barry.Manning@portlandoregon.gov>
> Cc: "Stockton, Marty" <Marty.Stockton@portlandoregon.gov>; "Zehnder, Joe"
> <Joe.Zehnder@portlandoregon.gov>; "Anderson, Susan"
> <Susan.Anderson@portlandoregon.gov>; "Hales, Mayor"
> <mayorcharliehales@portlandoregon.gov>
> Sent: Friday, March 13, 2015 9:31 AM
> Subject: RE: Richmond Neighborhood Association letter re March 9 2015 vote on
> planning issues

>
>
>

> Allen – I have to say I'm disappointed. Height is critical to density, and density, which makes transit more viable, is critical to reducing carbon emissions. And I expect our population increase to way outstrip current projections, given that it appears that much of the rest of the country will become uninhabitable at a rapid rate as a result of climate disruption.

>
>
>
>

> From: Allen F [mailto:allen_field@yahoo.com]
> Sent: Thursday, March 12, 2015 9:31 PM
> To: Planning and Sustainability Commission; Manning, Barry
> Cc: Stockton, Marty; Zehnder, Joe; Anderson, Susan; Hales, Mayor; Commissioner Fritz; Commissioner Fish; Novick, Steve; Commissioner Saltzman
> Subject: Richmond Neighborhood Association letter re March 9 2015 vote on planning issues

>

> Dear Planning and Sustainability Commission and Mr. Manning: Please find enclosed a letter from the Richmond Neighborhood Association explaining its vote this week requesting a 3-story height limit for SE Division St. and supporting the creation of approval criteria for zone change requests from CM2 to CM3 under the Mixed Use Zones Project.

>

> Respectfully,
> Allen Field
> Chair
> Richmond Neighborhood Association

