

ADDRESS	COMMENT	EMAIL	NAME	COMMENT		LIAISON		NEIGHB	TAGS
				NT_ID	CZIP	_DISTRICT	HOOD		
7155 n Fenwick ave	I support additional density capacity in Portland neighborhoods, especially those neighborhoods near public transit options like Max. Allow more liberal development of duplexes they should not be limited to just corners. Up zone to allow higher density developments.	edwardsjacob02@gmail.com	Jacob Edwards	27306	97217	North	Arbor Lodge	Housing types, Mapping the "a" overlay	
2611 NE Knott	I support all efforts to increase the amount of housing in Portland! Increased density is so much more efficient. I know this is a contentious topic and I appreciate the city's efforts - thank you! I have lived in the Cully neighborhood for the last 45 years. It is a neighborhood of larger lots and older and smaller houses. A lot as changed over the years. As urban renewal has driven minorities out of the closer in neighborhoods through rezoning and building of "new" housing, Cully has been a refuge. Our neighborhood is now one of the last affordable places to live for these and many other people. I have seen a few lots that have been bought up in anticipation of the RIP coming into effect. These are family lots with and older house that are bought for \$300,000 that will then have 9 houses built on them with each one selling for over \$400,000. This displaces many people of all races who are financially not as well off as the new occupants. Besides displacing poor people there is the urban gardens and green spaces that will be replaced by apartment like housing. Cully is known for it urban food gardens and green spaces. We would hate to see this all disappear under the weight of three story Cottage Clusters (Apartment buildings)	bkerensa@gmail.com	Benjamin Kerensa	27310	97213	Southeast	Mt. Tabor	Housing types	
5905 NE Failing St	Overall, I support the modest density increase of the RIP (more density would be better, triplexes everywhere would allow way more housing to be built because the finances of replacing one home with a duplex just don't work out in most cases but a triplex or fourplex often would work out financially). But my geographically specific comment - it isn't about this particular property, but rather about this whole chunk of upzoning historical narrow lots, and the associated lack of upcoming of historical narrow lots southwest of here in Eastmoreland and Woodstock. The areas in Eastmoreland and Woodstock seem much more appropriate for upzoning. They have a much higher percentage of sidewalks and paved streets. They have higher income and fewer renters. The "commercial strip" on SE 52nd is not a good anchor for density in this area - there's pretty much a laundry and a convenience store. Line 75 on SE 45th and the parks and open space (e.g. Tideman Johson Natural Area!) in Eastmoreland seem like much more appropriate reasons to upzone those areas rather than these areas. Here are representative Google Street Views. This spot in Eastmoreland would not be upzoned under BPS's current proposal: https://www.google.com/.../data=!3m6!1e1!3m4... But this spot in Brentwood-Darlington would be upzoned under BPS's current proposal: https://www.google.com/.../data=!3m6!1e1!3m4... Why upzone the poorer, more-minority, sidewalkless area but not the richer, less-minority, sidewalked area? I would suggest the reverse.	liz.rickles@gmail.com	Liz Rickles	27312	97212			Housing types, Mapping the "a" overlay, Displacement	
10242 SE Ramona St	Thanks and please do let me know what the outcome of this is! While I understand the need to increase density, it doesn't make sense to me that this block (which includes my house) will increase in density as it's really actually farther from "amenities" than property along Albina and Rosa Parks and Lombard and Vancouver that is not being increased in density. I don't want my house/lot to increase in value; I don't want my property taxes to go so high I can't afford to live in a house I've saved my whole life to buy. I don't want my garden--which is the whole reason I purchased this house--to be shaded out by blocky overpriced condos or apartments built on neighboring lots.	malexreed@gmail.com	Alex Reedin	27314	97206	Southeast	Brentwood-Darlington	Housing types, Narrow lots, Mapping R2.5 rezones	
700 N Stafford St		Claire.rivers@icloud.com	Claire Rivers	27315	97217	North	Piedmont	Mapping R2.5 rezones	

7442 SE 70th Ave	<p>As a homeowner in the area affected by this proposed draft of the residential infill project, I am in favor of the changes it entails. It is my hope that more available units in the neighborhood might ease the housing crunch we have been experiencing. We fully support the infill project. We have a very small house, 780 sq ft, on a large corner lot, 10,000 sq ft. We thought an ADU on our lot would be a good idea.</p> <p>PBOT informed us that as our proposed project would exceed a 35% increase in built value, we'd need to install approx. 200 LFt of curb, gutter and sidewalk making the project wildly expensive.</p>	marypierce@ionmedia.com	Mary Pierce	27317 97206	Housing types, Affordability
3501 SW Caldw St	<p>Policy and vision are not in alignment.</p> <p>I wish to offer full support of any zoning changes that would allow for higher density building of additional units and multi units. Having lived in Europe for years, I have lived first hand in cities similar in size to Portland that much MUCH higher density and less huge houses taking up tons of room. I lived in Hamburg, GR for a while and marveled at the amount of apartments, ADUs and multi units in the city and how it created an abundance of housing for people of all income levels. It also created more community and connection and less separation. Also, because of this, the city designed more efficient public transport systems and asked residents to be less reliant on cars.</p> <p>We have a huge problem in Portland. Not enough housing in a cosmopolitan center that is hugely popular to live in. We need zoning laws that allow for higher density building in residential areas.</p> <p>I'd like to specifically add testimony to and support of changing the law to allow duplexes to build ADUs on the same lot. I see a lot of duplex lots with large, unused open spaces which could be utilized. My family owns a 9000sf lot with a duplex on it and they want to build a third unit to rent out. And they can not. It's wasted space in my opinion. And would allow someone a new place to live. I fully support this changing as soon as possible.</p>	dennis.kitch@comcast.net	Dennis Kitch	27319 97219 West	Multnomah Housing types
7405 NE Prescott	<p>Thanks!</p> <p>I strongly oppose the new "a" overlay. A zoning change that so broadly imposes a THREE HUNDRED PERCENT increase in zoned household density, is simply irresponsible. The consequences of such a drastic action can not possibly be adequately anticipated or managed. Additionally, the infill project proposed is both too broad, and unfair. It is unfair in that is not evenly applied throughout the city, heavily burdening neighborhoods like mine. It is also too broad. Zoning needs to control use. Opening up for development, everything so many blocks from any commercial area or thoroughfare, is unnecessarily destructive. Zoning used intelligently and strategically is really important. Please do not throw out wholesale, the zoning protections we rely on. We badly need a "Middle Way" here, and this proposal is not it.</p>	robin@robinjackson.net	Robin Jackson	27320 97218	Scale, Housing types, Affordability
4308 SE AshST	<p>I strongly oppose the zone change to my neighborhood to allow the new a overlay. Ladd's addition is an historic neighborhood, renowned for its beauty/ People come from all over the city to walk and cycle and appreciate the architecture, the trees., and the rose gardens. the proposed zoning changes would seriously compromise the character and beauty of the area</p>	emailterryd@yahoo.cfo	Therese Dion	27321 97215	Housing types, Mapping the "a" overlay
1846 se ladd av	<p>I have reviewed in detail the zoning changes proposed by Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission with regards to our property. We have lived at this location for 30 years and originally purchased the property because of the character of the neighborhood.</p> <p>While I understand Portland's need for increased density, I feel that this proposed zoning change will effectively erode the character and livability of the neighborhood. These old suburbs are not the place to increase density in the manner proposed and will only tend to make long term residents sell and move due to increased problems that we already face from the City approved increased density on Hawthorne and Division. I am sure that this is not your intent and I would implore the Planning and Sustainability Commission to not approve this zoning change.</p>	fredakerman92@gmail.com	freda kerman	27322 97214	Mapping the "a" overlay
1634 SE 54th Ave	<p>I have reviewed in detail the zoning changes proposed by Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission with regards to our property. We have lived at this location for 30 years and originally purchased the property because of the character of the neighborhood.</p> <p>While I understand Portland's need for increased density, I feel that this proposed zoning change will effectively erode the character and livability of the neighborhood. These old suburbs are not the place to increase density in the manner proposed and will only tend to make long term residents sell and move due to increased problems that we already face from the City approved increased density on Hawthorne and Division. I am sure that this is not your intent and I would implore the Planning and Sustainability Commission to not approve this zoning change.</p>	mb@beamanarch.com	Michael Beaman	27324 97215 Southeast Mt. Tabor	Housing types

7089 N Wellesley Ave	<p>I applaud the city's efforts to preserve neighborhood character while at the same allowing a variety of new infill housing options. This is a difficult balance to strike, and yet it is exactly what these proposed amendments have achieved through a long and thoughtful process. We need the kinds of housing options allowed by this proposal in order to advance equitable development, maximize our investment in existing infrastructure and transit, allow more people to age in place, and minimize travel times by concentrating development. Many people don't like the word "density," but that's exactly what we need, and exactly what this proposal offers in strategic moderation, if we are to continue to be a leader in livability and sustainability.</p>	susanpshanks@gmail.com	Susan Shanks	27326 97203 North	University Park	Housing types,Affordability,Visitability
	<p>As a longtime resident of this neighborhood and homeowner since 2005, I'm very supportive of the city's direction to better manage home sizes with a reduced FAR -- I think this will help constrain new dwellings to better fit in with the existing neighborhood homes. At the same time, I see increasing density as a positive and necessary evolution in our city planning, so strongly support the proposal to allow additional ADUs / duplexes / triplexes.</p>					
	<p>There is an example currently under construction in my neighborhood - a triplex development at SE 50th and Lincoln that would otherwise probably have been another ugly and oversized Everett Custom Home - I would much rather see more right-sized, affordable houses like what's being built there than oversized monstrosities that ruin neighborhood aesthetics and are not affordable for those currently living here.</p>					
	<p>Having said that, the race to the bottom suggests that we are likely to see some very unsightly duplex and triplex developments from developers who are seeking to minimize costs and maximize profits. I feel that one way to potentially ameliorate these drawbacks would be for the city to sponsor additional design competitions, like the skinny house designs from several years ago. I'd like to see not just one but several city-approved duplex and triplex designs that could be built with minimal / accelerated permitting and possibly reduced fees. Those designs should be chosen for aesthetics and fit into the existing urban landscape -- possibly a way to gain density without sacrificing our neighborhood aesthetics.</p>					
4133 SE Lincoln Street	<p>Looking forward to seeing Portland moving forward and embracing its denser future as smartly and efficiently as possible without giving up what has made us a destination.</p>	dan_pdx@hotmail.com	Dan Tochen	27327 97214 Southeast	Richmond	Scale,Housing types Mapping the "a" overlay
1634 SE 54th Ave	<p>How would a neighborhood go about requesting a design overlay zone to go along with the proposed overlays? I bought my little ranch house in 2009 and have loved my neighborhood for several years. However, when greedy developers started knocking down perfectly wonderful houses and building the giant, ugly, sun blocking monsters I drive through my neighborhood with a sick feeling in my stomach. My neighbors and I are very negatively affected by the demolitions and the extremely oversized and unattractive houses they build in their place. If these proposed</p>	mb@beamanarch.com	Michael Beaman	27328 97215		
4317 SE Nehalem st	<p>zoning changes put an end to this misery I am all for it...100%</p>	matizzle.fox@gmail.com	Matilda Fox	27329 97206 Southeast	Woodstock	Scale
0841 SW Gaines St.	<p>As the owners of this property, and residents of Portland since 1988, we strongly support the proposed changes. Limiting the size of new single-family homes, and allowing ADUs and duplexes, makes total sense and is a great way to keep Portland neighborhoods both livable and more affordable. With the growth that has occurred and will continue, we need to find ways to make it possible for more people to live in our neighborhoods. These code changes will limit the spread of "McMansions" while making it possible to have more flexible and affordable types of homes like ADUs and duplexes. This is smart and equitable. Please vote yes to support this balanced, carefully thought out proposal. Kudos to City staff who have worked so hard on this.</p>	ruthadkinspdx@gmail.com	Ruth Adkins	27330 97239 East	Lents	Scale,Housing types,Affordability

April 6, 2018

Dear Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission:

I have lived in Portland for 15 years, moving to Portland because of the affordability of housing (at the time), the lack of traffic problems in getting around the City (at the time), the relative safety compared to other big cities (at the time) and the fact that Portland was a city of unique and distinctive neighborhoods, each with its own unique personality and beautiful, old historic homes, (also fast disappearing). Unique places like the Bay Area and Seattle have already been changed beyond recognition from what were livable, affordable places, to cities with no personality and are now totally unaffordable except for the uber wealthy, changing forever, what made each of those places special. My questions for the City--how much is too much? What is the motivation of the City to increasing housing beyond what might be reasonable in terms of impact on traffic, parking, schools, infrastructure and job availability? Do you just keep building until there is not one square inch left of the original neighborhoods, and to what end? How much do you want to change a city that was unique among cities throughout the country and was the main reason people moved here in the first place? When does the expansion stop?

The City is now proposing more infill--making every neighborhood more crowded, with less parking, and worst of all, potentially many, many more vacation rentals. I feel that this proposal cannot begin to be considered until the issue of Airbnb's and other vacation rentals, is addressed. There are currently more than 2500 legal Airbnb rentals--places that could have been permanent rentals for people looking for housing. Some are legal and many are not--many are merely apartments or condos where the owner doesn't live there and is renting this out for a vacation rental. I highly recommend that the City take a look at limiting airbnb rentals to a percentage of a neighborhood to keep every ADU from potentially being just another temporary rental and thus impacting the neighborhood away from a community. Without this safety in place, you will merely be increasing temporary rentals, not helping at all with the current housing crisis, and ruining existing neighborhoods. Streets in neighborhoods are already jammed with on street parking. Is it reasonable to assume everyone moving here will ride a bike or take the bus? I strongly recommend limiting both the number of vacation rentals to a percentage of homes/apartments either by lottery or registration before moving ahead on any further plans for ADUs and duplexes in neighborhoods, and also considering the impact on parking, traffic, noise pollution and affordable housing if this proposal is approved. I'm all for progress and improving our beautiful city, but not by increasing housing past what the area can reasonably support.

Most sincerely,

rusinow.terry@gmail.com

Ms. Terry Rusinow
2306 NE Everett St., Portland, OR. 97232 503-830-0650

rusinow.terry@gmail.com

terry rusinow

27331 97232

Parking,Other

While there are no plans to change the zoning of our property, we are in a neighborhood where single homes are being removed to build multiplexes and small office buildings are being replaced by huge apartment buildings. This is drastically changing the quality of our neighborhood - especially with respect to parking. We currently live on a corner lot with no parking on our property, but potentially many spaces on the street, but because of apartments, a school, nearby restaurants, a care facility with no parking for workers, the street in front of our house is nearly always filled with cars. Our once lovely neighborhood is feeling crowded and tempers are rising about lack of parking for those who actually live on this street. When new multi-family housing is put in the neighborhood, there MUST be adequate off-street parking for the number of cars that will be added to the neighborhood - not just a few spaces for a huge apartment building. It is unrealistic to believe that just because we are near bus lines, folks will not have cars. And parking for apartments must be affordable, otherwise folks will just park on the street. It would be great to have public parking for the restaurants and businesses in the neighborhood. With infill, the quality of our neighborhood is declining, not improving. Taller buildings reduces our visibility of the sky and it feels cramped and depressing. Thank you for considering my feedback about infill in my neighborhood.

2604 NE Flanders St

freda53@gmail.com

Freda Sherburne

27332 97232 Southeast Kerns

Parking

More Questions than Answers

Affordable housing is an important "missing middle piece" in Portland today. How best to achieve the goal of ensuring a supply of affordable housing for current residents, as well as for the prospective influx of new arrivals? And do we care about the change in quality of life for current neighbors who will now live with

3 questions we should ask ourselves:

- 1) Will the new in-fill zoning rules create more short-term hotel accommodations, aka, air bnb, rather than permanent long term housing?
- 2)What carrots and or sticks are available ensuring the new in-fills and ADU's are actually long-term rentals, not hotel short-term air bnb's? Do you even care?
- 3)How will we fund the resources necessary to monitor and enforce the legal air bnb regulations already on the books at our current levels?

In the interest of offering a solution, rather than merely complaining, here is 1 idea: why not set a percentage of "short-term" hotel stay accommodations, air bnb, per neighborhood.... like the taxi medallions in NY city? Each approved medallion has a number that is linked to an address and added to Portland Maps. An address can be checked on-line: either a primary long-term rental designation or short hotel-like designation with the medallion #. Medallions can either be sold and bought through private market place or "returned" to the city who keeps a waiting list.

Should we care about the diminished quality of life for our current neighbors who are being asked to now accept a daily parade of overnighters, as would be the case with an influx air bnbs on their street?

4915 SE Ash	More Questions Than Answers The proposed residential infill plan is unfair to people who chose to buy houses in neighborhoods with the current density limits. People plan their lives with long horizons, and when the city suddenly changes what people can reasonably expect it amounts to a violation of trust. People moving to Portland do not have a "right" to live in existing neighborhoods; they do not have a "right" to force those neighborhoods to be rezoned so that they can live in them; and they do not have a "right" to devalue the quality of life in these neighborhoods in order to accommodate their own lifestyle desires.	szeidel@gmail.com	susan zeidel	27333 97215	Other
6533 SE 30th Avenue	The size limitations on infill structures are too large and not in scale with the rest of the neighborhood. Basements and attics should NOT be excluded from determining the size of a proposed structure. Excluding basements and attics is a loophole that will allow huge buildings. Huge buildings will only make home affordability worse and ruin the character of Portland neighborhoods. Instead, we should be encouraging duplex conversion of existing structures and the building of ADUs.	brucegilley@yahoo.com	Bruce Gilley	27334 97202	Housing types
4033 NE Hoyt Street	I am supportive of allowing a new overlay for my R5 zoned property to allow one house and one ADU. I am not sure that two ADUs would fit on properties like mine with a small yard, and close spacing to my neighbors. Another concern would be parking if most houses on my block did have ADUs. It is a fairly narrow street with several rental properties, and sometimes parking can be tight.	bruce97212@gmail.com	Bruce Newton	27335 97232	Scale,Housing types
1704 SE 58th Avenue	I think this city needs more housing. I am for this change.	JuliaCNM@comcast.net	Julia St. Lawrence	27336 97215	Housing types,Parking
3541 ne 125th ave		kylesnoozy@gmail.com	Kyle Snoozy	27337 97230	Housing types
5020 SE 35th Ave	Please do not allow for infill overlay (R7, R5, R2.5 base zones) in the Reedway neighborhood – specifically around my home at 5020 Se 35th Ave. The area about a mile in all directions around my home has unique architecture that should be preserved. It is a development of ranch style homes build in 1962 as a "Tour of Homes" community. The theme was "A little bit of country in the city". The homes are all split or single level ranch homes. Traversing the neighborhood is like a trip to the past when Jell-O molds and deviled eggs were the rage. If you destroy this unique neighborhood with ugly modern infill, you not only damage our property values, but strip the city of an important area of historical architecture. The value of the minimal amount of infill you would be able to do would never be worth the damage you would do to the neighborhood and the history of the city.	Annette.Matthews@va.gov	Annette Matthews	27345 97202 Southeast Reed	Mapping the "a" overlay

3712 SE 32nd Ave.	<p>Please do not pass this "overlay" zoning as it will further ruin the neighborhood. We already have apartments full of people who all have cars with limited parking. We have home owners who don't maintain the property they have now and if they add two more housing facilities on their property, chances are there will be sub-par structures. Who will be checking these units to be sure they are fire safe and have appropriate plumbing for waste, etc.? The answer is no one....the city doesn't have the staff to monitor these dwellings...they'll become dangerous shanties... don't rely on individual homeowners to take care of a city's problem by creating more problems. My neighborhood is crowded enough with all the apartments...put these extra housing units in the rich, plush neighborhoods, not the struggling poorer neighborhoods...we have enough problems to deal with...we all deserve to have a safe and reasonably populated neighborhood....we just want a fair density and safety. Thank You for your considerations.</p>	lindasuzuki@yahoo.com	Linda Suzuki	27347 97202 Southeast	Creston-	Housing types, Mapping the "a" overlay, Parking
3636 SE Tibbetts St	<p>I would like to see the setback requirement for detached two-story ADUs relaxed. I could build a nice, two-story ADU where my current detached garage is located and because my lot is against a large grade change in the rear, it wouldn't affect my neighbors behind me adversely. But I do not want to build an ADU 5ft from the side property line because it will greatly reduce my backyard size that is dominated by a large fir tree's roots. Thank you. I strongly oppose the proposed 'a' overlay zoning change for my zone, R7, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -It is incompatible with the existing neighborhood -It lines the pockets of developers and those wanting to make a quick buck, thus valuing money over retaining the fabric of a neighborhood -Increased noise – my neighborhood is a quiet oasis that I do not want to lose -There is no infrastructure in place to support it -More housing units promote overcrowding which increases traffic, traffic congestion and parking issues -It destroys wildlife. More housing units destroy trees and land, displacing birds and other creatures <p>We intentionally moved to this neighborhood for a reason – it is quiet and the neighborhood spirit has been retained. We owned a home in the Hawthorne area for over 20 years. With infill, new apartments, condos and skinny houses, the overdevelopment destroyed the neighborhood. We couldn't get out of there fast enough.</p> <p>And now we live with the threat of this happening again. More housing units allowed in a concentrated area rips neighborhoods apart. It does not bind neighbors together.</p> <p>In the flyer I received regarding the zoning change, it states: "A zoning change alone won't solve our housing shortage, but it will give more people opportunities to live in these vibrant neighborhood close to schools, parks, shopping and good transit options."</p> <p>Doesn't the city of Portland understand that with a zoning change such as this, the neighborhood will no longer be the neighborhood that it once was? It will no longer have the vibrancy that it once had. Expecting a neighborhood to retain its beloved character once this kind of zoning takes place is ludicrous.</p>	keentv@gmail.com	Nathaniel Flynn-Ryan	27348 97202 Southeast	Richmond	Scale
3614 SE Insley St.	<p>I understand the need for more affordable housing, but not at the expense of destroying my neighborhood.</p>	lizornan@gmail.com	Nannette Gatchel	27349 97202 Southeast	Reed	Housing types, Mapping the "a" overlay, Parking
2346 SE 101st Ave	<p>This proposal allowing multiple accessory dwelling units in our neighborhood is a bad idea. It will congest 101st Ave SE since there will be no parking except for the street for the ADUs. It will cause traffic accidents and traffic jams, make our neighborhood less safe and more dangerous to the safety of our children. 101st Ave SE has no speed bumps, unfinished sidewalks, and ambulances and police use it as a designated emergency route to the hospital. In September, 2016, police chased a suspect in a stolen vehicle through my fence at 80 miles per hour knocking down my 20 foot arborvitae. This proposal is not the answer to the housing crisis. It's a recipe for disaster.</p>	bonnerdon@gmail.com	Donald BONNER	27350 97216 East	Hazelwood	Housing types, Mapping the "a" overlay, Parking
2041 NE Highland St	<p>I support the proposed changes. We need to keep Portland accessible. Oversized single family houses on small lots are an inefficient use of land and do not fit with the character of the neighborhood.</p>	kberlee3@gmail.com	Kimberlee Barry	27351 97211		Housing types, Affordability

I am glad to see Portland is waking up to the fact that we need infill housing.

You are not going far enough.
These rules need to apply to the entire city.
More housing is needed in the entire city, not just some sections.

I own 13750 NE San Rafael St in Portland.
I have 24,000 square feet of land.
I want to split the lot into 3 lots and build 2 new houses while keeping the existing house built in the mid 50's.
And i would like to have ADU units with them.

The city will not allow me to have a lot
51 feet wide and 145 feet deep to meet the
7500 square feet needed for this area.

The reason is the Glendovver layover. Something that was aproved some 25 plus years ago, no one seems to know how old this rule is. When the area was annexed from the county to the city some 30, 40 or more years ago.

The Glendovver layover is completely out of date and removed from the books.

I am one block off of halsey (2 lanes each way) and just a few blocks from the Gateway district.

I have 24,000 square feet of land and can
only get 2 houses on it. I am in R7 zone.

Is someone in the city willing to work with me to get 3 houses on my property?

I am trying to help with the housing crisis and the city is stopping me.

Thanks
Mike Janniro

2248 NW Johnson st

Cramming more infill needs to be accompanied by infrastructure enhancement. Example: about four years ago the tree-studded acreage behind us was leveled and had 14 3-story condos built. Single car garages with a single car driveway has caused many of these folks to park all over the neighborhood, street traffic has increased dramatically, and water pressure has dropped to the point you can barely shower anymore. Our irrigation system no longer has enough pressure to water the lawn. Have talked with many neighbors and we have all experienced these issues

mjanniro@ix.netcom.com

Mike Janniro

27352 97210 East

Russell

Housing types, Mapping the "a" overlay, Affordability, Other

11728 SE Madison St

(especially the water issue) since the new development went in.
In recent months, I have become curious about the potential changes around my home and the greater PDX area and was pleased to receive your public notice about proposed zoning code and map changes. We invested in buying a house in portland specifically to invest in our community, and the ability to be part of the rental solution down the road as a 2.5 zoned overlay is desirable from a personal and community perspective. Us homeowners are stewards of our land and community and it is also on us and any developers to develop and make changes to properties respectfully. I'd love to see Portland continue to support the craftsman aesthetic and the practice of building structurally sound and beautiful homes.

skicat1@comcast.net

Vicki Andersen

27357 97216 East

Mill Park

Parking

5525 NE 29th Ave.

More broadly, I am encouraged by Portland's commitment to environmental and social integrity in it's city planning processes. Thanks for doing the work to build our city responsibly and intelligently.

bfbabbott@gmail.com

Ben Skye-Babbott

27358 97211

Affordability

I am writing to voice my concerns and with the proposed changes for my property and to ask that they not move forward in this form. I am a school teacher with Portland Public Schools and It is very difficult to live in this city. I bought one of the smallest houses on my street with just enough room for my family. I knew that as my children grew (in age not number) I would need to add a bedroom and a bathroom. The way the current changes are proposed that will be difficult if not impossible. I don't want to make my house much bigger and I fully understand and support the spirit of these changes, but the rules are too restrictive. If I add a little space up stairs I will go over the limits under these new rules. The ratio of .5:1 is the problem. .65:1 or .75:1 would reach the same goal without making my property unlivable for my family and would not drastically reduce my property value. This home is my primary investment as well as my living space. In effect this would mean that I cannot add on because my unfinished attic adds increases my square footage to over what the new limit would be. This means that the property will be less desirable and decrease in value.

If you pass these changes my family will be forced to move into a larger home but will have to sell this property with lower equity. In short, I may not even be able to remain in the city. I have already experienced this when the recession hit and I had a similar experience with my first home. I am tired of people with no stake in my personal financial future making decisions that have huge impacts on it. First wall street took thousands of dollars from my family when we did all the right things. Now my city is trying to do the same thing. Don't do this. It is not fair to the working families of Portland.
new 'a' overlay zone.

This so called "overlay zone" is effectively a rezone that takes away the very restrictions the "R5" or "R7" zones are designed to uphold. No longer will the lots on my street be restricted to one house per 5,000 square feet. Instead, the overlay zone permits duplexes, multiple ADUs, and even triplexes on corner lots.

The effect of this is very clear. This will give more incentive for developers to demolish older homes in order to cram multiple units onto one lot. As a result, Portland will lose more and more historical homes that give the city much of the character that is has. We have already lost so many beautiful homes to developers that only seek profit, and could care less about the quality of housing that they build. Please do not promote this with the zoning changes that are proposed.

The idea that this rezoning will promote more affordable housing is a farce. The current crop of skinny homes and duplexes being stuffed onto single family lots are far from affordable. The new duplexes and triplexes that are built will be no different.

The way to more affordable housing is to promote true high-density housing (apartments and condos) in the core of the city, and along major arterial roads and vacant lots. Additionally, the city can work with Metro to expand housing options in the suburbs. Once the vintage homes in Portland are torn down, they are gone for good. This rezoning policy will only speed up and reinforce this destruction.

If you were to ask anyone that grew up in Portland if any homes are "affordable" in their eyes, most would say no. Affordable homes in Portland are a thing of the past. This city is well on it's way to becoming the next San Francisco in terms of real estate prices. To think that allowing multiple units on single lots will make this city affordable again is a pipe dream. The only chance for housing units that are even remotely "affordable" to the masses is to build high density housing. Even then, chances of a return to affordability in this town are slim. Don't destroy what is left of old Portland, all for the illusion of cheaper housing. The results will not be pretty.

For an example of how tearing down old buildings and building new ones has not worked to provide affordable housing, take a look at N. Williams Avenue, N. Interstate Avenue, and NE MLK Jr Blvd. All of these locations were forever changed by so-called "urban renewal". The plan was to get rid of so-called "blight" and improve neighborhoods. The housing and commercial real estate that was built is more expensive than at any other time in

2625 NE 30th Ave.

hook.ryan@gmail.com

Ryan Hook

27359 97212

Scale

635 NE Simpson Street

camsouth@gmail.com

Cameron South

27360 97211 Northeast King

Housing types,Narrow lots,Affordability

Hello:

I do not understand why you feel the need to make drastic changes to the zoning codes of my property. You state it is regard to the need for affordable housing and need for increased housing stock due to "projected" influx of people moving to Portland. Personally, I would love to live in downtown San Francisco BUT I CAN'T AFFORD IT AND I DON'T SEE IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CITY TO CHANGE THEIR LAWS TO PROVIDE IT FOR ME. Who is this benefitting? It is certainly not benefitting me, the current owner. The only people who will benefit are the developers and realtors, and you, the city with increased taxes/permits and revenue. They have been the beneficiaries so far with this "housing crisis." And do you truly believe it will result in cheaper housing? What it will result in is increased density with no parking, tons of tree, shrubbery removal, and a significant degradation of the quality of life in my neighborhood. Do you actually think that people will not have cars who chose to move here? So you allow developers, in this new overlay, to build houses without ANY parking requirements. That is just plain crazy. So persons who live one block from me do not have to take this burden on, my god, with your proposals, I could have a beautiful one story home that is across the street from me, torn down and replaced with a triplex with NO PARKING. WHO IS BENEFITTING? Additionally, my home, which I have lovingly restored, will MOST DEFINITELY be torn down when I sell. The money is too great for the developers. How is this practicing sustainability.? Perfectly good homes being torn down? Let the housing market correct itself. It already is, as less people are moving here. Get back to the basics, hire more police officers and fix the damn potholes. Thank you.

3509 NE Alberta Ct

ervnancy@msn.com

Ervin Siverson

27361 97211 Northeast Concordia

I am strongly in support of the proposed zoning changes that will affect my property and my neighborhood. Through the RIP, the City of Portland has done an excellent job of accommodating a wider range of housing options, and allowing the retrofit of existing development to increase density, while ensuring that new development is compatible with existing neighborhood patterns. I'm incredibly fortunate to own a home in a beautiful Portland neighborhood with great parks, transit options, and places to walk to. I believe that more people at a range of income levels should have this same opportunity. People complain about Portland neighborhoods losing their character, but I think the greatest threat to a neighborhood's character is becoming unaffordable to all but the wealthy.

6123 NE 35th Pl

katerogers82@gmail.com

Katherine Rogers

27363 97211 Northeast Concordia

Housing types, Mapping the "a" overlay, Affordability

I disagree with the proposed changes. You have already changed my lot from a R5 to a R2.5, but now you want to cram even more housing on a half-lot? NE Killingsworth and NE Ainsworth's traffic has become almost inaccessible from the hours of 4pm-7pm due to the amount of residents crammed into my neighborhood. YOU NEED TO DEVELOP INFRASTRUCTURE and PUBLIC TRANSIT if you plan on having twice to 4 times as many people in the current space. Otherwise we will all be stuck in traffic all the time.

5621 NE 28th ave

kenallen88@gmail.com

Kenneth Allen

27364 97211 Northeast Concordia

Mapping the "a" overlay

I absolutely object to the proposal of adding ADU units to properties in our neighborhood or any proposal of bigger homes, compared to current approved plan. The parking situation is already a nightmare on our street (Tillamook) and we already have too many problems with the Section 8 housing at the end of the street with numerous adults living there and a massive amount of cars. I bought my home in this neighborhood for the pure purpose of the quaintness. Please respect our neighborhood - AS IS - and find another solution for the housing crisis in PDX.

502 NE Tillamook
12801 SE Sherman
St

Toscasauntie@hotmail.com

Sonia Collier

27365 97217 Northeast Eliot

Housing types, Parking

I oppose this plan.

kingle96@gmail.com

xiao chen

27366 97233

I urge the Planning Commission to reduce the FAR allowance as proposed, or even more. I live in a neighborhood of older homes in inner NE Portland. Our block has a character and aesthetic due to the modest but quality 1920s bungalows and large trees. There are small front yards, but enough for neighbors to gather, children to play, and gardens to beautify, especially at this time of year when spring blooms bring hope. The monster houses ruin the historic nature of the neighborhood, the "commons" of the block, and the light for those who live next door. We have had several of these monsters in our neighborhood and one on my block just recently. It makes us feel sad to see the character of our block diminished because of one huge new house that sticks out like a sore thumb. The house they tore down was very similar to our own and there was not need to destroy it. The 1920s bungalows still look good, if they've been maintained, after nearly 100 years. I hate to see what these monster houses will look like in 100 years. The character and livability of the city is a made up of the character and livability of its neighborhoods. Attractive neighborhoods make the inner city a desirable place to live. The monster houses don't add density, they don't add affordability, they don't add livability or character. They are not part of a sustainable city, which should be moving toward less square footage per resident, not more. And the often tear down perfectly good homes that could be restored or remodeled, producing less waste and consuming less resource in the process. Rather than replaced by cheaper materials that will not last. I really see no redeeming value. Please curb this trend by increasing setbacks and reducing the FARs for established neighborhood lots.

2925 NE 29th Ave

Debra Sturdevant 27367 97212

Scale, Affordability

I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed changes to land use rules in my neighborhood.

Who are your constituents? Is it the developers, who stand to make a fortune tearing down perfectly good homes to build more homes? Is it the people who may move here, who have not paid a nickel in taxes? Is it the realtors, who will profit mightily without any investment in the neighborhood?

Or is it me, someone who has an investment in the neighborhood and city, who has paid taxes faithfully for years, who has improved the neighborhood I choose to live in.

Let's be honest with ourselves. The underlying lots definitions in my neighborhood, written over a century ago, were never intended to be manipulated in this way. A single family home on a 5000 square foot lot. A place to have a small garden. A place for kids to play. A back yard.

Your proposals will eliminate all of this in my neighborhood. It will assure that virtually every home sold will be torn down. The money that developers will make is too great. Can you imagine, in the lot next to me, a duplex that can be 35 feet tall, with a detached ADU in what was the back yard? And with NO PARKING. And your changes to FAR are a joke. All the lots in my neighborhood would now have to be attached housing that now can be even taller. And can have a ADU in what was the backyard. The footprints are even bigger, not smaller. This will absolutely ruin the character of my neighborhood.

3509 ne Alberta Ct

ervnancy@msn.com

Ervin Siverson

27368 97211 Northeast Concordia g

Scale, Narrow lots, Mapping the "a" overlay, Mapping R2.5 rezones, Parking

I am your constituent. I am the taxpayer who is here now. I hope you listen to the people who will be most affected, not the ones who stand to make the most profit.

2708 SE Market St

seanderly@gmail.com

Stephen Anderly

27369 97214 Southeast Hosford- Abernethy Other

I would like you to consider special exemptions for unique neighborhoods. Specifically I live in a 15 block area that has Storybook House types. I am afraid that infill will spoil our neighborhood much as an infill in Peacock Lane disrupted that neighborhood. I notice you have exemptions for historical houses but not neighborhoods. You may want to expand that definition.

4154 NE Glisan

eric@millerwenger.net

Eric Miller

27370 97232 Southeast st

Laurelhur Other

I write in support of the proposed zoning code changes, with one caveat. A significant portion of recent infill development and replacement has been of low quality design and construction. I would hope that the city could adopt requirements and a streamlined review process to help ensure high quality development that preserves the character of our city.

2122 NE 95th Place

cornellsrnd@yahoo.com

Stephen Cornell

27371 97220

Parking

I am a 66 year old third generation Portland resident. I have watched the city of Portland become much too crowded. This idea of constantly trying to jam more people into our existing Urban Growth Boundary is not working. Hopefully, as home prices go up less people will move here. I do not want my neighbors building ADUs. Our street will be jammed with even more vehicles. ADUs will all produce at least one or two vehicles. As much as the "planners" would like, most people are going to have a vehicle.

7028 SE Martins St	Letter attached. I am in strong OPPOSITION of the proposed new 'a' overlay zone in Eastmoreland. This neighborhood cannot support duplexes and triplexes on corner lots. There is not adequate parking. There is NO CAPACITY FOR HIGH DENSITY HOUSING IN EASTMORELAND. Duniway Elementary and Sellwood Middle School are at capacity. There are NO plans for increase in school funding or space. This would NOT provide for affordable housing, as developers would maximize lots and sell homes for an average of \$850,000. Overlay would only incentivize more home demolition, causing more environmental waste.		Alana Buckallew	27372	97206	Southeast	Mt. Scott-Arleta	Housing types
7100 SE Reed College Place	There is no need for an overlay in Eastmoreland. As city planners, please be responsible and protect citizens who are extremely high property tax payers and avoid an 'a' overlay zone. Protect schools that are at high capacity and look for growth in other areas.	elizabethsuper@hotmail.com	Elizabeth Super	27373	97202	Southeast	Eastmoreland	Housing types, Mapping the "a" overlay, Parking
7100 SE Reed College Place	Opposition for 'a' overlay zone in Eastmoreland. No capacity at schools, parking. This would only increase demolitions as developers race to smash historic homes and turn them into duplexes and triplexes. No need for 'a' overlay zone in Eastmoreland. Be responsible city planners and not in the pockets of developers.	zimdays777@gmail.com	Shane Rogosin	27374	97202	Southeast	Eastmoreland	Mapping the "a" overlay, Housing types, Mapping the "a" overlay, Parking
6111 SE 36th	I oppose the proposed "new "a" overlay" in our neighborhood. I support the Eastmoreland Historic District. The demolition of perfectly good houses for no reason needs to end. This is not a neighborhood that needs triplexes. The street and road system in the neighborhood cannot support such density.	schoutenhank@yahoo.com	Hendrik Schouten Jr	27375	97202	Southeast	Eastmoreland	Mapping the "a" overlay, Parking
1632 SE 48 Ave	My husband and I own several properties in the SE Hawthorne neighborhood. Though there are some things I like about the proposal, I do not support it passing. What I do like is the proposal to have smaller homes on lots, not allowing homes to take up the whole lot, and height restrictions. I do not like at all, that people can build up-to 3 ADUS and the demand to have properties zoned R.5 to build two structures. Also, ruining our neighborhoods and taking away lawns, trees and greenery will not help the housing crisis. I propose that you demand that all the multitude of Apt. complexes that are going up and have gone up provide Low income housing. What will happen with the proposal is that people will build, remove lawns and continue to charge high rents and nothing will be solved. Please do not ruin our neighborhoods more than they already have been with huge Everett homes, a disregard for the style of home in the neighborhoods and the lawns disappearing with every new huge home.	carinda2@excite.com	Carrie Roth	27376	97215	Southeast	Richmond	Scale, Housing types
5316 N. E. 34th ave	NO, Please do not re-zone my property. In the past year Multnomah County has passed the Historical House De-Construction Ordinance that has decreased my 104-year old, simple small house property value for potential developing investors. And now once again you are suggesting the same type de-valuing my property for potential buyers. I'm not rich by any means and need every dollar of my investment. PLEASE I plead with you not to re-zone my property! This re-zoning is harmful to not only myself but many of my Neighbor's that may not know the ramifications of this re-zoning will mean for current property investment. Christopher	fiddy225@gmail.com	christopher schmidt	27378	97211	Northeast	Concordia	Mapping R2.5 rezones
42 Finch Lane	We own a house at 5119 SE Taylor St, Portland OR 97215. State ID# 152E06AB 9800. Our daughter lives there. This house is in the area affected by the proposed zoning change. The proposed changes are very good ideas and may help to maintain the character of the neighborhood. A 2nd floor addition was added to the house west of ours and it blocks light and the view and is totally out of character with the surrounding houses. Let's not allow that to happen again.	mossknitter@gmail.com	Leslie Quenell	27381	98261			Scale
3801 - 3803 SE 33rd Ave	I am very much in support of the Residential Infill Project plan, and the zoning designation that would be applicable to property I own, per the notice that was sent to me for Proposed Zoning Code And Map Changes. Why did this parcel, and its neighbors near the high-frequency transit line not get up-zoned to 2.5? It's frustrating to watch this privileged neighborhood throw a fit with the Lincoln diverters and not be asked to take its share of growth. Especially with the addition of the new a overlay, all of the area between Division and Belmont near transit should be	spienovi@comcast.net	Sil Pienovi	27382	97202			Scale, Housing types, Mapping the "a" overlay
2725 SE 36th Ave	upzoned to R2.5 and should have the a overlay applied.	alankessler@gmail.com	Alan Kessler	27383	97202	Southeast	Mt. Tabor	Mapping the "a" overlay, Mapping R2.5 rezones

I believe that the square footage of a basement should not be included in the total area of a house. My house is 1.5 stories with 1,600 sq ft of living space and plus a basement which is at least 75% below ground. If you include the area of the basement in the total area, I will not be able to add a rear dormer upstairs because I will exceed the 2,500 sq ft limit. My second floor is 500 sq feet with two rooms on either end. The house ideally needs a rear dormer because (1) there is not enough space to carry a queen sized mattress upstairs because the hallway at the top of the stairs is too narrow (a dormer would widen the space). (2) Neighboring houses to the north and south have bedroom windows that directly face my upstairs bedroom windows so there is no privacy if we both have our blinds open. Both of the neighboring houses have rear dormers but my house does not. Ideally, the upstairs rooms need a rear dormer to let light in while creating privacy if the neighbors blinds are open. (3) A rear dormer will not affect the appearance of the front of the house. It will not look oversized compared to other houses in the neighborhood as most houses of my style have rear dormers. (4) Including basements in total area will encourage people to finish their basements to add extra space and I personally don't think that a dark underground basement that is prone to water intrusion is a good space to use as living quarters. Thank you for your consideration.

3132 NE 11th Ave

joannaferry@yahoo.com

Joanna Ferry

27384 97212 Northeast Sabin Scale

This lot and all of the 2.5-zoned lots along Woodstock should have the a overlay applied. Woodstock and Chavez are both transit streets, there are two grocery stores just down the street, many restaurants, lovely parks, a MAX station down the hill, etc.

2725 SE 36th Ave

alankessler@gmail.com

Alan Kessler

27385 97202 Southeast k Woodstoc Mapping the "a" overlay

This testimony relates to this lot and all of the other lots in Eastmoreland.

Eastmoreland was zero percent black in the 2010 census. It is home to one of the most segregated elementary schools in the district. It has a long ugly history of redlining and exclusionary zoning.

It is unconscionable that the a overlay would not be applied throughout this rich, white enclave.

At the very least, the areas within 1/4 mile of Woodstock and the MAX station should be up-zoned to at least R2.5 and should have the a overlay applied. Portland is not meeting its affirmative obligation to integrate this neighborhood unless it takes opportunities such as this one to up-zone and provide incentives and allowances for affordable housing.

2725 SE 36th Ave

alankessler@gmail.com

Alan Kessler

27386 97202 Southeast and Eastmorel Mapping the "a" overlay, Mapping R2.5 rezones, Affordability

To whom it may concern: I understand you are proposing infill based on the idea that Portland has a housing shortage and you claim adding these overlay areas will reduce the shortage. I do not believe Portland has a shortage. Rather, I believe the problem is affordability. Rents have not increased because of shortages but simple greed by landowners and the perception of cheaper housing by those moving here from cities and states that are even higher. Increasing infill is not going to lower rents to "affordable" levels. Instead it will just increase crowding, traffic, lack of parking, and frustration among citizens as they find their quality of life within their neighborhoods reduced. Tempers flair and more disputes arise often times requiring police involvement. In a perfect world people are considerate of one another and aware of how their behavior or noise level may be adversely affecting those nearby. But, we don't live in a perfect world. I know too that you'd like more people to ride bikes or take mass transit instead of driving but again that is not practical for a large segment of the population. We do not have the weather for it and many in our population are older and/or suffer from some sort of disability that makes them feel vulnerable and fearful to ride the bus. My uncle, mother, and husband are all examples of those who do not feel safe either riding the bus/max or standing at the bus stop in the dark or inclement weather waiting for a ride. Thus, they either drive or arrange for someone to drive them where they need to go. I believe one of the things that makes Portland wonderful is that we have diversity of neighborhoods. We have neighborhoods that are primarily single family houses, some that are primarily multi-family such as apartments and duplexes, and neighborhoods with a nice mix. Please don't ruin our single family neighborhoods by over crowding them. Especially under the guise of supplying affordable housing. Please do not allow our quality of life and neighborhood to further decline with crowded streets, decline in parking, and obstructed views (by tall apartment/retail buildings). Thank you for considering my testimony.

3344 NE 26th Ave.

janddmaki@comcast.net

Denise Maki

27387 97212 Northeast Alameda Affordability, Par King

I'm sure I am not alone in my thinking/views.

1615 NE 28th Av	<p>My wife and I are opposed to the new overlay and increased density rezoning in this area. Traffic and parking are already at dangerous and unstable levels and the increase in this traditional Portland neighborhood further threatens to undermine the cohesiveness and livability of the area. There is already a diverse set of properties including single and multi-family, single family and multi-family units. The East side of Portland has already borne the brunt of the cities re-zoning and density increasing hysteria.</p> <p>For both safety and future livability, we request that this rezoning be defeated. People living in these neighborhoods have a right to have some say in what these continue to look and feel like.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Tim and Nicole Cleary</p> <p>Type or paste your testimony in this box...</p>	clearytim4@gmail.com	Tim Cleary	27388 97232 Northeast	Sullivan'S Gulch	Mapping the "a" overlay,Parking
2015 NE 37th	<p>My wife and I are opposed to the new overlay and increased density rezoning in this area. Traffic and parking are already at dangerous and unstable levels and the increase in this traditional Portland neighborhood further threatens to undermine the cohesiveness and livability of the area. There is already a diverse set of properties including single and multi-family, single family and multi-family units. The East side of Portland has already borne the brunt of the cities re-zoning and density increasing hysteria.</p> <p>For both safety and future livability, we request that this rezoning be defeated. People living in these neighborhoods have a right to have some say in what these continue to look and feel like.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Tim and Nicole Cleary</p> <p>Type or paste your testimony in this box...</p>	clearytim4@gmail.com	Tim Cleary	27389 97212 Northeast	Grant Park	Mapping the "a" overlay,Parking
6699 SE Scott Dr	<p>your testimony in this box...</p> <p>The plan looks to increase housing density in our neighborhood along the Sandy corridor. I think this is smart planning and if the plan works to control the scale of the growth, I think the visual character of the neighborhood should hold. What I worry about is the increased traffic within the neighborhood and car trips on Sandy. I think this zoning plan should be accompanied by a transit plan that calms traffic within the neighborhood (there are very few controlled intersections right now). Transit along Sandy is frequent but not rapid in any sense, and without significant improvements the street will become clogged.</p>	clearytim4@gmail.com	Tim Cleary	27390 97215 Southeast	Mt. Tabor	Mapping the "a" overlay,Parking
4435 NE 75th Ave	<p>As a homeowner at a property being given the new "a" overlay (in an R2.5 zone) I would like to express my enthusiastic support for this change. This is exactly the kind of smart density increases that we need in order to keep this city livable and affordable (or at least no more expensive than it already is) as we grow. I would only like to more of these kinds of changes, and faster. As someone who is lucky to live in one of Portland's great neighborhoods, we need to start letting more people live in and enjoy them as we look towards the future.</p>	Oakley.brooks@gmail.com	A Oakley Brooks	27391 97218 Northeast	Roseway	Scale,Housing types
3514 SE Taylor St	<p>I am for the proposed changes in the zoning of my neighborhood. I have seen far too many perfectly affordable and usable houses being torn down and replaced by massive infill houses. I can see tearing down old houses that need replacement, but many of these new houses are out of scale with the neighborhood and neighboring houses. The new recommended FAR ratio would help with keeping houses in scale with this area.</p>	erinlise@gmail.com	Erin Machell	27392 97214		Mapping the "a" overlay,Affordability
4528 NE 32nd Ave	<p>Infill can harm the character of existing neighborhoods, which character is what makes the neighborhoods special, unique and desirable. Neighborhood character adds to the richness of the city. The destruction of existing homes to create additional density can undermine communities and create less desirable neighborhoods.</p>	jopricepdx@gmail.com	James Price	27408 97211 Northeast	Concordia	Scale
2734 NE 32 Place	<p>Our family chose to live in our neighborhood in part because the population is less dense.</p>	tylerorowski@gmail.com	Tyler Orowski	27410 97212		Housing types

I oppose the proposed Zoning Code and Map changes being considered by the Planning and Sustainability Commission (PSC).

We do have a shortage of affordable housing in Portland. But increasing density through demolition of existing houses is not the solution. Developers who demolish one affordable house never replace it with two affordable houses. Rather they replace it with two larger houses, each at double the price of the affordable house that was destroyed. They are making lots of money and the new home buyer, or low-income renter are the ones who cannot find affordable housing. Thus, the City of Portland, through RIP and the Overlay proposals, seems to be fueling a speculative real estate market, rather than addressing the very real need for affordable housing. Currently we have too many market rate rentals and houses--and many of these are being used for short-term rentals through sites like AirBnB, further eroding the availability of affordable units.

3009 SE Rex Street

I urge you NOT to adopt these proposed changes to the Zoning Code and Map. Thank you.

sqroot@msn.com

Angela SQUIRES

27411 97202 Southeast and

Housing types,Affordability
Eastmorel

I would like to go on record in opposition to the proposed changes. Increasing the density of dwellings and people in our neighborhoods will allow more people to live in them, which sounds like a good thing, but it will change their character for the worse in terms of traffic, noise, crowding, and aesthetics. It will also have a negative effect on property values in terms of appreciation. I agree that property values are very high here now, but we did not create the market that drove them, and in effect you are proposing to ask us as long-term homeowners to donate some of our appreciation for the good of the "other guy". For those of us who saved forever to buy a house and took a risk to buy one when appreciation was uncertain, that is not fair. If the city wants infill, are they going to compensate us for the hit to appreciation?

2745 NE 35th Ave

lauries@sterlink.net

Craig Laurie

27413 97212

Housing types

Dear PSC, City Council, RIP decision makers, and neighbors,

My family would like to argue against adoption of the new 'a' overlay in areas like our own which are historically significant and already offer many diverse housing options --- single family, duplexes, adus, apartment buildings, etc.. It looks like the Sunnyside/Hawthorne area is particularly impacted by these proposed changes. Our base zone has already been changed from R5 to R2.5 and the 'a' overlay allows not just a doubling but a 6X increase in the number of dwellings historically allowed on a lot like our own. The doubling of allowable dwellings alone will have drastic and unforeseeable consequences. The 'a' overlay is unprecedented, extreme and unwise.

We see what the new development looks and acts like. The new dwellings are not in any way affordable. They rob our neighborhoods of trees, green spaces, solar gain and aesthetics, while benefitting those who want to sell at a large profit, the developers ready to step in, and the wealthy newcomers who can afford the new construction. The 'a' overlay highly incentivizes demolition of existing homes to make way for way more and way less affordable homes. The greenest house is a house which already exists.

We all see that adus and basement apartments are added and then rented out on short-term platforms like Airbnb or VRBO. This is fine with me, but does not increase affordability or long-term housing stock.

If there is to be application of the infill proposals, they should be spread more fairly across the city, impacting all neighborhoods, even those housing people with the highest socio-economic status. If the new construction is aimed at people who have not yet moved to Portland, why not situate it mainly along light rail lines to decrease future car congestion?

This is a wholesale experiment being conducted without a test run or a public vote. I see that good people support it as a way to increase affordable housing stock, but at what price, and with what guarantees that their positive goals will be achieved?

I would argue for a vote on these proposals. The current discussion is in danger of being monopolized by those with the most to gain, as opposed to those of us who already live here.

I would also argue for a trial of these bold ideas in a small area, with a serious study to see how livability, housing costs, parking, traffic and other factors are impacted. Existing studies show that affordability is not improved by infill. Thank you for your consideration. We are extremely worried about the real life fallout from these proposals and concerned that our voices will not be heard.

1327 SE 32nd Place

Sincerely,

cap823@hotmail.com

C Poliak

27414 97214 Southeast Sunnyside overlay,Parking

Housing types,Mapping the "a"

I support the idea of infill, but I believe there should be a height limitation. I have seen too many one-story houses suddenly cast into shadow by the new tall and skinny house next door. Sunlight is important and perhaps a right. Maybe the city could impose a limit of, say, no more than 10 ft over the existing structure? Or perhaps, the closer to the property line, the lower the new building has to be? Speaking of which, I thought we had a 6 foot required space between a building and the property. Is that no longer true with infill? Some of these skinny houses seem almost on the line.

8829 NE Hill Way	thank you, Marian Flood	marazul@juno.com	Marian Flood	27415 97220	Scale,Narrow lots
2013 NE Ridgewood Dr	I am absolutely in favor of the proposal to limit the construction of very large homes, and to limit structure size in proportion to the lot size. It is good you have heard us on this issue. The damage already done is heartbreaking. Not to mention UGLY.	emmitsma@gmail.com	Connie Coleman	27416 97212	Scale

I am writing out of concern about the residential infill project (RIP). The stated goals are laudable: increasing housing availability and affordability, accomodating economic diversity, and avoiding urban sprawl. But the most careful research on urban growth and real estate pricing, as well as the experience in other urban areas that have tried similar measures, indicate that RIP is unlikely to increase any of these goals, and instead will foster the opposite.

How could RIP not increase housing availability, one might ask? If we are to believe the projections about population growth, the demand for new housing in the next decade will dwarf any infill that can be accomplished in inner neighborhoods; only large developments (apartment blocks, suburban expansion on raw land, etc) could do this. Sure, some duplexes, triplexes, and ADUs will be built, and a few hundred more residents will be crammed into these historic old neighborhoods like the one I live in (Sunnyside). But these new units will be expensive to build, on expensive lots, so affordability will decline rather than increase. And the features that make these historic neighborhoods so attractive -- charming homes, trees and other greenery, quiet residential streets with relatively low traffic volume -- will be significantly damaged. This is a large price to pay in order to achieve a small amount of new housing stock, and all to accomodate people who don't even live here (yet).

How can these future residents be accomodated? By building dense new construction farther out on the light-rail lines.

Finally, let me point out that the drastic effects of RIP (including the zoning-change overlays) are irreversible. City residents should be allowed to vote on such a dramatic step. Anything less is undemocratic.

1327 SE 32ND PL	With concern, E. A. Smith Sunnyside resident & homeowner	ericaldensmith@yahoo.com	Eric Smith	27422 97214	Housing types,Affordabil ity
1633 NE Sartoga Ave 4564 N.E. 81st Ave	The proposed area in inner North East Portland for "a" overlay zone will cause more problems with the limited space for parking cars on the street. Also allowing ADU's is yet another step in gentrication process of the historically black neighborhoods.	steven.bressler@gmail.com agkenn2000@yahoo.com	steven bressler Aaron Kenny	27424 97211 Northeast n 27425 97218 Northeast Cully	Woodlaw Mapping the "a" overlay,Parking

2954 NE 48th Ave	I would like to go on record in opposition to the proposed changes. This is an experiment being conducted without a test run or a public vote. I would argue for a vote on these proposals; I would also argue for a trial of these bold ideas in a small area, with a study to see how livability, housing costs, parking, traffic and other factors are impacted. Existing studies show that affordability is not improved by infill. My family is extremely worried about the real life fallout from these proposals and concerned that our voices will not be heard. Other options, such as building dense new construction along public transit corridors and farther out on the light-rail lines, have not been fully explored. The drastic effects of infill (including the zoning-change overlays) are irreversible. City residents should be allowed to vote on such a dramatic step. I also disagree with the micromanagement of setbacks and drastic FAR size reductions that have been thrown in with this omnibus proposal. We request that this rezoning be defeated for both safety and future livability. People living in these neighborhoods have a right to have some say in what these continue to look and feel like.	michael.m.mackenzie@gmail.com	Michael MacKenzie	27426 97213			Affordability, Parking
3040 NE 25th Ave	I am so glad to see these changes. They are a much needed step towards reducing the housing crisis that our city currently faces. It won't solve the problem, but at least we'll be moving in the right direction. The mass demolition of Portland's unique architecture will not result in more affordable or beautiful neighborhoods. When a home is knocked down and replaced with a duplex, the homes sell for just as much as the single homes around them and often are ugly, intrusive buildings that betray the city's heritage. Instead of mass demolition, encourage homeowners and developers to convert the basements and garages of existing homes into ADUs of varying size. This will result in the duplexes and triplexes the city needs without affecting the visual profile or safety of the streets. It will also allow a variety of home sizes -- studio units and one- and two-bedroom apartments -- that will encourage greater diversity in our neighborhoods. New construction could also be required to follow this model of appearing to be a single family home but actually being divided by floor, resulting in new higher density homes that blend into and contribute to the existing neighborhoods.	callmerex@gmail.com	Rex Larsen	27427 97212	Northeast	Alameda	Affordability
4010 NE Klickitat St		tiffney.townsend@gmail.com	Tiffney Townsend	27428 97212	Northeast	Beaumont-Wilshire	Housing types
6243 NE 14th Ave	Please do not increase the urban density of my neighborhood.	christopherknaus@gmail.com	Christopher Knaus	27429 97211			Housing types, Affordability, Parking
7325 SE 21st Ave	Letter attached. I absolutely STRONGLY disagree to the new proposed changes to the zoning of my neighborhood - Overlook. Traffic/parking is already a nightmare with adidas next door and I bought my home for the sole purpose of how the neighborhood was laid out. As I appreciate the city trying to solve a housing crises, I would ask you to look at how to move homeless people out of our city and to areas with more space vs. homelessness taking over our city/streets and neighborhoods!		John Stephen Hardy	27430 97202			Housing types, Affordability, Parking
2145 North Webster Street	Kindly respect Overlook and it's integrity. Thanks. I support the draft recommendations on zoning code and map changes dated April 4, 2018. There are three new homes replacing two older homes next to my property, each approximately 4000 sq ft, on 5000 sq ft lots. This is a consequence of rezoning of our neighborhood from R10 to R5 several years ago. These homes overwhelm the lots.	Joeymbaird@yahoo.com	Joseph Baird	27432 97217	North	Overlook	Mapping the "a" overlay, Parking
3710 SW Hillside Dr.	I support the recommendation to limit house size in R5 to 2500 sq ft.	scottisrael@comcast.net	Scott Israel	27433 97221			Scale
5506 SW 50th Ave	Please stop packing us in like rats. In all US cities where urban density soars, crime rates soar with the density. We bought our home 20 years ago because we wanted a quiet, safe environment. Traffic in and out of the neighborhood was easy and slow. Now, there are already so many extra houses in our neighborhood, and each of them has at least two cars, that there is always a line at the traffic lights to get out of my neighborhood at any given time of day. How are our neighborhood schools going to cope with all the extra children all those duplexes and triplexes will bring? Overcrowding has been a problem at Maplewood, Robert Gray, and Wilson since my daughter started first grade 18 years ago. At no time did class size shrink and I know because I volunteer at the schools. And your proposal to add yet more houses to our neighborhood will make that even worse. So much traffic speeding down our street makes the parents on my street afraid to let their kids wander around. Please, let us continue to enjoy our neighborhood and our neighbors. The extra houses bring transient families. The duplex next to us has been there about 6 years and it has been sold 4 times already. PLEASE stop destroying our way of life!	g_drau@yahoo.com	Donna Rau	27434 97221	West	Hayhurst	Housing types

8415 SW Capitol Hwy	<p>All that I see coming from this is for a builder to buy the property when for sale and tear down the house and build two or three house on the same property. There goes the neighborhood we like now. We get over crowded road which we all ready have and still no side walk because you let the builder get away with it so nothing gained and everything to lose</p>	Bacremer1@msn.com	Brian Creamer	27435 97219 West	Multnomah
	I am in favor of the proposed base zone for R5.				
	I am not in favor of the proposed new "a" overlay for the R5 base zone. I want the current "a" overlay to be removed.				
6336 N. Detroit Avenue	<p>The new infill housing in our neighborhood has negatively altered the its feel. Certain streets are ridiculous - giant, three story houses sit like aliens dropped from the sky next to 800 sq. ft single story homes. Approved ADUs have radically different effects on adjacent properties' amenities: Some take into consideration the effect new building height will have on access to light (which impacts people's enjoyment of their outdoor space, the productivity of solar panel systems, their sense of privacy, etc.). Others completely disregard this - and can legally do so - causing animosity between neighbors. I am not convinced there is sufficient oversight and understanding of the full range of implications of infill construction to support increasing the number of permissible structures on property in my neighborhood.</p>	breeswill@hotmail.com	Bree Oswill	27437 97217 North	Arbor Lodge Housing types, Mapping the "a" overlay
2415 n blandena	<p>We strongly oppose these new infill regs. Portland already is impossible to get around. Traffic is a nightmare not only during rush hours but all day and even on weekends. While you promote mass transit that is impossible to use for most of our travels. North Portland pollution levels are already in the top 5% of the entire country. Why make it worse.</p>	fhonl@comcast.net	Kathryn Honl	27438 97217 North	Overlook
	I oppose the proposed changes. At least the ones I was able to understand because your materials are not accessible to the average person.				
	I am specifically concerned that changes to the maximum house size for my lot will prevent me from adding an addition to my 110 year old house.				
	I also noticed that there are proposed changes to parking rules. I found this while scrolling through the Map App, as it is not described anywhere else on your website. I am concerned that the changes are out of character for my street, would negatively impact me, be cost prohibitive to implement, AND seem like a gross and unnecessary over reach for the city.				
	<p>There is not an explanation of why these changes are proposed in your FAQs and are not mentioned in the mailer. I am specifically concerned about the following: "Garages and parking-Not allowed between the dwelling and the street on lots less than 32' wide." Why? There is no explanation of this in your FAQs and it is not mentioned in the mailer. What is the purpose of this change?</p>				
	<p>"Alley accessIf an alley abuts a narrow lot, parking is allowed, but access must be from the alley." This is not consistent with the current design/use of my street. We would have to pave our alley and then take out our entire back yard to add a driveway in this format. We have been planning and saving up to add a paved driveway off the street entrance to our house, which is the same format as every house on our street, and the historic purpose of the space (has a gate opening and pavers). This would be out of context for my neighborhood.</p>				
2911 NE Emerson St	<p>This and other descriptions are not written in ways that are meant to be understood by the public. For example, what is considered a "narrow lot?" I am considered a narrow lot? If so, it should say that.</p>	rebeccalthomsen@gmail.com	Rebecca Thomsen	27439 97211	Scale, Narrow lots, Parking

dealt with here in Portland in and around year 2000. Contractors are not going to leave this on the table, but we need our neighborhoods to look like neighborhoods not storage facilities. We need to maintain a connection of the living area to the street and that is not just a door and a hall that is a room facing the street at garage level. In recent years this lesson has been lost, but we need to not continue SNOUT HOUSING as that is extremely bad planning for our community development. Our neighborhoods need to be neighborhoods inviting people to commune with neighbors and SNOUT HOUSES isolate neighbor from neighbor which is not good for our city. We need affordable housing, but not at all cost as in allowing this blight on our city. <http://japr.homestead.com/files/BELLO.pdf>

Smaller housing needs to be developed differently. Have a block of houses be developed with garages facing a back alley way and all living spaces face the street. This model has been used successfully over and over again throughout the city through various decades. We should never settle for snout houses. Garages can be in front, but living spaces upfront are the priority over garages preferably with covered porches. Again, this is about community being involved with others not isolating themselves from others and by doing so you have safer communities that look out for each other. Communities that are more desirable and affordable to live in. Ideally, smaller houses should have shared walls to look like larger units overall for the health of the community they exist in, but the priority is living space and a porch out front for community participation in our neighborhoods for the health and safety of each community.

Housing 2500 square feet and larger should not be eliminated from any neighborhood. Large houses need to be changed on how we look at them throughout the city as we should change to life cycle style housing. What I mean is that large houses should have the ability to divide into at least two separate living spaces at any given time. One unit could be equipped with electric baseboards for instance when HVAC is being used for the entire facility. Again we need to think about our houses as smart living spaces able to adapt to life changes. We start out with little money so the large house is a living space and a rental/air B&B. We get enough money to have a family and use the extra space so it becomes one until to have the space for a family. We get older and we need assistance then the extra space becomes healthcare provider living space separated or not. Our job gets taken away for any number of reasons then the extra space divides out for a rental. If your finances become so strapped then the spaces can become separated more permanently and the extra space can be sold off as a second unit. Always, the house will have the ability to be purchased and made a single unit again at any time that an owner acquires all properties within the same unit. The flexibility in this design will add some extra expense to building a house initially, but the long term flexibility of this design will benefit the community tenfold by having this extra potential housing throughout the city and make people being forced out of their homes lessened as they will have options. Again, don't legislate large houses out of any neighborhoods as these houses are needed everywhere for families ,however, do require them to be able to not just act as one home, but can function as two or more as housing needs make large houses that can

1336 NE 69th Ave

fowell101@gmail.com

David Fowell

27440 97213

Scale, Housing types, Narrow lots, Parking

I am in full support of this proposal with one exception. Before addressing that issue, I just want to say that it's about time that we committed ourselves, as a city, to building new housing in every neighborhood and every zone. It's not enough just to put it on transit streets. We need new option and new forms of housing everywhere if we're to meet the needs of our changing city and its people, both here and yet to arrive.

If it was up to me, you would go even further and reassess the actual base zones. R5 is an anachronism, as are all single use type or "family" referencing residential categories. We need a city built for change, not one that is stubbornly committed to a past long since gone. We need to face up to the fact that residential zoning largely keeps people apart, reinforces patterns of segregation, and feeds fears the individuals have about lagging property values. In all, our residential zoning doesn't help to house people. Instead, it has become a crutch for those in need of reassurance that they are in control of the future and can stop change. Note that "neighborhood character" has long been the refuge of those unwilling to deal with change. We should not make enabling that objective an institutional policy and objective for the city.

Consequently, I applaud the RIP for moving us into what I think is a much better direction. It could do more, but this is a good first step and I support it.

However, as mentioned above, I have one disagreement with the proposal, and that is with the application of a .5 FAR to residential zones. On a 5000 square foot lot, a poorly designed, poorly sited 2000 square foot structure can have a bigger negative impact than a well designed, carefully sited 3000 square foot structure. Simply applying a blanket 2500 square foot limitation does nothing to achieve more site-sensitive development. Allowing citizens to believe that we've solved the problem of site sensitivity with the blanket, shotgun application of an arbitrary FAR will only lead to greater disillusionment and probable unforeseen and negative outcomes. Since the FAR limit won't make development more site-sensitive, I can only surmise that it exists to tax or penalize presumably greedy, insensitive rich people and their developers. I suspect that it won't even do that misguided mission well. My suggestion: address site-sensitivity directly and use a residential FAR only in a specific, strategic way.

3082 NE Regents Drive

Again, I am writing mostly in very strong support of the RIP and hope that it remains true to its purpose as you go through the adoption process. Sure, it could go further and it could be better (see above), but for now, lets not let the perfect be the enemy of the good and get on with it. Thanks for doing this work!

seltzere@gmail.com

Ethan Seltzer

27441 97212

Scale,Housing types,Mapping the "a" overlay,Affordability

This proposal needs to be evenly applied across all residential properties, in all neighborhoods in Portland. There should be no A overlay, it should just be part of the base code for all R2.5-R10 properties.

It is unfair, unethical, unequitable, and overly complex to exclude some areas of the city from having additional housing opportunity while other neighborhoods and properties (sometimes directly across the street) get the benefit of this proposal.

5229 NE MLK Blvd.

It was super dissapointing to read all of the comments to this effect in the last round of feedback, only for no changes to be made to the proposal draft language. The current A overlay is equivalent to the history of redlining that was used as a tactic when our city first implemented a zoning code, excluding low-income and communities of color from benefits. I urge you to drop the overlay completely and just evenly apply this across the city.

lucas@propelstudio.com

Lucas Gray

27442 97211

Housing types,Mapping the "a" overlay,Affordability

Affordable housing is certainly a legitimate concern. I am hopeful that the Commission will continue to identify and assess all possible ways to increase the availability of housing.

The proposed zoning code and map changes raise two very real concerns,

1. Street parking and traffic congestion are of concern now. Increasing rental housing units and living quarters per existing lots will only increase parking and traffic problems. I hope that the Commission will employ expert traffic planners to study and estimate the impact of the proposed zoning and map changes on street parking and traffic congestion. Until then the proposal should not be considered for approval.

2. Home invasion and burglary rates tend to be higher in mixed owned and rental unit areas. I think that this proposal will probably result in increased home insurance rates and increased employment of tax supported police and security personal.

3410 SW Hamilton Ct	Respectfully submitted,	mr8283@aol.com	James Rose	27443 97239		Housing types,Affordability,Parking
6335 N. Delaware Ave.	I grew up at 6335 N. Delaware Ave., Portland, Oregon 97217. My parents built this home in 1940, the year before I was born. I realize that city planners would like to encourage denser housing, but already Delaware Ave. is filled with cars parked on the street. Vacant lots which were used for family gardens have now been filled by multi-unit houses. This has not improved the neighborhood. Further change in the proposed zoning code will further reduce the livability of the neighborhood. Hence, I am against the proposed zoning code change.	louis_wildman@hotmail.com	Louis Wildman	27444 97217		Housing types,Parking
101 NE Morris St	I think it is a great idea to allow triplexes on a corner lot. My property is a 7500sqft former church building on a 4000sqft lot and I have been limited to only using it as a duplex under current codes. It would be great if there were more options available for existing large buildings such as the one I live in. Maybe an option to go through a special review and consideration of unusual existing buildings such as mine that allowed for more options (such as more units) as long as they fit with the neighborhood. I currently feel like I'm wasting a lot of space that could make a great additional living space for someone. Also, would appreciate incentives to homeowners to develop additional living units as I think there are a lot of people who would like to help with the housing shortage, but can't afford to. Waiving city fees or taxes or something like that (only for homeowners, not big developers) could help. I love the idea of allowing attached townhomes instead of 'skinny' houses. so that they look more like surrounding neighborhood. Anything to keep neighborhoods looking consistent and affordable while increasing density is great! I understand the need for additional housing in Portland and think ADUs are a reasonable approach. However, in this neighborhood, with its narrow, dead-end streets, the roads are already insufficient to handle any more traffic/parking. Several infill homes have been built, adding to what was already a challenging situation when more than one car is on the road. Our end of Alice Street is full of holes, and it's the "good" side - across Capitol Highway, there are deep ruts that only got worse when the City allowed multiple houses to be built.	dan.garland@comcast.net	Dan Garland	27445 97212 Northeast	Eliot	Housing types,Narrow lots,Mapping the ,Affordability
9250 SW 42nd Avenue	Without improved infrastructure, the addition of multifamily housing and multiple ADUs in this neighborhood is unreasonable, in my opinion. And if enhanced livability is the goal, this is a flawed strategy.	lynmcmamara@comcast.net	Evelyn McNamara	27448 97219 West	Ashcreek	Housing types,Mapping the "a" overlay,Parking
3815 SW Lyle Ct. 8834 N Peninsular Ave	Although this proposal will not matter much to my property, per se, it potentially will lower the value of my property in the future. Also, by allowing smaller, cheaper units in what has been a very stable, single family residential neighborhood of large family houses this proposal has the potential to start breaking up the existing character of the neighborhood, which is what we like and why we move here. Also, if the city tampers with the neighborhood it has the potential to start driving out taxpayers who came here for this kind of neighborhood. There is a carrying capacity for this neighborhood and we are at it now. Please leave well enough alone. Thank you. I am in support of smaller FAR, increased setbacks, and restrictions on smaller lot development.	gaby1@comcast.net	Gabrielle Humphreys	27449 97221 West	Bridlemile	Housing types Scale,Narrow lots
		br.liedma@gmail.com	Bryan Liedman	27450 97217 North	Kenton	

904 sw Westwood drive	<p>I approve of the proposed draft. Especially the clause allowing ADUs</p> <p>As a property owner, I strongly object to the new 'a' overlay proposal. Our 50 x 100 lot is already compact and very close to the homes located on both sides of our property. Were a ADU be added to either of these property, we would sacrifice additional privacy where there is very little to sacrifice.</p> <p>Our street is currently a primary overflow parking area for visitors to the Marquis Care Facility located on SE Belmont, as well as the Caldera Restaurant and Stark Street Station businesses located on Stark. Several homes located on our block of 62nd Avenue have no driveway or garage in which to park their car, meaning on-street parking is a necessity and competitive.</p> <p>Furthermore, in terms of personal preference, I would not purchase a home abutting a duplex or a home with a detached ADU and I believe many other home buyers would feel similarly. Does the city plan to reimburse single family home owners for the decline in property values resulting in the 'a' overlay? Homes are purchased not only for the structure but for the aesthetic of the street they reside on. Zoning changes which do not honor the age of the existing structures or the original design of the neighborhood are irresponsible and unfair.</p>	J_mershon@yahoo.com	Jason Mershon	27451 97239 West	Hillsdale	Housing types
645 SE 62nd Ave	<p>I oppose the new rules. Our neighborhoods will be destroyed by this. Neighborhoods are needed to keep Portland the type of city that it is. To allow duplexes essentially anywhere and triplexes on each corner is poor use of the space. We actually NEED the green space to keep us sane and to help us handle all the rain we have. It is hard to believe that parking in this proposal is so ignored; poor planning. We already have such a mess on the roads, soon every neighborhood will have it as bad and NW 23rd. it would have been much better to limit the RIP to closer to the main roads and not allow it to sprawl into the neighborhoods--most will have their character destroyed over time by this. It would have been much better to identify areas that could handle big high rises--like the Pearl and increase the density with proper parking requirements included. Portland will soon just be another ugly City with these rules.</p>	steveh75@gmail.com	Steven Hawkins	27452 97215		Housing types,Parking
7817 SW Ruby Terrace	City of Portland-					
	I oppose your proposal R.I.P. and overlay "a" because:					
	1. The propose overlay states 300' corridor for rezoning. This is excessive. Consider 150' on either said of Sandy Blvd. for R2.5. This will allow apts but not overwhelm sides streets with the increase of apt owner's cars.					
	2. The elimination of 2 lanes on Sandy will increase traffic—including heavy trucking on side streets (a fact that has already happened), and will increase pollution on streets paralleling Sandy. Not all people have the ability to bike to stores (think parents with toddlers, physically challenged and/or wheelchair bound individuals). Taking public transportation AND having several shopping bags is inconvenient at the least.					
	3. Infrastructure in Portland is woefully inadequate and antiquated and the sewer system is over 100 years old. To this the city wants to add another 100,000 people?					
	PDOT has not kept up maintenance in decades, yet it is well known the city has over 3 million (Uber/Lyft account) and other slush fund accounts. The extra funds should be used in resurfacing roads/fixing potholes/increasing train and bus service. It's called City management 101—infrastructure comes first, THAN housing.					
	4. Portland has a unique architectural heritage. This residential infill will rapidly destroy it. NYC is a prime example of historical architectural buildings that were destroyed in the 1960's. Almost a decade later it was realized the impact of losing the buildings and the need to slow down demolition.					Housing types,Narrow lots,Mapping
5212 NE Alameda St	5. R.I.P. & "a" destroys quality of live and affordability. The skinny houses are being sold for as much or more than the original 100-year-old house that was demolished. This does NOTHING to create affordable housing. It only serves to enrich developers and increase the city's tax base.					R2.5 rezones,Affordability
			Stephanie Ritzert	27454 97213		

I support most of the city's proposed zoning changes for residential areas like Sellwood, where I live, and appreciate the city's efforts to encourage density. I have two main areas of feedback, one positive and one negative.

First the positive: I think the ability to increase the number of ADUs on a property is a wonderful way to increase density. I have yet to see an ADU that in any way detracts from the neighborhood's character or livability (including the one my neighbors built directly adjacent to our property line); their size allows them to fit within the extant character of the neighborhood or to go unnoticed altogether.

Now the negative: While I do not oppose all new construction, I do believe the proposed maximum size limit for new-construction homes is insufficient. 2,500 square feet above ground for the R5 zone is still monstrous by historical standards. There are "houses" currently going in around Sellwood (see the NW corner of SE 15th and Lexington) that destroy the entire surrounding city-scape (sight-lines, light, etc.) for the "small" neighboring structures -- typically bungalows with 800-1300 above-grade square feet. In addition to considering a smaller overall size, on the order of 2000 above-grade square feet for R5 lots (basement living space could be separate), I would like to see a limit on roofline height or number of stories. There are no historic houses in Sellwood that have more than two stories below the eaves of the roof; what three-story houses exist are typically four-squares with originally unfinished attics. The "third floor" in these structures typically sits beneath a pitched roof, and hence has much less impact than the third story of new constructions, which consists of a continuation of the vertical outer walls -- creating a towering-monolith effect. Even the largest of historic homes do not tower over neighbors in this way. These lots simply don't accommodate greater size or height without negatively impacting neighbors. It's sad to see one-story bungalows with massive three-plus story structures now looming over their houses and yards, crowded up against the property lines -- I fear this happening to our house at some point. I also wonder if a greater set-back could be required even for any structures of two stories. Again, I applaud the effort to increase density, and understand that Portland is growing, but I think more can be done to protect the unique feel of neighborhoods like Sellwood that are part of what has made Portland such an appealing place to live in the first place. I hope the city can intervene and limit these kinds of oversized constructions ASAP, before these neighborhood pass a tipping point in terms of quality of life for long-time

1114 SE Lexington St residents. Thank you!

akrenkel@gmail.com

Aaron Krenkel

27455 97202

Scale,Housing types,Mapping the "a" overlay

been around since 1996. This allows developers to add additional density on 45,000 SFR lots in Portland, today. This overlay exists in Sellwood, King, Kenton, Boise, Sabin, Concordia, Montavilla, Woodstock, and many neighborhoods east of 205. Since 1996 only 212 out of 45,000 lots have produced that additional unit. That's only .4%.

Duplexes on every corner? Has produced, according to BPS, only 3.5 to 5% of possible duplexes.

These "incentives" have not resulted in the hoped for result. Why? Developers want to build single family houses.

That's where the largest profit lies. Why cover 85% of the SF areas and convert them to multi-family as proposed here? BPS hopes that developers will build what we need, not what sells.

You can't build you way out of a housing affordability problem.

This year over 600 permits for new houses have been issued. Last 2 years, 700 each. In 2010, only 300. So let's assume this building boom will continue forever.

700 units a year, approximately 350 demolitions, so a net increase of 350 new houses a year. Push that forward 20 years and you get 7,000 new households. Assume they will all be duplexes and there's 14,000. Still short of the 24,000. And we know that developers will not simply build all duplexes. And they will not be affordable.

Costs- RIP is for the rich.

Analysis of a hypothetical 9 unit cluster development on SE 92nd- land, permits, construction, profit, sales, etc. will yield a 1,250 square foot home for \$381,000. This is affordable to a household income of \$75,000.

Let's look at those house diagrams in the RIP booklet. All of these cost examples assume a land cost of \$350k with demolition of an existing house.

First, a 2500 sf duplex would need to sell for \$833,000. So half would be \$415,000. Affordable to families making \$85,000 plus.

A 2500 sf house with a 750 square foot ADU in back would be \$942,000.

A 2500 SF duplex with detached ADU would be \$976,000.

A 2500 square foot house with 1250 sf basement and detached ADU would be \$1,118,000

Who can afford these?

The recently published addenda from Johnson Economics deserves careful scrutiny from each member of the PSC. Cites current rental rates at above \$4,000 a month in order to justify new zoning rents at \$2500 as a reduction. He uses the average rental rate of %2.00 per square foot when the real average, today, is \$1.44 per square foot. All in an effort to show future rental rates in a favorable light. Other presented scenarios show that RIP will succeed if developers can build on \$57,000, 5,000 square foot lots. Sure, but none exist in Portland. Please, there are some good things in RIP, but none of them will result in affordable housing. The temptation will be to placate builders by allowing larger homes to be built which will result in merely 1:1 replacement of affordable housing stock. Please

4007 SE Taylor St

molinaroarchitect@gmail.com

Michael Molinaro

27456 97214 Southeast Sunnyside

2600 S.W Troy Street
Portland, Oregon 97219

April 15, 2018

Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission
Residential Infill Testimony
1221 S.W. Fourth Avenue, Suite 7100
Portland, Oregon 97201
By MapApp and Regular Mail

Re: Residential Infill Project

Dear Commission Members:

We are writing to express our opposition to further pursuit of the portion of the Residential Infill Project proposal that would allow deviation from current zoning restrictions applicable to R5 and R7 designations. According to the map recently published by the City, the proposed overlay allowing duplexes and triplexes would be applicable to our property and our entire neighborhood. It would adversely affect our quality of life.

We purchased our home in 1985 at this specific location expressly for the reason that lots are relatively large and the zoning protects the feeling of openness and space between neighbors that many of us prefer. At least, we thought the zoning protected us. It is a neighborhood of single-family dwellings mostly inhabited by those who own the properties. We have worked diligently to enhance the visual appeal of our home and property, for the benefit of ourselves and our neighbors.

Allowing duplexes and triplexes would destroy the very things that brought us here in the first place. The increased traffic and density would be objectionable, as would the change of character that inevitably occurs when properties shift from owner occupied to renter occupied. We understand that many people if given the opportunity might like to move to Portland. Accommodating at least some of them is a reasonable objective, but not at the expense of those of us who have been here for decades. It is poor policy to injure the current, home owning, taxpaying residents for the benefit of those who might like to move here in the future. There is no obligation to take such action and no logical reason to diminish the livability of neighborhoods in order to pack in possible newcomers.

2600 SW Troy Street

kqjd1@gmail.com

Kevin Davis

27457 97219

Housing types, Mapping the "a" overlay

I am providing feedback on the planned A overlay in the historic Eastmoreland neighborhood. My property will be impacted by this change in zoning. I am adamantly opposed to this overlay change. The city is considering making short-sighted zoning change to one of the cities beautiful assets. A change with devastating impacts to a nearly 100 year old neighborhood. This change will encourage historic and treasured homes to be destroyed by developers that are only motivated by short term profits. I am disappointed that the Planning and Sustainability Committee is even considering these zoning changes in Eastmoreland and other historic neighborhoods. This is the opposite of a "sustainable" decision. There are neighborhoods and streets closer to the city center in which this level of density may be appropriate but the Commission needs to apply judgement and recognize the negative impact this short term decision has to the long-term quality and livability of our beautiful city. I am also confused why a neighborhood like Portland Heights is excluded while the equally historic and beautiful neighborhood of Eastmoreland is included in the new overlay. I hope that the Commission is not allowing their individual ideology regarding density destroy mature and treasured assets with a negative impact for generations. I request that the Commission reconsider the A overlay in Eastmoreland and maintain the existing zoning in the neighborhood.

2760 SE Tolman St

tbergler@percipiogroup.com Tim Bergler

27458 97202 Southeast and

Housing types, Mapping the "a" overlay

I have several concerns and issues with the proposed zoning code and map changes in the notice that was recently sent out by your department.

As a resident in the Alameda neighborhood, I cherish the charm and neighborhood feel we currently have. In recent years watching old homes being demolished to make way for either a huge house or 2 huge houses or multiple family structures has bothered me, but I tried to keep an open mind and realize the need for housing. Although, I do question if it has really been a benefit to anyone but the developer who made a profit and left ,and maybe the city for getting a healthy revenue from the property tax.This type of construction has actually driven up housing prices in the neighborhood. Not real sure how it has helped the neighborhood, higher taxes are not a benefit and most of the existing home owners prefer older homes, a reason many people move to NE neighborhoods.

Then a few months ago one of the commissioners announces it is now okay for a home owner to let an RV (or camper) with it's tenants to park in a driveway, as long as the homeowner has given permission, has bathroom facility covered and plug in for said RV/camper. I did not see anywhere that states they have to get permission from neighbor's who may be affected.

Now we come to the pamphlet your department sent out. There are several issues, the first is this seems like it has not been well thought out or very transparent.

Proposed base zone of R5 (I use this one since that is what affects our lot) At first read it sounds like the maximum sq. footage on the exempld 5000 sq. for lot is 2500 sq. feet, correct me if I am wrong but that is the foot print of the house. So if the foot print of the house for the first floor is 2500 sq. feet as long as you keep the house under the height restrictions, you could have another story with 2500 sq. feet, have a basement (even though you don't include the sq footage), so really you could build a 5000+ sq. foot house. The way the brochure you have sent out is written is not clear. Many people commenting online are under the impression that only a house with the TOTAL square footage of 2500 sq. feet can be built
 OR if you want you could add a couple of ADU's OR choose a duplex OR a duplex and an ADU OR a triplex if you want to max out a corner lot.

2915 NE Dunckley Street	Has any thought gone into why current taxpaying residents have moved here? A 5000 square foot lot is not huge, even with a charming little bungalow on it. Most people in our neighborhood anyway, covet a little backyard oasis,	sharshar1107@msn.com	Sharon Johnson	27459 97212	Scale,Housing types,Parking
1422 SE Carlton St.	I am fully in support of the proposed changes. It is important to me to maintain my neighborhood's character by making sure that new or reconstructed houses have a similar footprint and height to existing houses and a small environmental impact. But I also support increasing density in a way that is in keeping with this character. ADUs are an excellent way to do this.	bierzuch@lclark.edu	Paulette Bierzychudek	27460 97202 Southeast League	Sellwood-Moreland Improvement Scale,Housing types

To the P&S Commission,

I am rising to protest in the strongest terms the proposed zoning code and map changes that will negatively affect the quality and livability of our neighborhood. The importance of affordable housing for the City of Portland is understood, but changing the character of our neighborhoods, as this proposal will undoubtedly do, is not the answer to this problem. Violating property rights by unreasonably legislating allowable housing size is an affront to the homeowners and tax payers in our neighborhoods. Current statutes as to allowable setbacks and housing sizes are certainly enough to prevent "overbuilding" on these R5 lots. As property values have continued to increase in Portland, the ability to build a quality home proportionate with the value of the lot is critical to the maintenance of the character and livability of our neighborhoods. The proposal to create a new 'a' overlay zone in the Overlook Neighborhood has even more potential negative impact on our community. Allowing up to two ADUs with a house on a 5000 square foot lot and placing duplexes (with an allowed ADU) and triplexes on these, already tight lots, will completely change the character and historic value of our neighborhood. This proposal will have the potential to create an overcrowded "urban ghetto" in what is now a safe, treasured neighborhood that currently augments the livability of Portland. I urge the Commission to reject this proposal and respect the concerns and desires of the citizens, like me and my family, who live in this wonderful Portland neighborhood.

Respectfully submitted,

4035 N Colonial Ave

Gregory W. Irvine and Connor L. Irvine

From: Alex Schwartz, 4600 NE Shaver St.

Re: Proposed new "A" Overlay to R5 Base Zone

gregory.irvine@gmail.com

Gregory Irvine

27461 97227 North

Overlook

Scale,Housing
types,Mapping
the "a" overlay

I am writing today to:

1. Express my support of proposed measures for reducing the scale of houses in R5.

Reducing the scale of houses in the Alameda and Beaumont-Wilshire Neighborhoods is a very important step to ensure that our community maintains its livability. Projects, hastily constructed, intended to maximize profits, have a detrimental effect on all of us. As our neighborhood continues to rapidly change, it is critical that new projects are thoughtful, and match the scale and scope of the historic development and protect our urban green infrastructure.

One of the greatest assets of the neighborhood is the backyard open space of a typical R5 lot, that on a landscape scale, taken together, provide habitat for song birds, pollinators, small mammals, and importantly human beings. This open space, also keeps storm water on site without the need for additional public green infrastructure.

When setbacks are pushed and backyards are lost, these treasures are destroyed. Also, these special places of relaxation and respite, in a growing urban area are lost.

2. Express my opposition to the proposed New "A" Overlay.

I am strongly opposed to any changes that would increase density in R5 neighborhoods. I understand the need for affordable housing and to provide property owners with creative solutions for housing. The proliferation of ADUs, duplexes, and other higher density arrangements in R5, are destroying the very qualities, which make Alameda and Beaumont Wilshire one of the premier single family areas in the city, where I have lived for over 15 years.

Spare R5 neighborhoods from density initiatives. Let's keep some areas single family! Protect the cultural, historic, and ecological fabric of our neighborhoods by planning density in areas that are not so firmly single family. What I have seen under the current rules is harmful development, by property owners who just want to cash in. I think as a city, we would regret increasing density in R5 in the future. We have the chance now to keep our city socially and environmentally healthy. I feel that a new "A" overlay zone only benefits economics for some and that environment and social items should prevail.

4600 NE SHAVER
STREET

3.29.90.darkstar@gmail.com

Alex Schwartz

27462 97213 Northeast

Beaumont- Scale,Housing
Wilshire types

6615 SW Virginia 3309 SE Sherret St	<p>Dear PSC Members</p> <p>I fully support the infill plans, with one caveat. Please require at least one parking space per house or per unit for duplexes and triplexes. Currently our neighborhood, John's Landing, is being used by commuters to OHSU and downtown and adding infill without parking will just exacerbate the situation. Recently new apartment buildings without parking have been added in the north end of the neighborhood and these infill projects will only cause further issues. Thanks Sarah</p> <p>I fully support all measures contained within the new zoning code and map changes.</p>	sarahsbradley12@gmail.com Sarah Bradley strongworkarch@gmail.com Alan Armstrong	27472 97239 27473 97222	Housing types,Parking
2817 se Grant	<p>After following this process from the beginning, I find myself extremely disappointed with my city government, especially its leadership. As an example, the recent mailers to all impacted homeowners were clearly sent out at the 11th hour to meet some basic requirements of public notice. These should have been sent out a year ago. None of my neighbors are aware of what the RIPSAC actually means and it is now too late to become educated and change the course of things. I know the city has a housing crisis. I likely couldn't afford to buy a home here at today's prices and my adult children cannot even afford rent. Like most Portlanders, I know we need to accept greater density, but that should also mean greater affordability. What you are proposing as a solution does absolutely nothing to address the housing crisis and destroys our neighborhoods in the process. Why is so little priority paid to internal conversions when that model has been so successful at providing affordable housing and maintaining neighborhood character? Why not return to the demolition tax and make it broader? But of course this doesn't work for developers. We are losing many quality rental or starter homes to demolition only to be replaced by expensive pieces of junk, and you are facilitating this. Furthermore, I am tired of hearing city planners who are supposed to work for the taxpaying citizens sound like they are being guided by the needs of the developers. My beloved city that I have lived in and worked in for over two decades has always had a strong independent streak. We shouldn't be in such a hurry to give it away.</p> <p>We are *not* in favor of the proposed zoning changes. We do not feel that the housing shortage that Portland is experiencing will be resolved with this plan. Instead, this change will promote demolitions in unprotected neighborhoods, many of which would be demos of suitable and affordable homes currently serving renters. These homes would be replaced with high-end dwellings, not to be afforded by those who are experiencing the impact of the shortage.</p>	stevesparks@centurylink.net Steve Sparks	27474 97214	Housing types,Affordabil ity Hosford- Abernethy
2545 NE 9th Ave	<p>Another concern is demo'ing old Portland homes will eliminate one of the reasons why Portland is such a desirable place to live.</p> <p>Please do not do this, consider other options.</p>	megan.v.bigelow@gmail.com Megan Bigelow	27475 97212	Northeast Irvington
3314 NE 22nd Avenue	<p>I oppose the proposed zoning code and map change due to its contradiction to our historic neighborhood philosophy and efforts to maintain livability by observance of current zoning requirements, vegetation and population guidelines. Potential seismic and radon contaminants already influence the density of this neighborhood and wish to adhere to population health guidelines versus emphasis on increasing density. The major fault line that runs below our streets should be seriously considered while building larger and dense units in smaller lots.</p>	tlkempner@comcast.net Toni Kempner	27476 97212	Northeast Alameda
5220 SW Shattuck Road	<p>I support the City's residential infill project and I my property is subject to a new overlay. I appreciate the City's efforts to promote more housing options within the UGB. These changes will provide additional tools for homeowners to make future changes on their property that also support the City's housing density goals. I know you are hearing a lot of opposition to your proposal from my SW Portland neighbors but please know that many of us support the additional flexibility you are trying to achieve. Thank you.</p>	alexcousins@comcast.net Alex Cousins	27478 97221	Housing types,Mapping the "a" overlay

I am opposed to the new floor area ratio rule which would lead to a staggering 63% reduction in allowed FAR.

I am also strongly opposed to the new lot width rules.

These changes will have a significant negative impact on the value of my home and land. I also believe they will not improve livability or affordability in our community.

2432 SW Broadway Dr I strongly oppose the proposed zoning code and map changes and encourage the committee and council to reject these measures. noneof@yourbusiness.com M Litwin 27479 97201 West Southwest Hills Scale,Narrow lots,Affordability

1422 SE CARLTON ST. I am in favor of limiting the size of houses on small (circa 5000 sq. ft. lots, as my neighborhood has been plagued with recent construction of enormous houses that are not in keeping with the character of the neighborhood. I am also supportive of modest increases in housing density as proposed. I am opposed to the new floor area ratio rule which would lead to a staggering 63% reduction in allowed FAR. reiness@lclark.edu C Reiness 27480 97202 Southeast League Sellwood-Moreland Improvement Scale,Housing types

I am also strongly opposed to the new lot width rules.

These changes will have a significant negative impact on the value of my home and land. I also believe they will not improve livability or affordability in our community.

2432 SW Broadway Dr I strongly oppose the proposed zoning code and map changes and encourage the committee and council to reject these measures. abc@defg.com Ma Litwin 27481 97201 West Southwest Hills

I am writing to voice my opposition to the proposed Zoning and Code Map changes which, if adopted, will affect the permissible uses of my property and my neighborhood.

It is my understanding that the purpose of this overlay zoning change is to provide more residential neighborhood housing options and address the housing crunch in the city. While the goal may be worthy, the proposed solution of not one but "up to two accessory dwelling units (ADU's) per property" is excessive and will have a detrimental effect to the neighborhoods affected by the change.

I believe the proposed change will negatively affect the livability of my neighborhood — a neighborhood which is already undergoing significant change. The Rose City neighborhood is predominately single-family homes. My street is filled with long-time homeowners who live in their homes. We also have several multi-family apartment complexes sprinkled throughout..with a large complex at the end of my block. In addition a new multi-family apartment 4-story complex is slated for construction in the next few months just a few blocks from my residence. Parking for this new complex was not included in the plans, which consequently, will add further problems to the already congested neighborhood street parking.

I understand the appeal for ADUs and allowing a single-family residential property to have one ADU seems reasonable. Adding two ADUs per property does not seem reasonable. Some property owners, who do not care about the historical character or livability of Portland's old neighborhoods, will squeeze as many ADUs as possible onto their properties to make money on rent. These changes will increase traffic, noise, congestion and parking issues threefold. They also devalue the properties of long-standing property owners.

Lastly, I would like to know if the proposed Zoning and Code Map changes are being proposed in other neighborhoods such as Irvington, Alameda Ridge, Eastmoreland, Ladds Addition and Laurelhurst. And if not, why not? In the past these types of changes have been forced onto the "less wealthy" neighborhoods of the city — Lents, Rose City, Cully, etc. This type of discriminatory zoning is creating a class divide in our neighborhoods. You're trading one problem for another.

I appreciate the opportunity of voicing my opposition and urge you to vote against the proposed Zoning and Code Map changes for the Rose City neighborhood.

2336 NE 54th Ave

lindseyb7030@yahoo.com

Lindsey Berman

27487 97213 Northeast Park

Housing types,Mapping the "a" overlay,Parking Housing types,Affordability

7529 SE 28th Avenue

I support the goals and the details of the Residential Infill Project as one means of increasing number and types of housing stock in the City of Portland with incentives to increase affordable housing availability in the city.

reulerj@comcast.net

James Reuler

27491 97202 Southeast and

High density is causing so many problems in our city: traffic congestion which causes even more air pollution, more crime and less elbow room for those of us who have lived our whole lives here.

Stop the madness.

Let people commute here from less dense cities.

At the VERY least, provide more parking.

We use to love this city, we are beginning to dislike to.

We are Seniors and need our family around us so we don't want to move.

It's not fair to those of us who are in this situation.

STOP the madness.

7408 N washburne

Sincerely, James and Kim Safranski

jksafranski@gmail.com

Kim Safranski

27494 97217

Parking

A dead end street has only one exit. It is inherently dangerous. In the case of a fire, gas leak, toxic spill, mass shooting or other police incident that demands evacuation, people could get trapped and need rescue. That is why the RIP Housing Opportunity Overlay will not be appropriate for dead end streets like mine, which are already overcrowded, over-long, and do not meet the fire code.

Imagine a night club with its fire exits blocked. Now imagine sending the Fire Marshal into that building to say, "Sure you can squeeze more people in here every night. Let's increase the occupancy limit. Public safety doesn't matter." That would be irresponsible. Who would think of doing that?

For the same reason, my dead end street on SE Henry Street, just east of SE 52nd (from 5208 to 5433 SE Henry St), should be exempt from the RIP Housing Opportunity Overlay. More housing density should not be added (increasing the number of people needing rescue) for the following reasons:

- There is a 7 foot fence blocking the dead end. I cannot climb it to escape. I would need rescue.
- It does not meet Fire Code or the Right of Way Code (33.654.120). It doesn't have a turnaround.
- At 475 feet, it is longer than recommended for a dead end street. (33.654.110 B:2)
- It already has almost twice the number of living units that it should have. (33.654.110 B:2)
- The overlay would allow three times the number of living units that is recommended.

A majority of the R-5 lot residents on this street have signed a petition opposing the RIP proposals. I have the signatures of 15 people, representing 9 of the 13 R-5 lots, who agree it would not be safe to add more people here. We already have 3 duplexes, 1 triplex, 2 fourplexes, and 3 flag lots on top of 10 regular single family lots. We are packed.

In 2016, we fought this same fight in the Comprehensive Plan when Planning Staff wanted to upzone the R-5 lots on this street to R-2.5 to increase density. The City Council decided that our street should not have more density. They gave us an amendment because they understood that public safety and City Code cannot be ignored. How can the City reverse itself on a decision it just made?

Due to PBOT requirements, its cost prohibitive to divide my lot and build another SFR. If the the new (a) overlay zoning allows me to build 2 ADU's vs one, it would help me yield a more best use scenario. So, I support the increased density allowance, or updated overlay zoning for my property.

As a homeowner in the Eastmoreland neighborhood I was disappointed to receive the notice of zoning changes to our neighborhood. The battle over the historic district has been detrimental to the ethos of our community. Long time friends no longer talk to each other, and the community that I was proud to be a part of was coming apart at the seams. It seems that we can all agree that we don't want "monster" homes in our neighborhood, nor do we want multiple dwellings on a single lot. I think almost all of us agree on that. That could have simply been achieved through rezoning by the city. Now you are trying to force high density living upon a group, that doesn't want high density living. You are changing the rules of the game with our biggest personal asset.

This problem of high cost housing is created from the arbitrary urban growth boundary. You created the problem a number of years ago, and want to force your values on the rest of us. I am against it.

I want the zoning on my property and surrounding property to stay R5. The Residential Infill Project (RIP) does not incorporate the amendments approved by the City Council on December 7th, 2016. We believed the Council would continue to abide by this decision. The RIP violates the purpose of the zoning code, which is to provide stability and predictability to neighborhoods and the development process. If the zoning is changed, this is a radical change to our neighborhood and it will be more dense and increase the chance that existing homes will be demolished, along with trees, garden space, yards for kids to play in etc....

5401 SE Henry Street	City reverse itself on a decision it just made?	aw123jobs@gmail.com	Arlene Williams	27496 97206 Southeast k	Woodstoc Mapping the "a" overlay
7334 NE Halsey st	Due to PBOT requirements, its cost prohibitive to divide my lot and build another SFR. If the the new (a) overlay zoning allows me to build 2 ADU's vs one, it would help me yield a more best use scenario. So, I support the increased density allowance, or updated overlay zoning for my property.	jdevportland@gmail.com	Jim Hunt	27498 97213 Southeast	Montavilla Housing types, Mapping the "a" overlay
6509 SE 34th Ave	As a homeowner in the Eastmoreland neighborhood I was disappointed to receive the notice of zoning changes to our neighborhood. The battle over the historic district has been detrimental to the ethos of our community. Long time friends no longer talk to each other, and the community that I was proud to be a part of was coming apart at the seams. It seems that we can all agree that we don't want "monster" homes in our neighborhood, nor do we want multiple dwellings on a single lot. I think almost all of us agree on that. That could have simply been achieved through rezoning by the city. Now you are trying to force high density living upon a group, that doesn't want high density living. You are changing the rules of the game with our biggest personal asset. This problem of high cost housing is created from the arbitrary urban growth boundary. You created the problem a number of years ago, and want to force your values on the rest of us. I am against it. I want the zoning on my property and surrounding property to stay R5. The Residential Infill Project (RIP) does not incorporate the amendments approved by the City Council on December 7th, 2016. We believed the Council would continue to abide by this decision. The RIP violates the purpose of the zoning code, which is to provide stability and predictability to neighborhoods and the development process. If the zoning is changed, this is a radical change to our neighborhood and it will be more dense and increase the chance that existing homes will be demolished, along with trees, garden space, yards for kids to play in etc....	rcole@fergwell.com	Ralph Cole	27499 97202	Housing types, Mapping the "a" overlay
4318 NE 35th PLACE		ebrownpdx@gmail.com	Eric Brown	27502 97211 Northeast	Beaumont- Mapping R2.5 rezones Wilshire

I am providing feedback on the planned A overlay in the historic Eastmoreland neighborhood. My property will be impacted by this change in zoning. I am adamantly opposed to this overlay change. The city is considering making short-sighted zoning change to one of the cities beautiful assets. A change with devastating impacts to a nearly 100 year old neighborhood. This change will encourage historic and treasured homes to be destroyed by developers that are only motivated by short term profits. I am disappointed that the Planning and Sustainability Committee is even considering these zoning changes in Eastmoreland and other historic neighborhoods. This is the opposite of a "sustainable" decision. There are neighborhoods and streets closer to the city center in which this level of density may be appropriate but the Commission needs to apply judgement and recognize the negative impact this short term decision has to the long-term quality and livability of our beautiful city. I am also confused why a neighborhood like Portland Heights is excluded while the equally historic and beautiful neighborhood of Eastmoreland is included in the new overlay. I hope that the Commission is not allowing their individual ideology regarding density destroy mature and treasured assets with a negative impact for generations. I request that the Commission reconsider the A overlay in Eastmoreland and maintain the existing zoning in the neighborhood.

2760 SE Tolman St

The R.I.P provides Portland with the platform to address equity, the environment and the look and feel of our neighborhoods for the foreseeable future.

We need affordable and low income housing distributed in all ZIP codes. Portland needs to diversify housing stock in all neighborhoods in order to ensure that the best schools are available to all students, regardless of race or family income. Why is the "a" Overlay zone virtually all on the Eastside?

The design and quality of construction in such a zone is an understandable concern to Portlanders. We are proud of our neighborhoods--that is why passionate opinions abound. Infill construction does not require luxury finishes, but these structures need to be well built to last for 100 years. Code must ensure that the houses/duplexes/ADU's are constructed so as to prevent demolition ->landfill in 30 years. If this new housing stock is shoddily built, everyone in the neighborhood will suffer.

DESIGN RECOMMENDATION:

Hold a National (or International) competition inviting architects to submit plans for the types of housing (e.g. 2500 s.f., ADU's, duplexes) the City wants to see developed. Have a panel of citizens select 10 suitable designs of each housing type submitted. These designs will be available for all interested citizens to vote on, with the top 5 designs in each category being identified. These designs would then be secured from the architects and made available for infill development. Developers who choose to use these pre-approved designs would have their permitting costs reduced by 25-35%. Yes, the City will lose some permitting revenue, but it would reduce conflict with the neighborhoods as they had opportunity to provide design input, it would reduce the cost of the house for the developers, and the purchase price for the eventual buyers. (The City did something similar 15+ years ago. Despite many submitted designs, and citizen input, nothing came of the initiative, with the only design appearing on the website being a pseudo-Tudor skinny house.)

Affordability remains the elephant in the room. We don't want cheap infill. This concern can be addressed through the implementation of a voucher system with funds contributed by all levels of government.

Portland is a city of creative and compassionate people. Let's think outside the box, play to our strengths and make our City even more livable--for everyone.

In Summary:

1. Build affordable, low income housing in every ZIP code, East side and West side, will drive equity.
2. Address design/quality concerns with "pre-approved design" process.
3. Work with state and federal representatives and agencies to provide vouchers to make housing affordable in every ZIP code.

6119 NE Sacramento Street

See attachment

tbergler@percipiogroup.com Tim Bergler

27503 97202 Southeast and Eastmoreland Mapping the "a" overlay

oakbay@q.com

Susan Ferguson

27505 97213 Northeast Park

Housing types, Mapping the "a" overlay, Affordability, Rose City Woodstock

aw123jobs@gmail.com

Arlene Williams

27506 97206 Southeast k

4125 NE 64th Ave.	I am opposed to the proposal to allow two ADU's in addition to a residential home in my area. The houses and lots are not large, in general. I think that this would cause change that would be too detrimental to the current character and ambience of the area. I would consider allowing one ADU on a lot with conditions . Neighbors should have a say. Some homeowners would not be good landlords. There are lots of factors that could have an effect on neighborhoods. I don't think it is wise to allow too much change too fast. Let's start with one possible ADU and see how that goes. I fear the area turning into a very different place very quickly.	janetradick@comcast.net	Janet Radick	27508 97218	Housing types
1923 SE 58 Avenue	I support the decision to implement zoning regulations to limit the size of new homes built that replace existing homes. I Respectively OPPOSE the Residential Infill Zoning Changes as proposed per your April 4, 2018 mailer. Gleaned from the mailers link to the City of Portland website is page 2 Scale of Houses. My property and family's home site since July of 1986 is zoned R5. Current Zoning Allows for an FAR of 1.35 (using your figures). Proposed Zoning allows for a primary structure 0.5 FAR and a detached structure of 0.15 FAR. This is a net loss of building area of 0.7 FAR. Using your example for an R5 5,000 SF lot there is a net loss of buildable area of 52%. Why do we need to reduce existing zoning code building are to accomplish residential infill? This reduction makes upgrading and/or building a detached structure less desirable financially. There will be little incentive to build infill if allowable is reduced total building area by half. This will not stimulate the growth the City planners are looking for. This change will reduce property values because of the lost building area entitlement currently in place with the current zoning code. Therefore, property owners should be given a rebate in property taxes for this loss. Since I doubt this is the case I strongly REQUEST that each property maintain its current overall FAR with a provision allowing separate infill structures within the overall site envelope. This will allow design to be more flexible to existing conditions without being overly constrained.	hjseigel@gmail.com	Howard Seigel	27510 97215	Scale
bobjarch@gmail.com	Sincerely, RSJ I am opposed to the proposed zoning changes for R5 Their stated purpose is to make housing more accessible, but making the minimum width of the lot 36' will reduce the current trend toward density and accessibility with skinny houses being built on 25' lots. Additionally, limiting the square footage to a portion of the lot size will eliminate the ability to build duplexes or other multi-unit dwellings that utilize more of the lot.	bobarch@gmail.com	Robert Janik	27511 90013	Scale
6840 No. Boston Ave.	I've lived in this house 12 years, and plan to be here up to and through my retirement. I do not want to see these proposed changes implemented. The city of Portland and it's council are right to be planning in advance for likely population growth and how it will influence traffic, neighborhoods and housing. The unfortunate consequence of some of the hastened changes is that home owners are not being offered the same kind of influence developers are receiving! Changing zoning and the RIP are allowing developers to chase their greatest returns by aiming their energies into higher priced neighborhoods to maximize profits. This in no way is helping homes become more affordable or reducing homelessness! Instead of protecting old growth neighborhoods like Eastmoreland (of which I am a 35 year resident) where visitors from around the world swoon at it's unquite, creative architecture and feel, the city is allowing it's slow but imminent demise by not regulating more wise development. The SE Portland area is ripe with neighborhoods that can use significant upgrade and infrastructure improvements. Why are not residential and commercial developers being better incentivized to develop where new development is so sorely needed. The city can be much more creative and do much more to support growth while preserving historical neighborhoods! Get creative and earn the respect of your constituency! I am a SE Portland 66 year native of which I have been so proud. Not so much these days.	Bobberinodude@yahoo.com	Robert Sumner	27512 97217	Scale,Housing types,Narrow lots
7314 SE 30th Ave.		roncascisa@comcast.net	Ron Cascisa	27513 97202	

3804 SE Carlton Street	I oppose the proposed "new "a" overlay" in our neighborhood. The demolition of perfectly good houses for no reason needs to end. This is not a neighborhood that needs triplexes. The street and road system in the neighborhood cannot support such density.	piratedel@msn.com	Dan Laffitte	27515 97202		Housing types, Mapping the "a" overlay
6426 SW Loop Dr	As a homeowner in the affected proposed zoning change, I am against any zoning changes that would allow a Triplex to be built on the adjacent corner lot next to my property. Please exclude SW Loop Dr and SW Idaho Dr from your proposed zoning changes. This change would affect the look and feel of our neighborhood that is made up of primarily mid-century homes. Thank You....	wmsimon@live.com	William Simon	27521 97221		Housing types, Mapping the "a" overlay
10825 SW 60th Ave	I'm not sure why this location is zoned R7 rather than R5 in close by neighborhoods. With the housing crisis in Portland it seems like changing the zoning to R5 would make additional housing available.	rboon5189@yahoo.com	Richard Boonstra	27522 97219		Affordability Mapping R2.5 rezones
8541 N Polks	My wife Amy and I want the zoning on our property at 8541 N Polk to remain R5. The current R5 zoning is already quite dense, and the change to R2.5 would degrade the character of the neighborhood.	patrick.rutledge@yahoo.com	Patrick Rutledge	27523 97203 North	St. Johns	
3583 SE Lincoln Street	I oppose adding the "a" overlay to the R5 zone. One ADU or Duplex is plenty. Increasing density in these inner eastside neighborhoods is not the answer to the housing shortage. Infill becomes undesirable when maximum densities destroy the liveability of the existing neighborhood. That is what will happen here if you adopt the "a" overlay to the R5 zone. I oppose this proposed infill change.	scott@fieldjerger.com	Scott Jerger	27530 97214 Southeast	Richmond	Housing types Housing types, Mapping the "a" overlay, Parking
1008 SE 112th Ave	Please do not overly the "a" zone in our neighborhood. We bought our home based on the space around us and the sense of privacy we enjoy. The development of ADU's close to our property will destroy what we have created in our outdoor living space. Also, our streets are already full of cars. Please seek other means of developing housing that will not destroy what people have already invested in in our neighborhood.	avab24@gmail.com	Ava Frank	27532 97216 East	Mill Park	
	I want the zoning on my property and surrounding property to stay R5. The Residential Infill Project (RIP) does not incorporate the amendments approved by the City Council on December 7, 2016. We believed the Council would continue to abide by this decision. The RIP violates the purpose of the zoning code, which is to provide stability and predictability to neighborhoods and the development process. If the zoning is changed, this is a radical change to our neighborhood. It will be more dense, increase the chance that existing homes will be demolished, along with trees, garden space, yards for kids to play in, etc. The most affordable and "greenest" house is the one already standing; RIP does little to encourage retention of existing houses. There is still existing vacant land that can be developed.					
3108 NE Ainsworth St	Much of what makes Portland a nice place to live is the neighborhoods, which are already being drastically changed for the worse by the infill that does not allow for appropriate infrastructure, leading to horrible parking, traffic congestion, and poor street quality. Please do not further denigrate the quality and character of Portland.	ken.magee52@yahoo.com	JANA SCHWEITZER	27533 97211 Northeast	Concordia	Mapping R2.5 rezones, Parkin g
	Hello,					
	I ask that you please upzone my house (2301 NE Rodney Ave) and the surrounding area from R2.5 to R2. The area is a mix of single family homes, duplexes, triplexes, and quads. The R2.5 zoning doesn't fit with the character of the neighborhood and is excessively exclusive.					
	We are right near downtown and have great transit access, and we should be sharing this privilege with more people.					
2301 NE Rodney Ave	Thank you for your time!	bradmbak@gmail.com	Brad Baker	27538 97212		

3124 NE 35th Pl 6201 NE 13th Avenue	Letter attached. I support the proposed change to add an 'a' overlay zone in my neighborhood. It is a good way to encourage density while preserving a neighborhood 'feel'. I HATE, HATE, HATE the proposal to change the zoning code for my house and the houses on the three other corners around me to permit houses with up to two ADUs, a duplex, a duplex plus an ADU or a triplex.	cca@pbl.net	Darren Singer Christopher Anders	27539 97212 27540 97211	Scale,Housing types,Visitability ,Parking Mapping the "a" overlay
6405 SE 44th Ave.	This proposal SUCKS. Hi, Portland-- I'm frustrated that my plan to add a second floor to my little house for an ADU is to be jeopardized by this confusing exception to the "a" overlay on my property. There are only a few of us whose houses have been excluded from the overlay-- what is the rationale for this? We would prefer to take advantage of the additional flexibility in our property use, since we will already be dealing with the traffic and congestion that comes with increased population density in the neighborhood. As compensation, we should share in the ability to benefit from the more intensive use of our land. Please reconsider our exclusion!	katie.essick@gmail.com	Katie Essick	27541 97206	Housing types,Parking
3233 SW Spring Garden St	Please reconsider our exclusion!	ajckormendy@gmail.com	Amy Kormendy	27542 97219 West	Multnomah Housing types,Mapping the "a" overlay

The St. Johns Neighborhood Association (SJNA) and St. Johns Center for Opportunity (SJCO) would like to submit our comments regarding the Residential Infill Project (RIP).

The RIP is a valuable project for the City of Portland, the policies of which will address multiple goals of strategically increasing population density and augmenting the type, size, and price of housing in Portland. While we appreciate that the RIP attempts to mitigate the ramifications of increased development, including predatory development practices and reduced affordability (and the consequent displacement of vulnerable communities), we also align with Anti-Displacement PDX Coalition's opinion that these guidelines (as currently written) will, over time, create more spatial disparity. And that there are programs, policies and interventions that will allow vulnerable populations to participate in the RIP to their benefit, instead of be shielded from it in an effort to protect them.

We believe that the RIP has the potential to significantly impact the communities of St Johns, and would encourage the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability to adopt a more robust set of anti-displacement tools (as highlighted in Anti-Displacement PDX's letter). Additionally, we would like to see our entire community included in this project, rather than a few small areas currently outlined in the 'a' overlay zone. We desire that this project protect our most vulnerable neighbors, preserve our diverse communities, and empower homeowners and renters to positively participate.

Background:

St Johns is a neighborhood with unique urban, spatial and socio-cultural attributes. It is one of the oldest developed areas of the city, sitting on a peninsula surrounded by water, marshes and greenspace, as well as bordered by the Port and heavy industry. It is a community traditionally made up of working class, blue-collar families and communities of color. Many of these families have lived here for generations. Many are homeowners, in which their home is their most valuable asset, creating financial and social stability inter-generationally. We also have a high rental population due to traditionally affordable rental apartments and homes. These communities remain a vibrant and vital part of St. Johns.

The neighborhood has also experienced acute and intense development pressure in the recent past. This has put lower income families, and especially renters in precarious positions, creating displacement and erosion of these described communities.

I support the proposal to limit house sizes to half of the lot size. I cherish the charm and character of Portland's residential neighborhoods, and it has been troubling to me (as a resident of southeast Portland) to see older homes bulldozed in favor of sprawling buildings that leave very little, if any, yard space and extremely tall and narrow homes built on lots that have been subdivided. As Portlanders, we are lucky that our neighborhoods have a distinctive look and feel---due to our city's history, style, and culture---that many other communities in Oregon and across the country lack. I have lived in neighborhoods that feel soulless because they are filled with new construction that takes up way too much space on the lots they were built on. Let's preserve our city's cohesive look and friendly feel and ensure that the future generations that live in these houses will have ample yard space for rest, relaxation, gardening, and beautifying these neighborhoods.

8250 N Lombard Street

lindsay@stjohnsopportunity.org

Lindsay Jensen

27544 97203

Housing types, Narrow lots, Mapping the "a" overlay, Affordability, Displacement

3437 SE Washington Street

mintchocchip584@hotmail.com

Regan Fisher

27545 97214

Scale

Hello: I am writing to express my utter horror and disagreement with RIP. This is the best you could do? Who wrote this, Vic Remmers? On Dec 7th, 2016, Amanda Fritz passionately stated that R5 lots need to remain R5 lots and it was agreed upon by the city council.

And looking what you have come up with, a 5k corner lot in the new 2.5k zone could have FOUR HOMES with no parking required. The total FAR of the lot is above 9. Your own planning department stated that the total sq footage comes from allowing the FAR for all structures to be combined for triplexes on corner lots (page3, #5 of your handout) I am told by your staff that is 1750sq ft x 2, plus three ADU another 750 equaling 4250sq ft. This is what the three triplexes can be built at. Plus another 375 sq ft for the ADU. That is 4625 sq ft that can be build on one 5000 sq ft lot. That is a FAR of .925. That is close to the biggest house ever built on a 5000sq ft lot in Portland. Four houses with no parking! And you raised the height requirement as well. I could have a 35 foot house next to my one story daylight ranch that is approx 17 feet in height. Twice the height! You don't think this is going to result in people like myself fleeing this city for much better options? This will lead to many teardowns.

Your summary that one can download is deceptive. From the sq footage of the triplex shown to the height of the houses. Leads people to believe this will make the scale of houses smaller. This is so untrue. They will be larger and intrude more into the next door properties.

3509 ne Alberta Ct You addressed nothing. It appears you have sold out to the developers. The scale of development proposed is staggering, beyond comprehension. So disappointed in the city of Portland. ervnancy@msn.com Ervin Siverson 27546 97211 Northeast Concordia types,Parking Scale,Housing

I believe that peoples perceptions of these 'giant homes' (A 4 bedroom home is not a giant home) are based on nothing more than the fear that their neighborhood is changing and they just aren't happy about it. Some reasons tend to be more personal, than anything else (could be, more traffic, sprawl, noise, less parking etc, ok, so no one likes that but it is what it is). Progress is inevitable, and the fact is that a family of 5 can not live in a 2 bedroom fixer-upper single story bungalow built in the early 1900's. In a lot of cases it's cheaper to tear down an older home than it is to retrofit one to current modern standards and be as energy efficient or sustainable as a newly built home - People who build new homes also tend to think more energy efficient, and embrace renewable energy as opposed to investing in those technologies in a very old home. A newer home with modern conveniences for todays families/lifestyle those people also need more space, more bedrooms/bathrooms, than these older homes can provide. The days where we all had to wait in line just to use the restroom or shower are long gone, or at least they should be given that working families and children are on the go much more than they used to be now that most parents have to work just to make ends meet. Older homes that need 'minimal' upkeep may be able to house someone willing to deal with constant 'fixing' but most families just can't deal with that, and who would? In my opinion it really boils down to how many people are living in that home and the type/size home they need to build for their family to be comfortable in. It's easy to call something a 'giant home' if 1 person lived alone in a 4-5 bedroom home (but even then, what business is it of mine, or anyone elses?) but a married couple with 3-4 kids? You just have to be realistic. If I were single, reitired and lived alone in a small house that I purchased in the 1950's/built sometime after during WW2, I might be able to be just fine living there, and fixing it up as it falls apart, and maybe might not be too happy that the house next to me is being torn down to build something larger, but thats a personal issue, but not really an arguable one from where I sit other than 'I might not like it'. Considering that everyones needs are different I don't think its right to tell people what they can and can't build on their property. Everyones needs are different and if someone purchases a piece of property they should be able to build what they want on it. It's just not reailistic to think that a 70-100 year old delapitated home can be retrofitted to accommodate whats needed for the 21st Century family.

1820 SE Umatilla St. Thats my 2 cents. tonyargguerrero@comcast.net Anthony Guerrero 27547 97202 Scale

5242 NE 35th place I DEFINITELY want the zoning on my property and surround property to stay R5. I want stability and predictability in my neighborhood as much as possible. I want single family homes as that is what our neighborhood stands for and LOVES. Please don't start putting multifamily dwellings in single family neighborhoods. STOP. KEEP R5 in my neighborhood. Kathleen spike@coachingworksinc.com Kathleen M Spike, MCC 27549 97211 Northeast Concordia Housing types

(the proposed massive apartment complex on 51st and Sandy with no parking provided) was an education in the reality of government, and my (and all my neighbors and neighborhood association) complete lack of a voice. I now know you are "encouraging" us to submit feedback but have no intention of listening at all. Despite my knowledge that this will turn out how city council has planned, I will still write this letter.

I strongly disagree with the RIP, with rezoning and with changing the overlay. People want to live here because it is fairly peaceful and not too overcrowded, and the rezoning will ironically destroy what drew people here. As a home owner, we purchased the house based on the zoning that was already in place. Altering it alters the way we live, our surroundings, and our stress levels. We probably wouldn't have purchased this house if it were zoned and had the overlay proposed already in place. While you profess to be helping people find affordable housing, you are also putting people who have found affordable in what they felt was a "good" neighborhood into a "bad" neighborhood. And now, we won't be able to afford to live in a "good" neighborhood. I am using quotes, as "good" and "bad" as these terms are relative. For us, "good" was a \$325,000 home with nice people as neighbors (no renters, like in our last neighborhood with lots of theft and no one new each other, and no one planted flowers, because they were just renting). "Good" means sidewalks and not too much traffic so my kids can play outside. Good to us didn't mean status, or expensive. If you make these zoning and overlay changes, you will be changing our neighborhood into the one we moved out of. And then we can no longer afford good housing.

I disagree with the closed-minds turned to the protest of the people on this issue. Why we don't get to vote on issues like these? Instead, a small group of people that were voted in to take action in our behalf (you, the government) has decided that we are stupid and not worth listening to. We are "deplorables", while city council-people act like they have an inspired vision that must be carried out to save us from ourselves. You were voted in to be public servants, but instead have decided to rule like kings. I challenge you to put this out to a vote, and further challenge you to carry out the wishes of the population. I wish that would happen, as I believe the RIP would be defeated. But, if I am wrong, then I would at least be able to accept it knowing that the majority thinks it is a good idea, and I got an honest chance to participate. I actually believe in democracy, and think that what the masses want is important to know. It's important for people to get to make decisions, and even self correct and most importantly, learn. Involving all people in decision making is key to a vital and unique city. But instead we are being subjected to the will of the City Council. City council has "decreed" the request of people who aren't here yet must come before the requests of people who are already here. I believe City Council has already decided this issue and doesn't care what the population thinks. And that is not democracy!!!!

2208 NE 53RD AVE	The only recourse I have is to know who is in office now, and vote against them next time. But honestly, that is all I have. I can honestly say that I have no say. Our system is broken, top to bottom, and I had no idea until I had an This proposal is a blatant attempt by the city of Portland to circumvent the voting process so the citizens can truly decide the future of our city.	jjenniferkersgaard@yahoo.com	Jennifer KERSGAARD	27550 97213 Northeast	Rose City Park	Housing types
	The following comments are my testimony regarding this ill-conceived proposal. 1.Increased traffic, noise and congestion. This decreases quality of life and safety in neighborhood without sidewalks – as well as those with them. 2.Increased population in neighborhoods puts a great burden on already overcrowded schools. 3.Limiting the size of a house to very specific square footage is beyond government overreach. Portland already has requirements for window square footage and garage placement, distance from property lines, and on and on. Where does it stop? 4.No off street parking required ? You have got to be kidding !!!					
5620 SW Cameron Rd.	I can't help but wonder what parts of this proposal we don't know about. This will do nothing short of destroying the livability of Portland.	mjerwin_pdx@hotmail.com	Mary Jane Erwin	27552 97221 West	Hayhurst	Scale,Parking Housing
980 Homer Circle 9715 N Edison St 4232 NE Couch St	I am the owner of this property. I would like to request that the new A overlay be applied to this parcel. It is ideal for multiple housing units and low-income housing given the proximity to PCC. I also think the remaining parcels that face 49th up to the border with Mt. Park should have the "a" overlay. Letter attached. Letter attached.	rfarmer@gmail.com	Ruthe Farmer John J. Corey, Jr. Mary Oberst	27558 80026 West 27559 97203 27560 97213	Far Southwest	types,Mapping the "a" overlay Other Housing types

2600 SW Troy St 2405 N Holman St	Letter attached. Letter attached.		Kevin and Gail Davis and Powell Ruth J. Richards Larry and Elaine Hermens	27561 97201 27562 97217 27563 97068	Housing types Other
5989 West A Street 11223 NE Flanders St.	Letter attached. Please include all areas in the City of Portland- West and East side. Since we cannot-- and do not have a vote in this issue, its only FAIR --TO INCLUDE ALL PEOPLE IN THE CITY OF PORTLAND.	hirocks@comcast.net jim.brunelle@comcast.net	James Brunelle	27565 97220	Other Mapping the "a" overlay
6316 NE Alameda St	As someone who grew up in the PNW and has lived in a variety of different communities from cities to mountain towns, my husband and I chose to settle in Portland for a variety of reasons. Part of that draw includes the ability to live in neighborhoods with trees, yards, and green spaces. We have lived in communities where homes are stacked upon one another, duplexes and condos are the norm and yet affordable housing was still an issue and quality of life was diminished. Not only will the new proposal inevitably lead to less green spaces and to further destruction of trees and wildlife, but with loopholes in the current proposal, developers do not have to provide these new dwellings as affordable housing. Before moving to our current neighborhood, we lived in another Portland neighborhood, which has zoning similar to that proposed. Over the years, we watched historic homes being torn down and trees being felled in order to use up every inch of space available to build larger structures on smaller lots including duplexes and multi-plexes. Please hear our concern, do not take away these valued aspects of our community. I disagree with the following Title 33 code provisions as noted in Residential Infill Project, Volume 2, Code Amendments: 1. 33.110.210. Creating a minimum of two units for R2.5 lots that are at least 5,000 square feet. Instead, BDS should rely on the historically platted lots or the land division process to provide infill. This provision will result in fewer opportunities for property owners to redevelop a site with a single family dwelling as it creates an additional layer of expense and review. The requirement for both an ADU and a single family house would lead many property owners to sell their land to a more "experienced" developer rather than take on this additional layer of development. Requiring an ADU would make many homeowners defacto landlords or short term rental hosts. Perhaps there could be added provisions for a covenant to add an ADU within a certain time period or limit this option to corner lot development. 2. 33.677.100. Allowing a flag lot as a property line adjustment is reckless and unnecessary. As the Amendments point out in the commentary, "flag lots are a less-desirable urban form". Why allow them by way of an administrative procedure? Flag lots should not be able to be provided without a land use review process. Flag lots do not contribute to good urban form and should not be allowed except in very select situations. If there is greater infill desired, then development should have to complete a planned unit development process or other rigorous land use review with relevant criteria, not an administrative process. 3. 33.110.265. Flag lots should not be smaller than 3,000 square feet—This lot size is too small and will create applications with multiple Adjustments in order to meet standards and offer little in the way of consistency for neighborhoods and adjacent property owners. 4. 33.611.260.C.3. Parking. Create standard lot widths that allow for one on-site parking space per unit. Do not waive parking requirements because of a developer wanting to build on an excessively narrow lot. Maintain current requirements that a garage and parking area must not dominate a street frontage. If an alley is available, require developers to use that alleyway.	ashleymagnuson@gmail.com m	Ashley Ellison	27567 97213	Housing types,Affordabil ity
2744 SE 34th Avenue		matthew.lachmann@gmail.com	Matthew Lachmann	27568 97202	Housing types,Narrow lots,Parking

As a 30 year owner of a small house in the Beaumont Wilshire neighborhood, I am writing to say that I am adamantly opposed to changing the zoning from R5 to R2.5. By allowing this zoning change, the sense of scale and "neighborhood" feel would be lost. We have struggled over the past years with new homes that are grotesquely oversized. The fact that these houses of such poor design and absurd size have been allowed by the City and the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability makes me to question who is overseeing and allowing these changes.

To allow this increased development within an established neighborhood seems to lack any aesthetic or design sensitivity. By allowing this zoning change, it will encourage developers to demolish more original, structurally sound and modest sized homes - making way for more behemoth structures such as duplexes and triplexes. By allowing this sort of development, open space, trees and access to daylight will be greatly diminished. Does this sound like something that you would like to happen to your neighborhood?

When I look at this proposed infill map, it appears that this odd rectangle shape is quite arbitrary - it strikes me as unfair that this same, significant sized infill is not proposed in the neighborhoods to the east, west and south of me (Irvington, Alamada, Dolph Park, Grant Park and Rose City).

As a trained architect, I am in favor the allowing development of ADU's (accessory dwelling units) on properties, given that the size, scale and design are compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. I believe that duplexes on corner lots are allowed with the current R5 zone. But I am very much opposed to this proposed zone change. I understand that this zone change was actually opposed by the City Council in 2016 - I do not understand why this same issue needs to be discussed again in 2018 at the request of Mayor Wheeler. I will be in contact with Mayor Wheeler and the city commissioners to share these same concerns. Please feel free to contact me with any questions at the email that I have provided.

We want the zoning to stay R5 and not to change, I want my property value to stay at it's highest and I have own this house for over 40 years and will not allow zoning change if possible..

We are fully supportive of the need to provide a greater number of housing options for Portland, given the growth of the city and the need to provide affordable housing. Our neighborhood consists of many older homes of relatively consistent size and design. We are in the proposed "a" overlay zone. While we can support the development of duplexes that are consistent with the design and mass of existing homes in our neighborhood, we strongly oppose the concept of triplexes on corner lots (such as ours). These would significantly impact the design and ambiance of the neighborhood and potentially impact the property value of adjacent properties. We see no reasonable rationale to create a separate criteria for corner lots.

I own and live in a duplex in Sullivan's Gulch, one of the few neighborhoods in Portland which is still naturally affordable. It would also be completely illegal to build today under the RIP proposal. The 3/27/2018 Economic analysis shows that the RIP would result in fewer homes being built. This is because homes have to both be legal and financially viable in order to be built. The RIP will require duplexes and triplexes to be so small that they won't be built at all, by private or public developers.

A growing Portland needs more homes everywhere. Please consider allowing buildings with multiple homes to be bigger buildings than those with one.

regards,

Holly Balcom

4515 NE 35th Ave		cathywazinor@msn.com	Cathy Wasilewski	27570	97211	Northeast	Beaumont- Wilshire	Scale,Housing types,Mapping R2.5 rezones Mapping R2.5 rezones
5129 NE 35th Ave		wadudgeon@aol.com	William Dudgeon	27571	97211	Northeast	Concordia	
5406 SE Sherman St.		nira1@verizon.net	Samuel Lawton	27572	97215	Southeast	Mt. Tabor	Housing types,Affordabil ity
2158 NE Halsey St	Holly Balcom	holly.balcom@gmail.com	Holly Balcom	27573	97232	Northeast	Sullivan'S Gulch	Scale,Housing types Housing types,Mapping the "a" overlay Housing types,Mapping the "a" overlay,Parking
1915 SE 52nd Ave	Letter attached.		Carla Todenhagen Quisenberry	27574	97215			
1327 SE 32nd Place	Letter attached.	cap823@hotmail.com	Carol Poliak	27575	97214			

Hi,

For this property, I was wondering why the scenic resource zone overlay (s), which was in the old zoning, was not included in the new zoning? Also, it looks like the design zone (d) overlay also was not included in the new zoning. These are listed on the old portlandmaps zoning (file LC), but not in the new zoning (file LC2), but the new zoning does not say that these overlays were removed.

1144 SE Rex St	Thanks After attending the "meeting" at Midland Library regarding the proposed zoning code and map changes in a sizeable area of Portland, I voiced my objection to the proposal. The reason for the objection is that the New 'a' overlay zone applies to select sections of Portland and not the entire city of Portland. If this recommendation is good for Portland, then it should apply universally to the entire city, within the entire city boundary. Sizeable areas of the city are exempt to this change and appear to adversely affect some tax payers and not all tax payers. Existing neighborhoods which have taken pride in their community will now be deteriorated by the proposed "in-fill". However some neighborhoods (possibly those where influential landowners reside) are not affected. Make this a city wide policy affecting all taxpayers or leave the zoning "as is" except for large undeveloped areas. I am concerned about the proposed new "a" overlay for our area, in particular the homes on our block and within walking distance from the University of Portland. My reasons: There are only 5 homes on our block on N. Haven - 2 on one side and 3 on the other. We are the middle home on the side with 3 (we are a new home built on a vacant lot). As such, all of the other homes are corner lots, as are the homes across Harvard, our cross street. Conceivably, every home could be a tri-plex with a minimum of 3 cars per building (possibly 6). That would be 18 to 36 vehicles on one short block. The other homes are much older and, if sold, would most likely be torn down and replaced. As we are across from the University of Portland, parking during the school year fills our streets; they are full from sun up to after sun down. When cars are parked on both sides, which they always are, only one car can pass at a time on N. Haven, Harvard and several blocks in from the school. It's difficult to maneuver and dangerous when cars swing around a corner and you are the one coming towards them. Without requiring garages be built for the residents of any new homes, the parking problem will be exacerbated appreciably with the addition of multi-family residences - duplexes, triplexes, homes with 2 ADU's, duplexes with 1 ADU . We are against adding the "a" overlay to our home and the homes in University Park. Respectfully. Brooke Hazard and Mary E. Nobriga	kulongos@hotmail.com	Justin Kulongosk	27576 97202 West	Mc Unclaime d #11	Other
11212 N.E. Flanders		schmitz_family@yahoo.com	Raymond Schmitz	27580 97220		Mapping the "a" overlay
6732 N Haven Avenue		bkhazard@comcast.net	Brooke Hazard	27581 97203 North	University Park	Housing types,Mapping the "a" overlay,Parking
6836 N Campbell Ave	I do not support this proposal the city streets and neighborhoods are already overflowing with the congestion. Instead of focusing on growing the population further in inner neighborhoods it's time for the City to focus on addressing infrastructure that will allow the town to function at it's current capacity and to handle future growth. Lets prioritize the issues, the expanding homeless population covering our neighborhoods and expressways in trash and tents. The mass congestion found on our key arteries into the city. Mass transit (MAX) that is slow, dirty and even dangerous yet exceptionally expensive for those who pay to ride. Last but not least the aging infrastructure that can no longer support this city's population. You go to sister cities like Boise and you have congestion control, clean parks free of tarps and tents, affordable housing and a functional community. I recommend our City take a look at their playbook for some insight. This proposal to add additional units to already small lots and crowded streets is not the answer.	adams.pdx@gmail.com	Stephanie Adams	27582 97217 North	Arbor Lodge	Housing types

Two ADUs/property proposed under the new 'a' overlay is excessive and will damage the livability of the neighborhood. In addition to increasing the built coverage/lot and reducing green space, it will increase the number of cars parked on streets and driving through neighborhoods. On many blocks there are already cars parked on both sides of narrow streets which effectively narrows the through-traffic to only one lane. Cars have to line up at each end of the block and thread their way through - accidents waiting to happen.

2119 SE 24th Ave	<p>New construction size limitations are appropriate however design review should be added to all historic neighborhoods to preserve their character, as in many similar areas of the country.</p> <p>The current proposal does too much to restrict housing size (pandering to a small but noisy group of NIMBY residents) and not enough to encourage more housing (a major concern for a huge number of residents).</p> <p>Suggestions:</p>	christanicholas@yahoo.com	Christa Nicholas	27583 97214 Southeast	Hosford- Abernethy	Scale,Housing types,Parking
205 SE Spokane St. #300	<p>1. Substantially increase FAR ratios for each additional unit beyond single family.</p> <p>2. Allow duplexes and triplexes on all overlay lots, and allow 4-plexes, at least on corner lots. Government financing (FANNIE/FREDDIE) allows owner occupied financing on up to 4 units. So why wouldn't you want to encourage building up to 4 units in a city that is facing a housing shortage.</p>	mcole@jmaproperties.com	Justin Cole	27591 97202		Scale,Housing types
4116 NE 64th Ave.	<p>We are opposed to our residential area being rezoned. One of the reasons we bought a home here was the character of the neighborhood which consists of single-family homes. We are against changes that would allow more density in our area. Thank you for considering this testimony.</p>	wipplinger@yahoo.com	Carrie Wipplinger	27592 97218		Housing types
3820 SE Alder St.	<p>We are opposed to our residential area being rezoned. We purchased our home because of the walkable, family oriented character of the neighborhood which consists of single-family homes. We are against changes that would allow more density in our area. Already with the condos and increased parking pressure just a block away has changed and negatively impacted the make up and safety of our residential experience. Thank you for considering this testimony.</p>	louannbennett@comcast.net	Lou Ann Bennett	27614 97214		Housing types,Parking
4134 NE 63rd Ave	<p>I oppose the new 'a' overlay for our area. Though, I do support allowing ADU's in order to help with our housing crisis, I do not believe sufficient concern has been granted to preserving the desirable qualities of this neighborhood. The present proposal will increase congestion on already narrow streets, and will result in destruction of trees and other green space. For this reason, I oppose triplexes on corner lots, as well as added ADU's on lots with duplexes. I would like to see a requirement or encouragement for off-street parking using permeable materials. Also, I add my support to previous testimony that questioned why these same proposals are not being applied to the more affluent neighborhoods adjoining ours. Many of these neighborhoods have much larger lots and wider streets.</p> <p>If the proposed overlay of the Eastmoreland neighborhood goes forward and the population of the neighborhood increases and continues to increase as the years go on as people sell their single family homes which are then demolished and turned into multifamily homes, or multiple homes on one lot, how do you propose the neighborhood school, Duniway Elementary, will be able to accommodate all these extra children moving here? Duniway is already crowded and Sellwood Middle School has the largest class sizes in Portland middle schools. Portland does not have any money to build new schools or hire more teachers and stick them in a portable because PERS has bled the state dry, so explain to me how you can add all this housing within already established neighborhoods and not address the education piece?</p> <p>Additionally, where are all these people going to park? Most of the streets in Eastmoreland are not very wide and if you have at least 2 cars, which everyone does, and a small house with 1 garage or no garage as these overlay properties will, there will be significant increases in street parking making driving down the street impossible if another car is heading your direction. We see this in Sellwood where people are often forced to drive backward down a street to escape oncoming cars - NOT SAFE. We are already absorbing the parking from the MAX stop that was put in on Bybee with no parking for MAX commuters.</p> <p>The city needs to stop being so short-sided in their decision making and actually think about the people who actually LIVE in these neighborhoods before thinking about slapping new rules that will diminish the quality of life for current residents.</p>	hafeeney@msn.com	Helen Feeney	27641 97218	Northeast Roseway	Housing types,Mapping the "a" overlay,Parking
6719 SE 29th ave	<p>We know this is all because you need money from new property taxes but this is not the answer.</p>	wilich@comcast.net	Tracy Williams	27642 97202		Housing types,Parking

There's been a lot of talk and discussion about the RIP (Residential Infill Project) over the past couple of months in our neighborhood. SJNA and SJCO (St Johns Center for Opportunity) submitted a letter to the City regarding St Johns' response to the proposal. The VERY oversimplified summary of the letter is that St Johns generally supports finding creative ways to niche density into our neighborhoods; BUT we believe that creating more density is not the only solution to our housing and affordability crisis. We believe strongly that the approach needs to have a robust programmatic and financially supportive way to help people (esp lower income and communities of color) take part in the RIP. Protecting them from predatory developers is only one part of the solution (albeit an important one). The City's "A overlay" which is a blanket zone meant to protect lower income areas by not letting them participate in the RIP is the wrong approach. First of all, it assumes the only risk of predatory development is in a geographically bounded area. This is overly simplified. Second, it doesn't offer opportunities to grow or transfer knowledge or financial help to help people who could use it greatly. This would allow residents to be a part of a better solution.

The comments were supposedly incorporated in the draft which came out on April 2. If you look at the comments, our sentiments were echoed by many! However, the A-overlay was not touched and it appeared as if few of the well thought out comments (Anti-Displacement PDX included very pragmatic, well developed, creative ideas of ways to help incentivize people to participate versus restrict them based solely on a geographic boundary) were not incorporated.

We know BPS can do better in an effort to stabilize our communities in place, and create and offer affordable options. Ie, if we incentivize people to build ADUs, instead of waving the fees or simply incenting the construction of more units (which will help affordability over time to create more units), one idea was to use those fees to fund programs that will help low income existing homeowners to participate in the RIP, or build affordable units. Create a financial stream from the RIP to help low income and disenfranchised communities stay in their neighborhoods and utilize the RIP!

9515 N Lombard Street

The bottom line is that BPS didn't seem to hear that we don't want the A-overlay. We want programs and policies that will help people participate in what can ultimately be a longer term solution for themselves and the housing crisis. We need our community values to be reflected in the solutions for St Johns. The proposed new "a" overlay is a radical departure from current zoning. I oppose the change and the "a" overlay because:

- a) I oppose the addition of multi dwelling developments to single family zones (what is the point of a SF zone?);
- b) I oppose the .5 FAR max. It should be at least .75;
- c) I oppose the allowance of duplexes on individual, non-corner lots;
- d) I oppose triplexes on corner lots.

The City of Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability is proposing to destroy Portland's remaining single family neighborhoods with these radical changes. Please do not do this.

3405 NE 44th Ave

Thank you, Phil Wuest

hill.rachel@gmail.com

Rachel Hill

27655 97203

Mapping the "a" overlay, Affordability, Displacement

philwuest@gmail.com

Philip Wuest

27663 97213 Northeast

Beaumont- Scale, Housing types

The RIP was supposed to be a compromise that would end 1:1 McMansions and increase the number of homes built. The baggage of setbacks and height limits that come along with the modest increase in allowable density threaten to nullify the effort.

Please add bonus FAR for each additional home on a lot.

Do not require front setbacks, our most-walkable neighborhoods have homes within 15' of the sidewalk; why should we freeze the form of the least-walkable neighborhoods in amber?

Do not count the square footage of any Affordable home toward the FAR limit. If someone wants to build affordable homes, we should let them build to the full envelope. Any other answer values aesthetics over housing.

Allow infill everywhere; do not exclude outlying areas or wealthy neighborhoods.
Eliminate parking requirements. Housing is a human right; parking is a social ill.

alankessler@gmail.com

Alan Kessler

27665 97202

Scale,Housing types,Affordability,Parking

2725 SE 36th Ave

My husband and I have owned our home in Eastmoreland for 34 years and in other parts of the city before that. We chose to live in this City and not in its Suburbs because of its lovely old homes and the character of its older neighborhoods. As long-term residents, we ask that you please consider our input on RIP:

- 1.We support RIP limiting the size of new homes built in relation to lot size and support allowing one ADU on each property.
- 2.We do not support allowing older, well-built homes that are affordable to many first time home buyers to be torn down by developers to build a duplex and a detached ADU, a single family home with two ADU's or on corner lots, a triplex, all where one single-family home stood before.
- 3.We do not support allowing older, well-built homes that are affordable to first time home buyers be torn down by developers, allowing lots to be split for two homes to be built.
- 4.RIP does NOTHING to encourage affordable housing in any neighborhood. Yes, it increases density and housing stock, but it doesn't encourage affordability. What is happening already is fact: Developers are competing for the same lower priced homes that first-time home buyers are struggling to get into, but the developers usually win because they can offer all cash offers with no inspection and usually a quick closing. Here's what's happening in every neighborhood on the East side of town: A reasonably priced home that might sell for \$300,000-\$600,000 is bought by a developer, torn down and the lot is split. Two homes are built and sold for \$700,000-over \$1 million each. New first time and many other home buyers are priced out of this market. With RIP in place, the competition for first time home buyers will make things even worse in this city, not better.
- 5.It appears that maintaining the beauty and character of our older neighborhoods is not being considered in the RIP proposal. RIP will destroy the character of our older neighborhoods and one of the very reasons why people choose to live in Portland. The city of Portland is at risk of losing its historic identity when it lets cherished, beautiful, historic homes be destroyed for the sake of accommodating growth.
- 6.The Rip overlay will decrease the value of my home and my entire neighborhood and many other neighborhoods in Portland, by all the reasons I've described in 2-5 above.
- 7.RIP is unfair. It unfairly targets many of the historic and beautifully developed East side neighborhoods but leaves in tack the beautifully developed West side neighborhoods. We wonder why the West Hills and so much of the West side of Portland have been spared by RIP and the zoning overlays. What other influences, political or financial, are at work here to have the East side so obviously targeted for RIP and the West side nearly untouched? I would like the commission to explore the detailed reasons for this disparity.

6309 SE 31st Ave

Thank you for carefully considering our testimony.

msdavis9252@msn.com

Maureen Davis

27667 97202

Scale,Housing types,Mapping the "a" overlay,Affordability

Attached is my proposal to go back to an old driveway design, as the default, to reduce visual impact of driveways, reduce heat island effect and impervious surface, and make it safer for pedestrians by limiting the usable and perceived width of the driveway.

1908 SE 35th PL	I realize this is in PBOT's arena, but hope the PSC can support this concept.	dougurb@gmail.com	Doug Klotz	27681 97214	Other
	I planned code changes to the scale of homes for the Grant neighborhood is welcome. Families move into the Grant neighborhood because of the schools, and while many of the existing homes are not readily adaptable to families with 2 or more children, the 2500 SQ FT FAR should be workable for remodeling or new structures. The height and setback limitations will help maintain a friendly neighborhood feel with new or remodeled homes.				
	I do not support the "New 'A' overlay option" to allow duplex and triplex on lots other than corner lots. This seems counter productive to the new codes to maintain the scale of homes and would crowd and overwhelm the neighboring in adjacent lots. Street parking is constantly an issue because these are older neighborhoods with single car garages and narrow driveways. An examples is the new apartment building construction that has either no parking or pay-for-parking resulting in apartment residents parking blocks away in front of single family homes. Increasing duplex/triplex on lots other than corner lots will add to the parking headaches.	billandgrant@msn.com	Grant Molsberry	27688 97212	Grant Northeast Park Scale,Housing types,Parking
2134 NE 36th Ave	4 things we should do:				
	1) Let buildings get a little bigger for each add'l home they contain				
	2) Let buildings w/ cheaper homes be bigger than buildings with expensive homes				
	3) Allow small homes everywhere, not just west of I-205				Scale,Housing types,Affordability,Parking
41st and se woodward st	4) Stop prioritizing parking over housing	Rob.mumford@gmail.com	Rob Mumford	27720 97202	
	I am writing to voice my opinion AGAINST the new 'a' overlay proposed allowing up to 2 ADU's in the yards of my home and my neighbor's properties. I live in the middle of the historic district documented from 2007 to 2010. By a definition, a local historic district is an area that has been deemed historically or architecturally significant, in this case by the county or city government, usually with approval from (or at the request of) local residents. The designation is intended to preserve the character of the area. Turning this historic district into a land of tiny houses/ADU's in our small, landscaped backyards and the additional foot traffic, automobile traffic, noise level, trash removal, uprooting of decades of established trees and landscape to make room for water and sewer lines, gas lines, electrical wiring etc. will permanently change this beautiful family neighborhood into a commune of transients. Not to mention the added burden of trash and recycling clean up. And has anyone figured out where these additional tenants will park? Many homes in our historic district already do not have driveways and roads are congested now with parked cars. I am vehemently against this proposal and urge the planning commission to reject this proposal outright and to preserve the Historic Irvington neighborhood we love where we are happy to know our neighbors, raise our children in a safe environment that is not overrun with strangers and renters, and keep noise and trash levels to a minimum. Joanne Connerty				
3017 NE 10th Ave	I noticed in the Parkrose area of outer east Portland where affordable homes are in much demand/needed and mass transit is available, there is no proposed zone changes. There are large single family lots that the 'a' overlay proposal would/could absorb. This would help the affordability of under served outer East County.	j.connerty@comcast.net	Joanne Connerty	27726 97212	Housing types,Mapping the "a" overlay,Parking
10933 NE Beech St	Thanks	rivercitypdx@aol.com	greg ford	27729 97220	East Parkrose Mapping the "a" overlay,Affordability

3627 SE Cooper St	<p>This property (and properties surrounding it) should not be zoned for a higher density, as proposed under the 'a' overlay, because it isn't within 1/4 mile walking distance to transit (#19 bus is farther than that and isn't frequent) and is more than 3/4 mile walking distance to frequent service transit (the Orange Line). Furthermore, it isn't within easy walking distance to any services or jobs. The justification for including it in the 'a' overlay (access to some sort of generic opportunities) is ridiculous in that allowing more housing in this location will only increase the number of cars on the road and parked in the street. Almost no one walks or rides their bike to transit or services from this general location. A more refined mapping analysis should be done to ensure that this proposal won't result in more car use. I am also concerned that permitting essentially 3 units on every lot will encourage, because of the increased value of the underlying land, the demolition of the smaller, more affordable single family houses that are common east of 36th. In fact, for many homeowners on fixed incomes, the increased land values, which will be reflected in their property taxes, may force them to sell. There has already been a lot of this sort of activity in the area resulting in new houses that are two and three times as expensive as the originals. Many of the original houses served as 2-3 bedroom rentals that accommodated households with children at a reasonable cost. By promoting housing that is even smaller (small duplexes and ADUs), this proposal runs the risk of pushing even more households with children out of the city.</p>	meg.merrick@gmail.com	Meg Merrick	27730 97202	Housing types, Mapping the "a" overlay, Displacement, Parking
	<p>I am working on a team at PSU that is reviewing the RIP plan. We know that in other markets when FAR is decreased market values decrease for land. We want to know how our city is going to handle a decrease in property tax revenues. There are already funding issues for our schools. We spoke with a duty assessor and property taxes are based on market rates and actual sales data. Changing the square footage that may be built on a lot is going to decrease the value of land.</p>				
	<p>On a personal note. I have a family of 8. I house my disabled mother, 3 brothers, my own 2 children and husband. A larger home size accommodates more people in my situation.</p>				
	<p>Most of the families i know with large families are not rich. They are working class. I strongly believe that by limiting the size of homes to the degree they are being limited pushes out large families. Portland should be a city where we have a choice to have a large family and accommodating home. I believe providing incentives to builders for building smaller affordable homes is a better method then turning our city into a socialist real estate market.</p>				
1325 SE 31st Ave	<p>My family is Vietnamese and we know how horrible socialism can be.</p>	monique@cpa2u.com	Monique Lum	27731 97214	Scale
1623 SE 50th Ave.	<p>Please consider changing my zoning from R1 to CM2 to match my neighbors to the north. In order to be economically feasible for development I'd like to go in with my neighbors on a development project.</p>	monique@cpa2u.com	Monique Lum	27732 97214	
3627 SE Cooper St	<p>Why is BPS using an overlay over the original Single-Dwelling base zones instead of outright rezoning the very large area included in the 'a' Overlay, a Multi-dwelling zone? That, to me, would be Truth in Zoning. For many, the flier that was sent to property owners was extremely confusing because it indicated that the "Base Zone" (a Single-dwelling zone) would remain the same. But with the 'a' Overlay, the zone isn't the same. It permits 3 dwellings on every lot rendering the Base Zone meaningless. This approach goes directly against the spirit of transparency. I hope that the City will address this and call it what the Base Zones with the 'a' Overlay is: a Multi-dwelling zone.</p>	meg.merrick@gmail.com	Meg Merrick Martha and Paul Works and Hribernick	27733 97202	Housing types
4129 NE Davis St	<p>Letter attached.</p>			27734 97232	Scale, Housing types Housing types, Affordability
1327 SE 32nd Place	<p>Letter attached.</p>	ericaldensmith@yahoo.com	E. A. Smith Peter and Sandra Dubinsky	27735 97214	
3734 NE Hassalo St 10240 SW Hawthorne Lane	<p>Letter attached. Letter attached.</p>		Donald Petersen	27736 97232 27737 97225 West	Northwest District Housing types

10131 NW Wilark Ave	Letter attached.		Doug and Ann Adam	27738 97231			Housing types
6855 NE Alameda St	I am in opposition to the proposed changes included in the document "Notice of Proposed Zoning Code & Map Changes That May Affect the Permissible Uses of Your Property and Other Properties".	karmibeau@gmail.com julia.gisler@portlandoregon.gov	Michael Wehner	27749 97213			
2134 Se 4th	hi		Frank Smith	27760 97214 West		Markham	
5026 NE 35th Avenue	--I want zoning on my property and the surrounding property to stay R5. The Residential Infill Project does not incorporate the amendments approved by the City Council on December 7th 2016. We believed the Council would continue to abide by this decision. The RIP violates the purpose of the zoning code which is to provide stability and predictability to neighborhoods and the development process. --If the zoning is changed, this is a radical change to our neighborhood. It will be more dense, increase the chance that existing homes will be demolished, along with trees, garden space, yards for kids to play in, etc. I strongly oppose this dramatic change, especially after the council did not approve this. We have serious concerns for our investments and quality of life for ourselves and neighbors. --the most affordable and "greenest" house is the one already standing. RIP does little to encourage retention of existing houses. Please do not proceed with these changes as is. Thank you.	adriened@msn.com	Adriene Daigneault	27761 97211 Northeast	Concordia		Mapping R2.5 rezones Housing types,Affordability
4903 NE 26th Ave	I strongly support the proposed changes. We need to provide a better mix of housing, and start adding back more affordable options. This is the right path to take for Portland -- it is in keeping with our values and culture. I'm thrilled that the City is taking measures to limit the building of the huge, super expensive houses that have been so commonplace in my neighborhood. It destroys the feeling of the block when a huge new single family home dominates it's block and obstructs the neighbor's light as well as privacy. I wish we could have fewer of the huge duplexes/condos as well. And finally, can we get better regulation of tree cutting? The developers level the whole plot--older (cute, usually) house as well as any trees or other landscaping. They are wrecking not only habitat, but the livability of the neighborhood when they do these things. Thank you again for instigating some limits to what has become plain old developer greed.	jack.boudreau@comcast.net	jack boudreau	27762 97211			
4511 NE 31st Ave		suebrantley@comcast.net	Susan Brantley	27763 97211			Scale,Other
5905 NE Failing st	I have lived in Portland for the last 51 years. I have lived in the Cully neighborhood for the last 43 years. The Cully neighborhood is home to many people displaced by previous city projects that wanted to "spruce up" the city. Cully has many large lots and is known for its neighborhood farms. This residential infill project seems like a way to get around good zoning regulations with a developers wish list in the form of an overlay. Developers have been buying up property in the Cully neighborhood in anticipation of being able to build apartments (Cottage Clusters) on land with homes that were affordable and had enough land to grow a garden in anticipation of building on cheap land. Each condo on this newly minted land will sell for more than the cost of the whole property. Displacement is a inevitable consequence of this program. With the loss of many productive local farming sites.	chrisdbrowne@yahoo.com	Chris Browne	27764 97213 Northeast	Cully		Housing types,Displacement
10510 Ne Brazee	R7 Zoning of the Parkrose heights with many large lots and the amount of warehouse space, workers who would enjoy homeownership who work at the millions of sq feet of warehouse space and close proximity to the pdx airport is a misguided use of land where the blue collar workers could enjoy homeownership. This is such a poor use of land this proposal should be reconsidered. Give workers a chance to own a home.	kurtchiapuzio@hotmail.com	Kurt Chiapuzio	27765 97220 East		Parkrose Heights	
	For this proposed zoning change, here are our comments:						
4541 NE 35th Avenue	We very much disagree with these proposed changes. We want the R5 zoning to remain unchanged for our home and neighbor hood. Don't change the R5. Keep it the way it was when we purchased our home more than 40 years ago. We don't need smaller lots and more homes in this area. And we don't need more congestion and more cars with no place to park. This change will only make it worse, much worse. It is already too congested. It will make the area less valuable. It's like stealing our money. It will make it worse. Keep the Dec 7, 2016 decision. Keep the R5 zoning.	hi.sheldon@gmail.com	Sheldon Hill	27766 97211 Northeast	Wilshire	Beaumont-	Housing types,Mapping R2.5 rezones,Parking

6107 NE 14th Ave	<p>In the R5 zone duplexes and triplexes should be given more floor area compared to single family homes. The current proposal gives them all a FAR of .5 so developers are not incentivized to build duplexes or triplexes. Maximum FAR should be .45 for single family, .5 for duplex and .55 for triplex to incentivize a higher number of duplex and triplexes which will be more affordable compared to single family homes.</p> <p>Briefly. You know we have spent many millions of dollars building good transit in this region. Transit that TriMet says is not fully utilized and even declining in ridership. This transit provides easy commuting access to downtown. So instead of infilling established close-in neighborhoods (to their detriment) why don't we direct development out to where we (at major expense) have developed transit destinations. Twenty minutes from downtown by train/bus there are lots and lots of underdeveloped properties where new duplexes, garden apartments, cottage clusters and "middle housing" would probably be welcome as improvements.</p>	vandepas@gmail.com	Martin Vandepas	27767 97211 Northeast	Woodlaw n	Scale,Housing types
425 SW Bancroft	<p>Yes. The developers would prefer to infill in established neighborhoods because that is how they make bigger money, faster, at less risk. But this is not good for the City. Its close-in, quiet, tree-filled and relatively traffic-free neighborhoods is one thing that helps make Portland great. Better to direct development to create new great places to live where we have invested in the transit rather than downgrade existing great neighborhoods. I support the thrust of the proposed scale of housing amendments. They correct a real problem.</p>	mjones@miltjones.com	Milton Jones	27768 97239		Housing types
425 SW Bancroft	<p>The "a" overlay proposal should be trashed. It would point Portland in a direction that has made other cities miserable paces to live.</p> <p>I oppose the proposal of changing my neighborhood zoning from R5 to R2.5.</p> <p>RIP does not incorporate the amendments approved by city council on 12/7/2016. And I would hope our city council would stand by their decision. RIP violates the purpose of the zoning code, which is to provide stability and predictability to neighborhoods and the development process.</p> <p>With the proposed change the neighborhood we love will be harmed. It will be more dense, increase the chance that existing historic homes will be demolished, and yards for trees, gardening, and kids playing will be taken away.</p> <p>I understand the city is growing and the city council is looking for ways to adapt. But it is also losing sight of the importance of the history of our city. The 'greenest' and most affordable house already standing. RIP does very little to encourage the retention of current homes and the preservation of them.</p> <p>Building multiple large expensive homes / duplexes on a single family lot is only a win for a developer. It does not foster good community, environment, nor value our city's history.</p>	mjones@miltjones.com	Milton Jones	27769 97239		Scale,Housing types
5016 NE 35TH PL	<p>Thank you for your time.</p> <p>Please understand that Portland is a great city because it is made up of diverse neighborhoods. the infill project would destroy one of the loveliest neighborhoods in portland, namely eastmoreland. i urge you to support eastmoreland as an historic district.</p>	lzreed@hotmail.com	Lindsay Reed	27770 97211 Northeast	Concordia	Mapping R2.5 rezones
7927 se 32nd avenue	<p>The PSC did an admirable job in developing the infill plan. But there is no explanation for excluding the NW and SW from consideration and just focusing on a small portion of NE. The single residential housing stock in the NW and SW generally occupy larger lots than those in the infill area and would be more suitable for ADUs. Extending the infill plan to all areas of Portland would be the most efficient road to middle-class housing.</p>	sallyrhy@msn.com	Sara Rhys	27771 97202 Southeast	Eastmoreland and	
2209 NE Klickitat		m.hakki69@gmail.com	Maria Hakki	27773 97212		Mapping the "a" overlay

I am a homeowner in Portland, and am writing to express my position on the City of Portland's proposed infill zoning changes.

I, and my family, are completely and vehemently opposed to the zoning changes, particularly as applied to neighborhoods that are currently primarily single-family housing. We question the legality of making such changes without the explicit approval of homeowners in a formal vote of the people.

The re-zoning proposal disregards the desires of residents currently living in neighborhoods with primarily single-family housing, such as Laurelhurst. Neighborhoods such as Laurelhurst were never designed or intended to accommodate the 'high density infill' that would be the result of the proposed zoning changes. Furthermore, these neighborhoods already have relatively high population density, and work just fine as they are – why would you want to destroy them, and in the process degrade the quality of life enjoyed by those of us who currently live here?

Shouldn't your higher priority be to those of us that currently live in Portland, rather than those you are trying to attract who might move here in the future? We are the voters and taxpayers, and your primary responsibility should be to us.

Most importantly, the proposed zoning changes are a misguided attempt at a 'one size fits all' plan for the entire city (albeit prejudiced against the east side). It disregards the historic character and architectural value of neighborhoods such as Laurelhurst. Neighborhoods like these are rare and precious gems, which should be preserved for future generations. Examples of neighborhoods with their early 20th century Craftsman architecture still largely intact and preserved, are rare, and disappearing. This historic significance is one of the defining characteristics of Portland, and should be protected. Once lost it can never be recovered, and an essential aspect of Portland's personality, and the very reasons many of us choose to live here, will be lost. I believe the relatively small incremental increase in population in single-family neighborhoods will accommodate is not worth the irreversible loss of historically important structures and resulting loss of tourism. I believe that to impose infill and destroy irreplaceable historic neighborhoods would be sheer foolishness.

The zoning changes are also woefully deficient in that they do not consider critical aspects of infrastructure. I believe you would be in breach of your fiduciary and civic responsibilities if these were not comprehensively considered and appropriate plans developed, as they will add tremendous costs and negative impacts in the future. The effects on

32 NE Laurelhurst Pl.

nickxland@gmail.com

Nicholas Landekic

27776 97232

Housing types, Affordability, Parking

We are very much opposed to this zoning change from R5. We want our property zoning to remain R5 as it was when we purchased our home more than 40 years ago. This proposed change if approved will greatly decrease the appeal and value of the neighborhood homes. We who live in the neighborhood should be allowed to vote on this important issue. But we live with a representative government, so mayor and commissioner(s) we desire you to represent us honestly by voting "NO" to this proposal which in essence is stealing our money (value of home). Remember the decision of 2016 and keep the R5 zoning for the same reasons then and now. Don't further mess up the neighborhood by having even MORE homes added. Lack of parking is already a problem, and getting worse. Too many tall skinny homes have already been forced in. Please give a lot of serious consideration of the negative impact to hundreds of home owners if R5 is not kept. Keep the R5 zoning.

4541 NE 35th Avenue

joycehill45@gmail.com

Joyce Hill

27777 97211 Northeast

Mapping R2.5 Beaumont-rezones, Parking

3903 N Willis	<p>Hi. My name is Jose chi yam and I have owned my property for 24 years. There is an empty lot next door to us which is being considered for building new homes. I STRONGLY oppose this as we have tended and treated this lot as our own property since we moved in in '94. Over the years we have enjoyed not having neighbors immediately next to us on one side of our home. Also, my kids regularly use this lot to play during the summer. With neighbors being squeezed in next to Us, we would lose our privacy, Not to mention my kids would Have to be more wary about throwing things over the fence from Now on. I do not agree with the proposed zoning code and sincerely hope we can continue to enjoy our long-held privacy and space.</p>	jcgwwe@yahoo.com	Jose Chi yam	27787 97217 North	Kenton	Scale,Housing types
5925 NE 18th Ave	<p>I fully support the proposed changes. There are too many large, McMansion type houses being built in the neighborhood. As our city grows we need smaller houses, ADUs and multifamily building on each property. We don't need huge single-family homes like they have in the suburbs all over America.</p>	eric.g.brody@gmail.com	Eric Brody	27788 97211	Sellwood-Moreland Improvement	Housing types
1745 SE Clatsop Street	<p>33.110.210 Minimum Number of Dwelling Units Required. If two units are REQUIRED to be built on a 5k sf lot in the R2.5 zone to increase the housing stock in the City of Portland, are you then going to REQUIRE one of the units be rented out? What if the owners do not wish to rent out the unit? The minimum density proposed should be an OPTION, not a REQUIREMENT. City of Portland, Oregon Rf: State ID # 1N1E26AA 1900</p>	pikesalasbreah@yahoo.com	Breah Pike-Salas	27796 97202 Southeast	League	Housing types
2209 NE Klickitat	<p>The proposed changes to the zoning code should not be allowed to take place. Judging from the published details of the zoning changes it is obvious that these are the results of concerted effort by well-meaning city officials and real-estate developers. And this is being done at the expense of home owners. There are residential areas that have been gentrified and became recognized historic neighborhoods. This was accomplished by risk-taking private home owners using their own hard earned money. Now greedy developers want to move into these highly marketable areas, build multiple-family dwellings, sell them at great profit and depress the values of existing homes. This is neither fair nor should it be allowed. City officials who are concerned about housing affordability should put their money where their mouths belong: Use abundant open space in NW and SW Portland to develop the needed multi-family dwellings that will alleviate the alleged housing shortage. Needless to say, developers are not receptive to this approach because of marketability issues. The alliance of city officials with greedy developers should not be allowed to incur financial loss to current home owners in the areas proposed for zoning changes. More importantly, city officials should remember that they are being paid by us: home owners.</p>	basil.hakki@gmail.com	Basil Hakki	27801 97212 Northeast	Alameda	Housing types

1. RIP will not produce a meaningful amount of additional housing, relative to current policy. See Johnson Economics report (215 net new units over 20 years).
2. RIP will produce high priced housing, not affordable housing. See Johnson Economics report (average rent of new units \$2,997/mo.)
3. RIP is contrary to city planning to guide density to city centers and transit corridors, and avoid sprawl. See Comp Plan.
4. RIP is unnecessary. Portland's current zoning already allows over 500,000 housing units, an increase of +79% from 2017 levels. See 2012 Buildable Land Inventory.
5. RIP encourages wasteful, environmentally harmful demolition of existing houses. See Johnson Economics report (5,187 demolitions).
6. RIP encourages over-large, over-tall buildings in neighborhoods of smaller houses. See attachments from city data (median house in Portland is 1,500 sf and 15 ft tall; in some neighborhoods the median is 1,144 sf e.g. St Johns) and RIP rules (2500 sf + 1250 sf daylight basement, 30 ft tall).
7. RIP rules incentivize 3 story flat-roof side-entry box form dominated by concrete pad and daylight basement/tuck-under garage (see attached image).

The PSC should reject RIP in its current form and fix its deficiencies as follows:

- a. Require affordability to permit density above existing zoning. Do not permit high-priced development to crowd out affordable development.
- b. More incentives for adding ADU to existing house. ADU cost (appx \$100-150K/unit) is lower than any other form of new housing; ADUs also avoid demolition.
- c. "a" overlay limited to areas close to commercial centers and transit corridors e.g. within 2 blocks. Design "a" overlay to achieve gradated density (high density on corridor, 2 blocks of middle density, then existing density) and avoid "density sprawl".
- d. Consider RIP together with Better Housing By Design (BHP) re-zoning of R1/R2/R3 zones. With both plans before PSC, assess which is more consistent with Comp Plan and housing type/price needs.
- e. Disincentives for demolition of existing naturally affordable housing. Disincentives for replacement of existing housing with more expensive new housing.
- e. FAR/height limits set with reference to nearby existing houses (e.g. largest/tallest house within 1000 ft) and to neighborhood (e.g. smaller/lower limits in St. Johns).
- f. Adjust rules to avoid incentivizing three-story, flat-roof, garage/driveway dominated forms.

461 NE Mirimar Pl		johnyaoliu@gmail.com	John Liu	27807 97232		Scale,Housing types,Affordability
4177 N Overlook Terrace	Looking at the map, I note that our lot is not part of this zoning change; this makes no sense to me, as we are one of the larger corner lots in the neighborhood. Our neighbors across the street are included in this rezoning change? I oppose RIP because as a long-time resident of Laurelhurst since 1981, I see nothing positive about demolishing older, more affordable homes to make way for the unsightly square box condos and large McMansions which I see going up all over the inner city. I understand that change is inevitable, but the rapid alteration of our city is not making it more livable or affordable.	dawninpx@gmail.com	Dawn Barry-Griffin	27808 97217 North	Overlook	Mapping the "a" overlay
3410 NE Multnomah Street		tanya46@me.com	Tanya Baikow-Smith	27810 97232		Housing types,Parking
6446 SW Loop Drive	Please see attachment I oppose RIP.	Jefairchild@comcast.net	James Fairchild	27811 97221 West	Hayhurst	Housing types,Parking
4104 NE Royal Ct	Against allowance of two ADUs plus house. It has been a life long dream to live in a neighborhood like Laurelhurst which I finally achieved and now the RIP proposal threatens to destroy the uniqueness of this neighborhood. I valued Portland because it seemed to value its old neighborhoods and theatres etc. And now this proposal threatens to destroy this legacy we should be protecting. In Laurelhurst there are many little bungalows that destroying would not improve density issues. You are just playing to the developers. Note on Peacock Lane a 300k house was completely torn down and replaced with 1million dollar new home and nothing has been accomplished to relieve housing. I am completely against the RIP proposal. You are helping Portland with RIP you are destroying our community.	susan.kalotay@gmail.com	Susan Kalotay	27815 97232		Housing types
3926 SE Pine St.		winkler_regina@yahoo.com	regina winkler	27816 97214		

I am against the proposed changes to the current R5 zone. Should these changes become effective the character of my neighborhood will likely change adversely. There is currently a house across the street from my home that is a corner lot and the home is very old, as is its occupant. He will likely not live in this home very long and I would anticipate that it would be a perfect lot for a developer to build a triplex unit on this property after removing the old house. Close by my home is a rental with a large back yard. I would anticipate this owner could maximize this lot by installing two ADU units on this property. So if these two things happen, and they are more probable than not I believe, the character of my nice block in Sellwood will change dramatically. Is that wise? There should be a balance between zoning changes that maximize density and current zoning that maintain a neighborhood's character. The City of Portland should not be in the business of changing the character of the City for the sake of property developers and builders who are capitalizing on the influx of people moving to the northwest. The City of Portland should strive to maintain its identity as a city that promotes positive changes while maintaining traditional values such as neighborhood integrity and identity. I noticed that the Notice of Proposed Zoning Code and Map Changes states that "These changes may affect the value of your property." It is not right that home owners' property values may be diminished for the sake of allowing unwise zoning changes that primarily benefit developers and builders.

I oppose the Residential Infill Project (RIP) for the Laurelhurst neighborhood. Based on past experience the only buildings I have seen demolished are smaller, more affordable single family homes. These affordable homes are then replaced by much larger single family homes costing over \$1 million that are out of scale with the rest of the homes in the neighborhood. Developers are not going to pay top dollar for a lot in a desirable inner Portland neighborhood like Laurelhurst unless they can build large, expensive homes they can sell for a huge profit. RIP will do nothing to increase the supply of affordable housing in the Laurelhurst neighborhood.

I testify that I vote NO for the proposed change for R5, no overlay zone. State ID#1N2E30DD 1000.

1424 S.E. Knapp Street

4254 NE Hassalo
2007 NE 61st Ave

stroobandm@yahoo.com	Peter Strooband	27818 97202 Southeast League	Sellwood-Moreland Improvement	Housing types
sfmcbride@hotmail.com	Steven McBride	27819 97213		Scale
dr.mchattie@gmail.com	Jennifer McHattie	27820 97213		

neighborhoods. Reducing the scale of new housing, measuring building heights from the lowest point of the lot, and averaging setbacks will allow infill to blend into the neighborhoods. These provisions will assure that Portland grows in a way that protects the great place that it is today.

I OPPOSE the RIP's A overlay that will affect 85,000 properties in the City. It adds capacity that is not needed. The Draft 2035 Comprehensive Plan clearly states that there is more than enough capacity under the current zoning for the growth that is projected through 2035. There is no need to add additional capacity for 85,000 units of unaffordable housing or 170,000 units of affordable housing. The RIP's A overlay adds these capacities by increasing the number of housing units allowed in the base zones. The RIP's A overlay:

1. Arbitrarily turns single-family zones into multifamily zones.
2. Incrementally increases the supply of unaffordable housing units while destroying the character of long-established single-dwelling units.
3. Will not increase affordability of housing.
4. Fails to address swelling traffic issues resulting from an influx of residents.
5. Fails to address the impact RIP would have on infrastructure such as schools, roads and sewage systems.
6. Fails to address more nuanced zoning that adjusts based on the unique qualities of different lots and neighborhoods.
7. Fails from a lack transparency and genuine public accommodation.

I do not accept the flawed concept of the A overlay.

I request that you eliminate the A Overlay in Multnomah and come up with a more neighborhood friendly way of locating density to accommodate growth.

If additional capacity is needed, then I support land-use planning best practices that require that base zones be changed in the Comprehensive Plan with community input. This approach would be consistent with Oregon's Land Use Goals. I urge you to remove the A overlay from the RIP.

Finally, I believe the current RIP recommendations are so incredibly far-reaching – affecting every person living and/or doing business in Portland – that the RIP recommendations should be placed on the ballot for a final-decision by the voters.

Address	Message	Email	Name	City	Zip	Neighborhood	Topic
3842 SW Dolph Court	Please add this to the record.	Gehl1b1@comcast.net	Gehl Babinec	West	27823 97219	Multnomah	Scale, Housing types
13235 SE Ramona St.	SE Portland is my home. I do not support the proposed zoning code changes. I do not want to see any further development at this time. It places a significant burden on our infrastructure. Please respect our space, and save the trees.	staciring@yahoo.com	Stacey Creighton		27825 97236		
4327 SE Ash Street	I support the RIP because the changes will likely increase the supply of housing and enhance 15-minute neighborhoods like mine. The proposed changes to R5 zoning, so as to provide for duplexes and triplexes on single dwelling, will destroy the character of Portland's few remaining neighborhoods that have not already been destroyed with mixed use dwellings. Tell Mayor Wheeler and the entire Council that we will be voting AGAINST ALL OF THEM if they continue to ruin Old Portland neighborhoods.	098hat@gmail.com	Dan Hoyt		27826 97215		Housing types
6230 SE 32nd Ave.	Lila and Donald Brightbill lila_brightbill1@msn.com STOP and THINK about how RIP negatively impacts the livability of our neighborhoods. Parking, congestion, noise and the architectural integrity of our community is being negatively impacted by RIP. This direction of supporting developers and turning a blind eye to how our communities livability has got to stop. Put the money into fixing the filthy homeless situation in this city, and stop giving developers a green light to make this city more and more unlivable. I have been in this city for 38 years, I own three properties and this RIP is the number one reason I am seriously looking for another city to call home. STOP, THINK, LOOK around this is not a good thing for our communities.	lila_brightbill1@msn.com	Lila Brightbill		27828 97202		Housing types
2616 N. Emerson St		syasko@gmail.com	sue yasko		27829 97217		Parking

1732 SE 47th Ave	<p>I oppose RIP! RIP = more displacement, more gentrification, more waste for the landfill and decrease in affordable housing; just to line the pockets of developers and create housing for wealthy people who want to live here.</p> <p>Dear commissioners,</p> <p>I'm writing to you to adamantly plead for your vote against new zoning codes that would affect my property and surrounding neighborhoods.</p> <p>Beaumont-Wilshire is a beautiful and peaceful neighborhood that is already becoming crowded. Us native Portlanders enjoy the companionship and support felt throughout the neighborhood - it is family-friendly, diverse, and pleasant. If the zoning is changed, the personality and environment of the area will change drastically. It will become dense, overpopulated, and more dangerous due to higher traffic and more people. Additionally, we bought our home in this neighborhood so that we could start and raise a family here. It is unfair to enact these new limitations and force a change of the local landscape.</p> <p>People who move to this area and buy homes in this neighborhood are mostly looking for the same things. An area close to the city that feels safe and secluded - like a small town in the big city. A location that has plenty of gardens, trees, and yards for a growing population of kids to play in, and a chance to preserve some of the culture that is innately Portland.</p> <p>I STRONGLY want this neighborhood to remain R5 zoning to preserve the neighborhood that we know and love. We believed the council would continue to abide by the decision made in December 2016. Please consider the pleas of the people who would be impacted by this change - do not plague us with unpredictability and regulations.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and service to this great city.</p> <p>Sincerely, Thomas Kaiser</p>	Amie.davis503@gmail.com	Amie Davis	27830 97215	Displacement
3408 NE Alberta Ct	NE Alberta Ct resident	tom.m.kaiser@gmail.com	Thomas Kaiser	27831 97211 Northeast	Beaumont- Wilshire Housing types
3408 NE Alberta Ct	<p>Please do not update our zoning to R2.5. I implore you to help us maintain and preserve our neighborhood's personality and environment by keeping it in its existing R5 zoning designation. We don't want our neighborhood to become overcrowded and more dangerous for our families by increased traffic and population density. Developers can still choose to build houses of the proposed type, but it should NOT be a requirement. We chose this area for a reason and want to preserve its culture and spirit! Thank you for your consideration in this matter.</p> <p>I am opposed to RIP. I feel it will ruin the neighborhoods that are established and have been for many years. Parking is already a problem and more houses will make it worse. Smaller more affordable houses will possibly destroyed to make room for larger less affordable condos, triplexes, and duplexes, that because of the nicer neighborhoods will certainly be high rent ones not reasonable. The idea that it will help the low income housing problem is just a fairy story.</p>	allycappiello@gmail.com	Alexandra Cappiello	27832 97211 Northeast	Beaumont- Mapping R2.5 Wilshire rezones
130 NE 41st Avenue		lanayounglove@comcast.net	Lana Younglove	27834 97232	Housing types, Parking

i oppose the rip proposal...this project will subject affordable single family homes to possible, and probable demolition, when the underlying lot lines are utilized to build two \$800,000 - \$1,000,000 homes, a duplex, that nobody can afford in portland....if affordable housing is the goal, this project doesn't provide it...the city of portland has allowed 300 plus homes/buildings to be demolished/yr, for several of those years....our heritage, history is forever lost, and destroys tourism, since pdx counts on that revenue....the people of portland are displaced even more with this proposal, as real affordable housing is a low priority within the city....i've seen friends forced to move away from the city neighborhoods, due to the demolitions...our 20 minute neighborhoods are sacred, and rip rips them apart...at the least, this should be voted on, a demolition moratorium should be enacted, and the mandatory deconstrutive ordinance needs to include 1950 houses and older...i've lived her since 1977, and am shocked old portland would allow this demo carnage....to truly tackle affordable housing, this project needs to be halted....portland has had a sad reputation for displacing folks in albina, legacy emanuel, n and ne portland....do the right thing please and listen to all the folks commenting here...thx

3344 ne 15th ave.

bone1953@msn.com

teresa mcgrath

27836 97212

Housing types,Narrow lots,Displacement

we are opposed to rip....included are examples of an affordable house demolished for 2 towering houses that nobody can afford in portland..

1. at 3037 se pine, 97214, a once affordable home was demolished in 2015, for two houses that nobody could afford...
2. the cute house sold to a developer for \$430,000, as the woman passed on, and left the house to her church...
3. sadly, the church didn't respect the community and neighbors who fought to keep this area liveable and affordable...
4. the new addresses are 235 and 227 se 30th place 97214, and sold for \$763,000 and \$800,000 ...

this is a perfect example of the rip, and how it dismantles neighborhoods, and increases traffic....our liveability, and our infrastructure is failing too..... the loss of privacy is evident....folks who invested in solar, gardening are shaded, but not compensated for the solar that was installedthe grit of portland and manufacuring is being gobbled up by these ideas....the pearl encourages walking, biking,etc, but portlanders can't afford to live there....people of color, the disabled, the working poor, and the poorest of the poor are severely impacted.....the homeless, especially vets and the mentally ill are desperate...lastly, there are many vacant lots on ne mlk, abandoned car washes, etc, where real affordable housing can be built, without succumbing to the tall canyons of se division...it's very sad this proposal aims an arrow at our vintage neighborhoods.....where will the children play when a postage size backyard is the only option?...so much money is earmarked for housing, and we have a glut of luxury apts now, that again nobody can afford....the property taxes are very high, as our infrastructure suffers, the lack of road repair as an example....the housing bonds that passed don't address affordability, except for a few.....we can't afford more bonds, in addition to the ones that already exist, primarily metro's bonds, for fixed- income seniors....thank you for allowing me to submit this comment.....

3344 ne 15th ave.

bone1953@msn.com

teresa mcgrath

27838 97212

Affordability

I am OPPOSED to the proposed Residential Infill Project. I have lived in my home for 34 years and do not want to see the changes proposed in this project. It will NOT result in more affordable housing, it will only make sure developers and builders get more money in their pocket while ruining my neighborhood. I have seen the new buildings going up in my neighborhood and every time a modest home has been torn down and a much larger and unaffordable home has resulted. Livability issues must be considered. Why does this project just impact the East side? What about where most of our city leaders live, the West side? Let's implement this plan there and see how it works out for the neighborhoods.

4254 NE Hassalo St.

janamcbride@hotmail.com

Jana McBride

27839 97213

I am against the RIP plan for the following reason(s)

1) It encourages the demolition of small affordable homes; and replaces these homes larger, expensive homes that the average person cant afford. Gone are the days that a family can purchase a starter home and then as their family grows, move into a bigger home. Now families are stuck having to choose between soaring rents/home prices -- or leaving Portland all-together. People who looking forward to age-in-place (in the home they've been in 30+ years), aren't able to do so.

2) It encourages pollution -- the greenest home is the one that is already there. Let alone, during the demolition phase of these small affordable homes --deadly toxins like asbestos and lead are released into the air. Since enforcement of current laws is mostly complaint driven (and BDS and other agencies are severely understaffed) there is no TRUE count of just how much damage is happening.

3) RIP basically says Portland ONLY cares about the people moving here; not the hard working folks that are already here and are trying to make a living.

442 NE Sumner St

Thank you for allowing testimony from hard working Portlanders who value neighborhoods. Residential Infill Project ("Project").

kwaido@gmail.com

Nat Kim

27840 97211

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 and the Zoning Changes will NOT provide affordable housing, but will increase land prices and cause an increase in speculative building and demolitions.

?The Project's and the Zoning Changes' 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 and the Zoning Changes have gone so far off the rails that it is almost unrecognizable. ?

We all want suitable and affordable housing, but this Project and the Zoning Changes 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 communities.

The proposed Project and the Zoning Changes make 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 and the Zoning Changes pass because the neighborhoods 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 and the Zoning Changes, you would be handing an entitlement for builders who would be allowed to increase density in R5 zoning by 200-300 %, more density than R2.5. That would allow up to 10 units on the equivalent of 2 adjacent 5000 sq. ft. lots. This betrays the communities you serve!

3842 SW Dolph Court

?We all love this city but the Project and the Zoning Changes before you is a collection of hastily considered

geh1b1@comcast.net

Gehl Babinec

27841 97219

Housing types, Mapping the "a" overlay

Re: Portland Residential Infill Project
Remove the 'A Overlay' from South Burlingame

1. I support the provisions of the Residential Infill Project that promote the retention of the existing character of neighborhoods. Reducing the scale, measuring height from the lowest point of the lot and averaging setbacks will allow infill to blend into the neighborhoods. This will allow Portland to grow in a way that protects the great place Portland is today.
2. The City has been ignoring our neighborhood input. I support the South Burlingame Neighborhood Association stance that we should not be in the overlay zone, and that one size zoning does not fit SW neighborhoods. The proposed zoning will take away the reason we have chosen to live here! Do we have to leave the city to live in a single family neighborhood?! Ninety percent of our homes are single story or single with an attic or dormer - this zoning will allow 2 1/2 story homes, with less set back than the majority. We lack consistent sidewalks. The homes in the SBNA neighborhood are in hilly terrain and more than 1/4 mile from frequent transit
3. I am opposed to the 'A Overlay' that is being applied to 87,324 properties in the city. In the Draft of the 2035 Comprehensive Plan, it clearly stated there was more than enough capacity under the current zoning for the projected growth that will happen through 2035. There is no need to add capacity over 100,000 units of housing capacity. The Portland Residential Infill Project is adding this capacity by changing the number of housing units allowed in the base zone. The single family zones will be turned into multifamily zones. The RIP staff has projected that the number properties utilizing the A Overlay allowance will not increase above the use of the provisions in the existing code. The A Overlay is a flawed concept that I do not support being applied to all Portland neighborhoods uniformly.
4. If added capacity is needed, I support the best practices of land use planning that require that the base zone be changed with community-based planning in the Comprehensive Plan consistent with Oregon's Land Use Goals.

Please add this to the record.
Thank you,
Jane Gordon

910 SW Evans St

gardeningforlife@gmail.com Jane Gordon

27844 97219

Scale, Mapping
the "a" overlay

Hello,

I support the provisions of the Residential Infill Project that promote the retaining of the existing character of neighborhoods. Reducing the scale, measuring height from the lowest point of the lot and averaging setbacks will allow infill to blend into the neighborhoods. This will allow Portland to grow in a way that protects the great place Portland is today.

I am opposed to the A Overlay that is being applied to 87,324 properties in the city. In the Draft of the 2035 Comprehensive Plan, it clearly stated there was more than enough capacity under the current zoning for the projected growth that will happen through 2035. There is no need to add capacity over 100,000 units of housing capacity. The Residential Infill Project is adding this capacity by changing the number of housing units allowed in the base zone. The single family zones will be turned into multifamily zones. The RIP staff has projected that the number properties utilizing the A Overlay allowance will not increase above the use of the provisions in the existing code. The A Overlay is a flawed concept that I do not support.

If added capacity is needed, I support the best practices of land use planning that require that the base zone be changed with community-based planning in the Comprehensive Plan consistent with Oregon's Land Use Goals.

Please add this to the record.

Thank you,

Tia and Tony Palomino

I am concerned that the PROPOSED ZONING CODE AND MAP CHANGES will create too much density for an already dense residential area. With all of the "skinny" house injected into our neighborhood (Roseway, 97218), it is already difficult enough to find street parking. With that in mind, I believe that the inner sector of Portland should be preserved as-is to retain the neighborhood feel and resist congestion. Portland has always been know for it's quaint neighborhoods and by providing more growth in the inner sector, I fear, we will lose the desirable aesthetic of Portland.

Thank you,

Karin Schmidt

Realtor/Home Owner

Roseway

8130 SW 11th Ave

tia@mymino.com

Tia and Tony
Palomino

27845 97219

Scale,Housing
types

4405 NE 76th Ave

pistolinka@yahoo.com

Karin Schmidt

27853 97218

Narrow lots

The current re-zoning of Portland's suburban areas intends to disrupt existing neighborhoods by opening the door for developers to demolish one existing structure, and replace it with 2, or more, structures. This proposal has a high likelihood to disrupt existing communities and displace renters in existing "more" affordable housing, with the outcome being more houses that each cost 25-100% more than the single house that is replaced.

Infill is already occurring, without the proposed zoning changes, to address those few houses in the community that have fallen into a state of dis-repair. They are acquired, and the older/decrepit house is replaced with 2+ houses. R5000-zoned lots are already being subdivided into smaller R2500 lots. These houses list, and sell, for more than any older house in the neighborhood (E.g. - \$630,000 to \$1,149,000 for the new houses sold in the last three months in my area; Recent examples are included as attachments to this testimony). Meanwhile, an existing house in good condition sells for roughly \$500K in today's market. For the egregious issues with the current building rules (E.g. – how house heights are measured, etc.), a specific proposal should be developed to address these issues.

The demolition of some neighborhoods, under the guise of an infill project to increase access for a diverse range of people, does not solve the problem it is advertised to address. Rather, the proposed re-zoning targets the destruction of housing that is otherwise in good condition, by shrinking the lots to 1/2 of the current size. This change will accelerate the destruction of stable and affordable housing, by demolishes it, and erects more expensive housing in its place.

Regarding infrastructure, re-zoning property to smaller lots does nothing to account for the increased load/congestion of surface streets. It is a fallacy that increasing housing density and, as is stated in some elements of the plan, the removal of off-street parking requirements for new development will make people suddenly stop having or driving cars. Rather, it is more likely that more houses will result in greater automobile density and cause a significant increase in the surface street congestion; this is already becoming an issue today in my neighborhood (Beaumont-Wilshire/Concordia) on 33rd, Fremont, and other arterials, and causing excessive numbers of drivers to cut through neighborhoods.

Disruption to ecosystem and wildlife. During the destruction of stable housing, and development of the new housing, the process today is to remove all vegetation from the property. This includes all vegetation, including old (50+ years) and well-established trees; everything is removed and not replaced. This razing of the land removes wildlife habitat that, even if replaced, will not be suitable for larger animals (birds, squirrels, owls) for many, many years.

If Seattle is a reference point for an infill project in Portland, then that may not be a relevant example. In the Seattle-area, many of the properties are much larger than that of the lots in Portland (7,000-10,000 sq. ft., or more).

Portland, when originally building the neighborhoods in the 40's & 50's, the ones that are slated for re-zoning, already zoned to a size that allows for greater infill than that of Seattle.

4827 NE 35th Pl.

This re-zoning plan is a bad idea. Allowing greater density is advocated by developers, as a means for more profit I am opposed to the RIP. As a long-time resident of NE Portland I oppose RIP because it erodes the quality of our neighborhoods by replacing current housing with multiplexes that primarily benefit developers. While increased density may be inevitable, measures are needed to ensure that new units fit with the neighborhoods and enhance their character. The proposal does nothing to address the ostensible goal of increasing affordable housing but instead replaces existing housing with multiple high-end units. Little wonder developers are among the biggest proponents of this plan. Also not surprising: RIP mainly affects the east side while most of the expensive neighborhoods on the west side are protected from its effects.

junmail@comcast.net

Dan Fischer

27854 97211

Housing types, Displacement, Parking

780 NE Laurelhurst Pl.

cmconnaha@gmail.com

Willis McConnaha

27855 97232 Southeast st

Laurelhurst

Housing types

I am writing to you to testify regarding your proposed zoning changes to the eastern part of Portland's Eastmoreland neighborhood. I am a resident living on SE Rural Street west of Cesar Chavez Boulevard.

My family and I strongly believe that Eastmoreland should share the load of accommodating Portland's rapid growth. That said, we are adamantly opposed to the new proposed 'a' zoning overlay. We and other residents of Eastmoreland chose the neighborhood precisely because of its single-family character, a character that the Neighborhood Association and current residents invest a great deal of energy and resources preserving (e.g. through street tree planting and maintenance programs). It would be unfair to undo that character by allowing multi-family units via the duplexes and triplexes permitted in the proposed 'a' overlay. It is unacceptable to us that the city would so radically alter the character of a neighborhood that we cherish.

There is a solution, though, to the challenge of allowing Eastmoreland to help house Portland's growing population while preserving the neighborhood's existing character: retain the ability to add Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) while eliminating the ability to create duplexes and triplexes. This compromise would achieve two public goods at the same time: maintaining the existing urban form and allowing the creation of many new housing units at lower price points.

The success of this compromise can be seen in other cities like Oak Park, Illinois (on the western boundary of the city of Chicago). In Oak Park, many large older homes have apartments or "flats" in a basement or upper floor plus ADUs in the form of converted garages or carriage houses. This allows Oak Park neighborhoods to house more people while retaining fair-sized yards and street trees. Many houses and lots in Eastmoreland could be treated in this fashion.

To reiterate, I am writing to request that you eliminate the duplexes and triplexes from the proposed 'a' overlay in Eastmoreland while retaining the ability to add ADUs.

Thank you for your consideration,
Marina Guizzetti

3806 SE RURAL ST

this property is at the bottom of a hill that runs from capital hwy down Dolph down spring garden ct. There is already seasonal flooding and additional housing would increase run off and make thing worse. Please consider removing the a overlay on all properties on spring garden ct from 35th to dolph, on Spring Garden street from 35th to 37th, and on Dolph from Spring Garden street to Capital Highway.

marinaguizzetti@gmail.com

Marina Guizzetti

27861 97202

Housing types

3535 sw spring garden ct

thanks

I strongly OPPOSE RIP. I have lived in my house since 1985. All of the smaller affordable housing is getting torn down by developers who build massive houses and then charge over \$800,000 for the "new" house. This does not provide any affordable housing and ruins our neighborhood.

lkringen@gmail.com

laura kringen

27864 97219

Mapping the "a" overlay

4105 NE Hassalo St.

Chrisschwab@msn.com

Marie Schwab

27865 97232

I am a homeowner and property manager and believe we should have more density in our neighborhoods, However your proposed plan of having options of SFR (single family residence) being turned into duplexes or triplexes (on corner lots) with additional ADU's is not going to give the middle or lower class an opportunity to ever purchase a home of their own. Once a house is turned into rentals by making it a duplex and/or adding an ADU or two the property it will become too expensive in the future for a blue collar or white collar worker to afford. And who do you know that wants to be a landlord anyway especially since Portland laws have changed for the mom and pop landlord where they now have to pay thousands of dollars to move out a bad tenant. And rents will still be high to cover such costs that they incur. It might sound good to a homeowner to make a house into a duplex, or triplex, that is if they can afford it, so they can have the extra income but what happens when they go to sell their home? Of course it will be worth more and they will get more money for it but please know it will be harder to sell first off because of the high price and second it will mostly be selling to a smaller investment market. Then over several years you will have whole neighborhoods filled with investment property and few homeowners. And the American dream for the less rich goes out the window. Please think real hard before implementing this new plan as it will drastically change the way we live as a community in the future. It seems this is yet another scheme cooked up by our bureaucracy to benefit the investors and wealthy in our city and also draws in the wealthy from other states. Stop thinking about yourselves and start thinking about the people you serve!

8005 N Fiske Ave

I oppose the aptly named RIP. In my neighborhood of Laurelhurst, it will further encourage demolition of existing housing and replace it with unaffordable units that will not be in keeping with the neighborhood, in particular promoting ugly box style three story "homes."

601 ne hazelfern pl

janandpres@yahoo.com

Jan Reynolds

27866 97203

Housing types

jacobl54@comcast.net

Jacob Lewin

27871 97232

density. I am a strong supporter of the urban growth boundary and am in support of increasing urban density. I have had many conversations with neighbors who are disgusted by the rise of apartment buildings, but I do not share their disdain for this kind of change. But the council has made some pretty key decisions that significantly created significant density in many neighborhoods, but leaving others unaffected. The changes that are now being proposed will only increase that density in the affected areas. The experience thus far demonstrates an unequal application of the principles regarding density and a failure on the council's part to anticipate problems.

In the last decade, the council responded to the housing crisis by allowing apartment builders to construct large apartment complexes without parking. The result in my neighborhood—and in others: discussions with people I meet from other neighborhoods (like the Lloyd district) often begin with their complaints about parking and density, turns in the conversation now initiated by me. The problems are the same everywhere: without access to parking with their apartments, tenants park on the street turning narrow two-lane thoroughfares into spaces that create more dangerous encounters between bikes and automobiles. This is true with regard to Milwaukee Avenue, which carries a lot of bicycling commuters. There are now very few places where the cyclist cannot avoid taking the entire lane, so this in itself slows down traffic, except when drivers pass, often in frustration in unsafe ways. Some people who live in apartments can bike and may choose to do so (though without improving safety, this also discourages them from making this choice), but the increase in parking along the streets shows that not that many are willing to give up their cars. I have friends who have trouble getting out of their driveways now as residents now try to squeeze their cars into any available space, including those directly abutting driveways. One of those friends has a business on Milwaukee Avenue that depends on the patronage of customers from outside of the neighborhood, and increasingly they cannot find parking. The limited parking near that business is often taken by Zipcars, which have an exemption from the limit.

I have lived in New York where I have gloried in my ability to live without a car, but Portland is not such a place, not yet. The rapid development of these apartment buildings raises a lot of questions to which government officials should start articulating answers: Will you increase public transportation to make life without a car more alluring? Will you start charging people for parking, tenants and homeowners alike? Is this the plan: to create a crisis that can only be resolved by imposing news fees? And is there any sense that you have plans to improve the livability of the city? Many people I know from around the city are considering leaving; I am not alone in this. And it is not because of the density perse, but because it has been increased without careful planning.

1534 SE Bidwell St.	The density created by the apartment construction boom affects some neighborhoods, like Sellwood-Moreland, while I am opposed to RIP. Please stop, think about how RIP is negatively impacting the livability of our neighborhoods. Schools, parking, congestion, noise, pollution and the architectural integrity of our community is being negatively	lipinlm@pacificu.edu	Lawrence Lipin	27875 97202	Parking
3048 SE Crystal Springs Blvd	impacted by RIP. RIP is not providing low income housing. Smaller affordable homes are being destroyed to make room for larger, cheaply built less affordable homes.	amylo@email.com	Amy Osterlund	27877 97202	Affordability, Parking

I agree that Portland needs to increase housing density and I support the goals of the Infill Project plan. However, I am testifying in regards to some particularly negative impacts that the plan would have for Homestead neighborhood in SW Portland, if implemented in conjunction with the city's current off-street parking plan.

As most of our neighborhood is within proximity of a frequent bus service route, most infill developments here would not require off street parking. As corner lots could have up to 3 units (including corners at previously unpaved rights-of-way/"paper streets", of which we have many), this could lead to severe parking shortages in our neighborhood when considered in addition to other developable lots.

However, unlike other neighborhoods in similarly dense parts of Portland, Homestead has:

-No amenities: no supermarkets, no nearby supermarkets, no restaurants, no coffee shops. Actually, NO services within easy walking distance.... just quite a few hospitals. Every errand requires a long bus ride or a drive. This is unlike many SE/NE/NW neighborhoods, which have regularly spaced and easily accessible commercial districts.

-Extremely hill topography: Anyone taking the bus to go shopping would not be able to make it back to their house with any groceries- stops are not that close, and the hills are steep. Thus, without a car, people would literally have to get all of their groceries from a convenience store, and even this would really only apply to younger, non-disabled people who could walk back up the steep hill carrying a gallon of milk and a few frozen dinners. Bicycle riding is tough here even for die-hard cyclists in good shape.

I strongly suggest that you either place some topographic constraints on the application of the current off-street parking rules, or remove Homestead from consideration as part of the Infill Project overlay "a" plan. This would be a great neighborhood for increased density, but without the provision of adequate off-street parking, it would be an untenable place to live. I wish that was not the case.

Topography has already contributed to many challenges for our neighborhood, in regards to the lack of accessibility and traffic problems on Marquam Hill, and also to the lack of commercial services. As many streets are too steep for easy walkability, please consider these issues as you allocate regions to the infill plan.

4408 SW Hamilton Ter

Thanks,
Yes, please build in my backyard! We need higher density, affordable housing, and more people in desirable Portland neighborhoods, like mine. My neighborhood in inner SW Portland has schools, restaurants, shops, a library, grocery stores, parks, great bus service, everything. It's a perfect spot to have higher density housing so more people can enjoy these amenities.

eric8schnell@gmail.com

Eric Schnell

27884 97239 West

Homestead Mapping the "a" overlay, Parking

Portland is changing, this is a good thing. The world is changing toward a low-carbon, mass-transit, urban, high-tech, sustainable, diverse future. Expecting the character of a neighborhood to remain fixed in time 20 or 50 years ago while the city grows is unrealistic and unfair. Growth through sprawl, or through pushing people that cannot afford expensive homes out to the suburbs is bad for the earth, bad for our fellow humans, and bad for Portland. Higher density makes mass transit more efficient and is good for the future.

I'm specifically talking about Hillsdale and Multnomah Village in SW Portland, but the same points apply to many neighborhoods all around the city. Please build more! Rezone to higher density everywhere. I grew up in the Portland area and now am a homeowner with young children who attend their neighborhood schools. I would love increased density in this neighborhood and other neighborhoods around Portland.

6912 SW 15th Ave

Plan for 2050, not 1950.

mkale@me.com

Michael Kale

27888 97219

Housing types, Mapping the "a" overlay, Affordability

4711 NE 26th Ave	I am completely opposed to RIP. RIP is being sold as a way to make Portland more affordable, when in fact it is simply a handout to developers. It upzones lots in established neighborhoods, incentivizes demolitions and drives rents and prices ever upward. It's undemocratic, unwanted and unwarranted.	zerofi@teleport.com	B Larrabee	27891 97211	
296 SE Spokane st	I oppose the Residential Infill Project. Portland is a city of neighborhoods and the RIP will clearly change the character of these neighborhoods without having a meaningful effect on affordability.	tah4444@hotmail.com	Thomas Hansen	27894 97202	
7314 SE 30th Ave	My wife and I oppose the RIP proposal because we feel the City has not put enough thought into the ramifications created by giving developers free reign on where and what they build within the SE boundaries. We've watched too many affordable homes be lost to demolition to make way for more expensive and crowded structures, oftentimes overshadowing neighbors homes and yards. All under the guise of making Portland more affordable and reducing homelessness! Developers are in it for the profit motivation, not to benefit the City, neighbors or citizens! Certain developers are targeting high end neighborhoods rather than directing their efforts where the city needs renewal! Why isn't the City directing location efforts and urban renewal where it is most needed with clear infrastructure goals including parks, sidewalks and the like? Do something with real vision that all residents can appreciate!! Be better visionaries and surprise us for a change!	roncascisa@comcast.net	Ron Cascisa	27895 97202	
6912 SW 15th Ave	I support dense housing in Portland. I support an Equity approach to housing. I apologize that so many of my neighbors are being so NIMBY about it when you are just trying to help families in Portland. I would like to see 4 or 5 story buildings in Multnomah Village, in Hillsdale Town Center and along SW Capitol Highway between them. I think the Hillsdale Shopping Mall (6302 - 6366 SW Capitol Highway) could accommodate a much taller tower or towers as long as it didn't block all the light. I live in SW Portland in Wilson Park and I do not have a planning/zoning background. I know that many families in Wilson Park with 2000+ square foot homes with daylight basements already have informal arrangements for multi-generational or two-family housing. Please consider zoning all the lots in Wilson Park for two-family dwellings (but please, not sprawling buildings) as this will increase housing density. I would like to change topic and say that parking is a problem in Multnomah Village. I imagine that it will become a problem for Hillsdale Town Center and Wilson Park soon.	alysa@mkale.com	Alysa Walker	27900 97219 West	Housing types, Mapping the "a" overlay
3309 SE Gladstone St	I understand the need for density/more housing, but the current practices in the name of it are NOT acceptable: way too many high-end builds (not enough affordable housing being created); too many trees cut (often illegally); safety procedures not followed (neighbors exposed to toxins); huge boxy new builds overshadowing adjacent homes and clashing with neighborhood style (destroying character of neighborhoods); not providing parking causing hardship for existing neighbors; allowing too many wasteful & unsustainable complete demos (instead of policies in place to mandate/incentivize reasonable flips, or at least deconstruction and salvage of usable materials); too many loopholes and exceptions for developers that fly in the face of regulations home owners must follow when remodeling. Finally, if we're serious about infill, we need to find a way to allow tiny-houses & other ADUs without cost-prohibitive requirements, AND a way to incentivize them to be housing, not just AirB&B-type units.	tee_leaves@yahoo.com	Tana Cahill	27909 97202	Scale, Housing types

literature for and against, I realize that this project will not address affordable housing needs, will not disincentive further demolition of affordable and usable homes, will not sufficiently restrict the size of infill housing.

RIP is unnecessary. By its own survey, the City of Portland has plenty of buildable land inventory to accommodate an additional 500,000 housing units, without encouraging further demolitions of existing homes.

I see that (self-described) profit-motivated developers have had undue influence in affecting the shape of RIP, from the RIPSAC committee to ongoing lobbying of City Council. The views of those motivated by profit and not by livability should not outweigh the views of residents -- homeowners and renters -- who pay taxes to support your salaries and the city's budget, and who have a long-term interest in the livability of the city and its neighborhoods.

I urge you to let the citizens of the city VOTE on this important proposal, which will have wide-ranging and long-term impact on the city where we live and where we've devoted our lives and futures.

The Planning and Sustainability Commission should instead consider the following in addressing infill projects:

- a. Require affordability to permit density above existing zoning. Do not permit high-priced development to crowd out affordable development.
- b. More incentives for adding ADU to existing house. ADU cost (appx \$100-150K/unit) is lower than any other form of new housing; ADUs also avoid demolition.
- c. Limit "a" overlay to areas close to commercial centers and transit corridors e.g. within 2 blocks. Design the "a" overlay to achieve graduated density (high density on corridor, 2 blocks of middle density, then existing density) and avoid "density sprawl".
- d. Consider RIP together with Better Housing By Design (BHP) re-zoning of R1/R2/R3 zones. With both plans before PSC, assess which is more consistent with Comp Plan and housing type/price needs.

4218 NE Flanders St

e. Disincentives for demolition of existing naturally affordable housing. Disincentives for replacement of existing housing with more expensive new housing. Gentrification and the forcing out of larger family groups will be the fate of Portland if RIP is enacted. The new density rules that RIP is creating in existing R3 - R7 zoning will create a lot of new building in existing family neighborhoods reducing the amount of outdoor space for children to play, making the streets more dangerous by filling them with cars. These new houses will cost more than the existing housing stock. People will not be able to find larger houses that they can live with other people in creating a sense of community. Small dense housing will make it so that people will not need to live with others and will divide us even more.

chiprofenfeld@gmail.com

Seth Rosenfeld

27910 97213

Housing types, Mapping the "a" overlay, Affordability

5905 NE Failing st

chrisdbrowne@yahoo.com

Christopher Browne

27922 97213

Displacement

0333 SW Nebraska St

We have a house in an area that is proposed to be rezoned. The house is from at least 1900, and we are very interested in maintaining the house. These zoning rules should allow flexibility to renovate the house so it is more likely to be maintained well after we've moved. The house has 3 bedrooms and only 1 bath upstairs (accessible thru the master). We hope to add a second bathroom when we can afford it. There is an existing deck off the master that we intend to use as the footprint for the extra bath. We would not be increasing the footprint of the house on the lot at all. The rules should allow flexibility for something like this since we are not increasing the house's size with respect to the lot. The FAR calculation currently seems like it would discourage this type of basic addition.

mbrady49@gmail.com

Mark Brady

27923 97239

Scale

1. The infill will *not* provide affordable housing. All the evidence to date, and independent studies, supports this. It will provide more housing, but not affordable housing.

2. The least expensive housing is always existing housing.

There has been a lot of new construction in north Portland, Mississippi, Burnside, Slabtown, Division, and other areas – is any of it “affordable”? Drive in any of those areas and you will see many new buildings. The prices seem pretty high to me. The infill program has even removed ‘affordable’ from its mandates, because YOU know it will not happen. I think it was disingenuous at best, and outright misleading at worst.

While a link between density and affordability might seem intuitively obvious, there is disagreement about whether this cause and effect really exists. Academic and other independent studies suggest that increased density does not result in more affordable housing:

Gerard Mildner, Director, PSU Center for Real Estate, November 2014: "Density at Any Cost" argues that reversing the housing mix to (much) more multifamily dwellings would substantially increase housing costs in Portland over the next 20 years, making it the 4th most expensive metropolitan area in the country. This work points out that use of cars has not appreciably changed over the past 20 years despite development of light rail and extensive bus routes, and warns "we shouldn't base our land use planning decisions on commuting assumptions that won't happen". Mildner also advocates for a more liberal - though thoughtful - approach to the Urban Growth Boundary.

https://www.pdx.edu/realestate/sites/www.pdx.edu.realestate/files/Mildner_UGR_article_3.pdf

Jim Russell, July 7, 2014, Pacific Standard: The "Illusion of Local: Why Zoning for Greater Density Will Fail to Make Housing More Affordable" points out that local market forces of supply and demand are irrelevant in driving down market prices, because influx of people with established wealth moving in from more expensive real estate markets (e.g. California, Asia) and foreign investment, lead to "a decoupling of housing from local labor market participation."

4014 NE Multnomah Street

<https://psmag.com/social-justice/illusion-local-zoning-greater-density-will-fail-make-housing-affordable-85313>

gabrielaron@gmail.com

Gabriel Aron

27924 97232

Housing types, Affordability, Parking

The RIP project is a completely misguided effort to increase ‘affordable’ housing in Portland. There is no way that the capitalist free market development community will ever build affordable, much less low income housing, on their own volition. It goes against the very tenets of profit motive. This work is better left to the public sector. The notion that with abundant housing, prices will “trickle down” is naive at best and deceitful at worst. Note how well trickle down economics has worked out. And the concept ignores the issue (Vancouver Canada) of corporate real estate investment funds buying and trading large quantities of urban real estate with no concern for whether units are occupied or not.

Please consider that in California the opposition to this concept comes not only from the supposedly elite NIMBYs, but from tenants rights organization, and low income communities of color.

And lastly, affordability is a relative term. If this concept were proposing a way to provide low income housing, I would be more in favor. But this measure does not provide any answers for low income folks such as those who care for our children, clean our houses, serve us food and coffee, mow our lawns, fix our cars, frame our art, sell us books, clothes, shoes, gifts, etc.

1925 se 56th

Kim@kimlakin.net

Kim Lakin

27925 97215

Affordability

Here are some links showing the Development Community supporting ADUs. A review of the PSC membership shows that there is substantial conflict of interest that needs to be addressed for the hearing on the Residential Infill Project.

<https://pmar.org/resources/for-consumers/real-estate-tips/may-2016/>

<http://buildsmall-livlarge.com/>

For the record of the Residential Infill Project
James Peterson

2502 SW Multnomah Blvd

2502 SW Multnomah Blvd
Portland, OR 97219

customwoodworking@msn.com

James Peterson

27942 97219

Housing types

3915 East Burnside Street

I strongly appose the in-fill project. I have been a Laurelhurst resident for 25 years and have watched traffic and infill residential development deteriorate the neighborhood. Removing smaller affordable (historic) homes to build infill expensive housing, just doesn't make sense. Some neighborhoods are worth preserving, Laurelhurst is one of them. I am opposed to the Residential Infill Project (RIP) as it is now proposed. I live in Eastmoreland, an entirely residential neighborhood, about 1600 heavily landscaped homes with virtually no businesses. There are no duplexes or triplexes in this neighborhood, and to add those now would entirely change the character of the neighborhood. I appreciate that there are housing issues in Portland, but a short drive into Clackamas or Washington counties reveals acres of undeveloped land and massive paved parking lots. In Portland we are already trying to squeeze in as many more people as possible. We are at the same time making housing less affordable. As a measure of that, new construction of single family dwellings typically is offered at double the price of the affordable, viable property that was demolished. The developers are certainly pleased, but the rest of us have to live with the consequences. Unfettered construction in the Pearl District destroyed Chinatown. In northeast Portland, residents were uprooted in a manner that has created crime problems in Gresham. I am not opposed to change, but I am opposed to planning that ignores consequences.

bzauner@msn.com

Beth Zauner

27944 97214

7505 SE Reed College Pl

jrwygant@gmail.com

James Wygant

27945 97202

Housing types

I am writing to you to share my opposition to the majority of the proposed zoning changes proposed within the Residential Infill Project. I am specifically opposed to the changes in the FAR guidelines for R2.5 as well as R5 and R7.

My family and I live in a large house with an ADU in north Portland which was built in 2016. We did not commission the building of this house but it fit our desire to have more space for our family. I imagine that this is the type of home which is considered to be too high/tall and which the RIP is looking to limit. I am fine with the idea of limiting the height of new construction. I would like to add, however, that the height of this house and those of its kind is due to the ADU which this proposal favors.

More on our perspective: we live next to a small house on a larger lot. We are very concerned that if the owner sells or dies and a duplex or triplex would be built. That would be akin to living next to a small apartment building. It would become an invasion of our privacy and would deflate the equity we have built from owning and improving two former houses and investing it into our "forever" home.

I would also like to tell you that Figure 9 of the RIP Summary Proposed Draft made me break out in a cold sweat when I saw it. It illustrates that a street that currently has 6 houses has the potential to hold 16 under R2.5. And that may not include hidden ADU's. That illustration, to me, is proof that your proposal is indecent and poorly constructed. I would consider that type of development in my neighborhood to be stealing from me and my neighbors.

Are we going to change our neighborhoods to accommodate the flood of people coming into Portland? Are we going to change the structure of Portland's neighborhoods so that people don't have to commute from a suburb? Are we going to incentivize developers to tear down smaller, more affordable homes and stack more expensive large structures which are just as unsightly as the "McMansion"? I ask you to please say no.

Dave & Dakota Whitlock
7325 N. Westanna Ave

P.S. I had my wife proof read this. She wanted me to add that our street already has a lot of traffic on it and to add more housing would make it worse. This brings up the equally-important point that changing the zoning regulations to increase density in Portland would further worsen traffic. Without allowing for increased street infrastructure and

7325 N. Westanna
Ave

whitlockd@yahoo.com

Dave Whitlock

27946 97203 North

University Scale,Housing
Park types,Narrow
lots

I am a native Oregon and an over 30 year resident of Portland. I appose RIP for the following reasons.

While I understand the expected population growth and resulting housing requirements, it can be dealt with in a variety of ways. Prior studies show that there is 20 years worth of build-able land within the Portland Boundaries and most won't require significant infrastructure improvements. As I am sure you already know, Developers without other guidance or incentives will build where they can make the most profit. This is and will cause the demolition of especially smaller more affordable homes in favor of Multi unit structures. While Multi Unit structures make sense in areas that are commercially zoned and have the supporting business and transportation, they don't belong in neighborhoods that have diverse single family homes with none of these supporting infrastructures. In these neighborhoods, smaller more affordable homes should be preserved for families. While larger homes in these neighborhoods should be encouraged / Incented to do internal conversions. Most every lot where single family homes exist can also support an ADU, nearly doubling the housing capacity without filling our landfills with quality materials, in some cases no longer available, as well has hazardous materials such as lead and asbestos, exposing Portlanders and generations to come to these hazards.

I would ask you to take another look at this and make the modification necessary, we can have both! If you don't make these adjustments now, it will be too late to do it later, you will be responsible for ravaging one of Portland's greatest assets, our beautiful neighborhoods. YOU will have to be the one accountable to your grandchildren, when they as why you let beautiful Portland neighborhoods be ravaged when there where better answers.

3048 SE CRYSTAL
SPRINGS BLVD

Dennis Osterlund
We OPPOSE the Residential Infill Project. We have lived in our Laurelhurst home for 49 years. The RIP will not provide affordable housing but rather bring higher priced housing as RIP encourages the building of taller, larger buildings.

dennis.osterlund@gmail.com Dennis Osterlund 27948 97202

Housing types

3236 NE Everett ST

larryandlaurel@comcast.net Larry & Laurel
Roberts 27949 97232

area, almost continuously, since 1967. Brooklyn looks almost exactly like it did in the 1970s. I like the nostalgic feeling as much as the next person--but if the City's intention is to increase density and housing options in the closer-in areas, the current plan for Brooklyn will more likely keep this very close-in neighborhood in 1975.

I'll give an example of why this plan, as proposed, will not work. Our Brooklyn rental is on a 5,000 square foot lot, zoned R-5. It is a well maintained, habitable rental, but it is not a very attractive house and some of its semi-permanent features are obsolete for today's home buyers. Basically, it's an ok rental, but it's probably not anyone's dream home. Our assumption when we bought the house was that, Brooklyn was so close to downtown and active neighborhoods, that it would soon follow its Division/Hawthorne/Sellwood/Westmoreland neighbors. To our dismay, as several other neighborhoods have continued to grow and thrive, Brooklyn has changed very little.

The reason that Brooklyn is stuck in 1975 has been confirmed by studies, which probably confirm what you and many others know: it is basically an island of small population, essentially surrounded by an iron and concrete moat from its neighbors, on each side by: railroad tracks; McLoughlin Boulevard/Holgate; and Powell Boulevard. Its demographics and population will not even support a grocery store! How does that compare to the other neighborhoods so close to downtown? While there are many nice homes in the neighborhood, there are also many that would be considered substandard for today's homeowners: homes that are too small or with substantial obsolescence issues on 2,500-5,000 square foot lots. Intermixed throughout the neighborhood are many smaller plexes (2-10 units) and commercial enterprises on its main thoroughfare (Milwaukie Ave.) that are usually seen in industrial areas rather than in the heart of a close-in residential neighborhood.

At this point, our rental house would seem to be a good prospect to redevelop. However, the Residential Infill Project would keep it R-5, but add an "a" overlay. The idea of putting two primary housing units on the property could justify redeveloping our property, under the right conditions. As proposed, it does not--which might demonstrate why this overlay zoning will likely not add the density the City is hoping for.

The basic proposal for the overlay would allow us to build a duplex if one unit had accessibility features. That is fine. What is an issue is the Floor Area Ratio limitations. Let me just say, as a basic matter, that redeveloping this as two rental units is not feasible. If the City's idea is that the area will become rentals, that is not going to happen. Put it this way: it would likely cost about \$900,000 to build this duplex (including the land/torn-down house value), while you could buy a reasonable nearby substitute for under \$500,000 (see RMLS in zip code 97202). Why would anyone tear down a house to build a duplex when one can obtain basically the same rent without incurring all of that extra risk I support the original stated objectives of the Residential Infill Plan; to limit maximum home size and allow for duplexes or triplexes to be built in residential zones in order to create more and more affordable housing. The current proposed draft is so watered down that it amounts to a blanket downzoning across the city and does not achieve the stated purpose. We need a pro-housing Residential Infill Project, not a retro-guard hope that older homes miraculously remain affordable despite overwhelming demand.

2000 NE 42nd

marckchasse@yahoo.com

Mark Chasse

27950 97213

Scale,Housing types

2225 NE 45th Ave
1818 SW Kanan St

pauldelv@gmail.com

Paul Del Vecchio
Helina Clayton

27951 97213
27952 97239

Scale,Housing types
Parking
Housing types,Affordability

4107 NE Hazelfern Pl Letter attached.

Alex and Fiona
Tait

27953 97232

I grew up in Portland, moved away as a young adult, then moved back here with my husband 29 years ago. We have always loved Portland for its beauty, diversity and stable charming neighborhoods. However, the intense focus on growing housing density in the city threaten to destroy the history, livability and back bone of our city.....our single family neighborhoods!

We agree with parts of the RIP. Size restrictions on new construction is a good and needed thing. What we don't agree with is the plan to add the new "a" overlay to the R5 zones which will destroy the single-dwelling neighborhoods in Portland. There is a place for apartments, duplexes and triplexes in the city. That place is NOT in single dwelling neighborhoods!

We know that people are moving to Portland in record numbers. However, that doesn't mean we have to create housing for them all when our infrastructure can't handle it. If Portland does not have the ability to house everyone who wants to move here, then perhaps those people will find another place to go. There is no shame in saying No, sorry, we don't have enough room here. It is UNFAIR to punish those of us who have lived here for years and worked hard to be able to raise our kids in stable neighborhoods, because the city wants to make room for people who just want to move here because they've heard Portland is great. If things keep going as they are, Portland will not be great. It will be a big mess of high density housing, no available parking, and gridlock on the freeways because too many people live here.

The previous mayor already damaged our city by allowing overnight camping on city sidewalks, etc. Portland's lax policy on this issue has created a huge problem of homeless camping on city streets and brought in a large influx of people from outside Oregon because they were made aware of how easy it is to just set up a tent and live anywhere in the city and no one will do anything about it.

We are begging you....Please don't damage our beautiful city further by implementing the "a" overlay in the R5 zone.

3636 SE Glenwood St

Linda and Tom Miller

lindasmiller55@gmail.com

Linda Miller

27954 97202 Southeast and

Eastmorel Scale,Housing types,Parking

Dear BPS,
 I am writing to show lend my support the "original" goals of the Residential Infill Plan. As a concerned Portland citizen, I believe we must limit maximum home size and allow for duplexes or triplexes to be built in residential zones in order to create more affordable housing. The current proposed draft of RIP is so diluted that it amounts to a blanket downzoning across the city and does not achieve the stated purpose. We need a pro-housing Residential Infill Plan; not an old-guard hope that older homes will miraculously remain affordable despite overwhelming demand. I'd like to see the handcuffs removed from developers so that we increase housing supply. Thank you.

2225 NE 45th Avenue

lisa.zigarmi@gmail.com

Lisa Zigarmi

27955 97213

Scale,Housing types

I oppose all this infill. My neighbor in back was allowed sq ft without counting full attic, basement, porch or extended alcove windows, with a heating unit almost touching my fence. It is so tall it blocks most of the sun from my garden which I have tended for 6 years, starting before they moved in. He sheared off all the tree limbs on his side in his hopes of killing my trees, and reached over and cut down off one of mine (on my side) that would have provided at least some blockage to the view of the monstrosity. The amount of cars this additional dwelling has now accrued spills over on his side of the street. An example of how destructive and irritating just one "infill" can be.

My friend sold a house for around \$300k, and it was divided into 2 lots, with a price tag of \$999k for one building. How this is helping the homeless is beyond my or my friends' comprehension. The only possibility is that now my property is valued less, with the ugliness and lack of sun in back.

The additional cars are not parked in garages to begin with, and certainly not in those that have no access or garage. They will cramp the streets and clog the arterial roads that are already in disrepair -- think 82nd Avenue potholes. It disturbs the neighborhood feel and with it will come more crime.

Then you have the Wapato Jail facility which folks didn't want to let the homeless use. An error to begin with, compounded by not giving them use.

Shutting down the mental health facilities added to this problem -- I've spoken with many homeless (who are mentally ill) and they don't want stable housing. My Dad provided low-income housing for decades downtown to the disabled and low income. They in turn had problems and complained when the mentally ill lived there, making them feel very unsafe.

I've spoken with those homeless who say they like living here on the streets, due to climate, and also since so many helpful options are located here for food, shelter, clothing. I myself have supported them via donating to various charities in town.

But please don't pass this off as a low-income housing opportunity! Developers are greedy 99% of the time, and are not going to build anything the homeless or even charities can afford. You folks are changing the face of Portland too much, and we alternative thinkers, home gardeners, artists, bee keepers, love thy neighbors, senior citizens are finding ourselves in a city we don't recognize or relate to anymore. So if you want a bunch of rich developers, land grabbers and mentally ill folks enjoying this city, that's your problem! Don't make it ours!

Sincerely,

8654 NE Boehmer St Diane Rumage

drumage@comcast.net

Diane Rumage

Madison
27956 97220 Northeast South Parking

Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission
 Residential Infill Project Testimony
 1900 SW 4th Avenue, Suite 7100
 Portland, OR 97201

Dear Commissioners:

The Sellwood-Moreland Improvement League (SMILE) is pleased to offer the following testimony on the Residential Infill Project Proposed Draft Report. Our testimony is organized by the 11 main proposals in the Proposed Draft Report. These are followed by some comments on the proposed zoning code in volume 2 of the report: The Sellwood-Moreland neighborhood is experiencing phenomenal growth with about 1,600 residential units in the development pipeline or completed since 2015, a 27% increase. We have 2.8 miles of mixed use corridor that has the zoned capacity to add thousands of additional housing units. A recent City report said that our neighborhood has 3 of the City's 12 privately financed developments that have triggered the new inclusionary zoning rules and 39 of the 89 (44%) resulting affordable units. The high cost of housing and home ownership in our neighborhood concerns us as does the cumulative effect of development in all zones which will increase traffic and parking congestion near our corridors which would reduce the viability of small businesses, increase crowding in our neighborhood schools, hinder emergency vehicle access, and reduce vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle safety (especially along narrow streets). Our testimony considers the phenomenal growth we are experiencing now, expected future growth, and the concerns of our members.

Topic #1 - Scale of houses

1. Limit the size of houses while maintaining flexibility

We have reviewed the square footage limits and estimate that about one-quarter of the homes built in our neighborhood 2012-2016 exceed the proposed FAR limits, so the proposed limits appear to preserve existing building scale and continue to allow most construction to take place. We would oppose an increase to the proposed FAR limits.

8210 SE 13th
 AVENUE

land-use-chair@sellwood.org Sellwood
 Moreland
 Improvement
 League 27957 97202

Scale,Housing
 types,Narrow
 lots,Mapping
 the "a"
 overlay,Affordability,Parking

I am a self-identified YIMBY. It's essential that we figure out how to house the additional 700,000-900,000 people who will be living here in the next 25 years. Let's keep them close to the central city to reduce pollution while focusing additional funding on improving transit, bikeways and pedestrian access. We must fill-in housing close to major employers and keep it convenient to schools. Thank you for your work on this challenging and emotionally charged issue. Cities aren't built in a day. They take time and thoughtful planning. Some people may leave Portland for smaller towns. People are moving here. Let's make room for housing -- we have no choice.

2310 SE Tibbetts

akdouglas@msn.com Aaron Douglas 27958 97202

Housing types

I am opposed to the Residential Infill Project as it is currently proposed. The flier I received informing me of potential zoning changes in my neighborhood says the R.I.P. is not a "done deal." I hope that's true. The Residential Infill Project applies too wide a policy across the city that does not take into account Portland's diverse and unique neighborhoods, architecture, walkability, trees, greenspace, and famously friendly personality. It allows developers too much leeway to destroy existing smaller and more affordable houses and replace them with larger, generically designed and less well built homes that are out of scale with surrounding houses and do not fit the character of the existing neighborhood. For example, many earlier houses on corner lots in Portland neighborhoods were designed with the lot in mind and the house set at an angle, with a sweeping view. Most new houses are simply built with the walls parallel to the lot lines, with no thought to the aesthetics of the lot or the surrounding area. These new homes are being squeezed in to fill the lot, and residents are expected to live internal lives with much less connection to their neighborhood and their neighbors. Razing smaller houses and replacing them with larger, more expensive homes, does not increase density or improve affordability. As a life-long Portland resident I know that Portlanders love their neighborhoods. The Residential Infill Project is a policy that encourages a rapid movement toward a one-size-fits-all generic vision of housing throughout the city, and it goes against what has made Portland such a desirable place to live for people from all walks of life for generations.

3529 SE Rex St.

jwdudman@earthlink.net

Joseph Dudman

27959 97202

Scale

I support the Residential Infill Project, which I believe will help encourage sensitive infill within Portland's great neighborhoods. The "a" overlay will take pressure off of neighborhoods that have already been required to absorb a lot of density, and will bring much needed economic and racial diversity to wealthier single family neighborhoods that have room to spare and resources that would benefit young and old alike. While the proposed lower FAR for single family homes is a valid approach for ensuring appropriately-scaled new construction that doesn't overwhelm nearby homes, there should be modest additional area allowed for duplexes and triplexes to help incentivize their being built, especially when preserving existing viable structures. I was able to fulfill my dream of owning a home at the age of 26 and have enjoyed the benefits of home ownership for most of my adult life. This is unachievable today for most young people or for those on limited incomes - we need to create more opportunities for Portlanders to benefit from the stability and security that possessing a home offers. We also need to create more options for renters in safe, quiet neighborhoods at reasonable price points - only a greater supply will provide that. We can't prevent people from moving here, and we can't expect all except the wealthiest to endure painful commutes as our city expands.

3620 SE Henderson Street

RIP, while not perfect, is a good first step toward accommodating our growing population to ensure a vibrant, healthy future for Portland.

Liz@revealarchitecture.com

Liz Dexter

27960 97202

Scale,Housing types

5324 SE 89th Ave

I feel the reduced size limits makes high-density plexes less possible. These are exactly the development that Portland needs to be encouraging to make infill an effective solution to the need for more housing.

portland@thehutch.net

Todd Hutchinson

27961 97266

Scale,Housing types

I am strongly OPPPOSED to the Residential Infill Project recommendations. After reading the RIP proposals and the literature for and against, I feel this project will not address the needs for the city to help with our housing issues, and I feel that it will destroy some of our most historic and stately neighborhoods. I also find it wildly telling that this project is only proposed on the east side.

RIP is unnecessary. By its own survey, the City can accommodate an additional 500,000 housing units, without encouraging further demolitions of existing homes.

Before you blithely make decisions that will affect the livability of thousands and the very character of a neighborhood, consider putting this matter to the public vote. It is the right and moral thing to do.

However, as a fellow neighbor said, I fear that this forum for public testimony is — like the RIPSAC neighborhood meetings before this — just a sham to placate opposers, and that the city's desire to "do something" about infill has created momentum for this horrible proposal regardless of its flaws.

3611 NE Senate St

Kristin_suter@comcast.net

Kristin Suter

27962 97232

I am strongly OPPOSED to the Residential Infill Project recommendations. After reading the RIP proposals and the literature for and against, I feel this project will not address the needs for the city to help with our housing issues, and I feel that it will destroy some of our most historic and stately neighborhoods. I also find it wildly telling that this project is only proposed on the east side.

RIP is unnecessary. By its own survey, the City can accommodate an additional 500,000 housing units, without encouraging further demolitions of existing homes.

Before you blithely make decisions that will affect the livability of thousands and the very character of a neighborhood, consider putting this matter to the public vote. It is the right and moral thing to do.

However, as a fellow neighbor said, I fear that this forum for public testimony is — like the RIPSAC neighborhood meetings before this — just a sham to placate opposers, and that the city's desire to "do something" about infill has created momentum for this horrible proposal regardless of its flaws.

3611 NE Senate St

Kristin_suter@comcast.net Josh Suter 27963 97232

I am in favor of the residential infill project and believe it is a step in the right direction to put more Portlanders into affordable housing and get more people off the streets. Please stop making Portland a city for the rich. Under the guise of "creating affordable housing" and "infill" you are adding houses/duplexes/ADUs that only the well-off can afford. What about the hairdressers, baristas, retail workers, restaurant employees, gas station attendants, bank tellers, medical assistants, (I could go on and on) who make a decent wage but are getting forced out of town by skyrocketing rents/mortgages? Those are the people who can least afford to commute long distances.

7205 se 71st ave

Gmattsons@gmail.com Garrett Mattson 27964 97206 Southeast Darlington Brentwood-

I moved to Portland because it was an easy going city--no traffic, uncrowded, no road rage, good places to eat, friendly people--things that I valued. Now it is none of those things (other than good places to eat...if you want to wait an hour or more to be seated). City planners have wrecked this town. It is on it's way to becoming just like San Francisco or Seattle. Shame on our leaders!!!

Stop demolishing perfectly good homes in neighborhoods. Stop putting up fancy, modern boxes that only the rich can afford. \$6-8 hundred thousand dollars is too much for regular people to afford. Stop selling out to developers. Keep Portland for regular people. In a short number of years my property taxes will force me out of my modest NE home. I am disgusted with what Portland has become.

4124 NE 75th Ave

Christine Hoerner christine132@hotmail.com christine Hoerner 27965 97218

I OPPOSE the Residential Infill Project for a variety of reasons:

1. RIP will not produce a meaningful amount of additional housing relative to current policy. See Johnson Economics report (215 net new units over 20 years).
2. RIP will not produce more affordable housing, but rather more high-priced housing. See Johnson Economics report (average rent of new units \$2,997/mo.)
3. RIP is contrary to city planning to guide density to city centers and transit corridors, and avoid sprawl. See Comprehensive Plan.
4. RIP is unnecessary. Portland's current zoning already allows over 500,000 housing units, an increase of +79% from 2017 levels. See 2012 Buildable Land Inventory.
5. RIP encourages wasteful, environmentally harmful demolition of existing houses. See Johnson Economics report (5,187 demolitions).
6. RIP encourages over-large, over-tall buildings in neighborhoods of smaller houses. See city data (median house in Portland is 1,500 sf and 15 ft tall; in some neighborhoods the median is 1,144 sf e.g. St Johns), and RIP rules (2500 sf + 1250 sf daylight basement, 30 ft tall).
7. RIP rules incentivize three-story flat-roof side-entry box form dominated by concrete pad and daylight basement/tuck-under garage.

The PSC should reject RIP in its current form and fix its deficiencies as follows:

- Require affordability to permit density above existing zoning. Do not permit high-priced development to crowd out affordable development.
 - Include more incentives for adding ADUs to existing house. ADU cost (approx.. \$100-150K/unit) is lower than any other form of new housing; ADUs also avoid demolition.
 - "A" overlay limited to areas close to commercial centers and transit corridors; e.g. within 2 blocks. Design "a" overlay to achieve graduated density (high density on corridor, two blocks of middle density, then existing density) and avoid "density sprawl."
 - Consider RIP together with Better Housing By Design (BHP) re-zoning of R1/R2/R3 zones. With both plans before PSC, assess which is more consistent with Comprehensive Plan and housing type/price needs.
 - Include disincentives for demolition of existing naturally affordable housing, and disincentives for replacement of existing housing with more expensive new housing.
 - Set FAR/height limits with reference to nearby existing houses (e.g. largest/tallest house within 1000 ft) and to neighborhood (e.g. smaller/lower limits in St. Johns).
 - Adjust rules to avoid incentivizing three-story, flat-roof, garage/driveway dominated forms.
- Off street parking for new dwelling units should be mandatory. The city should also require that builders pay for sidewalks and all related street issues that they require homeowners to pay for. When builders are given exemptions for things that private homeowners are required to pay for it very much feels like the city is in bed with profit makers and not here to serve the tax payers that put them in office and financially support this city.

Furthermore, not requiring off street parking for new dwelling units puts a burden on existing city dwellers. And frankly it doesn't feel like the city officials give a darn about this reality. The topography of the West Hills makes the ideal of public transportation and biking very hard to achieve. The city of Portland needs to put real thought into how to make the West Hills more environmentally sound in terms of transportation.

I support the new 'a' overlay for my neighborhood and for the infill project in general. We need more housing options and more density, especially in areas like Irvington. This will help keep my long-term neighbors in their homes and provide more opportunities for all people. Thank you for your work on this issue.

I support additional density in Hillsdale and SW Portland.

68 NE 41st Ave

dansmail66@yahoo.com

Daniel Shramek

27966 97232

Scale,Housing types,Affordability

4181 SW Council Crest Dr

wpchamberlain@comcast.net

Peggy Chamberlain

27967 97239

Parking

3326 NE 11th Ave
628 SW Chestnut Street

alexis.peterka@gmail.com

Alexis Peterka

27968 97212 Northeast Sabin

Mapping the "a" overlay
Mapping the "a" overlay

cmfinkpdx@gmail.com

Carl Fink

27969 97219

Residential Infill Proposal has been controversial in almost every neighborhood in Portland, but it is a broad solution to a problem of buildings too large and out of character with our neighborhoods. I agree with limiting the size of housing while accommodating more people. What we really need to address are these issues: Infrastructure of utilities, streets and parking. Southwest Portland still has miles of unpaved steep streets. There is little or no parking, and narrow roads that can only accommodate one car at a time. Therefore, I propose taking the corner lot tri-plexes off the table. Development of ADUs would need to also accommodate at least one off street parking space. The most concern that I have is the loss of trees and watershed degradation, especially in our sloped neighborhoods. Why have we not had an environmental assessment regarding the overbuilding of Portland? Do we have a metric for much needed public greenspace and gathering places? There are more than street trees needed to provide healthy habitat. Let us not go back to the industrial model of housing at the expense of mental and physical health for everyone. I think that a model of choice is good, and limiting the size of house per size of lot is the right direction. I am very disappointed with the proposed zoning change. The changes would degrade the quality of the area. Decreased parking, trees removed, increased traffic making the streets unsafe for children- just to name a few reasons. Maintaining the quality of our neighborhoods should be the goal! There is existing vacant land to be developed! Why do you continually ignore the wishes of the voters? Please continue to honor the decision of 2016 and keep the R5 zoning.

I live next to a corner lot. Any triplex at the height of 30' like the one built on 43rd and Klickitat will totally block out the sun to my garden. I understand that there used to be a "Sunshine Rule" where a structure could not be built close to the property line, blocking out the sun to a neighbors property to the north. Then the city changed the regulations to a height requirement instead. Five years ago, a mega-house was built on the north side of my property looking down on my backyard. As much as I disliked the invasion of privacy, it did not block out the light to my yard. I have lived in Portland all of my life (66 years) and I love our neighborhoods. By increasing the density in these areas with this new overlay will destroy the character of these neighborhoods for those who haven't even moved into the city! Building these structures along main streets like Sandy boulevard makes a lot more sense, close to public transportation and shopping. Please preserve our livable neighborhoods!

7136 SW 3rd Ave

sharedgardens11@gmail.com

Leslie Pohl-Kosbau

27970 97219

Scale,Housing types,Parking

4405 NE 35th Ave

cmcwane@aol.com

Candace McWane

27971 97211 Northeast

Mapping R2.5
Beaumont- rezones,Parking

3111 NE 50th Ave

Thank You
Daniel Campagna

danielsgarden@gmail.com

Daniel Campagna

27972 97213

Scale

There are no two homes alike in Eastmoreland and few neighborhoods across the United States can make such a claim. The preservation of the individual architecture, character and beauty of homes in Eastmoreland would be a travesty to see wiped off the map of our history and torn from that fabric of our past. While notching forward with population growth, trends and styles, humanity must always respect and pay homage to the architecture of yesteryear. Living in Eastmoreland is a choice, as much as it is not too.

We recently moved to a home which was completely restored by a company which would have made far more money had they demolished the house and built two homes on the same lot. Instead, the fine people of Portland Houseworks choose to preserve the home for the virtue of the neighborhood. They choose acknowledgement of and veneration for the past over financial gain and greed. The ladder of which is destroying the neighborhood we and so many others want to see maintained for future generations to come, just as others have done before us.

6835 SE 29th Avenue, Portland, OR 97202

At the end of the day, the Residential Infill Project will be adopted and neighborhoods like Eastmoreland will slowly decay and fragment into a hodgepodge of housing density and increased tax revenue for the city, like they want. Keep Portland, Portland has become Keep Portland Weird, without exceptions anywhere.

asundholm@gmail.com

AARON SUNDHOLM

27973 97202 Southeast and

Eastmorel

The integrity -- and beauty -- of neighborhoods such as Alameda, Beaumont-Wilshire, Vernon, Sabin, and others is that each house has a little bit of land -- especially a front garden / lawn and a backyard or side yard. This is where children play and where neighbors meet to talk. When you "densify" a lot -- either by building a giant house or by adding too many additional structures -- you lose this gracious space, and in turn, you lose both the character of the neighborhood as well as the decency and relaxed atmosphere that is so obvious in these neighborhoods. We used to live in San Francisco -- we know what "dense" is like, and it's not pretty or fun.

So, please ... stop the overbuilding of giant homes on these lots. What is the 'right size' for 5,000 square feet? Is it 2,500 sq ft? Is it 3,000 sq ft? Maybe even 3,500 sq ft. But not a house or duplex (or triplex) that fills in virtually all the lot space.

And one ADU, essentially a converted garage makes a lot of sense, and is historically accurate in these neighborhoods. But two ADU's plus a home in 5,000 sq ft? NO -- there's no open space left. These 'density' moves will kill what has been made this area so livable.

So where do the newcomers go? Why not encourage other zones similar to East Portland, but far enough outside of Portland so that open land remains in-between. Don't turn this into wall-to-wall New Jersey; rather put "dots" on the landscape that are small, vibrant, communities that can grow, and then spin off additional ones further out. There's a lot of Oregon to preserve if done this way.

4207 NE 24th AVE	Thank you for listening. RIP will encourage demolition of our most affordable housing. RIP does NOTHING to encourage affordability. Developers want RIP because they want to plunder Portland's most successful neighborhoods. RIP flies in the face of long-term plans calling for density around regional centers. RIP does little to encourage density in East Portland, where it is needed most and where residential land is available. .	jsrr1950@gmail.com	Joel Schipper	27974 97211	Scale,Housing types
2226 NE Hancock St		fredleeson@hotmail.com	Fred Leeson	27975 97212	
8847 NE Tillamook St	Letter attached.		Kathy Hawkins Nicholas and Robyn Landekic and Label	27976 97220	Housing types,Parking
32 NE Laurelhurst PI	Letter attached.			27977 97232	Housing types,Affordability,Parking
6911 SW 34th Ave	Letter attached. We currently have a duplex at 4139 NE Ainsworth St. & 6015 NE 42nd Ave. and are very happy with the changes to the 'a' overlay because we would like to create a third unit in the basement of the home facing 42nd Ave. However, after talking with one of the city reps yesterday about our situation, we realize that this is only allowed if we do not split the lot into two. A triplex is allowed on a corner lot, but not an additional unit if the lot is divided. When the lot is divided the duplex would be reclassified as 2 attached houses, but the new 'a' overlay does not allow for 3 units in this scenario. To get around this limitation, we would like the minimum lot size for a duplex to be 3,000 sf (instead of current 4,500), which would allow us to have 3 units on this property even if we divide the lot. Thank you for considering our request.		Barbara Blakesley	27978 97219	Housing types,Parking
PO Box 13434		beckya76@gmail.com	Rebekah Anderson	27979 97213	Northeast Concordia Housing types

I support increasing density in the city with well designed spaces. My neighborhood historically has had large families, sometimes more than one family in these houses, thus well-planned improvements ought be easy for competent designers and architects.

My specific concerns include:

*a minimum of one off street parking place for each dwelling - the expectation that residents will all use public transportation and bicycles is overly optimistic and unrealistic for the foreseeable future. I certainly support the trend to increase public transportation, of course, over time.

However, parking in the city is an issue now in many neighborhoods due to lack of off street parking. Some developments have been allowed without even one space per unit.

*preservation of regulations for set-backs and space between neighboring buildings

*preservation of regulations controlling building height limits

*preservation of/requirement for front doors rather than only garage doors on the street side of buildings

*minimal demolition of homes, in contrast to updating/remodeling

*preservation of green areas for the environmental as well as emotional needs of the city

3632 NE Davis Street Thank you

rlorwoll@gmail.com

Rebecca Orwoll

27980 97232 Southeast st

Laurelhur

Scale,Parking

I am opposed to the proposed infill project for many practical reasons (impact on water, sewer, schools, traffic) but primarily because it degrades the quality of life for citizens currently living (and paying taxes) in Portland. My husband and I made our largest single investment when we purchased our home. We searched for a traditional, single-family home in an older, established neighborhood that we presumed would remain the same.

However, with the predicted influx of new residents, the city is proposing that we change our neighborhoods to accommodate new population growth. I feel the RIP will not only change our neighborhoods, but also result in a decline in the quality of life for those of us who are currently living and contributing to the city of Portland. I'm witnessing it already!

The current rush by the city to house the predicted onslaught of new residents has given developers an opportunity to build apartment buildings without providing adequate parking. This has unfortunate consequences for current residents of the neighborhoods. For example, the multitude of apartment units currently being built in West Moreland and Sellwood (with insufficient parking for its residents) forces the residents without parking stalls to find street parking. Occupants of the new apartments have just begun to move in and are already jockeying to find parking. With hundreds of additional apartments being built (again without adequate parking), this problem will only get worse. Residents who have lived here for years and enjoyed patronizing the local shops, restaurants, and businesses now have to decide whether to drive around for half-an-hour in hopes of finding parking or just give up and drive outside the city for these services. (You may suggest that people walk or bike to local businesses, but for many older people and families with young children, that is not necessarily an option).

7905 SE Reed College Place

I believe the proposed RIP will ultimately change the quality of life for Portland residents while damaging the traditional and unique neighborhoods that make our city special. For these reasons, I am opposed to the infill proposal.

miparshall@gmail.com

Mary Parshall

27981 97202

Parking

I am opposed to the zoning changes proposed for the city of Portland and more specifically for my neighborhood and property. My single family lot could be changed drastically into a three unit space. I am concerned as to parking, green space/trees, school overcrowding, sewer and power line, and pure ascetic value. My home is 100 years old, in excellent condition; realistically in the proposed new zoning, it would be demolished by the next owners and replaced with at least 2or3 new structures which would be larger and more expensive than the house is now with no garage and very little yard. Every neighborhood has its own character; this zoning proposal threatens to destroy that. Some change for increased density is necessary as Pirtland grows but this is not a well thought out solution!

7926 se 31st

Mlk1108@comcast.net

Melinda Williams

27982 97202

Housing types

May 1, 2018

City of Portland, Oregon
Planning and Sustainability Commission

Via E-Mail

We are strongly opposed to the Proposed Zoning Code and the related Residential Infill Project (RIP).

The RIP will ruin Portland neighborhoods that are established and have been for generations. Starter homes and smaller more affordable houses will be demolished to make room for larger less affordable condos, triplexes, and duplexes. Single family, owned occupied neighborhoods will be destroyed. Parking, congestion, noise and the architectural integrity of our community are being negatively impacted by the RIP. We are already seeing monster three story multi-family buildings that dwarf over their neighboring small, affordable houses.

The RIP is reminiscent of the long ago proposed Mt. Hood freeway. Fortunately, residents and the City of Portland wisely recognized the destruction of Portland's family neighborhoods was unacceptable and better alternatives existed.

We urge you to cease the efforts on RIP and the resulting destruction of Portland neighborhoods. Density can be achieved in mixed-use areas closer to the city center and not in the residential neighborhoods of Portland.

Sincerely,

Bruce and Sally Williams
7150 SE 27th Ave.

7150 SE 27th Ave

Portland, Oregon

I am OPPOSED to the 'a' OVERLAY because:

-According to the project's own economic analysis, IT WILL PRODUCE VERY FEW HOUSING UNITS in addition to what was already expected.

-The NEW UNITS WILL BE MUCH MORE EXPENSIVE than the units they will replace and will be AFFORDABLE TO ONLY 8 PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLDS.

-NATURALLY OCCURRING AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNITS, many of which are single-dwelling houses that can accommodate households with children, WILL BE DEMOLISHED for new, more expensive units.

-Rather than promoting higher densities within walking distances of centers and corridors with access to frequent service transit, the 'a' Overlay SPREADS OUT DENSITY TO AREAS WHERE MOST RESIDENTS DRIVE TO SERVICES AND JOBS. This will only INCREASE THE NUMBER OF CARS ON THE ROAD and parked on the street.

-The proposal UPZONES SOME AREAS TO R2.5 THAT ARE NOT WITHIN WALKING DISTANCE TO FREQUENT SERVICE TRANSIT OR SERVICES just because they have underlying lot lines.

-The CHARACTER OF OUR NEIGHBORHOODS IS BEING SACRIFICED for a misguided, supply-side belief that just building more will produce the affordable housing we need.

-INADEQUATE ANALYSIS WAS DONE before it was promoted by City staff.

Developers have run rough shot over city hall and I do not trust that RIP will improve either the quality of the affordability of my neighborhood. I don't trust what has been a long crooked process.

Parking Concern - This corner lot under 'a' overlay may have triplex construction.

Daily there are already 7-11 cars parked at the corner location extending North on Idaho Dr due to SW Community/Gabriel Park shopping stores/offices patrons and employees

3627 SE Cooper St

24 NE 66th Ave.

4307 SW Idaho Dr

bandswilliams@comcast.net	Bruce and Sally Williams	27983 97202	Scale,Housing types,Parking
meg.merrick@gmail.com	Meg Merrick	27984 97202	Mapping R2.5 rezones,Affordability,Parking
kkcoughlin@yahoo.com	Kevin Coughlin	27985 97213	North Southeast Tabor
mnsk@teleport.com	Jack Schunk	27986 97221	West Hayhurst Parking

4306 SE 59th Ave	I oppose the Residential Infill Project. RIP will encourage demolition of our most affordable housing only to be replaced by larger, more expensive units. Please do not enact RIP as currently written.	Searomaa@gmail.com	Susan Aromaa	27987 97206	Rose City Scale,Housing types
5133 NE Multnomah Street	I feel that the Proposed Draft contains positive changes. I think extra large homes are ugly and I agree with the proposed size limitations. I also feel that the Draft offers more extensive and reasonable housing options to combat our housing shortage.	scarolus3@gmail.com	Sarah Carolus	27989 97213 Northeast Park	Rose City Scale,Housing types
	My husband and I own a rental in University Park, three rentals in Arbor Lodge and reside in upper Overlook on the bluff. My family and I have lived in North Portland since 1977.				
	I am finding this proposal very frustrating. The North Portland Peninsula is built out. Roads don't support the traffic/population now. There are limited solutions, especially for early morning and late afternoon commutes. There are only 3 major streets to take folks from St. John's to the east - Columbia, Lombard and Willamette. Too much money and effort is being spent on bikes and not enough on cars. Cars aren't going away. Why is RIP even being considered for North Portland given that it is a peninsula.? Further density will destroy the livability of this area. My calculations show that @ 50,000 more residential units can be added in North Portland under the current plan and 75,000 with the RIP. This would cause gridlock for the entire area.				
	RIP does not improve livability in Portland. We do not have adequate parks now (and Forest Park and PIR should not be considered in park acreage for No Portland). Streets are already full of parked cars; we need more green space not less, and I do not want to live with multiple buildings on each lot, no place (or sun) to raise my prized roses, water my dog, or with multiple cars in front of each house. I want to control my circumstances, not have the City ram them down my throat. Zoning changes are not going to create or sustain "vibrant neighborhoods" if thousands of more residents are stuffed into the North Portland Peninsula. Commissioner Eudaly's comments do NOT reflect the majority of Portlanders. She said no density is too high, that her mission is redress all past discrimination and that R2.5 is too low a zoning for SFH - that R1 or CM (5 stories) should be allowed throughout the City. She previously said that she would like 40,000 ADUs (while staff has used 7,500 as the upper limit for development). What is she thinking??????				
2945 N Willamette Blvd	The 2035 Comprehensive Plan hasn't been tested yet and already we are revising it with RIP. Why are we in such a hurry to put this in place by March 2019? As Commissioner Fritz reminded folks at the Wednesday City Council meeting, the 2035 Comp Plan provides for over 250,000 additional units of housing using current zoning and Metro required only 110,000 units. RIP is overkill. Let's figure out if we can manage the mandates of the Comp Plan first. As a property owner of a single family dwelling home in Southeast Portland, with 25 years of investment in my neighborhood and home, I will be negatively affected by Portland's proposed Residential Infill Project (RIP). First the proposed overlay zone to double density in my neighborhood, will do nothing to improve diversity or affordability. Instead, it is a well finance ruse paid for by developers, to help developers turn a profit and screw Portland's community. The effect will be to destroy livable neighborhoods, eliminate precious remaining green-spaces, and irreparably harm the future character of our middle class neighborhoods. Once this process fully takes hold, I predict that only the very wealthy will be able to afford to own a home in Portland. Living wage jobs are what the City should be investing in, if it wants to help diversity and affordability. Without decent living wage jobs as the cornerstone foundation of our community, RIP is nothing but a developer scam and con-job on our community. The City Commissioners need to wise up and reject this horrible and destructive plan.	hoddick@up.edu	Jill Hoddick	27990 97217	Parking
2805 SE Harrison St	Commissioners need to wise up and reject this horrible and destructive plan.	thomasepri@gmail.com	Thomas Price	27991 97214	Housing types

415 ne mirimar

I am opposed to the extent of rezoning in Overlay A in Laurelhurst and across the NE and SE zones of Portland. There was no evidence or basis to determine that 1/4 mile from transit was the correct threshold. In fact, this arbitrary criteria impacts entire neighborhoods without regard to either increased transit use or the character of the infrastructure. A little nuance, such as actual access to transit or aligning density intent with character (such as internal demise into duplex rather than demolition build new duplex structures without regards to context). This poorly designed proposal should be reconsidered and revised to reflect the characteristics of structures and neighborhoods throughout Portland.

edelson8@gmail.com

jim edelson

27992 97232 Southeast st

Laurelhur Mapping the "a"
overlay

My husband Bernard Gach and I reside on Jordan ave. Currently the city of portland is in violation of the residents have required no parking on the eastern side of Jordan Ave. However the bureau of transportation is violating this city law by allowing parking for businesses within 200 feet of the Street that has a State highway routed over it. Lombard Blvd. The allowance of these parking spots is a danger to the users of the highway system. As a recent 32 year retiree of ODOTs engineering and project development duties. I understand roadways and access control. To arbitrary change a legal street width is a different process. The plat map for my street is a legal document that can not be changed. Without due process. Be aware that my duties at ODOT as an engineer in a privileged an confidential role.

The city continues to ignore parking driving laws. I should be able to drive down my street and not have to worry about vehicle damage. I also have a community police breakroom at the oddfellows hall where these dangerous conditions exist. There is enough room for 2 cars travelling and one car parking. However the intersection with the lombard has access issues and turning radius issues that lead to accidents. These streets that we live on are too narrow and reducing lot widths will only endanger the residents of the city streets further. Look at the plat maps. The widths listed are the legal widths. Turning off a busy street onto another street with restricted widths and pedestrians is a risky position for the city.

7451 N Jordan Ave

This City is responsible for their Actions.

jthrelkel@gmail.com

Jesse Threlkel

27993 97203 North

University
Park

Perhaps in the future “Neighborhood Character” will have more to do with the character of our neighbors, rather than an unwillingness to accept change; diversity and affordability of homes would take priority over casting communities in amber; new residents would be welcomed into established neighborhoods through sensitive infill, rather than being excluded to protect the status quo. The “a” overlay is a great step toward remedying Portland’s exclusionary history, as it will encourage duplexes and triplexes to be built within traditional single family residential neighborhoods.

The following relevant quotes are from the September 2016 Obama White House Paper “Housing Development Toolkit”: “Over the past three decades, local barriers to housing development have intensified, particularly in the high-growth metropolitan areas increasingly fueling the national economy. Locally-constructed barriers to new housing development include beneficial environmental protections or well-intentioned permitting processes or historic preservation rules, but also laws plainly designed to exclude multifamily or affordable housing. Local policies acting as barriers to housing supply include land use restrictions that make developable land much more costly than it is inherently, zoning restrictions, off-street parking requirements, arbitrary or antiquated preservation regulations, residential conversion restrictions, and unnecessarily slow permitting processes.”

“Barriers to housing development are exacerbating the housing affordability crisis, particularly in vibrant regions with high job growth and few rental vacancies. The most recent data shows that half of renters pay more than 30 percent of their income in rent, and more than 1 in 4 are severely rent-burdened, paying more than 50 percent of their income in rent. For families working to buy their first home, rent burdens delay their plans, making it more difficult to save for a down payment. While the housing market recovery has meant growing home values for existing homeowners, barriers to development concentrate those gains among existing homeowners, pushing the costs of ownership out of reach for too many first-time buyers. This has contributed to a lower homeownership rate in the US, which has fallen to its lowest level in 50 years. Homelessness is on the rise in some of our nation’s most rent-burdened cities despite continued decreases in homelessness nationwide – for example, according to figures released by local homelessness coalitions, Washington, D.C. saw a 31 percent increase in family homelessness last year amid a 14 percent increase in homelessness overall, and homelessness grew by 6 percent in Seattle and Los Angeles.”

3620 SE Henderson Street	Please find a link to the entire paper, as well as to several current research papers on this topic by academics at Harvard, Georgetown, UCLA, and The Brookings Institute, among others here: https://app.box.com/s/eyfxc2vr6at0e7rvesdi8556q9qz15cs	Liz@revealarchitecture.com	Liz Dexter	27994 97202	Housing types
1902 Se 26th Ave	This project will NOT help affordable housing goals. I'm for affordable housing, but this project is a boon for special interests, specifically developers and builders and a threat to everything that makes Portland a great city. Please don't let this happen. The Residential Infill Project is a land grab, thinly disguised as a progressive initiative. Say RIP to RIP. Thank you. To the Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission: I oppose the Residential Infill Plan in its current form. Three and four households on every lot is too dense for Portland’s single family house neighborhoods. High density should be in city centers and on large corridor streets. The buildings allowed by RIP are too large and tall for most of Portland’s neighborhoods. Infill size and height should be compatible with neighboring houses. Our smaller bungalows should not be redeveloped to large, expensive housing. RIP will increase demolitions, toxic contamination, and environmental waste. I support accessory dwelling units. I support additional units sensitively added inside existing houses. I support reasonable density without demolition. I oppose RIP.	gary@garywhitewriter.com	Gary White	27995 97214	Affordability
4128 NE Davis St.	Sincerely, Becca Smith-Morgan Ryan Morgan	cheekyb@comcast.net	Rebecca Smith-Morgan	27996 97232	Scale,Housing types

2237 SE Pine	<p>As a resident of Buckman neighborhood, I fully support the concepts in the Residential Infill Project's proposed draft. I live in a house that was built in 1892. On my street we have triplexes, duplexes, single family homes, and a 20-unit apartment complex. Because of this diversity of housing stock, my street has a diversity of incomes and people that you don't find in other neighborhoods that are exclusively single family homes. This is what we should strive for as we add new residents to a growing city and as we struggle with housing affordability. RIP is a good approach to adding new, diverse housing stock while allowing existing neighborhoods to maintain their charm. For those who worry that it will lead to demolitions, I can only say that the ability to add ADUs is likely going to keep me in my house longer and to keep my 1892 house standing for decades to come.</p>	kellett.bob@gmail.com	Bob Kellett	27997 97214	Housing types
2034 N Humbolt Street	<p>In regards to the proposed zoning code and map changes I would like to say the neighborhood has gotten a lot better in the last 15 or 20 years. People are remodeling the homes. People are building new homes. New people are moving in. Most of the trashed homeowners have moved away. Crime has gone way down. I am not afraid people will break into my car or home. I am very happy with the way the neighborhood is going. I do not think we should restrict someone wanted to build a big new house. Or remodel and add on their existing home. Thanks, Brett Lawrence</p>	brettlawrence77@yahoo.com	Brett Lawrence	27998 97217	Scale
10135 N Mohawk	<p>I am concerned that the proposed RIP will displace many who are disabled or on a fixed income. I've lived in Portland for over 40 years and watched several neighborhoods gentrify. Density has not caused housing to become affordable for low- income workers. Most people I have known cannot afford to live here anymore. The RIP plan does not have any safeguards for the Mobility impaired there are no mandates to build livable housing for disabled folks. There are no mandates to ensure that Disabled parking will be available for those who depend on it. Rip instead says they have Visitable Units and offer Developers incentives to provide both Visitable and affordable Units. This goes against Universal Design, The Fair Housing Act, The ADA.. I am also concerned how this affects those who are houseless and dying on our streets. The Housing that should be built should prioritize those already here and Houseless. Building for those that will come is a recipe for displacement and more Houseless. The infrastructure is crumbling and Planners should look to Houston Texas for a reference on the bad combination of rapid development and natural disasters.</p> <p>City Of Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability ATTN: Residential Infill Project 1900 SW 4th Avenue Suite 7100 Portland, OR 97201</p> <p>RE: Testimony on the Residential Infill Project To the Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission: I oppose the Residential Infill Plan in its current form.</p> <p>Three and four households on every lot is too dense for Portland's single family house neighborhoods. High density should be in city centers and on large corridor streets. The buildings allowed by RIP are too large and tall for most of Portland's neighborhoods. Infill size and height should be compatible with neighboring houses. Our smaller bungalows should not be redeveloped to large, expensive housing. RIP will increase demolitions, toxic contamination, and environmental waste.</p> <p>I support accessory dwelling units. I support additional units sensitively added inside existing houses. I support reasonable density without demolition. I oppose RIP.</p>	ktadlock2001@yahoo.com	Kelly Tadlock	28000 97203	Displacement, Visitability
3441 East Burnside St	<p>Sincerely, Seth Daniels 3441 East Burnside St</p>	sethdaniels@hotmail.com	Seth Daniels	28001 97214	Scale, Housing types

City Of Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability
 ATTN: Residential Infill Project
 1900 SW 4th Avenue
 Suite 7100
 Portland, OR 97201

RE:Testimony on the Residential Infill Project

To the Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission:

I oppose the Residential Infill Plan in its current form.

Three and four households on every lot is too dense for Portland's single family house neighborhoods. High density should be in city centers and on large corridor streets. The buildings allowed by RIP are too large and tall for most of Portland's neighborhoods. Infill size and height should be compatible with neighboring houses. Our smaller bungalows should not be redeveloped to large, expensive housing. RIP will increase demolitions, toxic contamination, and environmental waste.

I support accessory dwelling units. I support additional units sensitively added inside existing houses. I support reasonable density without demolition. I oppose RIP.

Sincerely,

Emily Lynn
 4142 NE Laddington Court
 Portland, OR 97232

4142 NE Laddington
 Court

dremilylynn@gmail.com

Emily Lynn

28002 97232

Scale,Housing
 types

I oppose the Residential Infill Plan in its current form.

Three and four households on every lot is too dense for Portland's single family house neighborhoods. High density should be in city centers and on large corridor streets. The buildings allowed by RIP are too large and tall for most of Portland's neighborhoods. Infill size and height should be compatible with neighboring houses. Our smaller bungalows should not be redeveloped to large, expensive housing. RIP will increase demolitions, toxic contamination, and environmental waste.

I support accessory dwelling units. I support additional units sensitively added inside existing houses. I support reasonable density without demolition. I oppose RIP.

Sincerely,

James MacPhee

4326 NE Hassalo St

jmacphee@gmail.com

James MacPhee

28003 97213

Scale,Housing
 types

I support the goals of the RIP, and understand the complexity of the decisions that need to be made. I would reference the following article about Seattle's attempts to deal with these complexities - <https://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2018/04/26/seattle-housing-what-works-next-218058> - your committee is clearly on the correct path, and I salute the work you're doing to make Portland livable, not just now, but for generations to come.

I oppose the Residential Infill Plan in its current form.

Three and four households on every lot is too dense for Portland's single family house neighborhoods. High density should be in city centers and on large corridor streets. The buildings allowed by RIP are too large and tall for most of Portland's neighborhoods. Infill size and height should be compatible with neighboring houses. Our smaller bungalows should not be redeveloped to large, expensive housing. RIP will increase demolitions, toxic contamination, and environmental waste.

I support accessory dwelling units. I support additional units sensitively added inside existing houses. I support reasonable density without demolition. I oppose RIP.

3617 SW Texas St

kamcharg@comcast.net

Kathleen McHarg

28004 97219

Housing types

4306 NE Flanders St

tcortese@hotmail.com

Tierney Cortese-
 Torrey

28006 97213

Scale,Housing
 types

don't see that the Residential Infill Project is designed to preserve existing houses. The City has been tearing down SOLID HOMES, allowing and encouraging developers to simply assert that these homes are in "disrepair," when in fact they are not. I am not opposed to density, per se. But I am opposed to the density which presumes that only brand new, over-sized, boxy construction is the remedy. Mother in law apartments over garages and small ADUs in back yards, apartments in basements, could all be affordable, and the rental income from these small scaale insertions could help existing homeowners stay in their homes. Incentives and loans for regular people, as opposed to the developers that have decimated historic homes is what I support.

I don't necessarily think that higher density should be limited only to the already higher density areas, but I do believe that small scale housing is the best way to increase density in residential areas without overloading infrastructure. These massive apartment complexes are wrong for the residential areas. Small duplexes or even small tri-plexes would be a decent "fit." The massive McMansions are "infill," but they don't handle much more population than the existing configuration of homes. the last thing we need is more displacement of lower income homeowners and renters who are now living in existing housing. With the constant influx of people from other areas of the country, there has been no downward pressure on rents. We get no relief; the "increased supply" argument is good marketing for developers, but it is dishonest. The developers and builder's profits seem to be the core "logic" behind the Infill proposal currently. The developers profit from demolition. Demolition of existing housing will not lower our rents nor will it prevent displacement.

I have received many letters and even visits to my home, unannounced agents knocking on my door, to offer to buy my house "for cash." My beautiful old Victorian is a target for demolition, though it has had tens of thousands in repairs and upgrades over the years. There is no value on existing housing stock, even though my home meets all density goals--i.e., 7 people live here comfortably, and my home has two kitchens, functioning basically as a duplex. There is potential for it to be a tri-plex, and potential to convert my two-story garage and even add a small home in my yard. This is what the City should be encouraging. I am 69 years old, and must seem like a willing target for developers who stand to profit from putting a major box on my large lot, or two huge single family homes that would do less for density than the options I have described. In other words, there are other ways to increase density that would improve the local economy by enabling local people to invest in their properties and take on full time (not vacation or air bnb) renters. Smaller scale buildings on existing lots, next to existing homes, not only increases affordable housing stock, it also preserves Portland's historic legacy. Losing all the old "Portland style" homes and Victorians and Craftsman homes is a tragic loss. Portland no longer looks like Portland in so many areas. It is becoming a generic, characterless urban development, losing what has been uniquely Portland. Smaller scale buildings also help the city meet its environmental goals. These enormous footprints we're seeing now in new construction is so inflexible that it requires removal of virtually all trees. The requirement to replace trees does not

214 NE Thompson

TeyunaSe@hotmail.com

Trudy Cooper

28007 97212

Scale,Housing types

ATTN: Residential Infill Project
1900 SW 4th Avenue
Suite 7100
Portland, OR 97201

RE: Testimony on the Residential Infill Project

To the Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission:

I am in opposition to the City of Portland's current Residential Infill Plan.

The vast majority of the area's single-family lots are simply too small to accommodate the projected density. I support development where it makes sense: downtown areas, large corridor streets and outlying areas that have the space to support the higher numbers of residents, cars and traffic.

What's more, I have witnessed developers level older, useable homes only to build quick and poorly constructed houses — dwellings that are not constructed to endure the test of time. And many of these demolitions follow no abatement procedures, exposing neighboring residents to potential lead, asbestos, PCBs and other toxins.

As it stands, the RIP is a quick fix to a larger problem that the city needs to reconcile. Expensive, inadequately built duplexes and triplexes will do little to solve for Portland's housing crisis. Three to four households on already small lots places an unfair burden on current residents and will provide new residents little return on their hard-earned investments.

Where space allows, I am in favor of ADUs. I support additional units judiciously added within existing houses. I support reasonable density without demolishing structurally sound homes. But I explicitly oppose the RIP. Let's be better visionaries and work together to grow Portland like true Portlanders can.

Sincerely,

Carl VanderZanden
3357 NE Oregon St.

I oppose the Residential Infill Plan in its current form. The buildings allowed by RIP are too large and tall for most of Portland's neighborhoods. By excluding livable basements and attics, the current 2,500 square foot size limit will, in reality, allow huge buildings closer to 4,000 square feet. This would make developers happy because they can build duplexes worth \$900,000 for each side but is terrible for housing affordability. Infill size and height should be compatible with the existing neighboring houses. Our smaller affordable bungalows should not be redeveloped to large, expensive housing. RIP will not improve affordability. RIP will increase demolitions, toxic contamination, and environmental waste. And by increasing already inflated land values, it will make housing affordability worse. Appropriately limiting new building size will reduce land values and help solve Portland's housing affordability problem.

I am in support of internal conversion of existing houses to duplexes and ADUs. I support ADU conversion of garages and small ADUs in backyards. I support reasonable density without demolition. I oppose RIP.

3357 NE Oregon St.

carlvdzanden@gmail.com

Carl
VanderZanden

28008 97232

Housing types

4033 NE Hoyt Street

newtons2@msn.com

Wendy Newton

28009 97232

Scale, Housing
types, Affordabil
ity

I am a resident of the Laurelhurst neighborhood, in which nearly all the houses are distinct and have constituted a vibrant neighborhood for many decades.

The RIP treats this neighborhood and all areas of the city the same--The RIP plan opens any lot in Laurelhurst, to multiple ADUs or gigantic houses that fill the entire lot and leave little or no areas for plants, for nature to thrive, for people to enjoy their leisure in their own yards and to have the luxury of space between one's own house and the one next door.

The RIP is a developer's dream. Let the builder tear down a lovely house in Laurelhurst and build a monstrous home covering the entire lot. Developers will have the perverse incentive to tear down viable homes in lovely neighborhoods because people will want to live in that neighborhood. But concurrently our neighborhood's unique character will be destroyed block by block by these new houses that destroy the area by their very presence.

Please redo the RIP with the aim of preserving unique neighborhoods--East Moreland and Ladd's addition are similar areas that should be preserved. These neighborhoods make Portland unique. Infill along Sandy Boulevard, for example, makes sense. The area consists mainly of parking lots and warehouse buildings.

3425 SE Stark St

It is time for Portland to scrap the current RIP and start over, with input from the neighborhoods.

such.renee@gmail.com

Renee Such

28010 97214

I appreciate the opportunity to provide testimony the the Planning Commission on the Residential Infill Project (RIP). I offer my testimony for your consideration as a professional planner and resident of the St. Johns neighborhood

The City of Portland is undertaking several efforts to ensure that its meeting the housing needs of current and future residents. The RIP is a commendable effort that seeks meet the City's growing and dire housing demands. Increasing the the allowable density in single-family zones by permitting duplexes, triplexes, and ADUs is a positive change for meeting our housing needs. Similarly, re-zoning selected properties from R5 to R2.5 is appropriate for adding new housing.

Notwithstanding my support for the general direction the RIP is proposing, I have several concerns that will pose barriers to achieving the desired outcome of the project or have unintended consequences.

- The "A" Overlay should not be removed. Removing the "A" overlay , particularly from portions of the St. Johns neighborhood north of Fessenden and west of St. Louis, will act as the 21st century's version of redlining.
- Setbacks should not be increased to 15. A five foot increase the front setback effectively reduces the amount of land can be used to build additional housing, particularly detached ADUs that are located behind the main house.
- Increase FAR for duplexes and triplexes. Duplex and triplex housing types should be encouraged. A one-to-one replacement does not alleviate the growing demand for housing in the City.
- Increase the allowed density for cottage cluster development. Cottage cluster development naturally requires smaller housing units in order meet the orientation design. However, there is not currently any financial incentive to construct smaller units in the current housing market, despite how desirable cottage cluster housing is. Increasing the allowed density for cottage cluster development would offset the barrier to smaller housing units and make the development type more viable.

8540 N Charleston Avenue

Thank you for your time and consideration. Clinton "CJ" Doxsee

clinton.doxsee@gmail.com

Clinton Doxsee

28011 97203

Scale,Housing types,Mapping the "a" overlay

Received our notices in the mail re: rezoning for our SE neighborhood. And while I totally support the need for more affordable housing, I have concerns about the most recent Residential Infill Project recommendations. I reviewed the Johnson Economics consulting firm's findings/summary and it is disheartening that the proposed project will produce little additional housing. As I understand it - this review was city-commissioned. Therefore, I sincerely think the city needs to rethink this project before it spends any tax payer's money on yet another "failed project" all in the name of "affordable housing". One would have hoped that the city had actually done the review during the initial phase and actually had a definite workable plan ready to present to the community and to the city. Enough of spending \$\$\$'s without any clear definite goals in mind. At best, I think what we need to do is do a limited pilot project to determine if the project is even feasible in obtaining adequate housing. Let's not spend alot of money only to discover it didn't work. Thank you for your time.

3586 SE 26th Ave

City Of Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability
ATTN: Residential Infill Project
1900 SW 4th Avenue
Suite 7100
Portland, OR 97201

joho@joehovey.com

Joe Hovey

28012 97202

RE:Testimony on the Residential Infill Project

To the Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission:

I oppose the Residential Infill Plan in its current form.

Three and four households on every lot is too dense for Portland's single family house neighborhoods. High density should be in city centers and on large corridor streets. The buildings allowed by RIP are too large and tall for most of Portland's neighborhoods. Infill size and height should be compatible with neighboring houses. Our smaller bungalows should not be redeveloped to large, expensive housing. RIP will increase demolitions, toxic contamination, and environmental waste.

I support accessory dwelling units. I support additional units sensitively added inside existing houses. I support reasonable density without demolition. I oppose RIP.

Sincerely,

Daniel S Alle
3925 SE Pine St
Portland OR 97214

3925 SE Pine St

portvikings@aol.com

Daniel Allen

28013 97214

Scale,Housing
types

Re: Properties Identified with State ID#'s as follows:
1SiE32BB 8700, 8800, 8900, 9000, 9100, 9200, & 9300

Testifier: Nick Johnson
2220 Prestwick Rd
Lake Oswego, OR 97034
503-502-2447
Nickjohnson536@gmail.com

My name is Nick Johnson and may be reached with the above contact information. I am authorized by owners of the above referenced properties to submit testimony requesting the inclusion of the properties in the proposed "a overlay" Zoning Code and Map Changes. We request our properties be included in the proposed change for the following reasons.

- The properties are immediately adjacent to properties included in the proposed "a overlay".
- Development of the property aligns with City goals of increased housing opportunities for our community.
- The probability of extension of existing SW Dickinson improvements providing better neighborhood access to existing homeowners and safe walking pathways for students to the Jackson Middle School is enhanced by inclusion of the properties in the proposed overlay.
- The properties are positioned in an area of varying property densities and provide a logical transition for increased density. They adjoin properties or are within 100' of constructed condominiums, multi family apartments, and single family homes.
- Capital Highway, a major transportation corridor, is one block away and provides access to Tri-Met , Portland Community College, Interstate 5, and Barber Boulevard.
- The properties are not included in existing environmental overlays.
- Existing utilities are within close proximity. A City of Portland waterline currently exists providing water to the property and City Sanitary sewer currently is approximately 110' away within the intersection of SW Dickinson & SW 41st

2220 PRESTWICK
RD

For these reasons and others, we ask the Commission to consider inclusion of the properties in the Proposed Zoning nickjohnson536@gmail.com Nick Johnson

28014 97034

Mapping the "a"
overlay

Even though the Hillsdale Neighborhood Association Board Members Abstained from taking a position on Residential Infill Project (RIP), as a 28 year resident of Hillsdale I, and many of my neighbors, DO take a position.

RIP includes many reasonable changes such as limiting the size of houses, revising how height is measured, improving front setbacks, and limiting building design. However, I cannot support the A Overlay proposal. Points that need to be considered:

1. There should be no "overlay" zoning changes unless the base zone is changed in accordance to community-based planning in the 2035 Comprehensive Plan that is consistent with Oregon's Land Use Goals. I purchased a home and pay taxes to live in a single-family neighborhood, please don't do a bait-and-switch.
2. Adequate infrastructure should be required prior to all new builds.
3. New builds must be required to provide adequate off-street parking, especially in SW where most streets do not have sidewalks or curbs. Neighborhood streets cannot become war-zones between people and vehicles. If Portland is a livable city, it must continue to protect neighborhood pedestrians and cyclists while allowing safe driving and reasonable off-street parking.
4. Offer financial incentives so developers will work on zombie houses. It pains me to see so many abandoned properties.

And btw- Collect all the taxes, fines, and fees due the city and county!!

1827 SW Dewitt St	Thank you.	orclh2@yahoo.com	Constance Harvey	28015 97239 West	Hillsdale	Scale,Housing types,Parking Housing types,Mapping the "a" overlay,Affordability,Displacement
4759 NE Going St	Please see attached file	cullyguy@gmail.com	David Sweet	28016 97218		
6421 SE 31st Ave	Letter attached.		David and Nancy	28017 97202		Scale,Parking
3531 SW Iowa St	Letter attached.		Dowell	28018 97221		
3524 SW Caldew St.	I request that the RIP "A" overlay be adjusted approximately 175 feet East and 150 feet South to include this property. The current proposed overlay ends across the street. The A overlay designation would enable us to add another rental dwelling unit to this existing corner duplex in an R7 zone.	bknier@gmail.com	Coletta Gray	28019 97219 West	West Portland Park	Housing types,Mapping the "a" overlay

It is worrisome that the RIP is reducing the potential built square footage across a vast majority of the city, while we are experiencing a housing shortage and rapidly increasing population. This is going to increase the cost of housing very quickly. When you limit the supply of something that is in demand, prices go up. The RIP as currently written is going to be devastating for housing prices as more people will be competing for drastically reduced supply.

I strongly encourage that the FAR limits be raised to .75FAR for 1 unit, 1FAR for 2 units, 1.25 FAR for 3 units, and 1.5FAR for 4 units.
 In order to encourage people to build more than one unit you would create an FAR bonus for each additional unit.

Further, this increased FAR will allow for large units that can accommodate families, co-housing, etc.

5229 NE MLK Blvd.	<p>Increasing unit counts, while at the same time decreasing allowable size is just going to lead to lots of small studio and 1-bedroom units. We need more housing diversity to address our housing shortage and population rise. The Upzoning proposed for the southeast area of Woodstock from R5 to R2.5 (which will require all new development to build at the R2.5 density) makes no sense given its proximity, or lack thereof, to frequent service transit or services. LOTS MUCH CLOSER TO WOODSTOCK ARE NOT UPZONED. This area does have underlying lot lines and that may be the reason but the history of the locations of these narrow lots have little to do with proximity to neighborhood centers or a desire for narrow lot development since in most cases they were sold off in pairs to create 50x100' lots.</p>	lucas@propelstudio.com	Lucas Gray	28020 97211	Scale,Housing types
3627 SE Cooper St	<p>Increasing the front setback is the wrong move. I strongly urge that you maintain the existing 10' setback or reduce setbacks to 5'. Increasing setbacks put a large percentage of existing housing as non-conforming. Further, it increases front yards at the expense of backyards. Currently, more people use backyards as a place for pets, for kids to play, for family gatherings, for gardening, etc. Pushing the house back makes these spaces less usable. It also limits the ability to add ADUs or other structures as future uses. Front yards are also typically bad for the environment, as they tend to be grass and consume lots of water. And with increased setbacks, there is less flexibility to site a house to avoid cutting down existing trees. It would be better to reduce setbacks and give owners and designers more flexibility on how they want to site their projects.</p>	meg.merrick@gmail.com	Meg Merrick	28021 97202	Mapping R2.5 rezones
5229 NE MLK Blvd.	<p>The front setback increase will lead to the removal of more trees, it will make front porches and views to the street further away, creating less "eyes on the street" which keeps our neighborhoods safer. We should be doing the exact opposite of what is being proposed.</p>	lucas@propelstudio.com	Lucas Gray	28022 97211	Scale
	<p>Please consider reducing setbacks, and if you won't reduce them, at least leave them as they are today, at 10' front setbacks and 5' side and rear setbacks.</p>				

reduce the number of ADUs built in Portland. I think this is the antithesis of the goals of the RIP and would be devastating if adopted as-is. The current RIP proposal create a series of new restrictions, limitations, and disincentives to building these housing types. It is adding rules and restrictions to a project type that doesn't need fixing. Rather than making it harder to build ADUs the RIP should be loosening up the rules to encourage more ADUs to be built - adding affordable housing stock across the city in all neighborhoods without relying on public funding.

As it turns out, there are some very significant failings of RIP's current draft regulations. For example:

- It would effectively eliminate 2BR detached ADUs.
- It would also effectively eliminate ADUs above a garage.
- Properties with steps leading up to the property won't be able to build a 2nd ADU due to visitability standards.
- It would also require bathrooms to be roughly twice the size of current ADU bathrooms. Oh yeah, and the oversized bathroom must be on located on the entry level.

Introduction

We want to thank staff for the proposal that is specifically intended to help foster more housing options, including an increase in ADU development. We concur that ADUs play a key role in increasing naturally affordable housing within residential zones.

With this common vision in mind, we will focus on some very specific aspects of the RIP that require detailed attention in order to create a regulatory environment that will enable more households the possibility of adding one or two ADUs, and encourage increased density to accommodate the current and future growth of Portland.

We believe the following key changes will allow ADUs to continue to thrive in Portland, and deliver one of the most flexible and affordable housing options being brought online today.

In this document, we provide feedback on the following elements of RIP:

- Two ADUs Everywhere
- FAR Policy Issues for Detached ADUs
- Visitability Standard for 2nd ADU
- Eliminate Visitable Bathroom Standards
- Accessory Structure Height Limits

5229 NE MLK Blvd.

I oppose the zoning change. Allowing higher density in this area would destroy the residential character of this neighborhood. Traffic and parking, already a problem, would become worse. I favor more apartments and condos in adjacent areas that are already zoned for this, and object to allowing two houses on one lot in this type of residential neighborhood.

lucas@propelstudio.com

Lucas Gray

28023 97211

Scale,Housing types,Mapping the "a" overlay,Affordability,Displacement,Visitability

2544 ne 38th Ave

themessners14@gmail.com

donald messner

28024 97212 Northeast Park Grant

Housing types,Parking

The new "a" overlay is completely unnecessary and overly complex. The new RIP should be making our zoning code simpler, easier to understand, and more equitable. The most equitable thing would be to apply the same rules to all properties, rather than giving some people access to the new housing opportunity while at the same time denying others the ability to make use of the new rules.

Commissioner Spevak made this point at the last Sustainability Commission meeting, stating that the whole overlay is being overthought, and the proposal would be stronger and more fair if the rules were simply applied everywhere.

5229 NE MLK Blvd.

I strongly encourage you to ditch the "a" overlay and simply adopt the new rules into the base zoning code for all properties.

lucas@propelstudio.com

Lucas Gray

28025 97211

Mapping the "a" overlay

I oppose the Residential Infill Plan in its current form. Three and four households on every lot is too dense for Portland's single family house neighborhoods. High density should be in city centers and on large corridor streets. The buildings allowed by RIP are too large and tall for most of Portland's neighborhoods. Density is killing the livability of our "little big city." Infill size and height should be compatible with neighboring houses. Our smaller bungalows should not be redeveloped to large, expensive housing. RIP will increase demolitions, toxic contamination, and environmental waste. RIP, in its current form, also does little to nothing to specifically address the need for low income housing or the ugly congestion that accompanies (significant) increased density.

I support accessory dwelling units. I support additional units sensitively added inside existing houses. I support reasonable density without demolition - accompanied by intelligent measures and infrastructure changes to address the increased congestion. I oppose RIP.

Sincerely,

3621 SE Ankeny St	<p>Steven Rebischke I'm written in opposition of the proposed height limit, FAR restrictions, front setbacks requirement. Front yards have almost no utility. Instead we should not artificially reduce how big new duplex and triplex can be which would limited the chance any of them will be build. We need more house not more lawns.</p>	srebischke@yahoo.com	Steven Rebischke	28026 97214 Southeast st	Laurelhur Scale,Housing types
4411 SE Division ST	<p>I write in support of the element of the plan that increase the number of housing units within Portland. Including the a overlay and flag lots.</p>	jonwa2@pdx.edu	Jonathan Walker	28027 97206	Scale,Housing types

utilizing one of the new proposed provisions for the skinny lots as my neighborhood is scheduled to change to R2.5. I have been planning to build an ADU in the back of this property and then I saw this proposed option to actually do a PLA and get a flag lot and build a 1000 sq ft house instead of in my case a much smaller detached ADU. I was very pleased with this new ability to create new small and therefore affordable Fee simple lots in these types of close in neighborhoods. But then I was told that because to get the 10 ft flag portion I would need to remove off street parking, this property would not qualify after all. see response from planner:

That's pretty cool. This proposal is precisely what we had in mind for your situation. The parking is a bit weird, since as it stands you would need one parking space for your house unless you are within 500' of tri met routes that run on 20 minute headways in the am and pm peak hours:

Peak Hour Service. Service provided by public transit to a site, measured on weekdays between 7:00 AM and 8:30 AM and between 4:00 PM and 6:00 PM. The service is measured in one direction of travel, and counts bus lines, streetcars, and light rail lines.

There is one more option, which would be to request an adjustment to this parking requirement, but this adds expense and time to work through the land use review process.

However, the conversation about parking requirements will come up at the PSC, and it would be good to provide testimony in this aspect, if you feel the rules should be altered. Instructions and links are provided below.

So I am taking this planners advice and testifying. I feel like 90% plus maybe of homes that could take advantage of this new flag lot provision can do so only by utilizing the side of the property where there is an existing detached garage or at least a parking pad. Very few properties could qualify for this provision if you cannot have an I OPPOSE the Residential Infill Project as it is presented. Additional units can be added with ADUs and interior conversions without encouraging wholesale demolition by greedy developers.

* 3-4 dwellings on a lot is too dense for the existing infrastructure. ie. the effect on sewers, schools, electrical grid and water supply has apparently not been considered.

* Scale of new buildings should fit into the neighborhood.

* Demolition creates toxic waste and adds to the landfill burden.

* Existing smaller houses are affordable and should not be demolished to make way for McMansions and developer profit.

1010 NE 87th ave

sarabettinger@gmail.com

Sara Bettinger

28028 97220

Narrow lots, Parking

3709 ne couch st

cassetta7265@comcast.net

jan cassetta

28029 97232

Scale, Housing types

629 SW Chestnut St

SUCH A SWEEPING CHANGE SHOULD BE PUT TO A VOTE OF THE PEOPLE!
If new housing options (specifically duplexes and corner lot triplexes) are to be allowed in new overlay "a" areas the new overly rules should only allow them on vacant lots and lots where inhabitable structures exist and need to be torn down. In other words, the new rules should prohibit the tearing down of an existing habitable dwelling unit just to build one of these new options on the property. This will prevent developers from abruptly changing the character of the neighborhood.

louis.santia@gmail.com

Louis Santiago

28030 97219 West

Hillsdale Housing types

If housing is a Portland problem and in portraying RIP as a Portland solution, then all of Portland should have RIP applied. Why do eastside neighborhoods have to absorb the infill when the west side is mostly spared? All of Portland should be included. Of course there aren't as many buses on the westside but if there are more people densely living on the westside perhaps buses will be added. And of course the City council members for the most part live on the westside and they wouldn't want more density. RIP unfairly puts density on the eastside then calls US NIMBYs. Unless all of Portland is subjected to RIP there can be no accusations of NIMBY. The Comprehensive Plan was a well thought out planning process and RIP is anything but and is unfair to the eastside. Apply it to all of Portland. All those people who are moving to Portland deserve a chance to have a duplex with a view of Mt Hood as we need more housing choices with views. After all we need to be concerned about the needs and wants of people who don't even live here yet. And lastly, RIP proponents think increasing housing supply will somehow make housing more affordable ignoring the fact that there is no check on demand. In fact trying to make housing more plentiful will only increase demand as other west coast cities are not foolish enough to think they can manipulate the market by such "planning" and their residents will move to Portland.

3372 NE Holladay St

City Of Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability
ATTN: Residential Infill Project
1900 SW 4th Avenue
Suite 7100
Portland, OR 97201
RE: Testimony on the Residential Infill Project
To the Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission:

doc-holladay@earthlink.net

Michael Booker

28031 97232

Mapping the "a" overlay

I oppose the Residential Infill Plan in its current form.

Three and four households on every lot is too dense for Portland's single family house neighborhoods. High density should be in city centers and on large corridor streets. The buildings allowed by RIP are too large and tall for most of Portland's neighborhoods. Infill size and height should be compatible with neighboring houses. Our smaller bungalows should not be redeveloped to large, expensive housing. RIP will increase demolitions, toxic contamination, and environmental waste.

I support accessory dwelling units. I support additional units sensitively added inside existing houses. I support reasonable density without demolition. I oppose RIP.

Sincerely,
Christa Brady Blecher
4301 SE Ash St
Portland, OR 97215

4301 SE Ash ST

christamb@yahoo.com

Christa Blecher

28032 97215

Scale, Housing types

City Of Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability
ATTN: Residential Infill Project
1900 SW 4th Avenue
Suite 7100
Portland, OR 97201
RE: Testimony on the Residential Infill Project
To the Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission:

I oppose the Residential Infill Plan in its current form.

Three and four households on every lot is too dense for Portland's single family house neighborhoods. High density should be in city centers and on large corridor streets. The buildings allowed by RIP are too large and tall for most of Portland's neighborhoods. Infill size and height should be compatible with neighboring houses. Our smaller bungalows should not be redeveloped to large, expensive housing. RIP will increase demolitions, toxic contamination, and environmental waste.

I support accessory dwelling units. I support additional units sensitively added inside existing houses. I support reasonable density without demolition. I oppose RIP.

Sincerely,
John P. Blecher
4301 SE Ash St
Portland, OR 97215

4301 SE Ash ST

I am very against this zone change. You are trying to solve a social issue with the zoning code. Reading your published research documents illustrates that you are manipulating the data to support of your actions. This has not worked in other Cities why repeat their mistakes. You will be impacting the underrepresented and not solving the housing needs or costs. Staff, Please listen to the people you are planning for not your textbooks. This is a unique place do not destroy our neighborhood to make your numbers work.

1832 SE 52nd ave

johnnyblecher@yahoo.com

John Blecher

28033 97215

Scale,Housing
types

Kerry.Lankford@gmail.com

Karen Lankford

28034 97215 Southeast Mt. Tabor

Planning Commission-RIP
1900 Southwest 4th Avenue, Suite 7100
Portland, Oregon 97201

Cc: City Council
Cc: Marty Stockton

To Whom It May Concern:

We have been long time residents of Portland for over 60 years and property owners for nearly 35 years. We have invested time, money, and an incredible amount of effort into our home and our community. We chose where we wanted to live and raise our family, and sacrificed many opportunities to be able to settle here. As they say "location is everything." Location is what we have...at least for now.

I strongly oppose your Residential Infill Project (RIP) and the "A" overlay that goes with it.

This project will negatively impact our community, including increased traffic, lack of parking spaces, and destruction of classic and historic homes. Parking on this block is already compromised due to school traffic. RIP will cause more problems, not only for the residents of this neighborhood, but also the parents dropping off and picking up students at the school. Not to mention, there will be increased safety concerns for the school children due to added traffic and congestion.

Instead of encouraging a more diverse population, RIP would only offer a benefit to the wealthy developers who are endorsing this project. This proposal will end the established neighborhoods that Portland is so loved for. The quality of life for everyone living here will be dramatically reduced. And, by the way, this was voted on and denied on December 7, 2016. Why is this even being talked about again? We already have twice as much vacant land than we need to meet projections until 2035. We have 16,000 vacant lots and more than 25,000 under construction.

It seems that the wealthy, influential neighborhoods are untouched, while us poor working class people are continuously being targeted. Where is the equity in that? We pay plenty of taxes, yet we have NO ONE to advocate for us. How unjust.

4238 SE Evergreen
St.

zapkuehnel@comcast.net

Frank Kuehnel

28035 97206 Southeast k

Woodstoc

Parking

Center for Opportunity's Affordable Housing.

I wanted to share my housing story because I was lucky enough to have purchased my first home when I turned 30, and that home purchase positively effected my ability to build a solid foundation for my future.

I purchased my first home in 1997 at the age of 30 after moving to Detroit Mi, from the San Francisco Bay Area. I scrimped and saved every penny I had to put a \$3500 deposit down on my beautiful 1200 square feet Tudor home with an FHA loan. I sold that same house 3 years later, and was able to take the proceeds from that sale to purchase a fixer in a distressed neighborhood in Oakland California. I invested in that home and neighborhood, and finally sold that home making a profit such that I could move to Portland and purchase another home, which was 13 years ago.

The west coast is unaffordable for most first-time buyers, and with Portland's rapidly rising housing costs, it is becoming unaffordable as well. I was lucky, but I dont think you should have to rely on luck in order to buy a home in the city you live in. There are many residents in Portland that deserve a chance to achieve home ownership by responsible fiscal management and the desire to have stable housing for themselves and thier families. Its time Portland stepped in to help with those goals.

A home is much more than a roof over your head. A homeowner has an asset that they can use to pay down debt, to reduce personal tax burdens, to provide stable housing for their children, to invest into the community they live in, and to profit from when they sell. We know that statistically, home ownership has both social and personal benefits for homeowners and the communities they live in. A homeowners net worth is 34% more than a renters. 77% of homeowners say it has helped them achieve long-term financial goals. More than 8 in 10 homeowners would prefer to buy a home if they had to move in the next six months, but likely cannot in Portland unless we strive to create more affordable options for home ownership.

The Residential Infill Project is a great step in providing more affordable housing, but it won't solve affordability on its own. This proposal would bring back some of the kinds of smaller-scale housing that Portland used to allow, but our current zoning code currently prohibits in the 45% of the city that is zoned for single-dwelling residences. We need Missing Middle, IZ, and permanently affordable homeownership programs. All these things work together to provide affordable housing. Portland takes price in being progressive, and being a leader. Its time we walked the talk and strengthened zoning to support Middle Income housing purchase opportunities.

I am opposed to the new zoning of our neighborhood. I moved from a zoned neighborhood very similar to the one you now propose for my new neighborhood. I moved from my previous address because there were duplexes, triplexes and other rentals surrounding my property that were owned by out-of-state residents or property owners that did not keep up the property and did not respond to requests to manage their property in an appropriate or timely manner. To turn the Grant Park neighborhood over to developers that would build duplexes/triplexes, destroy charming smaller homes and destroy the ambiance of a friendly neighborhood populated with mostly single-family homeowners, would be a real travesty. I understand there is a housing crisis. I see apartment buildings going up everywhere. To allow commercial buildings (and duplexes/triplexes ARE commercial) in the midst of a residential neighborhood will not only fail to solve the real issues concerning homelessness and/or housing shortages, but will destroy many of the neighborhoods for which the city is lauded for and the very reason people want to live in Portland. Please go back to the drawing board and keep duplexes, townhouses, triplexes and other commercial buildings out of our residential neighborhoods. As a tax payer and property owner, I am vehemently opposed to these new zoning laws that do NOTHING to solve the homeless problem. It only creates more opportunities for developers (that do not live in our neighborhoods) to destroy what is so attractive to our citizens to begin with. Please re-think this.

9816 N. Leonard
STreet

rhonda@urbannestpdx.com Rhonda Spencer 28036 97203

Housing
types,Affordabil
ity

2645 NE 42nd Ave.

mcnashtrinity@gmail.com Maureen Nash 28037 97213 Northeast Park Grant

Housing types

I purchased a home for my daughter at 2803 NE Cesar E Chavez Blvd Portland 97212 in 2010. After looking at many houses in Portland, we chose this home because of its location in the Grant Park neighborhood of Portland. This is a beautiful, family oriented area of the city with nice homes, good schools and a beautiful park. My question to you is simple, why would the city of Portland even think of destroying this special area by allowing duplex and even triplex homes on these somewhat small plots of land? I notice that the Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability prides itself in developing "creative and practical solutions to enhance Portland's livability, preserve distinctive places and plan for a resilient future". How is this accomplished by changing the unique Grant Park neighborhood into just another extension of downtown? If you visited our area, you would see children riding bikes, family get togethers, beautiful 1920's homes with cats watching quietly from porches, kids playing sports at Grant Park, neighborhood block parties, dogs playing "fetch" with their owners, residents tending to their gardens, teenage boys working on their cars-all of the everyday peaceful activities that our residents take for granted. Your proposal to allow duplex and triplex buildings will add to the density of this region, increase neighborhood traffic, create parking problems, make parents think twice about letting their children ride their bikes to school, decrease the value of each property and in general, destroy this wonderful community!

4749 N 53rd Street

scottsdalegallery@cox.net

Leslie Levy

28038 85018

Housing types

This proposal has been heavily underwritten by developers who keep assuring us that more demolition and more new units will yield affordability despite all evidence to the contrary.

Market rate units are advertising vacancy but rent isn't falling (Ex: Modera Pearl 6 weeks free, Peleton 2 weeks free, The Russell up to 4 weeks free).

Single unit housing is being torn down and replaced with luxury duplexes.

Examples from my zip code:

-109/111 NE Morgan 2,400 sqft \$659k per unit

-620/626 Going 2,500 sqft \$949,500k per unit

-1905 Ainsworth/6034 NE 19th 1,700 sqft \$599-609k per unit

-660/670/680 NE Webster ~2000sqft \$699-729k per unit

RIP will bring more of the same. It will accelerate the destruction of existing housing and it will be replaced with high end housing that is far out of reach for the median Portland family.

RIP will only promote infill for the wealthy and speculative investor portfolios.

The city cannot continue to raise alarm about affordable housing while simultaneously implenting wide reaching policy that has *zero* parameters included to ensure affordability.

6845 NE Rodney

askeppert@gmail.com

Amy Keppert

28039 97211 North

Piedmont Affordability

managing building mass/bulk is laudable.

After meeting with BPS officials at the recent "office hours" at the Woodstock Library to discuss detached ADU designs under RIP, we found a portion of the current Zoning Code which, because it is NOT being changed under RIP, is at odds with the intent behind the RIP proposals. Specifically, the definition and requirements for "living area" actually counteract the intent behind the new changes to FAR requirements coupled with the changed definitions of "floor area" and "basements". There are two conflicts.

First, under the proposed "floor area" definition, attic spaces with less than 80 inches are excluded from the floor area calculation. However, the current (and unchanged under RIP) "living area" calculation only excludes attic areas with a ceiling height of less than "5 feet" or 60 inches. As such, floor area and living area calculations in attics will differ slightly.

Second, the more problematic conflict, due to the larger potential measuring delta, has to do with basements. Under the proposed FAR requirements and the proposed "floor area" definition, basements do not count towards floor area. (The newly proposed definition of "basement" provides a clear description of what is and isn't a basement and should be commended for the clear allowance for daylight basements.) This change makes sense with BPS's stated goals for the RIP generally because basement area does add potential to housing choices, by allowing for a wider variety of housing sizes, while not increasing building bulk. However, the current (and unchanged under RIP) definition of "living area" does include basement areas, thereby counteracting and effectively cancelling the allowances for basement areas that the RIP intends to create.

One solution to both of these problems would be to simply remove "living area" as a requirement and/or definition and use only "floor area" as a metric. This would simplify the application of the Zoning code considerably, eliminate the appearance of double jeopardy, and create less confusion for the general public. If doing so would be considered too radical or potentially too damaging to other portions of the Zoning Code, a more subtle revision could serve to bring the "living area" definition into line with the intent behind the "floor area" definition changes under RIP. Such a revision to the "living area" definition would be to 1) replace "5 feet" with "80 inches" under the attic area exclusion and 2) to simply strikeout the latter half of the bullet point related to the basement area exclusion as follows:

Living Area. The total gross building area of a residential structure excluding the following:
• garage area;

7405 SE 22nd

leif.halverson@gmail.com

Leif Halverson

28040 97202

Scale,Housing types

managing building mass/bulk is laudable.

After meeting with BPS officials at the recent "office hours" at the Woodstock Library to discuss detached ADU designs under RIP, we found a portion of the current Zoning Code which, because it is NOT being changed under RIP, is at odds with the intent behind the RIP proposals. Specifically, the definition and requirements for "living area" actually counteract the intent behind the new changes to FAR requirements coupled with the changed definitions of "floor area" and "basements". There are two conflicts.

First, under the proposed "floor area" definition, attic spaces with less than 80 inches are excluded from the floor area calculation. However, the current (and unchanged under RIP) "living area" calculation only excludes attic areas with a ceiling height of less than "5 feet" or 60 inches. As such, floor area and living area calculations in attics will differ slightly.

Second, the more problematic conflict, due to the larger potential measuring delta, has to do with basements. Under the proposed FAR requirements and the proposed "floor area" definition, basements do not count towards floor area. (The newly proposed definition of "basement" provides a clear description of what is and isn't a basement and should be commended for the clear allowance for daylight basements.) This change makes sense with BPS's stated goals for the RIP generally because basement area does add potential to housing choices, by allowing for a wider variety of housing sizes, while not increasing building bulk. However, the current (and unchanged under RIP) definition of "living area" does include basement areas, thereby counteracting and effectively cancelling the allowances for basement areas that the RIP intends to create.

One solution to both of these problems would be to simply remove "living area" as a requirement and/or definition and use only "floor area" as a metric. This would simplify the application of the Zoning code considerably, eliminate the appearance of double jeopardy, and create less confusion for the general public. If doing so would be considered too radical or potentially too damaging to other portions of the Zoning Code, a more subtle revision could serve to bring the "living area" definition into line with the intent behind the "floor area" definition changes under RIP. Such a revision to the "living area" definition would be to 1) replace "5 feet" with "80 inches" under the attic area exclusion and 2) to simply strikeout the latter half of the bullet point related to the basement area exclusion to read as follows:

Living Area. The total gross building area of a residential structure excluding the following:

- garage area;

7405 SE 22nd Ave.

stephanie@ericson.org

Stephanie Ericson

28041 97202 Southeast

Sellwood-
Moreland
Improvement
League

Scale, Housing
types

I support the provisions of the Residential Infill Project that promote the retaining of the existing character of neighborhoods. Reducing the scale, measuring height from the lowest point of the lot and averaging setbacks will allow infill to blend into the neighborhoods. This will allow Portland to grow in a way that protects the great place Portland is today.

I am opposed to the A Overlay that is being applied to 87,324 properties in the city. In the Draft of the 2035 Comprehensive Plan, it clearly stated there was more than enough capacity under the current zoning for the projected growth that will happen through 2035. There is no need to add capacity over 100,000 units of housing capacity. The Residential Infill Project is adding this capacity by changing the number of housing units allowed in the base zone. The single family zones will be turned into multifamily zones. The RIP staff has projected that the number properties utilizing the A Overlay allowance will not increase above the use of the provisions in the existing code. The A Overlay is a flawed concept that I do not support.

If added capacity is needed, I support the best practices of land use planning that require that the base zone be changed with community-based planning in the Comprehensive Plan consistent with Oregon's Land Use Goals.

2710 SW Troy St
910 SW Evans St

Please add this to the record.
See attached document.

rkmun@hotmail.com

Robert and Karen
Munford
Jane Gordon

28042 97219
28043 97219

Scale, Housing
types

910 SW Evans St	See attached document.		Jane Gordon	28044 97219	Scale,Housing types,Mapping the "a" overlay
	<p>I am writing in opposition to the Residential Infill Project (RIP) as it is currently written. While attempts to construct "affordable" housing are laudable and to be encouraged, the present approach is unworkable. Absent subsidies (and to my knowledge - none of sufficient magnitude and breadth to accommodate the projected housing demand have been proposed), simple economic considerations militate against extending RIP into existing residential neighborhoods that are primarily zoned for single family occupancy: costs of land acquisition, demolition and/or remodeling, prices for materials and construction work are fixed variables. Market prices depend on these baseline costs plus supply:demand considerations. Since subsidies are not under consideration, construction of a few multi-residential buildings (the "supply") in areas with established single family residences will - by definition - be lower than the demand: thus, prices will remain high and therefore unaffordable for the intended demographic. Rather, what will happen is what's happening now: an old home will be purchased by a developer, demolished and a very high price (at market level) building will be put in it's place because the supply < demand and the market will bear the cost. The only potential offset would be construction of high rise apartment buildings in single family zoned areas. Add to this pollution costs (aerosolized particulates such as diesel exhaust, lead paint, asbestos and other toxins in old homes) and collateral factors (increased population burdens on narrow streets, sewers, schools) and the entire proposal ceases to be justifiable. For these and many other reasons, I object to the RIP as written. Construction of high rise apartments and condominiums along major transportation routes (e.g., Sandy Boulevard) is much more logical.</p>				
3641 NE Couch Street	Sincerely, Keith A. Comess	kacomess@gmail.com	keith Comess	28045 97232	Affordability
	<p>I am submitting this note to register my objections to the Residential Infill Proposal, at least as it extends to neighborhoods that are primarily zoned as single family residences. The Proposal will not solve housing affordability issues: rents, leases and sales prices are all reflective of market considerations. No builder will continue to invest when the market nears saturation levels. The smart developer always aims to keep supply just below demand to keep prices high and successful builders are - by definition - business savvy. Even ignoring this obvious insight, fixed costs (land, materials, wages, equipment and time) cannot be offset without public subsidies. Furthermore, even if these basic economic considerations are considered "irrelevant", the impact on taxpayers for infrastructure enhancements to accommodate the hoped for additional residents, will be substantial: these costs have not been factored into consideration for the builders because the RIP does not require it. In conclusion, I am opposed to RIP. Put multi-story apartment and condo complexes in commercially zoned areas where the investment will (possibly) pay off: not in areas currently zoned primarily for single family homes.</p>				
3641 NE Couch St	Sincerely, Frances DeRook	fderook@gmail.com	Frances DeRook	28046 97232	Affordability Scale,Housing types,Narrow lots,Mapping the "a" overlay,Parking
1120 SW 5th Avenue	See document attached.		Urban Forestry Commission Duane and Patricia Morrow	28047 97204	
44 SE 75th Avenue	Letter attached.		Christopher and Edith Buhle	28048 97215	Housing types
6233 NE Alameda St P.O. Box 14184	Letter attached. Letter attached.		Frank DiMarco	28049 97213 28050 97293	Housing types

I object to the Residential Infill Proposal. As a graduate student in Public Health, my focus is on the adverse consequences of exposures to environmental toxins/pollutants. Demolition and construction pollution is a significant public health hazard. In fact, it is a major contributor to dangerous levels of air pollution in rapidly expanding cities such as Delhi, India where temporary construction moratoriums were needed to reduce airborne particulate toxins (e.g., diesel smoke, vaporized concrete) to "safe" levels. For demolition or "redesign" of old homes, there are other added considerations. These may include (but are not limited to) aerosolized lead paint, asbestos fibers, noise pollution and destruction of tree cover and other vegetation. Add to that overcrowding of limited public resources (parks, schools) and absence of coordinated, strategic planning for significantly increased population density in areas originally designed for a much lower population burden, and the Proposal falls apart from public health and logical considerations. While the goal of limiting urban sprawl is commendable, this end can best be attained by construction of high-rise apartments in areas currently zoned primarily for mixed commercial and residential use.

3641 NE Couch Street

Sincerely,
Saskia Lynn DeRook Comess

saskia.comess@yale.edu

Saskia Lynn
DeRook Comess

28051 97232

I am strongly opposed to the Residential Infill Plan (RIP) in its current form.

The proposed zoning changes in RIP will result with infill that is simply too dense for Portland's East Side single family house neighborhoods. High density should be limited to close-in city center and on large corridor streets. The buildings proposed and encouraged by RIP are too large and tall for most of Portland's older neighborhoods.

Infill size and height should be compatible with neighboring houses. Our smaller bungalows should not be redeveloped to large, expensive housing. RIP will increase demolitions, toxic contamination, and environmental waste. RIP only targets East Side neighborhoods for increased density without looking to the West Side on pen areas. RIP has no provisions to address increasing the infrastructure to support the increased car traffic, bike traffic, burden on utilities, schools & city services!

3925 NE Hazelfern Place

I support accessory dwelling units. I support additional units sensitively added inside existing houses. I support reasonable density without demolition. I support expanding the urban growth boundary where infrastructure and transportation corridors can support. I oppose RIP.
I am opposed to the Infill Project as presented. I share the concerns voiced in this quote below by Professor Loren Lutzenhiser. We all want affordable housing but I do not think that will be the result.
Professor Lutzenhiser's quote:
"But relatively few Portlanders would be able to afford any of the size-restricted houses, duplexes and triplexes the recommendations are intended to encourage, said Portland State University economics professor emeritus Loren Lutzenhiser.
After reviewing the analysis for the Portland Tribune, Lutzenhiser noted that even if the recommendations are approved, 5,000 to 6,600 lower-priced housing units will be demolished and replaced with units that cost much more. And, he said, 90 percent of Portland households will not be able to afford them, based on the federal standard that housing costs should not exceed 30 percent of income.

johndeodato@gmail.com

John Deodato

28052 97232

Scale,Housing types

7605 SE Reed College Pl.

"There will likely be replacements of affordable units with units affordable only to households — mostly singles and couples given today's demographics — with relatively high incomes," Lutzenhiser said. "Alarm bells should be going off."

jncarlson@ipns.com

Joanne Carlson

28053 97202

Housing types,Affordability

822 NE 72nd Ave

If I understand the proposed zoning changes correctly, I'm writing to voice my support. Portland needs to pursue smart paths to density and allowing ADU units within existing neighborhoods is a step in the right direction. My property is R5. I can not afford to build an ADU but I am in favor of this zone change. I particularly support the allowance of duplex and triplex structures.

kai.mcmurtry@gmail.com

Kai McMurtry

28054 97213

Housing types

in the adopted comprehensive plan, not respectful of the variety of neighborhood characteristics that exist in the city, and which would lead to simplistic and polarizing situations. Not only is it important to support the diversity of the neighborhood character, but the condition of housing, scale, history, and economic factors can play a significant role in defining what is appropriate.

During the entire SAC process, I repeatedly emphasized that “truth in zoning” is essential for rebuilding public confidence in the planning and zoning process and providing clear guidance for owners, designers, builders, and for the review process. I say that considering the primary metric for the zoning code is the density of dwelling units, and am concerned that the alternative housing proposals are further undermining the intent and purpose of this tool. Current zoning density around centers is under-built and scattered middle housing defeats comprehensive plan goals to focus density around walking scale centers. This is a successful model advocated during the past 40 years and is yet to be realized, especially in the newer areas of the city. A complex of cyclical market forces, not existing zoning regulations, are driving the current housing price escalation and, consequently, the proposals under consideration will not mitigate the cost of housing. Rather the widespread application of “middle housing” is likely to accelerate price increases in an already overheated market, destabilize neighborhoods, and cause loss of viable and more affordable housing and increase demolition and displacement.

Key recommendations include:

- Test and model physical and economic impacts for proposed code changes prior to drafting and implementing zoning code changes.
- Create development standards that fit neighborhood context and aspirations.
- Ensure that scale of houses fits neighborhood context, protect solar access and privacy, and maintain individual green spaces.
- Use commonly understood terms and provide clear definitions of what is allowed in each zone, a concept known as “truth in zoning.” Avoid contradictory criteria such as the use of density when lot sizes are the governing criteria.
- Rezone areas in the City that are appropriate for higher density and alternative housing.
- Allow historically platted narrow lots to be recognized in zone R2.5.
- Save viable existing housing.
- Actively engage neighborhood and business associations to participate in decision-making during planning exercises and for major developments to improve understanding of context and needed design guidelines.
- Direct density to centers, as called for in the current and new Comprehensive Plan, to reinforce the establishment of centers, walking scale neighborhoods, use of transit and reduction of auto dependency.

Specific recommendations:

I have lived in Portland for 61 years and it breaks my heart to see what's happened to our city. Cramming more and more people on top of each other in an attempt to solve a unsolvable problem is madness. Throwing in the towel to developers and speculators at the expense of our neighborhoods is unconscionable. For a city that claims to be concerned about livability and the environment this is hypocritical. Making such a blanket decision denies neighborhood associations and it's citizens the right to defend against the blight that has destroyed so much of what had been Portland's historical beauty.

4007 SE Taylor St

molinaroarchitect@gmail.com

Michael Molinaro

28055 97214

Scale,Housing types,Narrow lots

24 NE 67th Ave

jameskendall@portlandscrew.com

James Kendall

28056 97213

RE:Testimony on the Residential Infill Project
To the Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission:

I am writing to express my opposition to the Residential Infill Plan in its current form. The possibility of 3 and 4 households on every lot is too dense and will ruin the character and livability of Portland's single family house neighborhoods . High density should be in city centers and on large corridor streets. The buildings allowed by RIP are too large and tall for most of Portland's neighborhoods. Infill size and height should be compatible with neighboring houses. Our smaller bungalows should not be redeveloped to large, expensive housing. If you do not believe this will happened, just look at the recent past and current dwelling(s) being placed on small lots. Many, if not most, of these new houses are not affordable or developed to fit into the neighborhood. RIP will increase demolitions, toxic contamination, and environmental waste. I support accessory dwelling units. I support additional units sensitively added inside existing houses. I support reasonable density without demolition. I oppose RIP!

Sincerely,
David Smith
3410 NE Multnomah St. Portland, OR 97232

3410 NE Multnomah
St

duck-man@comcast.net

David Smith

28057 97232

Housing types

residential zoned neighborhoods. The streets and infrastructure are not adequate to deal with more people, cars and big structures as things are now. It is growing difficult to see this push for increased population density as anything other than a financial opportunity for the City and the developers. "Anything goes" is not a vision, and that seems to be the direction things are headed in. The City allowed a single family dwelling 4590 sq ft house to be built on my street where the average house is 2000 sq ft. If there is a vision for how this can be done in an area with proper infrastructure and space, like the Pearl District, perhaps it can work. It is hard to believe that there is not land in all parts of the city that are available for development. It is very hard to see why residential neighborhoods are the best choice for this idea, unless you consider how valuable the land is. The NE part of the city beyond 82nd could be developed and improved, the industrial NW could be also. Is the land too polluted, or not profitable enough? While Portland is a desirable and fast growing area, destroying the neighborhoods to put up multiplexes with no parking (see Fremont, Alberta, etc) will diminish the quality of life for those who have worked hard to make the neighborhoods what they are. This seems like forcing a square into a round hole for everyone except the City and the developers. Many of us have watched as neighboring houses have been demolished and replaced with massive structures that don't fit in any way other than being rammed into a small space. Trees are not being replaced at the rate they are disappearing, no matter what the code/law says.

Many Portland neighborhoods do not have roads wide enough to deal with the current car population. In areas zoned for commercial enterprise, that can be expected since the cars may be there for a few hours, and then change. In residential neighborhoods, cars may be parked for days, weeks or months. Those spots are essentially unavailable and the roads are bottlenecked. Consider what that will be like with the addition of several additional cars on each street with a multiplex. People are going to come with cars to a residential neighborhood because they need transportation to differently zoned areas. In a mixed use area, there may be apartments/plexes but the roads and transportation options are sufficient to give people the option to use public transportation. That is simply not possible in narrow road neighborhoods. NE 33rd Avenue congestion is already bad, adding dozens of cars to neighborhoods that can not handle Tri-Met bus traffic will make things worse for everyone, including the bus drivers. It is hard to see who wins in this situation except the developers and the City, and they don't live in the neighborhoods. This is a short sighted idea that might feel good to some in a utopian city bureau, but for those of us in the neighborhoods with poor roads, lead contaminated drinking water and rising crime, it is hard to have much faith in the vision of the policy makers in this city. Please share examples of how this has improved the quality of life for anyone anywhere in the city, other than developers in this red hot real estate market. I'd be interested in hearing what the neighbors along Fremont and Alameda in NE Portland have to say about the large developments with inadequate parking and infrastructure. Actually, I know what they say, you in the City's Planning Bureaus should hear it. You will find almost complete opposition for the reasons listed above.

3810 NE 36th
Avenue

crashpile@yahoo.com

Andrew Jaquiss

28058 97212

Scale,Housing
types,Parking

As you know, the City is at a crossroads. Our single family residential zones contain homes that have ceased to become affordable for the average Portland family to move in to. Yet the current zoning prevents more units from being constructed on lots in these zones, which might act to bring down the cost per new housing unit. Instead, the entire site acquisition cost must be borne by a new single-family house. This results in more and more large, expensive homes that aren't affordable to most of the families who might be able to fully use their space, and generally are purchased by people of means who don't actually need all that room.

Supply, in short, is not meeting demand.

The decision point we find ourselves at is this:
 Do we allow this situation to continue and worsen? Or, do we take effective steps to fix it?

After reviewing the latest staff proposal from the Residential Infill Project, we find that the current proposal does not plan to significantly improve the situation with regards to affordability. No significant changes are proposed from the proposal that was analyzed by Johnson Economics in their October 17, 2016 memo to Tyler Bump of BPS. Indeed, a revised memo from Johnson Economics from April, 2018 confirms that the current staff proposal will not add significantly to the supply of housing units affordable to median-income households in Portland. In the 2016 memo, the RIP project was projected to actually result in a net reduction of housing units produced in Portland over the next two decades by 8,000 units over the baseline; hardly a ringing endorsement of the success of this proposal! The 2018 memo reverses this and predicts a net increase of 600 or so new homes over the next 20 years, though it rests on questionable assumptions, including that existing homeowners would be willing to accept \$80-\$130,000 as the sales price for their home in central Portland (what the memo refers to as "Residual Land Value"). (Call us if you know somebody willing to sell for those prices, please!)

Further, the Johnson Economics reports indicated that it would be unlikely that any of the resulting units would be affordable to a household making the Median Family Income or less for the City of Portland. It is our view, as neighbors who are concerned about the ability of our children, our aging parents, our friends and other potential new neighbors to afford to live near us in the future, that the Residential Infill Project is currently flawed, but that with a few simple fixes, it can be tuned to help deliver a more affordable future for our city.

PO Box 11194

In that spirit, we respectfully request that the PSC recommend the following changes be made to the staff proposal. The attached Inclusive Cully Policy was adopted by the general membership and the board of the Cully Association of Neighbors (CAN) in April 2015. The goals established by this policy would be well-served by the Residential Infill Project, and particularly by the housing options available in the 'a' overlay zone. CAN requests that the 'a' overlay include ALL of Cully, including the area between Cully Boulevard and 82nd Avenue, which is currently excluded due to displacement risk. This is the area that would most benefit from the housing options of the RIP, which would assist us in our anti-displacement efforts.

chair@concordiapdx.org

Chris Lopez

28059 97211

Scale,Housing types,Narrow lots,Mapping the "a" overlay,Affordability,Displacement,Parking

4759 NE Going St

cullyguy@gmail.com

David Sweet

28060 97218

Mapping the "a" overlay,Displacement

A new 'a' overlay is proposed for my R5-zoned neighborhood. I strongly oppose adding an 'a' overlay on my and my neighbors' properties for a few reasons. Currently, my street is comprised of single-family homes. If the 'a' overlay were to be approved, and people could build duplexes and ADUs on their properties, it would negatively impact my neighborhood.

The amount of non-permeable surfaces would increase substantially, worsening rain runoff impacts. It would also decrease habitat for wildlife in the area, of which we have bunnies, squirrels, and numerous bird species. Allowing concrete and buildings in the place of the current trees, shrubs, and lawns would alter the look and feel of the neighborhood, which makes it a desirable place to live. Many of the homes have driveways and garages, which afford off-street parking. Adding more buildings and livable space per property will remove off-street parking spaces and increase the number of cars in the neighborhood making it more difficult for the many young children to play on the sidewalks and streets and for my friends and family to find parking close to my home.

One of my neighbors is a quiet couple in their 90s and do not have much time left. When they pass (and if the 'a' overlay is approved), the next property owner could decide to build to ADUs in the backyard. That means I would be living next to a construction site for up to a year and then easily have three times the amount of people living in the same space that two did before. I do not want seven people living in the same amount of space that two have happily lived in for years. My quality of life would be severely negatively impacted if I had seven people living next to me on one property given the extra noise, traffic, and trash they would generate.

So, considering the desire to maintain wildlife habitat and permeable surfaces, maintain the look and feel of the neighborhood in which I chose to purchase property, and avoid having dense multifamily space next to me, please DO NOT approve an 'a' overlay zone for my area.

4550 NE Shaver St Thank you for your consideration.

jennifer.c.loomis@gmail.com Jennifer Loomis 28061 97213

Housing types, Parking

I urge you to reject the Residential Infill overlay as it currently exists. I have attended several meetings about this project but I am unable to obtain a reasonable justification for why homes like mine in Cully are being excluded from the beneficial changes while still being subject to the negative changes that reduce the possibilities of what can be built on our land. My home is near 3 bus lines and since it is zoned r7 we have room for adu's there is no reason to draw a line around our neighborhood preventing myself and my neighbors from benefiting from these changes. As it is I feel like this is actually a back door downzoning of my property and would prefer to see the RIP rejected entirely rather than being passed while excluding our neighborhood from opportunity once again.

4519 ne 72nd avenue

warloeb@peak.org Bjorn Warloe 28062 97218

Housing types, Mapping the "a" overlay

To the Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission:

I oppose the Residential Infill Plan in its current form.

Three and four households on every lot is too dense for Portland's single family house neighborhoods. High density should be in city centers and on large corridor streets. The buildings allowed by RIP are too large and tall for most of Portland's neighborhoods. Infill size and height should be compatible with neighboring houses. Our smaller bungalows should not be redeveloped to large, expensive housing. RIP will increase demolitions, toxic contamination, and environmental waste.

What I see happening now in my residential neighborhood is the demolition of older, more affordable homes in favor of newer and vastly more expensive homes. When a new condo building goes up, the units the units are all very expensive and don't include parking. Who are we building for when developers are all targeting the luxury market?

I support accessory dwelling units and additional units sensitively added inside existing houses. I support reasonable density without demolition. I oppose RIP.

Sincerely,

Jen Featheringill
547 SE 49th Ave 97215

To the Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission:

I oppose the Residential Infill Plan in its current form. Three and four households on every lot is too dense for Portland's single family house neighborhoods. High density should be in city centers and on large corridor streets. The buildings allowed by RIP are too large and tall for most of Portland's neighborhoods. Infill size and height should be compatible with neighboring houses. Our smaller bungalows should not be redeveloped to large, expensive housing. RIP will increase demolitions, toxic contamination, and environmental waste. It will forever alter the beauty and charm of so many unique and historic Portland neighborhoods. The new houses I've seen built following demolition in my neighborhood are sold at two or three times the cost of the original home and only benefit developers.

I support accessory dwelling units. I support additional units sensitively added inside existing houses. I support reasonable density without demolition. I oppose RIP. I sincerely hope you make the best choice for the future of Portland and do not allow RIP in its current form to go forward. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Kathleen M. Hanson

I am testifying re: property near Sellwood Bridge. I find two discrepancies exist between the Residential Infill Project Summary premises and reality.

1. Premise: p. 3 Housing Options "Apply the new 'a' overlay to properties zoned R7, R5, and R2.5 within 1/4 mile of corridors with 15 minute bus service."

Reality: Trimet 99 bus which crosses Sellwood Bridge does not run the route between 8:15am and 4:00pm. (8 hour daytime gap)

2. Premise: p. 3 Housing Options "Expand the new 'a' overlay on proximity to amenities such as community centers"

Reality: The Sellwood Boys and Girls Club sold in 2016 for mixed-use development.

Both the Sellwood Community Center and the Woodstock Community Centers are currently targeted for closure.

2. Premise: p. 3 Housing Options

547 SE 49th Ave

jenry513@comcast.net

Jennifer Featheringill

28063 97215

Scale,Housing types

4146 NE Flanders Street

jeffandkatiehanson@yahoo.com

Kathleen Hanson

28064 97232

Scale,Housing types

P.O. Box 364

4scotton@gmail.com

Brenda Scotton

28065 97367

Mapping the "a" overlay

1426 se 35th Ave	It's clear that this will not create affordable housing. This will only destroy the city. The neighborhoods are why I love portland and choose to live here. EVERYTIME a condominium goes up they are beyond affordable. I used to live in one on the sw waterfront and the rent raised so much we had to move. I am STRONGLY against this because it is very clear it is not about proving affordable housing but making money.	Rmosseay@gmail.com	Ryan Mosseau	28066 97224	Affordability
1723 SE 52nd Avenue	I strongly OPPOSE the proposed zoning changes for the Residential Infill Project. My property taxes have steadily risen way beyond national inflation and are no longer within reason. The price of housing just continues to go through the roof and the only people benefiting are developers and real estate agents. The zoning change will cause unbearable crowding for long time residents without solving the lack of affordable housing in Portland.	marcusgander@hotmail.com	Marcus Anderson	28067 97215 Southeast Mt. Tabor	
3024 SE Woodstock Blvd	I do not support the RIP. As it is being proposed, it will not solve the housing shortage and will lead to more expensive housing. In our Eastmoreland neighborhood, historic homes on larger lots have been torn down and replaced with high cost per square foot McMansions or two smaller expensive dwellings filling the same lot. This practice increases the cost per square foot of the dwellings and does little or nothing to improve density while destroying the beautiful historic neighborhoods in Portland. The most effective and aesthetic solution is to construct high-rise apartments and condominiums both in the central core and along the 205 corridor in close proximity to public transportation. Dollars per square foot of housing, including cost of property, is cheaper for high rises and consumes less space. These new units should have required parking. The issue of how many affordable cost housing units in these complexes will have to be decided by city officials. Opposed!	sandjgoodman@gmail.com	Jay Goodman	28068 97202	Parking
	<p>I oppose the Infill program for several reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Portland is a city of neighborhoods. Infill would obliterate that. We know all our neighbors on the block and have for years because we are a neighborhood. With duplexes on every lot and multi-plexes or apartments on every corner, we all will become isolated, strangers, not neighbors. 2. Parking with the infill proposal becomes a nightmare on our neighborhood streets. To suggest that because we are near mass transit, people won't need cars is nonsense. Just look at the FACTS and REALITY of what has already happened in neighborhoods where you have allowed apartment buildings without parking. The streets are jammed with parked cars. 3. If Infill is such a great idea, why have you exempted the west side? Is it because you live there and don't want YOUR neighborhood impacted by Infill? Shame, shame, shame. 4. To suggest that developers will build affordable housing on these small city lots such as exist in Laurelhurst is nonsense. The developers would take a small house for \$600,000 and knock it down to build a duplex or a double townhouse. Those would be sold for at least \$800,000 each. Just look at what happened on SE 28th across the street from Crema. That double townhouse is on the market for \$1.2 each! The home they replaced was valued at far less than that. How is that affordable housing? 5. Close-in neighborhoods have expensive housing because of their proximity to jobs downtown. Developing the neighborhood into small, affordable housing is fantasy. No developer is going to do that when they can get more than they put into acquisition. They will always sell the new residences for FAR more than they paid. That's NOT affordable housing. 6. Infill is not the solution to affordable housing. It will only enrich developers and force more modest income families and singles farther out into the margins of society. Portland is an expensive town because it is desirable. Infill will NOT fix that, but only make it worse. 	marlynrlewis@yahoo.com	Marlyn Lewis	28069 97232	Housing types,Affordability,Parking

6425 SE 32nd Avenue	<p>OPPOSE- I do NOT support the RIP. Every study I've read confirms that older, less-expensive homes will continue to be demolished and replaced with new housing that many people cannot afford. This is a sneaky program marketed and disguised to be helpful to residents who need more affordable housing options but, in fact, it will just benefit developers and landlords. This will also contribute to the already problematic parking problem on narrow streets, overcrowded schools, etc. Please be mindful about the RIP- implement affordable housing where it makes sense, not in established neighborhoods with existing, suitable housing at varying price points.</p>	aparshall@gmail.com	Allison Makinson	28070 97202	Parking
4207 NE 24th AVE	<p>I have a concern that too much density may lead to too much on-street parking and resulting traffic congestion -- if not stalemate -- as well as safety for children playing. Here are my thoughts ... When you add too much density to a lot ... e.g, two ADU's in 5,000 sq. ft., or a triplex (or larger) on a corner lot, you may wind up with more cars parked on the street. Many households have 2 cars, so the ADU's are likely to park both on the street, and the 2nd cars of the triplex owners may be on the street to avoid stacking one in the garage and one in the driveway as there is so little free space in front of or around these homes. The result is that streets, such as our NE 24th Ave, could have cars lining both sides of the street, making it difficult for moving cars to pass one another; we already see on our normal size street that cars tend to wait for an on-coming car to pass when cars are parked opposite on both sides of the street. The cars can do this because there are still openings to for one of the on-coming cars to pull over. But on narrower streets, there are only 3 lanes maximum, and with two of them completely or mostly parked up -- such as already happens on streets approaching Alberta Street, you will have stalemates with traffic -- and more so with the increased traffic of package delivery vans. In addition, with so many parked cars, it becomes that much more difficult -- even at Zero Vision 20 mph -- to see children playing on the sidewalk, and going into the street. So, too much density can lead to congestion, and safety problems. Thank you for listening. I am in support of the Residential Infill proposal.</p>	LainePDX@gmail.com	Laine Schipper	28071 97211	Housing types,Parking
5224 SE Lincoln St.	<p>I believe it will positively affect housing pressures that Portlanders face. I am writing in enthusiastic support of proposed base zoning restrictions throughout the Beaumont-Wilshire neighborhood. Over the past 10 years, I have seen wonderful small starter homes, and single level homes, demolished and replaced with gigantic homes that do not match the character of the neighborhood, nor the size of the lot on which they are built. These demolitions make purchasing a home all the more difficult for first-time homebuyers. Additionally, long-time residents who wish to downsize and remain in their neighborhood are finding it increasingly difficult to find smaller homes. Any zoning / overlay restrictions that will help keep the character and accessibility of Portland's neighborhoods are good for all of our residents. Thank you!</p>	lauratova@gmail.com	Laura Belson	28072 97215	
3907 NE 35th Avenue	<p>The areas designated to be rezone do not meet RIP's own criteria for rezoning: •NE 33, 34 Ave. & 35Ave. between NE Siskiyou and NE Mason •NE 33, 32 Place, & 32 Avenue between NE Siskiyou and NE Stanton Note: The 32 Place block is classic tutor homes and 10 lots near Stanton would be rezoned. The impact of potentially 20 skinny houses at one end would decimate the street, the livability and property values.</p>	cyrano@fastmail.com	Ryan Blaszak	28073 97212 Northeast	Beaumont- Wilshire Scale
2922 NE 32 Place	<p>Interestingly the homes designated for rezoning on 32 Place are occupied by long time owners who are experiencing constant solicitations from developers who want to purchase the houses in anticipation of the zoning changes. This is also a predatory practice aimed at older owners. These areas should not be rezoned and RIP must be voted on by the citizens of Portland. It's our city!!!</p>	JoanKelley06@comcast.net	Joan Kelley	28074 97212	Mapping R2.5 rezones

I am a concerned homeowner in my neighborhood. I am not in agreement with the proposed infill project for the following reasons
 *I bought my home rather than a condo to be in a neighborhood that includes yards and driveways not in a closed in close quarters arrangement
 *I believe the proposed changes will adversely effect my home value because it will cause over crowding and will no longer be a sought after neighborhood
 *The changes will cause parking issues and additional traffic in the neighborhood
 *It seems that additional housing could be found in other open spaces that are available that would not infringe on the livability of my neighborhood
 Please reconsider this absurd idea that this is the only way to increase housing availability. There is plenty of land around the Portland area that would not include this infill proposal. If this commission is not able to find better solutions than this we may not have the right people making decisions for the city of Portland.

4004 SE Flavel St

heftl@yahoo.com

Linda Heft

28075 97202 Southeast k

Woodstoc Housing types, Parking

I oppose the adoption of the Residential Infill Project rezoning of Portland. The Residential Infill project is a land grab by developers that has been given a fast track by City Council. The corruption and rampant cronyism that is embodied in the RIP process has been sickening.
 Everyone on City Council will be held to account for their support of this giveaway to developers and their pals in speculative real estate investment. NO ONE has been fooled. The people of Portland can clearly see that RIP has one purpose—to open up the entire city to unregulated demotions of vintage single family housing stock under the pretense of accommodating future growth. It does not address the serious issue of the lack of affordable housing. It will not afford any protections to historic properties. Ladd's Addition, an historic district, (where I live) will not be exempt from rezoning and the wave of new construction that will be encouraged by this change. RIP has also had the side effect of encouraged attacks on neighborhood associations and the control that they exercise over their own areas. City government is supposed to protect its citizens from abuses by special interests. I have lived here for over 40 years. I know what Portland is about, and remember a time when city government worked for progressive ideals and effectively reflected the values of its citizens. From Hales to Wheeler, City Council has pushed for the passage of RIP and failed us by giving all the power to developers and speculative investors. There is plenty of shame to go around. We will not forget. There is time to save your careers. Wake up and vote NO on RIP.
 RIP will destroy livability in neighborhoods. It's a money grab for the city. Pack people in with a lower quality of life to generate tax revenue.

1744 Se Ladd Av

zedeek@comcast.net

David Minick

28076 97214

6425 SE 32nd Ave

ryan_makinson@hotmail.com

Ryan Makinson

28077 97202

MY PROPOSAL ON SIZE AND SCALE. Limit FAR and max height to lesser of 1) current draft RIP code limits or 2) 10% larger than greatest house FAR and height found within 1 block (500 ft). This respects neighborhood context.

The developer can still build larger and taller than the largest/tallest house in the vicinity. Over time, neighborhoods can grow larger and taller (due to "10% larger"). But we won't have a wave of small houses rapidly replaced with much larger/taller infill that is out of context and character. "One size fits all" does not fit any.

BDS staff can administer this, because BPS has a database of height (LIDAR) and size (assessor habitable sf) of every house. I received that data from BPS and used it to prepare the charts I previously submitted, such as the attached:

Also, you should carefully examine the measurement methods for loopholes that can be used to create infill far larger than what BPS is advertising. Excluding habitable basements that are half daylight permits buildings of 3,750 sf, not 2,500 sf. Excluding attics with less than 80 inch headroom allows full-height attics with an easily removed drop ceiling. Measuring height from mid-point of grade permits tuck-under garage with sloped driveway, and 2 1/2 floors above. The prohibition against entry stairs with more than six steps above grade ("jetway stairs") can be circumvented by building up grade at that point. Beware that RIP does not inadvertently channel Portland neighborhoods to a uniform look-alike infill building typology devised to maximize FAR by exploiting porous code.

461 NE Mirimar PI

johnyaoliu@gmail.com

John Liu

28078 97232

Scale

To the Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission:

I oppose the Residential Infill Plan in its current form. Three and four households on every lot is far too dense for Portland's single family neighborhoods. High density should be in city center and on large corridor streets. The buildings allowed by RIP are too large and tall for most of Portland's neighborhoods. Infill size and height need to be compatible with neighboring homes. Our smaller bungalows should not be demolished for large, expensive housing. RIP will increase demolitions, toxic contamination and environmental waste.

Portland will become a shell of its former self should RIP go through in its current state. I have watched far too many small and more affordable homes demolished, only to be replaced with more expensive housing.

I do support ADU's. I support additional units sensitively added inside existing homes. I support reasonable density without demolition. I support a mandate for actual affordable housing(not market rate housing!) I firmly OPPOSE the Residential Infill Project.

I also oppose the I OPPOSE the URM mandate. Older brick buildings are the heart and soul of the city. We need to find ways to preserve Portland's character, not tear it down!

Sincerely,

1745 SE Locust Ave	Stacey Atwell I am opposed to the RIP as written. As a long time resident of the Westmoreland neighborhood I have seen the negative impacts to quality of life caused by encroachment of out of scale cheap looking apartment buildings, parking density and unsafe traffic patterns. I have seen the destruction of older more modest homes to make way for large, expensive and out of proportion new construction. We are losing what makes our neighborhood livable without really addressing affordability, homelessness and congestion.	stacey.atwell@gmail.com	Stacey Atwell	28079 97214	Scale,Housing types
1504 SE Tolman		nancywpdx@gmail.com	Nancy Williams	28080 97202	
10135 N Mohawk	I cannot support RIP and I request an option for all to vote on it. I support the Real Choice Initiative brought forward by Allen Hines and Supporters. The Real Choice Initiative points out the lack of Livable housing options within the RIP for those with mobility impairments. It is time in 2018 to include all marginal groups within Public Policies. The RIP has touted Visitable Units as being Sufficient to address those with Disabilities. This does nothing to assure that the Disabled Population has a fair chance at accessible affordable Housing. There is also no assurances in RIP to provide Accessible Parking to those who must rely on it to use their homes. The Laurelhurst community is unique with its park being the first city park in the nation to be put on the Historical Register. This park serves multiple neighborhoods from near and far for picnics, weddings, botanizing and photography. Surrounding this feature are mansions such as one in which Eleanor Roosevelt used to stay during her active period and architecturally dated single family homes. The neighborhood serves the city as is. While I recognize that inside some of the existing homes could be renovated to accommodate more individuals, the facade must be preserved to envelope a unique historic neighborhood that embeds a current national historic park developed by the famous Olmsted foundation.	ktadlock2001@yahoo.com	Kelly Tadlock	28081 97203	Visitability,Parking
255 SE 33rd Ave	I very strongly oppose the Residential Infill Project. It benefits developers more than anyone else by far. The strain on the already strained infrastructure will be great and expensive. Please reject this plan. It will not help those for whom it is ostensibly intended. A bad, bad idea. If the goal is truly more more affordable housing (and I do not believe it is) there are so many better ways to go about this. P R Glasgow	mharlin@macforcego.com	Marilyn Harlin	28082 97214	
1902 SE 26th Ave	I strongly oppose Residential Infill Project, it is not what Portland needs to become a better place to live for anyone.	pamelaglasgow@pdq.net	Pamel Glasgow	28083 97214	
8201 SE 8th Avenue	It will destroy the livability of the city. Don't ruin our fair city please!	banzi@andalus.com	J Banzi	28084 97202	

3415 NE 31st Ave.	I am strongly opposed to the proposed draft, specifically the proposed "a" overlay for R5, R7 and R2.5 zones. This proposal does not consider the right of current property owners to maintain the value in their properties conferred by the historic character of the neighborhood, tree canopy, landscaping, and adequate on-street parking for residents (most houses in this area - indeed most of close-in east-side Portland do not have garages or garages of adequate size to actually park in). The current residents, who have been investing in these neighborhoods through their taxes and property improvements, are being prioritized at a much lower level than people who haven't even moved here yet. If the city's priority is affordable housing, then it should ban the practice of demolishing small, starter, affordable houses in order to build very large, expensive homes (typically 2 or 3 times the price of the demolished house).	lmatwill@live.com	Linda Atwill	28085 97212	Housing types, Parking
1723 SE 52nd Ave.	I strongly OPPOSE the proposed zoning changes for the Residential Infill Project. My property taxes have steadily risen way beyond national inflation and are no longer within reason. The price of housing just continues to go through the roof and the only people benefiting are developers and real estate agents. The zoning change will cause unbearable crowding for long time residents without solving the lack of affordable housing in Portland. Residents should have more say in drastic changes like the RIP. Increasing the density of houses and increasing the number of dwellings per lot will have a negative effect on current home owners. It will change the character of the neighborhood by cramming more people into smaller spaces. It will create more congestion and place more stress on public services. It will also decrease home values. The city is experiencing an unprecedented boom in apartments and condos. I do not believe that there is a housing shortage. The city needs to put its muscle behind making existing housing more affordable. Stop letting developers build tear down affordable homes only to build much more expensive homes.	queenmumsie@hotmail.com	Janet Anderson	28086 97215	
7326 SE 27th Ave		orrule@comcast.net	Gary Rule	28087 97202 Southeast and Eastmorel	Housing types Scale, Housing types, Narrow lots, Mapping the "a" overlay, Mapping R2.5 rezones, Affordability, Displacement, Visitability, Parking
1908 SE 35th Pl.	See pdf	dougurb@gmail.com	Doug Klotz	28088 97214	
3314 NE 22nd Ave	I object to this zone change. I am in a historic district/neighborhood maintaining a near century home with all the required special rules. If this zone change is implemented it will change the aged character of the historic neighborhood. If this change is made why would I want to invest into my home to maintain its historic character? Hi Planning and Sustainability Commission,	tlkempner@comcast.net	Leon Kempner Jr	28089 97212 Northeast Alameda	
8600 SW White Pine Lane	I appreciate your work on this matter. Among all the important issues being discussed--I believe the setback matter is perhaps the most pertinent to ensuring Portland stays, and becomes, a great city with vibrant street-life and a village-like camaraderie. Please consider keeping setbacks as small as possible. This will allow for much more creative site-planning as well as a more encompassing, cradling urban realm. Braden	bradenbernards@gmail.com	Braden Bernards	28090 97225	Scale

I oppose the rezoning of Portland neighborhoods through the Residential Infill Project.

I have been very disappointed with some of the infill occurring in my neighborhood, so when I first heard of the RIP, I was encouraged. The recommendations to come out of the group, though, were not what I (or my neighbors) was looking for.

The RIPSAC seemed dominated by those who have a financial interest in the decisions. I would encourage you to vote on this project based on what is best for city residents rather than developers/construction industry. With elections coming up, Portlanders are looking to elect politicians who will serve the needs of residents first and foremost.

I am strongly opposed to the housing overlay zone proposal. Portland should stick with the recommendations of its comprehensive plan and restrict the areas of greater density to those in transit centers/corridors. Duplexes/triplexes/etc should only be allowed if they do not involve demolishing any home already on the lot. ADUs or additional units can be carved out of existing homes. Also, the reduced size of buildings should still apply, no matter how many units are in the building. Developers will try to get away with building enormous structures just by calling them duplexes. We already have several of these in our neighborhood, and they are not compatible with existing housing, in addition to decreasing the property values of the homes around them (no one wants their backyard or all the windows on one side of the house completely blocked from sunlight, for example).

4213 NE 32nd Ave.

Thank you for taking the time to read and consider my comments.

djpartch@gmail.com

Jackie Partch

28091 97211

Scale,Housing types

I am against the RIP in this newest form. I feel that the planners really didn't listen to the last round of feedback. this new plan will replace renters that rent single family homes with other unrelated adults and encourage developers to create high profit duplexes to replace our current affordable market rate housing. You need to have a stipulation in the RIP that requires the preservation of the existing house and renters and encourage and incentivizing adding units to the backyard or basement. Do not allow for more demolitions of existing houses! This is bad for the working class that live in older buildings, like myself and bad for our health since they are pulverizing materials into the air with no regard for public health. There are so many other options. Our governments lack of innovation is really discouraging. Please change this bad policy into a good one.

1717 W. Burnside

patrickhilton@yahoo.com

Patrick Hilton

28092 97209

I was born and raised in North Portland ..what is going on is criminal ...the entire city is no longer affordable ...everyone in city hall should be fired / voted out of office ...you tax beyond reason then waste millions in city resources with out penalty ...as you can see by my address i had to leave because of your policies ...beginning to hate Portland and what it stand for

349 e paseo way

gmdowney6@gmail.com

Greg downey

28093 85042

I support the RIP code changes, and ask that Portland for Everyone's suggested improvements be incorporated to encourage more affordable and accessible housing options:

- Allow the "housing options" provisions in all areas of the city to improve equity outcomes and encourage the creation of additional walking scale neighborhoods.
- Allow internal conversion of existing houses into multiple homes in all areas, and provide additional incentives for housing preservation and reuse.
- Incentivize more housing, accessible housing, and affordable housing, but ensure that requirements and bonuses are structured so that each may be more feasible.
- Revise the affordable housing bonus to include an additional home as well as FAR increases for below-market rate, family-sized homes.
- Create an accessible housing bonus, allowing an additional home as well as FAR increases for projects that are 100% fully accessible.
- Allow small triplexes on mid-block lots. Also allow these projects to access the improved affordable and accessible housing bonuses.
- Create a true cottage cluster code that encourages the development of smaller, more affordable homes.
- Rezone all historically narrow lots from R5 to R2.5, with design improvements, to let more households share land costs and provide housing options that more families can afford.
- Support a healthy urban tree canopy by designing flexible code provisions that incentivize saving trees and create less impervious surfaces.
- Eliminate minimum parking requirements for all housing types citywide.

I OPPOSE RIP.

RIP will incentivize more demolition of our city's remaining affordable housing stock in favor of new, luxuriously unaffordable market-rate apartments, McMansions, & commercial spaces. Spaces that ultimately sit empty and held as investments. RIP will exacerbate the affordable housing crisis by replacing affordable homes with unaffordable ones. The up-zoning outlined in RIP will make lots with existing homes more valuable as teardowns than they are as affordable homes.

RIP does nothing to address our near complete lack affordable-housing, which has risen to the level of humanitarian crisis. We are seeing disturbing-numbers of Seniors, disabled folks, and children among Portland's homeless population. RIP does nothing to bring to these Portlanders back into the stable housing that they need. It is inhumane to build more luxury housing while thousands of people sleep on the street.

RIP encourages environmental degradation via toxic, un-contained and poorly overseen demolitions and threatens our established urban canopy through rampant tree loss. Attritions that create an unhealthy living and working environment for all our citizens.

Our neglected infrastructure can't handle overwhelming developer-driven, market rate growth. Our combined-sewage system, our water problems, our schools, roads, and public-services aren't being improved in ways that match either current or future growth.

3620 SE Henderson Street

Liz@revealarchitecture.com Liz Dexter

28094 97202

Housing types, Mapping the "a" overlay, Mapping R2.5 rezones, Affordability, Visitation, Parking

5034 NE Rodney Avenue

Jacquiewalton@hotmail.com Jacquie Walton

28095 97211 City Central Downtown

I firmly oppose RIP as currently proposed!

I'm a native Portlander and am shocked that at the sweeping changes RIP could make to the affordability of our housing. With homelessness on the rise and displacement so prevalent why are we considering removing existing stock of affordable living wage single-family homes for multiplexes that will simply NOT be affordable?

Have you considered the sweeping changes that would come to our historic neighborhoods and architecture?
Is this handout to developers really the precedent we should be setting for the future of our beautiful City?
Is this push for density just to enrich the City coffers?

3236 SE Johnson
Creek Blvd.

I strongly encourage you to let the citizens of the City vote on this issue and to perhaps do a test study in a particular area that will NOT lead to any more demolitions.

scottice@mac.com

Scott Tice

28096 97222

Housing
types,Affordabil
ity

I am having difficulty understanding what Zoning Code and Map changes the Planning and Sustainability Commission are considering, which changes they will actually put in effect, and how these changes will affect the character and beauty of my neighborhood and other neighborhoods in Portland.

I fear that despite the hard work and good intentions of all involved, these changes will not preserve existing housing and encourage new development that is compatible with and supportive of the positive qualities of existing residential neighborhoods.

I fear that the concept of increased density will not meet design compatibility requirements but may encourage knock down and replacement of older traditional Portland homes with units that simply maximize developer profits.

I urge the PSC to consider the budgetary impact of increased density.

How will the average property tax of \$5,000 per home cover increased demands on existing infrastructure, fire and safety staffing, and traffic congestion?

How will the average property tax of \$5,000 per home cover increased demands on the school budget with per pupil costs of \$11,830 for a High School student and \$10,442 for a Grade School student?

I know the intentions are to ease the housing crisis and improve peoples lives, but I urge all involved to get this right before making policy that could negatively impact the lives of existing home owners.

Development must be slow enough to include balanced finances that will allow infrastructure, city services, and education spending to keep pace without causing property tax increases so large that they create a hardship for, or displace existing home owners, especially seniors and retirees whose taxes support education while putting no demands on educational spending.

Please try to avoid the negative consequences that result from rapid growth and increased density. Make decisions that strengthen and not destroy the character and beauty of Portland.

5414 se cesar e
chavez blvd

I hope you will make the right decisions that will not sacrifice the historic, and iconic Portland neighborhoods that

afantasi@gmail.com

anthony fantasia

28097 97202 Southeast k

Woodstoc

Housing types

I firmly oppose the RIP as currently proposed!

If the purpose of the RIP is to increase affordable housing and density, and help house those who are homeless or displaced by the current epidemic of demolitions, the RIP as proposed does neither.

Tearing down historic, living wage, single family homes, only to be replaced with one or two large, significantly more expensive, unaffordable single family homes, clearly helps neither affordability nor density. Yes, some are replaced w multiplexes, all with soaring rents or purchase prices often close to \$1,000,000.

This plan helps no one but developers, and only exacerbates the current housing crisis.

I strongly request that you let the citizens of Portland vote on this issue. Portland neighbors and neighborhoods will be - with demolitions at epidemic proportions, we already are - irreversibly affected by the proposed RIP. We deserve to have a voice in the development and direction of our city.

7938 SE 35th Ave.	Thank you, Kristi Ana Byrd 1-4 units is considered a single-family house by the FHA, VA, Fannie Mae, and Freddie Mac and can be purchased with a standard 30-yr mortgage. Our zoning codes should reflect this, and allow a four-plex on any residential lot, otherwise, our conservative banks will be more progressive and committed to housing choices than our zoning code.	kristiab@comcast.net	Kristi Ana Byrd	28098 97202		Housing types, Affordability
PO Box 13172	This 4-unit single family house coexists between two 1-unit single family houses.	neilheller.pdx@gmail.com	Neil Heller	28099 97213 Southeast	Sunnyside	Housing types
PO Box 13172	The 'a' Overlay should be applied broadly. Whole sections of neighborhoods should not be excluded based on demographics or income levels. I oppose RIP. These neighborhoods do not have the parking, school and street infrastructure to handle more of your infill. I am born and raised in Portland and we are turning into SFO or Seattle. Dirt, traffic and crime. Sad to see a city that I once loved go down this road.	neilheller.pdx@gmail.com	Neil Heller	28100 97213 North	St. Johns	Mapping the "a" overlay
6719 SE 29th Ave		mwilliams@tumac.com	Mark Williams	28101 97202		Parking
PO Box 13172	The St Johns Neighborhood Association has asked to be fully included in the 'a' Overlay in order to allow additional housing options/opportunity for their residents. The SJNA request is supported by Anti-Displacement PDX. The attached 11 page .pdf contains technical criticisms of the ADU code changes within RIP, as well as proposed code fixes, representing the concerns of 22 companies that specialize in ADU design, construction, and development across Portland.	neilheller.pdx@gmail.com	Neil Heller	28102 97213 North	St. Johns	Mapping the "a" overlay, Displacement
4227 NE 10th Ave	The City cannot make these sweeping changes destroying the inner Eastside neighborhoods without a vote of homeowners. Our lovely city is being demolished every day. Nothing about the RIP is designed to build affordable housing it is instead a land grab. I demand to vote on this proposal.	kol@accessorydwellingstrategies.com	Kol Peterson	28103 97211		Scale, Housing types
3923 NE 9th	To Whom It May Concern: I am writing this note, and will keep it short this time, to share that I greatly oppose the city's decision to shove density down our throats. Portland, like many other smaller cities were not designed to support large amounts of people, let alone having the tax revenue to pay for those that come here with no jobs or money. These types of decisions need to be put up for a vote, not based on the local democrats in office and their desire to remain in power by bringing in guaranteed voter bases. I am getting more and more frustrated with how Portland is being run, all I see are big ugly apartments all over the place with large amounts of vacancy. Using low income, affordability and other "hot topic" buzz words is merely a ruse.	eileen_schill@hotmail.com	Eileen Schill	28104 87212		
5044 NE Rodney	I demand the local city put this to a vote and hear what the people say. And be clear, no smoke and mirrors.	dawn@orcaservices.net	Dawn DelCastillo	28105 97211		

To Whom It May Concern:

I have lived in this city my entire life and as an African American I am appalled by how the city uses minorities to get what they want. Many of the families I grew up around lived in NE Portland and were primarily Black with some other races mixed in. It took all we had to purchase our family home, like the others and the city has made it too expensive to live here. Not only because of housing costs, those that owned or own their homes aren't effected, is the other bills and taxes you keep adding on.

Many of the older more established residents are on a fixed income, when you raise the taxes, water bills, garbage, gas, electric and other ridiculous levies all you do is make it impossible. They then become forced to sell, to which you blame rising housing costs. Wake up.. This rests solely on your shoulders.

These families should be allowed to remain, if they need help paying your high taxes then help them. If they want to sell and make a nice profit then that is their choice. They own a home to do just that.

I oppose your plan to infill and bring in density, take care of your own people and stop inviting other non-residents to come here.

5044 NE Rodney ave
This needs to be added to the ballet so that the citizens of the city can decide what they want to happen with their tax dollars.
Type or paste your testimony in this box...I oppose the RIP infill project. This is not a move to make affordable housing. It is a neighborhood wrecker.

JSCOTT.NWMH@COMCAST.NET

Joanne Scott

28106 97211

2019 SE Cypress Ave
Annie Meyer
Type or paste your testimony in this box...Please stop producing multi-dwelling homes on small parcels of land here in Portland. The population of this town has already exceeded critical mass density. Quality of life is plummeting here. Protect the reasons people want to come here in the first place. Don't ruin it by selling out and making residents unhappy and developers happy.

anniemeyerartwork@gmail.com

Annie Meyer

28107 97214

2027 SE Madison St
Kimberly Critelli

critellikim@yahoo.com

Kimberly Critelli

28108 97214

Housing types

Hello,

I've lived in the south Burlingame area of Portland for almost 40 years during which time there have been many changes in the neighborhood and surrounding areas. Ours is a safe and lovely part of Portland, where people take pride in their homes and yards and relationships. We're fortunate to experience the friendliness of people living here, of those moving into homes, and our friends walking past and conversing with neighbors.

More and more frequently, however, I'm noticing construction of new homes that do not fit the existing character of our wonderful old neighborhood. Ours is part of an old community with some homes that date back almost 100 years. The new homes constructed by unscrupulous developers stand out because they're tall eyesores built on narrow lots and the thought of also constructing ADUs without planning for the congestion that will result without adequate off-street parking is just foolish. And there are also ridiculously large homes being erected that are far from affordable for most people and certainly can't be considered in line with your mission to increase density in Portland neighborhoods.

These sly developers are taking advantage of the existing infrastructure by attempting to build their eyesores in existing neighborhoods. This is just wrong. As it is, we do not have sidewalks in many parts of our neighborhood, so walkers are forced to walk in the street. The congestion that comes with additional parked cars on our streets is going to make it more dangerous for people walking their dogs or taking their children to parks or walking them to school.

Conversations with my neighbors confirm that we are all extremely unhappy with the Residential Infill Project currently before the Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission. We want to retain our single family zones, we want to measure home heights from the lowest point of the lot and average setbacks to allow infill to blend into the neighborhood.

This is my firm vote against the "a" overlay opportunity zone.

1624 SW Carson
Street

Linda Billings

ljbillings@comcast.net

Linda Billings

28109 97219

Scale,Housing
types,Parking

Attn: Residential Infill Project
1900 SW 4th Ave, Suite 7100
Portland, OR 97201

cc: SusanAnderson@portlandoregon.gov; Morgan.Tracy@portlandoregon.gov; JuliaGisler@portlandoregon.gov;
brandon.spencer@portlandoregon.gov PeggyM@RestoreOregon.org; Dan@RestoreOregon.org;
wolsey_9@hotmail.com; janbak@pacifier.com

Dear Mayor and Commissioners,

On November 16, 2016, Professor Loren Lutzenhiser testified to the Portland City Council that the Residential Infill Project would produce duplexes that “are only affordable as an ownership option to the highest income 15-20% of the current renter population (incomes of \$75,000-\$85,000/year are required” and that “ADUs would be affordable for as much as 40% of the renter population (i.e., households with incomes of at least \$45,000/year).”

He also found that “renovation of existing dwellings (rather than demolishing them), and adding ADUs to those and additional sites, would achieve the same density as demolition – with - duplex+ADU – replacement — at about 15% of the total cost to the households involved.”

But his most important conclusion was the high environmental cost of demolitions as compared to adding ADUs to existing homes. “Although new construction is often claimed to be highly energy efficient (e.g., with various green certifications and modern code requirements), detailed building energy performance modeling finds that the consumption and CO2 emissions differences are negligible between a duplex plus ADU combination vs. a renovated existing building with an ADU. The newly constructed buildings use only about 3% less energy than the “renovate + ADU” configuration.”

“Our demolition and new construction carbon emissions estimate is in the neighborhood of 47,000 pounds of CO2 emitted in the demo-construction process. The estimate for a major energy retrofit of an existing house is about 1,500 lbs (about 1/30th as much), and building a new ADU is estimated to produce around 12,000 pounds of CO2.”

The continued demolition of buildings across Oregon amounts to a staggering amount of embodied energy that is literally being thrown away. Every time we raze an older house and replace it with a new, more energy efficient one, it takes an average of 50 years to recover the climate change impacts related to its demolition. See January 28, I am writing regarding the zoning code changes proposed via the Residential Infill Proposal. I believe that this proposal is ill-conceived and essentially uses density to address the city's affordable house needs without regard to the impact on east side neighborhoods, many of which will be radically and transformed for the worse should this proposal become official city policy. I sincerely appreciate that there is a great need for affordable housing in Portland, however the RIP proposal won't do much, if anything to increase affordable housing. In fact, RIP is likely to encourage the demolition of smaller, more affordable homes to be replaced by larger, more expensive structures. Instead, the city should make it easier to internally convert a single-family home to a duplex. Allowing an ADU is a sensible form of growth. Additionally, this proposal should spread the impact by placing the overlay zone on all single-family zones in Portland, not just on the east side. It makes no sense to exclude areas east of 82nd St. or the entire west side.

4130 NE 18th
Avenue

paulsmajkut@gmail.com

Paul Majkut

28110 97211

Scale,Housing
types

4341 NE Glisan St

Please preserve maintain Portland's long tradition of preserving the best of what we have while adapting to the future we want and need. Thank you for your consideration.

mills2323@gmail.com

Rick Briasco

28111 97213

Housing
types,Mapping
the "a" overlay

This Residential Infill Project draft should probably be retitled the Developer Enrichment Project.

I recently received notification from the City regarding proposed zoning changes. After investigation, I believe that RIP (as currently proposed) will likely seriously hurt Portland neighborhoods and livability while simultaneously worsening the affordable housing crisis. Some of my neighbors, including experienced architects, urban planners, affordable housing activists, and land use attorneys have followed the RIP process. They have summarized in testimony they have given (or are planning) the many ways in which the RIP proposal is flawed and how it may have unintended and harmful consequences. The organization "united neighborhoods for reform" has summarized many of the concerns that I share. I will attach a document they have prepared discussing some of their views on RIP.

The two primary concerns that I have are:

1. The assumption that there is a shortage of land zoned for housing development is absolutely not correct. The truth is that developers desire a larger supply of parcels that are centrally located and highly profitable to develop. City planning should be honest and reality-based, not based on "alternative facts." An honest approach is also critical to addressing the affordable housing crisis - If building affordable housing is not profitable, developers will have no incentive to build it. Pretending that replacing a small and affordable single family home with two luxury townhomes increases the supply of affordable housing is the type of Trumpian logic that will harm our city, not help it.

2. RIP as currently proposed neither requires affordability nor provides funds to enhance the availability of truly affordable housing. Instead, changes to allowable FAR, the exclusion of basements and attics, and other technical changes seem designed to replace current relatively affordable housing with much more profitable luxury housing. The incentives in RIP seem to be tilted towards demolition, profiteering, and a transformation of close-in neighborhoods into luxury enclaves.

I urge City Council to carefully consider the analysis from UNR and address the problems that have been identified with the current RIP draft. I understand that our city will inevitably become more dense, and as a former New Yorker and twenty-year resident of Portland's second-most-dense residential neighborhood I welcome increased density. Increased density, however, should not come at the cost of livability, neighborhood character, and affordability.

I STRONGLY OPPOSE the RIP proposal in its current form. Allowing the demolition of existing homes in well-established neighborhoods will only remove affordable homes from the housing stock and rip apart the character of our neighborhoods. It's illogical to think that developers are going to build affordable homes in their place as they would not maximize profits.

The Buildable Land Inventory certified that there was adequate land available for residential development on existing vacant land for the next 20 years. Please utilize that space before causing irreversible damage to our existing neighborhoods. The use of our vacant land and sensitively adding ADU's into and around existing homes should be sufficient for growth.

Additionally, the RIP ignores the Councils approved amendment to disallow the rezoning of 'historically narrow' lots in R5 zones to R2.5. These 'split' lots have been treated as full lots for almost 100 years and have been zoned correctly as R5. The split lot was a marketing tool used by the original land developer. It is unfair to the current owners of these properties to utilize this historical remnant now to create an easy land-grab for developers.

Changes this drastic should be brought up for VOTE by the citizens of Portland.

2618 NE 8th Ave

seangreen@mac.com

M Sean Green

28112 97212

Scale,Housing types,Mapping the "a" overlay

3043 NE 35th Avenue

jbelleveau@gmail.com

Jacqueline Belleveau

28113 97212

Housing types,Narrow lots

Consideration of building height, FAR, front door height adjustments in floodplain areas-

- Building homes that conform to flood mitigation requirements in these zones often requires additional height to raise the home above flood grade. Please consider allowing 3-5 feet of additional height in floodplain areas.
- Building homes that conform to flood mitigation requirements often requires having a "throw away" first floor. This floor could be used for occupancy - but only for uses where flood damage isn't a threat (like shop space, garage, storage). Please consider allowing these areas to be held exempt from FAR calculations so that only 100% livable space is counted toward FAR.

8642 SE Holgate Blvd
1207 SW Broadway

-Front doors for homes in floodplain areas often need to be raised higher than standard homes. Please consider allowing 3-5 ft of additional height for front doors of homes within flood plains.
Type or paste your testimony in this box...

cora.potter@gmail.com
jerome@housingoregon.org

Cora Potter
Jerome Brooks
Larry and Wanda Vinton

28114 97266
28115 97205

Scale

2030 NE 58th Ave

Letter attached.

28116 97213

Housing types

The proposed zoning code attempts to achieve two mutually contradictory goals:

- A. Preserve neighborhood character by imposing a maximum FAR of .5:1, thus disallowing replacement of small homes with large homes.
- B. Increasing density by allowed duplexes on all lots with (a) overlay and allowing triplexes on corner lots.

Clearly, Goal B undercuts Goal A, as owner-occupied housing would make way for rental units.

But if one only looks at increasing density to accommodate growth, the proposed zoning code fails to deliver.

1. Duplexes and Triplexes cannot be affordably developed today in most Portland Neighborhoods
Duplexes and triplexes have not been built for decades in Portland for the simple reason that the development cost per unit far exceeds achievable rents. Given this cost structure, any developer would attempt to minimize development costs with the only factor under their control: quality.

If the high cost of land, City permits/fee/SDC's and construction were to somehow to go down, the following unintended consequence would occur:

2. Shift from Owner-Occupied to Renter-Occupied Housing
Over time, the replacement of single-family homes by duplexes and triplexes would reduce the supply of owner-occupied housing and increase their prices, exacerbating the current lack of affordability of family housing in Portland. Traditional neighborhoods would feel the impact of increased on street parking, potential conflicts with absentee landlords regarding upkeep and maintenance, and the inevitable destabilizing effect of frequent turnover among renters.

One form of higher density housing is expressly disallowed.

3. No Opportunities for Row House Development
Minimum lot width of 36 feet disallows the development of row housing, a development type that has wide acceptance in Portland neighborhoods. Row houses add density, provide units for owner-occupants and generally

2905 NE 51st Avenue
456 SE 68th Ave

Letter attached.

n.guitteau@comcast.net

Nancy Guitteau
Betsy Hayford
Steve and Deborah Waksman

28117 97213
28118 97215

Rose City
Northeast Park

Displacement
Housing
types, Affordability

2302 NE Tillamook St Letter attached.

28119 97212

It seems that if you have InFill, then no neighborhood should be exempted. This will not help us with good affordable housing. It will only increase people per sq.ft. prices will not go down due any of these infills. OK, Yes an 800K home will be torn down and 2 or 3 unit building could take it's place, but the price will still be up there in the 600K range, due to the location. You End up driving up housing & land prices pushing people out of their homes. Parking is already at a premium on a lot of streets. Is this what we want for Portland. How about creating mini-city centers like around the Montavilla area. Plenty of room to go UP as well as having a great area. Making valleys like you have done on inner Division St. or what you have done on Burnside is Horrible. Plan it out and do a MAJOR project. Have an idea like: Make Montavilla a destination FRENCH/SPANISH Area. Make sure the laws are such that you need to use those styles in all multi-unit buildings. Even assist businesses to change to the new format of the area. Large roundabouts with cafes and room for outdoor seating for restaurants. BUT MAKE IT A DESTINATION Point. Get Tri-Met involved for transportation. Get Builders inspired and involved as you do with the new garbage apartments that are being built right now. Require parking. This isn't the first time this has been done, why are you not dictating how you want the city instead of letting the builders drive this show? Very disappointing. Infill is not the answer, unless you are really trying to ruin Portland.

646 NE Hazelfern Pl.

dennis.j.lundahl@outlook.com

Dennis Lundahl

28120 97232

TAG1

TAG2

TAG3

TAG4

TAG5

Housing types Narrow lots Mapping the Affordability

