

2018 SE Ladd Ave  
Portland, OR 97214  
May 26, 2015

RE: SE Quadrant Plan

Dear Members of the Planning and Sustainability Commission:

The comments that follow are my individual opinions, but they are informed by the groups with which I am affiliated. I am a long time officer and board member of the Hosford-Abernethy Neighborhood Development Association (HAND) and have served as the HAND alternate to the SE Quadrant SAC.

In general I support the SE Quadrant Plan as it has evolved and commend the staff for their excellent work and diligence in trying to incorporate the range of concerns expressed by SAC members.

My overarching concern is that the proposed zoning and other code changes proposed in the SE Quadrant Plan lead to the continued investment of capital in CES businesses that will retain and/or generate jobs in the Central Eastside (CES) rather than turning the CES into an even hotter location for real estate development. That means looking carefully at where the Ex zone should exclude housing and discouraging housing on industrially zoned land at the south end of the district despite the desire from some for zone changes there.

With that in mind there are several key issues that come to mind:

- 1) Housing affordability. I know the PSC has previously discussed this issue as part of the Comprehensive Plan. I strongly support the proposed amendment that speaks to the need to find a sustainable source of funding in order to create and preserve affordable housing in the area. On a related note, I remain concerned about how to preserve the existing affordable housing in the district, much of which predates the industrial sanctuary. Making it a nonconforming use is not the way to preserve the housing stock (e.g., I support amending the EG-1 zone to preclude housing, but there must be some way to grandfather in existing housing so it can be adequately maintained, sold, etc. for its entire useful life.)
- 2) Business affordability. I also want to find ways to keep a range of sizes and prices for business tenants to encourage incubator businesses in the CES. Could we encourage nonprofit Community Development Corps to create a few commercial or industrial land trusts as real estate prices continue to rise?
- 3) Building height and FAR. RC-d, e. I remain concerned about the proposed height and FAR for the Clinton Station Area so I am glad to see the word "study" in the amendments. Assuming that up through SE 12th we are able to access Central City Design Review, provides some reassurance. However, as a neighbor I want to see the west end of Powell Blvd redeveloped in a thoughtful, effective manner that improves the look, feel and function of the area. That requires a plan that takes in both sides of Powell Blvd beyond the boundaries of the station area and involves BPS, the CEIC, HAND and Brooklyn working together with PBOT and ODOT on land use and transportation issues. Is that in the budget or on the drawing board?
- 4) Big Box Retail. RC-f. Unless I misunderstood this amendment — I don't think big box retail belongs in the CES. Limiting the size to 40,000 sq feet doesn't prevent an auto oriented retailer from landing there and adding greatly to the congestion and parking challenges the district faces.

5) Transit amendments. I strongly support the proposed transit amendments. The entire inner Eastside is seriously lacking in north/south transit connections because we lack arterials that run the length of the area. The transit amendments that speak to improving bus connections along Water Avenue and those that would seek to improve connections from the Clinton Station to the Rose Quarter and Lloyd Center are important for the overall transportation system.

Thank you for your consideration of these issues.

Sincerely,  
Linda Nettekoven