

## Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

May 15, 2018

4:00 p.m.

### Meeting Minutes

**Commissioners Present:** André Baugh, Jeff Bachrach, Ben Bortolazzo, Mike Houck, Andrés Oswill (arrived 4:45 p.m.), Chris Smith, Katie Larsell, Michelle Rudd, Katherine Schultz, Eli Spevak, Teresa St Martin

**City Staff Presenting:** Morgan Tracy; Stacy Brewster (Commissioner Saltzman's office)

*Chair Schultz* called the meeting to order at 4:01 p.m. and gave an overview of the agenda.

Documents and Presentations for today's meeting

### Items of Interest from Commissioners

*Commissioner Spevak* will be leading a street tree ride as part of Pedalpalooza next month on Father's Day. Role of trees in the urban streetscape and trees in the ROW.

*Commissioner Bachrach* was on a vacation including London, where they have banned plastic straws. Coming soon to Portland...

### Director's Report

Susan Anderson

- There will be a resolution in Portland re: plastic straw ban this summer!
- On May 24, we have the long-awaited celebration because the Comp Plan and Task 5 projects will have their final vote at Council, followed by the last part of the CC2035 Plan. Thank you to the PSC for creating the framework and vision for this work.

### SW Start St Renaming

Hearing / Recommendation: Stacy Brewster (Commissioner Saltzman's office)

Stacy gave an overview of the project and context of where we are today. We were approached with the idea about a year ago. The name (Harvey Milk) and location (SW Stark) are both pertinent to the committee's recommendation. Stacy had walked the committee through the City's process for street renamings. Early this year, we were able to accommodate the request since the two other potential street vacations came off the table (we're only allowed to process one street renaming request at a time). Council waived a portion of City Code that would have required the entire Start St be renamed. The portion in SW Portland, downtown, is less of a lift, and this is a very distinct 13-block section of the street.

The committee began collecting signatures very quickly (completed the requirement in 3 weeks), showing how engaged people have been. The results are in the packet PSC members received. The City Auditor also did a survey to addressees on this section of the street. Outside of the scope of the documents, when the committee met with us, we talked about this as an opportunity to do more on SW Stark to honor the local LGBTQ community. It could be murals, historical markers, etc, like what has been done in other cities (e.g. Chicago). We are in the early stages of thinking what this could look like in Portland.

We have a placeholder for the project to be at Council on June 14.

*Commissioner Smith:* The survey only came back with 40 percent support. Why is that?

- Stacy: The Auditor's Survey is a small survey compared to the signature-gathering process.

### **Testimony**

1. Lisa Schroeder: 32/45 businesses surveys approved of the name change. We surveyed some owners, and one owns the majority of the businesses on the street, who wasn't in favor... so that may have skewed the numbers. I've seen Stark St go from the hub to being decimated for the LGBTQ community. I know how important it is to have something to look up to and people they can aspire to, and Harvey Milk was significant and a good leader. *See written testimony.*
2. Cameron Whitten, Harvey Milk St Project: In favor of renaming Stark St. I am amazed to see the coalition that has come around to support this street renaming. As a young, queer person, I didn't come out until later. While we have seen milestones, we have more to do to show the LGBTQ community has a place and importance in Portland. *See written testimony.*
3. Michael Whitmore: Moved to Portland in 1994, and the only place at that time for anyone in the LGBTQ community was Stark St. But it's no longer like this. I want to see this street renaming to honor Harvey Milk and to support the LGBTQ community in Portland. He was a great advocate we should honor.

### Written Testimony

*Chair Schultz* closed testimony at 4:19 p.m.

### **Discussion**

*Commissioner Baugh* fully supports the renaming. I would encourage that we honor local LGBTQ community members along the street as was mentioned.

- Lisa: We are honed in on honoring other members of the community... park benches and statues are an example of what we are thinking of.

*Chair Schultz:* I also want to celebrate someone local, so I'm happy to hear there are efforts to take this further.

### **Motion**

*Commissioner Smith* moved to recommend the street renaming of SW Stark St to SW Harvey Milk.

*Commissioner Houck* seconded.

(Y10 – Bachrach, Baugh, Bortolazzo, Houck, Larsell, Rudd, Schultz, Smith, Spevak, St Martin)

### **Residential Infill Project**

Hearing: Morgan Tracy

*Chair Schultz:* Tonight is a continuation of the RIP hearing, and we know everyone wants an opportunity to speak. We heard testimony from 53 individuals last Tuesday, and have received over 600 pieces of written testimony via the Map App as well.

Testimony will be limited to 2 minutes per person maximum. If someone has already said something you were going to say, you can say you agree with them, but then we'd ask you share your other/different comments instead of simply repeating.

Morgan gave a brief overview of the project and the 11 proposals:

**Scale of Houses**

1. Limit the size of houses while maintaining flexibility
2. Revise how height is measured
3. Improve front setbacks to better reflect those of adjacent houses
4. Improve building design

**Housing Options**

5. Create a new Additional Housing Options overlay zone
6. Apply the new overlay zone in select areas
7. Provide incentives for affordable housing and historic preservation
8. Encourage more cottage cluster development

**Narrow Lots**

9. Rezone some historically narrow lots from R5 to R2.5.
10. Improve building design for all narrow lots (less than 32 feet wide).
11. Revise rules for the R2.5 zone.

Morgan also highlighted the amount of testimony we've received to date and the number of calls the call center operations has fielded.

*Commissioner Larsell:* It would be interesting to see how testimony has been submitted based on area of the city from where the comments came from.

- Morgan: Yes, we can do that.

*Chair Schultz:* I will also ask our commissioners to please refrain from asking questions of testifiers unless absolutely necessary to clarify their comments so that we can get through as many people as we can this evening.

I will call up 4 people at once (in the order testimony cards were received) as well as the next 4 people to keep us moving quickly as we try to hear as many people as possible.

As we did at the last meeting, I will share a statement about PSC members' potential conflicts of interest about this topic:

While it's not clear whether the proposed changes create a potential conflict of interest for PSC members because the changes affect such a broad class of property owners in single-family zones, in the interest of transparency, we have the following declarations:

- Commissioners Oswill, Smith, Baugh and Bachrach do not own properties in single-family zones in Portland.
- All other PSC Commissioners own between 1 and 3 properties that are in single-family zones.

**Testimony**

1. Kim Tallant, BDS: Land Use Services implements the Zoning Code. We have some concerns about the draft, particularly the cumulative impact of multiple code projects impacting customers. The biggest concerns is adding FAR to single-family development, which is unlike the commercial side where we do use FAR. We suggest more closely evaluating existing tools and standards such as height.

Visitability requirements are more akin to building code review as opposed to zoning code. There are 8 Admin Rules in the process, which are an added layer of complexity in addition to the zoning code.

2. Kristen Minor, Portland Historic Landmarks Commission: PHLC entirely supports density in single-family zones, and RIP does this. We do have a few suggestions about how this is done. We are looking for increased incentives for owners. Tuck-under garages will create more holes in the street frontage as you walk-by, which isn't what we want to see. The other side is that we believe the height measurement will create more flat rooves. *See written testimony.*
3. Carrie Richter: Concerns that code amendments don't prioritize and protect historic in Portland. Refine height and FAR considerations. Also consider that old house preservation is essential to an affordable housing strategy. *See written testimony.*
4. Peggy Moretti, Restore Oregon: I endorse the comments from PHLC. We are concerned that RIP has morphed into a proposal that will address issues it wasn't planned to address. We are particularly concerned with the a-overlay. Understand the consequences and weigh those and beef up incentives of retention of existing housing. *See written testimony.*
5. Terry Parker: Concerned about housing affordability, density versus quality of life. *See written testimony.*
6. Doug Klotz: Supports project with changes suggested by Portland for Everyone. Flexibility is key. *See written testimony.*
7. Jonathan Harker: Retired as City of Gresham planning director. Support allowing more housing options, reducing parking requirements. But equitably, so changes to the proposal are needed. Status quo means inequity. *See written testimony.*
8. Mary Kyle McCurdy, 1000 Friends of Oregon: Supports the changes as proposed by Portland for Everyone. Stronger RIP is essential to achieve GHG goals in the region. Infill housing, density, and diversity in housing choices are key. Choice is essential. Locating more housing near transit is not enough, and it must be expanded to all our neighborhoods. *See written testimony.*
9. Alan Kessler: The people here today are not the stakeholders. The people testifying are extraordinarily privileged few. Portlanders in general are the proper focus... those here today and those who are moving here. The "demolition crisis" isn't an appropriate term. I support RIP since it's incrementally better than the status quo. And we should be going farther. Do not exclude East Portland from the a-overlay. *See written testimony.*
10. Jake Antles, Cully Assn of Neighbors: Our board voted unanimously to support RIP with some recommendations. Expand incentives for affordable housing, not just on corner lots. More robust affordability incentives are important. Allow a bonus unit on lots throughout the city. Legalize 4-flexes.
11. Robin Harman: Conflict of Interest is concern with *Commissioner Spevak*. This proposal won't create affordability for most people. Doesn't encourage retention of standing affordable homes. Proposal doesn't support the 2035 Comp Plan's plan around density in centers and corridors. The overlay is being abused. Overlays misses the intent of missing middle housing. *See written testimony.*

12. Vivian Satterfield, OPAL: Tomorrow I'll be sworn in to the Home Forward commission. I've been doing this work for a decade in Portland. We've been talking about housing affordability for a long time. We have to do everything we can to expand opportunity for everyone to call Portland home. I have helped move too many of my members. Increasing density, particularly in East Portland has to be part of this proposal. We can and should be doing more.

*Commissioner Smith:* Congratulations on the appointment. Concern has been expressed about housing units being created, but they don't get close to the 60 percent MFI level. What do we do?

Vivian: We have a bond we're pushing through. But we know those bearing the brunt of this are those with no income. This is just one piece of the work we need to be doing.

13. Robert Hemphill: Generally in support of RIP and advocate for changes submitted by Portland for Everyone.
14. Tamara DeRidder, Rose City Park NA: We conducted a survey and the board supported. Request a minimum of 6-month extension before the PSC offers their recommendation to Council. Reject the a-overlay as submitted; we need more discussion time. Reject the proposal about rezoning R2.5. Reject the visitability criteria because it's inequitable and impractical. *See written testimony.*
15. Chris Chen: We need RIP to deliver transformative justice to provide diverse housing choices and reduce the exclusionary policy we've had. We are here to restore the missing middle. Housing choices and density promote equity. Strengthen the proposal.
16. Donna Cohen: Support increased density. Need the a-overlay in St Johns. We need a strong push for middle housing, 4-flexes, cottage clusters, row homes, etc. We should have a review for how the design standards are applied. Your actions should reflect voices of all people, not just those you're hearing from. We need much more in terms of affordability incentives overall.
17. David Rosenfeld: This decision is extremely consequential. I worry that the proposal will squander a once-in-a-generation opportunity for us to create an affordable future for Portland. The affordable Portland is disappearing too quickly. We need more housing variety with incentives to build it and fewer barriers to build.
18. Tim Miller, Enhabit: ADUs can have a tremendous social impact and create access for homeless and aging in place and other opportunities. We support the intent of RIP but it needs more improvements... housing options throughout the city. ADUs for up to 800 sq ft of livable space. Basement units.
19. Leon Porter: Support enhancements of RIP that Portland for Everyone and Portland Small Development Alliance. Internal conversations, waive SDCs for them. Duplexes and triplexes will likely still not be affordable, so 4-plexes and up to 8-plexes on corner lots.
20. Sarah Iannarone: Thank you to PSC members. Speaking on behalf of people who haven't arrived here yet and accommodating growth for the future. Support inclusive development policies. Support Portland for Everyone's recommendations. Importance of the role of planning in our sustainable future. We want Portland to be a place where everyone can prosper. When you hit a fork in the road, aim for flexibility and responsiveness to change.

21. Nikki Thompson: Represent low-income tenants in eviction court. Much of this is due to the tenant not being able to pay the rent. Evictions create an almost-instantaneous barrier to finding new housing. We must do whatever we can, and adding housing options will help.
22. Andree Tremoulet: You are part of the conscience of the city. You also face a technical choice in the proposal as well as a moral choice. It's about building in future affordability.
23. Patty Nelson: Appreciate trying to get affordable housing into the plan, but I think this is going to do the reverse. Peggy Moretti's comments today are pertinent. I want to see changes about scale of houses. Do not support the a-overlay.
24. Isha Leinow, Cully Assn of Neighbors: Board appreciates your work to move RIP forward and efforts to make our city more livable. Upgrade cottage cluster code... allow by right.
25. Emily Kemper: Concerned about affordability of housing in the city. RIP SAC member, but unfortunately that language has evolved, and our affordability crisis has gotten worse. As a homeowner of an historic home, I fear that some of the proposals will increase complexity for homeowners and builders. RIP is not enough of a carrot. We should think more about incentivizing to increase resiliency, energy efficiency.
26. Maureen Andersen: Supports relegalizing small housing units as part of RIP. Prioritize proximity over space in terms of housing. Parking should not be prioritized anywhere.
27. Madeline Kovacs, Portland for Everyone: Support the proposed draft's efforts but it needs to go further to meet Portlanders' housing needs. *See written testimony.*
28. Constance Beaumont: Support more affordable housing including ADUs and internal conversations. I'm not sure how affective RIP will be overall. It scatters density randomly. RIP doesn't enhance pedestrian-friendly streetscapes. *See written testimony.*
29. Susan Lindsay: RIP's goals of housing options is being ignored in the close-in areas. The plan is elitist.
30. Janet Baker, UNR: We've heard lots from Portland for Everyone, which I'd note was co-founded by *Commissioner Spevak*. We haven't heard enough about the displacement potential with this proposal. Look at the real potential of displacement for renters. *See written testimony.*
31. Margaret Davis, UNR: Housing choices cannot deprive others of their choice and need for existing, affordable housing. RIP should only occur on vacant historic land. RIP is not about affordable housing. *See written testimony.*
32. Matt Ferris-Smith: Don't let Portland become how Ann Arbor, where I'm from, has become. We have an UGB, but that only slows sprawl. Strengthen the RIP to allow for more housing choices. Consider 0.1 FAR per additional housing unit; keep R5 setbacks at 10 feet; allow triplexes on all lots; waive parking requirements for all homes.
33. Gideon Arom: Support RIP and Portland for Everyone. If we want to solve the housing crisis for everyone, we need more housing inventory, which means more density, particularly in single-family zones. Allow at least tri-plexes mid-block. Eliminate parking requirements citywide.

34. Brian Jones: Supports the intentions of RIP and those to strengthen the plan. But these don't go far enough. We need flexibility.
35. John Liu: We can't agree what RIP will do. But here's why RIP will actually lead to displacement. *See written testimony.*
36. Daniel Miller: We need something more substantively. More ADUs, consistent changes for all residential zones, all housing types. Support proposals of Portland for Everyone.
37. Brynna Hurwitz: A-overlay as proposed shouldn't be in Hayhurst... lack of transit. Lack of accessibility. Topography is a landslide hazard.
38. Denise Demaray: Agree with Brynna, particularly the limited bus service in Hayhurst. We will also need more transportation services with more density.
39. Dr Virginia Janzig: Concerns about Bridemile neighborhood's lack of services that won't accommodate future growth and population. Lack of sidewalks puts people at risk.
40. Susan King, Hayhurst NA: concur with the previous speakers. We do not support the a-overlay, because it is currently a one-size-fits-all plan. Better to accommodate housing choices by removing the overlay in our area and allow more moderate infill. Retain existing allowances for one ADU. Add: homeowners receive SDC waivers; stronger enforcement. Increased density here isn't good and can't be accommodated safely. Environmental degradation is another concern.
41. David Schoellhamer, SMILE: Frustrated with single versus commercial and multifamily zones as opposed to looking at evaluating cumulative impacts throughout the city and our neighborhood. RIP is different from BHBD, but they are both in front of you within a month's time. Consider these projects together. *See written testimony.*
42. Liliya Jones: Supports changes proposed in RIP to increase housing affordability and density. I don't want Portland to become a place where young people can own only by inheriting a house. RIP is a good move, and I support the changes proposed by Portland for Everyone to improve the proposal, particularly eliminating parking requirements.
43. Sam Noble: Built an ADU over my garage last year and would like to build a basement ADU as well. Support Portland for Everyone's recommendation, particularly additional FAR.
44. Eric Thompson: Original member of RIP SAC, wherein a majority of the representatives found agreement. But the proposed draft doesn't take into account the complexity of infill. FAR-based sized limits are too restrictive. Construction of middle housing options won't materialize due to economic reality. Code as currently written isn't quite there, but it's close. With some refinements, we can get there.
45. Mike Mitchoff: Represents both the "old Portland" and the future. Building and remodeling houses. Worked on RIP SAC. Support the project but not in its current form. FAR is too restrictive and challenging. R5 and R2.5 FAR proposals will restrict flexibility and creativity and make it more difficult/expensive to build. Detached structures... please be careful. Know all the ramifications of the code amendments that will affect ADUs before you make changes.

46. Garlynn Woodsong, Concordia NA: Supports RIP with 6 recommendations... allow 4 housing units on all residential properties; allow higher square footage with FAR; height bonus for 2+ units; smaller front setbacks; create equal opportunity in all neighborhoods; form-based codes – don't reinvent the wheel.
47. Ben Schonberger, Housing Land Advocates: Promote land use policies that support affordable housing. RIP is too timid. Show more leadership and look ahead to Portland's future. Some of us are lucky and won the housing lottery; we bought a while ago. I want more people to have my neighborhood. Change zoning to have more neighborhoods like mine; expand the a-overlay, let buildings be bigger, and eliminate parking minimums. HLA wants more opportunity for more Portlanders.
48. Gary Runde: I represented West Portland NA on SWNI then land use chair. Key points from the SWNI letter. Oppose the a-overlay as presently applied due to our inadequate infrastructure in SW. We are not opposed to additional density, but we need to be careful about our lack of resources. *See written testimony.*
49. Lina Menard: Build Small Coalition member. Generally support recommendations for Portland for Everyone and Cully Association of Neighbors. RIP is a moment in time, but there are more opportunities, particularly for internal conversion of larger existing homes. *See written testimony.*
50. Laura Webb: RIP has been hijacked by developers. Demand is open-ended with a lot of money in play. The market won't cater to those at the lowest incomes.
51. Robert Bernstein: [continuing Laura's comments] Developers want to build close-in. People want their home in a neighborhood that they want to live in. BPS disrespects this and those seeking affordable housing. I would like to see that flag lots be required to use only existing driveways. *See written testimony.*
52. Tanner Balder: Support more multi-family housing everywhere. Our housing monoculture is failing. We need to increase FAR for duplexes and triplexes, get rid of parking requirements. Prioritize abundance, diverse Portland.
53. Gabriele Hayden: Direct support to purchase a house, but that wealth was built from inequitable zoning rules. RIP's goal is to move us forward and reach a compromise with existing homeowners. More restrictions and limitations will make it harder for me to build an ADU and create more options for others.
54. Al Ellis, UNR: UNR and Beaumont-Wilshire concur with testimony from Restore Oregon. Because we are advocating to preserve single-family homes doesn't mean we oppose building of alternative units. But middle housing proposals concentrates these in the middle of densely-populated neighborhoods with very few vacant lots. Affordability is relative, but destroying the stock of existing homes makes the situation worse.
55. Soren Impey, Portland Tenants United: My unit is non-conforming. The housing crisis has displaced thousands of Portlanders. RIP needs to emphasize affordable housing. We've had too little input from tenants in this project. The .1 FAR affordable housing is an insult. Support the ADPDX recommendation of the a-overlay citywide. Ability to transfer affordability. RIP is a wash when it comes to needed housing. Reject the current proposal.



56. Ted Labbe, Depave: Staff didn't integrate our comments about tree preservation from the Discussion Draft into the Recommended. We support the Portland for Everyone coalition. RIP should promote more livability. Offered 3 amendments to the proposal about tree preservation. Keep existing 10-foot setback in R5. Why do we need off-street parking? Remove tree code exemption on sites less than 5000 square feet. *See written comments.*
57. Roseann Johnson: Family business. Main concern is about economics and housing affordability. Support a-overlay throughout the city... it could be incorporated into base zones. Rezone all historic lots from R5 to R2.5 to allow smaller, well-designed houses to be built in these areas. Allow higher FAR values for all types of housing to generate the most affordability.
58. Steve Elder: Concerned about parking. Can't rely only on transit to maintain our quality of life. Curb cuts don't necessarily mean less parking (2 cars could park in the same driveway).
59. Alan DeLaTorre, Age Friendly Portland: RIP SAC member. Portland has an aging population and woefully poor accessibility for this population and the disability community. Policy 5.9 in the new Comp Plan calls for Universal Design, which we should include in this project as well. I'll be publishing a report at the end of this month re: quantifiable costs of visitability. *See written testimony.*
60. Micah Meskel, Portland Audubon: We appreciate the focus and intent of RIP. Greater density is good for housing options and lower emissions. Disappointed that tree preservation is missing from the proposal. Support Portland for Everyone's amendment re: setback at 10 feet. Remove Title 11 exemptions for 2500-5000 foot lots. Remove the parking requirements to help preserve and protect more tree and front yard trees.
61. Lynette Yetter, Cully Neighborhood Farmers and Habitat for Humanity: All of Cully should be noted as a displacement-risk area. Parks and urban farms help make Portland livable. We need to create zoning ideas that sustain and support urban farms like our parks. *See written testimony.*
62. Elizabeth Cashman: A-overlay is a bad fit for Hayhurst as other have said. It's inconsistent with the Comp Plan goals. Don't forget the trees.
63. Paul Grove, HBAMP: Testimony includes images of housing types that could be impacted. Echoes Portland for Everyone's sentiments. Cannot support proposal in current form. Opportunity zone should be extended into East Portland. Narrow lots are needed in a land constrained environment, and we need flexibility. FAR requirements need to be more flexible to ensure housing types will be built and meet neighborhood context.
64. Gary Miniszewski: Has been dealing with moderate-density housing with Habitat project at 165<sup>th</sup> and Glisan. RIP process is the wrong vehicle to address the need for affordable housing. Ask staff and City Council to go back to drawing boards on land use element of Comp Plan to have more land for middle housing.
65. Eric Lindsay: Property owner, manager, small-scale developer. Feels that won't reach threshold effect to create ample middle housing across amenity-rich neighborhoods, but will continue trend of 1:1 replacements with smaller homes. Seems more like a new home massing reduction project than infill project; economic report supports this. Amend the draft to incentivize small multi-family buildings. Agrees with Garlynn Woodsong, OPAL, Eric Thompson, Portland for Everyone. As developer, would rather build things that are more affordable, and allowing FAR increase for more

units would make that viable. *See HBA written testimony.*

66. Mike Andrews, South Burlingame NA: Strongly opposes RIP. The a-overlay would negatively impact livability; requests removal. Does not follow 2035 Comprehensive Plan, support planning goals, result in affordable housing or prevent home demolition, will negatively impact environment. 3 units on a lot is contrary to Zoning Code definition of single-dwelling zone. None of the neighborhood is within ¼ mile from frequent transit; low walkability and transit scales; failed intersection and cut-through traffic; poor sidewalk access; unpaved streets. *See written testimony.*
67. Eliana Andrews: RIP will mostly create negative outcomes. Increase neighborhood noise and remove valuable open space. It encourages demolition of existing houses. *See written testimony.*
68. John Kesslerling, on behalf of client: My client's house was used as a triplex but determined that it was being used improperly. Current zoning code did not allow it. RIP is necessary provided some edits. Increasing affordable housing and preserving historic are not mutually exclusive goals. Properties that could be made into 3-units isn't happening now. The City needs to work with private citizens, but this isn't possible with the current guidelines. Consider the arbitrary prohibition.
69. Jane Schekey: The environment needs to be created for us. Do I care about those who haven't moved here yet? Not really. You should talk to the people who currently live here. Not the incoming developers.
70. Jim Gorter: Recommend get rid of the a-overlay. Implications of demolitions. RIP is contrary to keeping existing housing. Work to save NOAH housing in all parts of the city. We need truth in zoning. *See written testimony.*
71. Neil Heller for Robert Liberty: Supports Portland for Everyone amendments to RIP. Encourages middle houses everywhere and expansion of a-overlay.
72. Jack Bookwalter: Disheartened by RIP's disregard for previously-adopted plans and policies. The residential zone capacity in Portland is sufficient to meet projected housing needs.
73. Rod Merrick: It's not whether we need additional density or housing but where and impacts. The a-overlay is the wrong approach. RIP ignores that we have enough land designated for housing for the projections for the next 20 years. Lack of analysis for the plan in terms of displacement and affordability and demolition impacts.
74. Sam Stuckey: Mill Park NA. Goals of RIP are good, but I'm concerned about the actuality. Pitifully few new homes will be built. Portland has a reputation as being walkable and welcoming, and we need zoning that makes room for new and current residents. Parking should be a choice, not a City mandate. We need to make enough space for each other. The people are amazing, and we need to treasure everyone.
75. Nan Gatchel: I like in the Reed neighborhood and live there because of the nature and quietness. This is the beauty and the draw of this area. The notice about RIP said the change would give people the opportunity to live in more vibrant neighborhoods. But with more people, the vibrancy of my neighborhood will be lost to buildings. We do need affordable housing, but I don't think this project gets us there.

76. Thomas Karwaki, University Park NA: RIP led to the largest NA meeting we've ever had. Universal design isn't met with the visitability requirements included in the proposal. Please change this for our residents. The best thing is to change it in the waiver of the ADU SDCs since it only works on the second ADU, which is unlikely. Everyone should have a-overlay. We would allow 4-plexes next to transit. Historic and tree components of the plan need improvements.
77. Vic Remmers: Homebuilder and member of RIP SAC. There were lots of good ideas that came out of that, but I'm disappointed in this proposal. It's too complicated, doesn't open enough opportunities. Sizes of homes is not feasible, so they won't get built, even if we change the code. BDS is already understaffed, and this is just more work for them... which equates to less housing being built, which goes against what the proposal is. *See written testimony.*
78. Laura Herbst: RIP is flawed, and it won't provide intended affordable housing. Also concerned about broad, sweeping swaths on the a-overlay map; not all neighborhoods are the same, and they each should be looked at individually. *See written testimony.*
79. Nick Fantasia on behalf of Anthony Fantasia: The city has grown at a staggering pace. Concerned that we're growing so rapidly that we aren't preserving neighborhoods and their character. RIP as proposed is for developers, not for maximizing housing. Concerned about financial draw on the educational system. Consider the need for sustainable growth. Preserve the character and welcome new residents.
80. Brett Schultz, Brett Schultz Architect: Infill and apartment buildings. Generally supports RIP but FAR limits, particularly for small lots, is an Achilles heel that will stifle development. Small lots can be created without demolition. Increase FAR to at least .8 for small lots and .5-.8 for 5000 lots.
81. Rick Michaelson: Thank you for your patience. But I don't think the testimony really helps; everything is supposition and speculation. Test the RIP proposal in specific areas of the city to actually see what it does on the ground. Allowing demolition of an 1100 square foot house to create a 2500 moves us in the wrong direction. More additions or FAR should be provided. R2 and R3 zones are for middle housing. If we need more of these zones, rezone. We don't need another overlay.
82. Taizz Medalia: The a-overlay suggests that people have been clamoring for increased density. The proposal is being rushed through without neighborhood buy-in. Most people don't understand what the rezoning would mean.
83. Tabitha Boschetti: Generally excited about the direction of RIP. There are missed opportunities. We need concrete measures as part of RIP. *See written testimony.*
84. Jennifer Gomersall: Thank you for your dedication and efforts. The math isn't there for RIP. You have to factor in real, on-the-ground data, which we don't have. We aren't solving the problem because not everyone can live in the city of Portland. There is only so much of Portland. There is disrespect going to diverse values.
85. Dan Fischer: Against RIP. Don't rezone R5 to R2.5... it encourages demolition. Narrow lots are give-aways to property developers. Opposed to current FAR and developers having to pay a fee for extra FAR. Don't support lack of off-site parking universally. Oppose increase in eaves into further setbacks.

86. Mark Jordan: Problem with a-overlay is that it isn't neighborhood-specific. This needs to be considered. I'm in King's Hill, and high-density housing is excluded in the map. Most the large houses that are included already have multiple people living in them... multiple generations, students, etc. Familiar with the developer game. They will seek a waiver on every lots that comes up, and they'll try to push setbacks and density requirements. Use a waiver process and take some time to do more neighborhood-specific work.

Written Testimony received

*Chair Schultz* closed oral testimony at 8:01 p.m. The written record will remain open until Friday, May 18 at 5 p.m. Thank you to everyone who is still here and those who all testified.

PSC members should submit their comments (priorities and goals; and top topics you want to discuss in a work session) and potential amendments at this point to Julie via email by Friday at 4 p.m. She will then send these out to us all for review and for staff to prep for the May 22 work session.

*Commissioner Bachrach*: Thank you to staff for all the work and the problems you're trying to work though.

**Adjourn**

*Chair Schultz* adjourned the meeting at 8:07 p.m.

Submitted by Julie Ocken