

COMMENTS_ID	CNAME	CEMAIL	CADDRESS	CCITY	CSTATE	CCOMMENT
						<p>Please make notices available to all community members and interested organizations -- not just neighborhood associations and business districts -- through an e-mail notification subscription system.</p> <p>Anyone should be able to sign-up online to receive e-mail notifications for land use proposals within specific geographies, such as zip codes or neighborhoods.</p> <p>For example, Living Cully would like to receive notices for any land use action that triggers the notification requirements within the Cully neighborhood. Individual neighbors and other organizations might like to sign up for notices in their own neighborhood or zip code. Please open up the communication and make it available for everyone. Thank you!</p>
30790	Cameron Herrington	cameronh@livingcully.org	6899 NE Columbia Blvd	Portland	OR	<p>Cameron Herrington Living Cully</p>
						<p>I am very please to hear that the Neighborhood Contact Code section is being revised. The one thing that I think is missing is the potential height/massing of the building and the given context. In my experience, the neighbors' biggest point of contention with new developments is height and setback to adjacent property. The proposed required signage and letter only shows the site plan and does not include the adjacent buildings either in plan or elevation or 3D rendering. Before going in for permit, the architect/developer will already have established the massing limitations on a site per zoning requirements (set back and building heights) so it makes sense to me that this massing information and context should be included in this neighborhood outreach. This information will provide the public with a better understanding of how the new building will relate to the context and how tall or large it will be and will be no more work for the developer as the research and documentation will have already been done.</p>
30801	Kate Piper	kathryn.c.piper@gmail.com	5769 N. Commercial Ave.	Portland	OR	<p>Thank you all for continuing to work hard to make our city run better.</p>

yeah Portland! civic engagement means doing what big business says. The scale of developments, the 45-50 units before neighbor comments is too large and allows lots of mistakes to happen and bad feelings to developer. This size development needs to take neighbors into consideration as to the placement of lights, the destruction of greenery, the blocking of light and shade and sun. crucial issues like parking and non car access need to be discussed before building starts. Business types can be discussed and recruited, and with over 3,000,000 square feet of vacant commercial space, that help can be useful to developers. There is no "planning" commission in Portland only a development arm of business. But why is the City so afraid of hearing from neighbors? The current updates offer nothing to the people who are living in Portland and with 16,877 vacant apartments why are more needed? The vacancy rate of nearly 8% is 4 points higher than what HUD finds necessary for tenant mobility.

Please print the rationale for the changes in developer contact. Who proposed it and why? Any case studies that led to this proposal.

Why are you afraid of the citizens of Portland?

Thank you for the opportunity to testify. I am emphatically opposed to raising the footage minimum for required neighborhood contact. It's appalling that this proposal has even been considered.

As our city grows, it is imperative that the city include the voice of existing residents and homeowners in new development. By changing the threshold to 10,000 feet, the city would essentially cut out all input from residents, neighborhoods, and neighborhood associations.

The "burden" of notifying neighborhood associations is MINIMAL (attending a meeting). If anything, developers in residential zones should be required to consider the input of associations in high-impact development (apartment buildings in previously single family home areas, new construction in neighborhood traffic corridors, development that alters and light and open space of an existing residence).

If the threshold for contact is raised to 10,000, it will show that the City cares far more for developers than it does for existing residents. It would be going in the wrong direction, and would send a clear and damaging message to developers.

Testimony from the Sellwood Moreland Improvement League (SMILE) is attached.

Letter attached.

Thanks for the opportunity to testify. Please see the attached letter.

30802 robert greene	greeneportland@gmail.com	6535 north fenwick	portland OR
---------------------	--------------------------	--------------------	-------------

30803 Anna King	annasking@comcast.net	1704 N. Highland St	Portland OR
-----------------	-----------------------	---------------------	-------------

30804 Sellwood Moreland Improvement League	land-use-chair@sellwood.org	8210 SE 13th AVENUE	Portland OR
--	-----------------------------	---------------------	-------------

30805 Robert Greene		6535 N Fenwick	Portland OR
---------------------	--	----------------	-------------

30810 Leon Porter	leonporter@yahoo.com	1822 NE Wasco St.	Portland OR
-------------------	----------------------	-------------------	-------------

30811 Bradley Bondy

bradleybondy@bradleybondy.com

7820 SE Stephanie Ct

Portland OR

I support this change! However I would like to see a few changes made though.

â€œWe shouldn't require neighborhood contact meetings for any developments under 30,000 square feet. That's around 20-40 residential units, which seems pretty reasonable to me.

â€œWe should have an email notification system for interested groups and individuals.

30812 Lucas Gray

lucas@propelstudio.com

5229 NE MLK Blvd.

Portland OR

In general, I support this update, but we need to make sure it is efficient and equitable and not a means for wealthy homeowners to slow down or prevent the development of new housing. Here are a few suggestions:

- no neighborhood contact meetings should be required for developments under 25,000 sf (or better, 40,000 sf).
- no neighborhood contact meetings should be required for developments with over 50% of their units being affordable housing.
- to increase equity and include renters, business owners, and other non-homeowners that may be impacted by a proposed project, we should implement an email subscription system allowing any interested person or organization to sign up to receive email notifications for land-use proposals, even people and organizations outside the neighborhood. Anyone who has signed up for the notifications should be automatically invited to any neighborhood contact meetings.
- There should be a time limit within which the meetings must occur. For instance, the meeting should take place within 3 weeks of contacting the neighborhood association and if the NA can't commit to a meeting within that time then the project should be allowed to proceed without the meeting.
- Notification signs must include the names of the developer, owner, architect, and contractor, and must include a rendering or 3D image of what the proposed development will look like.

At a high level, I support the changes to the Neighborhood Contact Code Update Project.

I ask that you please say there is no neighborhood association meetings required for projects under 40,000 square feet. I'm on a neighborhood association board and the meetings are not often productive. It would be better to just allow smaller developments (like those under 40k sq ft) to skip the meeting.

I ask that you please also include an email notification subscription system allowing any interested person or organization to sign up to receive email notifications for land-use proposals, even people and organizations outside the neighborhood. Anyone who has signed up for the notifications should be automatically invited to any neighborhood contact meetings. This way it is not only current residents who can be involved in the process, but also prospective future residents.

30813 Brad Baker

bradmbak@gmail.com

2301 NE Rodney Ave

Portland OR

Thanks for your time and consideration!

I am generally supportive of the proposed neighborhood contact changes. Having worked at the District Coalition helping neighbors navigate new development processes, I support a greater transparency in information. The move away from certified letters is positive. Putting the onus on property owners to host a meeting is also a positive. Requiring a sign that alerts neighbors to future development is long overdue. Engaging neighbors earlier in the process is also something that has been long sought by neighbors.

One suggestion I would make is to explicitly require developers to include information about proposed bike and automobile parking on the required sign and in their presentations. Parking is always one of the big concerns neighbors have with new development so in the interest of transparency, it should be part of the required information.

Another suggestion I would make is to require the initial developer email/mail be sent to a centralized city address where it could then be posted to a city website. This would enable more people, beyond those who participate in neighborhood associations, to track upcoming development.

Thank you to the project team for their work.

30815 Bob Kellett

kellett.bob@gmail.com

2237 SE Pine

Portland OR

30817 Daniel Heffernan	djheff1@gmail.com	2525 NE Halsey Street	Portland	OR	<p>I feel that the original notice requirement for all projects between 10,000 and 45,000 square feet was too broad but the requirement that all projects with more than 25,000 square feet host a public meeting may be too narrow. I suggest that the rule add middle tier that requires developers to offer to meet with the neighborhood association and present information about projects that exceed 20,000 square feet but are less than 40,000. The date for a meeting needs to occur with 45 days of the offer. If no meeting is scheduled in that timeframe the requirement would be waived. The request could be delivered by e-mail to the effected neighborhood association and to its affiliated neighborhood coalition. There would be no required information meeting for projects larger than 40,000 sq ft. The developer would host those events and provide notice to the neighborhood association.</p> <p>I support the Neighborhood Contact Code Update, but with a few revisions to the signage/notification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Height/massing of the building should be included. * A 3D drawing should be included that clearly shows how large the building will be compared to adjacent buildings. * The number of parking spaces that will be provided, and where the spaces will be located, should be included. <p>Also, there should be NO minimum square footage that triggers neighborhood notification if the development is adjacent to residential units.</p>
30818 Jacquie Walton	jacquiewalton@hotmail.com	5034 NE Rodney Avenue	Portland	OR	<p>Thanks.</p> <p>I strongly oppose this. This proposal is an attempt to silence the neighbors living in the neighborhoods affected and takes away our voices as community members. It's an attempt by huge development groups to shift the balance of power and exclude the very people it affects. Please don't vote this through.. we are carrying neighbors who wish to be heard on issues that will directly affect us!</p> <p>Testimony from the Overlook Neighborhood Association and the North Portland Neighborhood Chairs Network attached.</p>
30819 Ashley Vincent	Ashstyle@hotmail.com	5035 ne Mallory	Portland	OR	
30820 Christian Trejbal	overlookna@gmail.com	8105 N Brandon Ave	Portland	OR	

Chair Schultz and Commissioners:

I support all the concepts of the Neighborhood Contact Code Update. The problem with the existing system is that when neighborhood meetings are held, attendees are frustrated that the proposal is a by-right project, and the builder is not required to take public input into account. I agree with dispensing with meetings for smaller projects and only requiring a sign. I agree with no requirement for projects smaller than 10,000 sq. ft. I disagree with the requirement for a meeting for projects 25,000 s.f. and larger. I would raise this required meeting threshold to the original staff-proposed minimum of 40,000 s.f., in cases where the project is "by right" (including using Community Design Guidelines). This would remove the burden of meetings where there attendees show up with unreasonable expectations that the project will be changed because of their comments. These meetings are often just another cost and delay, that contributes to the high cost of building housing, affordable or market rate, in Portland.

Thank you.
Doug Klotz

30821 Doug Klotz

dougurb@gmail.com

1908 SE 35th Pl.

Portland OR

I am a home owner in the Hosford Abernethy neighborhood. I have lived in Portland for 50 years. I have no connection with the real estate or construction industries, and never have. I am testifying on the Neighborhood Contact Code project as an interested home owner. I feel that the neighborhood associations have far too much influence on development, and this proposed draft does not reduce their influence. The neighborhood associations mostly represent affluent, white, older home owners and not renters. I am more concerned about the loss of diversity and affordability in the city than I am about the esthetics of what gets built. I feel that the entire city process excessively inhibits development and construction and we need a process that encourages development rather than inhibiting and slowing it. I would like to see more lenient factors for triggering public input, and I would like to see the neighborhood associations having a less prominent role. For example, public meetings could be held in city offices or other public spaces in the neighborhood, with the association members invited to attend along with everyone else, but not as hosts.

30822 David Robboy

uncleyascha@gmail.com

1736 NE 21st Ave

Portland OR

30823 Adam Thompson	Adam.ltho@gmail.com	2006 N Emerson	Portland	OR	First, I'm disappointed that this is even being considered. Eliminating the requirement for developers to discuss their proposals at neighborhood association meetings would undermine the democratic process and erode neighborhood involvement in projects that they would not otherwise hear about. This is an essential part of an ongoing conversation about how we want development to look in our neighborhoods and I feel that this is not up for debate whether we keep this requirement in place. I strongly urge you to keep this requirement in place. Thank you for serving the needs of residents and not just developers. Finally, I agree with statements made in Overlook NA's testimony. Again I will be very disappointed if this goes through. I understand the need for growth but this is not the way to achieve that.
30825 Kimberly Tallant	kimberly.tallant@portlandoregon.gov	1900 SW 4th Ave	Portland	OR	Please see attachment from BTS Chief Technology Officer and BDS Director
30826 Erik Molander	epmolander@gmail.com	340 NE Bridgeton Road	Portland	OR	The Board of the Bridgeton Neighborhood Association has unanimously approved our testimony as set forth in the attached document.
					I live at 2160 SE Lambert along with 3 other neighbors at 2162, 2150, and 2152 SE Lambert. We own the driveway from our homes to Lambert St in the attached photo. When the construction project at 22nd Lambert was proposed, in spite of the fact that we are among the closest neighbors and that the proposed front doors would be opening up to our driveway to which they have no property rights, we were never notified about a public meeting about the project. Not one of us was contacted about the meeting.
					We found out about the meeting months later in casual conversations with other neighbors on 22nd Avenue who told us, "We wondered why you weren't there!"
					I will feel the impact of this omission as long as I own my house because the design as built will probably require constant efforts to keep our driveway clear and available for our use. This omission may also have a financial impact on all of us if the driveway is subjected to use beyond our own.
					The proposed draft may change the responsible party for the neighborhood contact however none of it will be effective if there is no check and balance, no public notification of meetings held by the contractor, and no effort to make sure that additional meetings are held when the building plans are significantly altered. I strongly suggest that wording within the Contact Code more clearly state who is responsible for contacting the neighbors and consequences for not doing so.
30827 Beatriz Marino	pdx01betty@icloud.com	2160 SE Lambert St	Portland	OR	Thank you, Beatriz Marin

30828 Robert Gelpke	bcgelpke@comcast.net	2221 SW 1st Avenue	Portland	OR	<p>After a long and eventually unsuccessful citizen attempt to limit maximum building heights that were part of NBP Capital's 11th hour proposal to redevelop RiverPlace as part of CC2035, it became quite obvious that the flow of information between developers, government officials, and citizens was sadly lacking. Even though the CC2035 process was obviously a legislative endeavor, it nevertheless gave insights into how that process was flawed from a communications standpoint. Those claiming "complete transparency " were doubted and many merely shrugged their shoulders and accepted it all as " just politics and business as usual". This is no way to come up with community centric solutions that are win wins for all. The worse the communications the worse the solutions. I am encouraged that this project that updates the Neighborhood Contact Code, is a step in the right direction but worry about how much muscle it will really have. Hopefully it won't be easily circumvented by seasoned, experienced developers. The scope of the code needs to be expansive enough to include ALL interested parties and not be limited to a single entity like one homeowner association. Large developments like RiverPlace are so dramatic in scale and community impact that information flow must be over broad areas with a multitude of interests. There are many ongoing efforts to address this. I can only hope that the synergy of these disparate efforts eventually merge into a critical mass of hope that will encourage community cooperation at all levels.</p>
30829 Michael Shea	mcchaix59@gmail.com	2304 N Alberta	Portland	OR	<p>Having the developer organize the meeting is a bad idea. Developers are often small and fly by night. They can barely organize their project. The neighborhood associations (at least ours - Overlook) know how to organize meetings, get the word out to neighbors, have the correct AV systems available. I anticipate that if developers try to organize meetings there will be many more appeals to city council due to lack of understanding about projects.</p>
30830 Elizabeth Deal	libbydeal@gmail.com	5045 NE Mallory Ave.	Portland	OR	<p>This is another shameless attack on Portland neighborhoods. Portland has prided itself on its neighborhood participation, but City officials have continually marginalized neighborhood associations and thus neighborhood residents. This is another attempt to take away the voice of the people who live in areas affected by development and give free reign to development companies. Stop this assault on Portland residents, we deserve to have our voices heard.</p>

30832 Doug Klotz

dougurb@gmail.com

1908 SE 35th Pl.

Portland OR

I wanted to correct my written testimony of 8-12-18. I got CDG and CDS mixed up. My fifth sentence should read: " I would raise this required meeting threshold to the original staff-proposed minimum of 40,000 s.f., in cases where the project is "by right" (including using the Community Design STANDARDS). " I also realize now that the proposal requires the meeting at that threshold, regardless of type of project, which I also support. The "d" overlay sites using the C.D. Guidelines or Design Review would have additional notification. Only in a "by-right" case would this Contact requirement be the only contact, which is appropriate, since project changes are less likely in such cases.

30833 Eric Scheel

scheel4real@gmail.com

2413 Se Division St

Portland OR

There is a recently installed cell-phone pole installed on 25th and SE Division St. It is massive and there has been no effort to make it fit in better with the surrounding architecture and environment. I have talked to many neighbors that are within 400 feet of the tower (the area that is supposed to receive letters notifying the neighborhood about the tower before it is put up) and not one person said they received a letter about a neighborhood meeting concerning the tower. I talked to Melvin Riddick who works in the City's Office of Technology Services and he said he went to the meeting with Verizon and not one neighborhood person came. I believe it is because Verizon did not send out letters like they are required to. No one who lives around this tower got notice of the meeting, so the neighborhood was not represented. Please have a better way of making people provide neighborhood notice because the current system is basically an honor system and is easy to cheat.

To Whom It May Concern:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the proposed update to neighborhood contact requirements. The Arbor Lodge Neighborhood Association (ALNA) regularly receives appeals from residents who feel they have no agency to learn about or influence redevelopment activities. New development in the North Interstate Planning District has largely ignored the community's needs and input. We are experiencing a glut of high-priced, small square footage studio apartments, with minimal housing opportunities for families and virtually no commercial space for residents to gather. We are a community that supports an inclusive vision of infill and density. The market, simply put, is not meeting the needs of our community.

The revision of the Neighborhood Contact Requirements presents the opportunity to increase awareness of new development, to promote meaningful engagement between developers and residents, and to establish accountability to the communities whose character and appeal are exploited by developers. The ALNA supports the proposed rules for signage to promote awareness. Unfortunately the changes detailed in the discussion, and now the proposed draft represent a step back, and reduction of opportunities for engagement and accountability. We are disappointed in the proposed draft, and urge the PSC to reject this proposal.

30836 Mark Wyman

land_usealna@yahoo.com

2209 N Schofield Street Portland OR

A revision to neighborhood contact requirements should promote

welcome and needed to improve recognition that context should include the people that live in the affected neighborhoods. Thank you for listening to the public.

However, there are several areas that I feel could use improvement:

â€C A 14 day timeline for a required applicant meeting with the community prior to a development permit submittal is way too short for the applicant to respond to public neighborhood input. It is of little benefit to approach the community at the 11th hour of the process and is little more than a gesture of appeasement. A 60 day timeline would be more appropriate and meaningful.

â€C The current 25,000 sf threshold to trigger a community meeting is too high to capture many large developments that we see going up on typical 5,000 sf lots. Consequently the public would effectively be denied the opportunity to offer suggestions to developers in these instances where the impact on the surrounding residents can be great when viewed in a context.

â€C For a meaningful dialogue with the affected communities, developers should be required to bring information in a form easily digestible by the public. The RNA/HAND/DCBA/STNA/Laurelhurst neighborhoods adopted a Notification and Community Engagement policy, which includes context facade elevations and site plans, privacy and view impact analysis drawings and solar shading analysis. These tools are what the community feels they need to understand a project in context and the potential impacts.

30837 Brian Hochhalter

bhoch@teleport.com

2133 SE 32nd Ave

Portland OR

I think we should add to notification, not take away from the current process.

NAs should still get a certified letter, in my opinion.

Also, having the notification meetings in the neighborhood where the development is located doesn't seem like too much of a burden for developers. A minimum meeting length and weekday hours seems reasonable as well.

I'd also like to see the lower threshold for notifications... people deserve to know about how their neighborhood is changing.

30838 Andrew Wilkins

andrewtaylorwilkins@gmail.com

850 NE 81st Ave

Portland OR

Thank you

Project.

For the past 2 years I've been the Land Use Chair for my neighborhood association. In that time we've had many new projects and developments. My first public meeting involved an architect who wanted to get ideas for how to make the project better fit in the neighborhood. Instead he got people lashing out at him and blaming him for problems on all sorts of issues, few related to this project. It was really sad to see so many people behaving so poorly...while only 1 or 2 people actually try to make helpful suggestions.

Fast forward to the first meeting I hosted. While the developer showed up, the only 'choices' we were given were basically fake choices, "Do you want this type of hardie siding or this other type". And then instead of allowing questions & responses in a nice calm fashion people did just about everything possible to turn this into a 'yell at a developer' session. Unsurprisingly, you could see the developers faces just glaze over; and from that moment forward we got no change. Meanwhile I had some mad citizen target me for hosting the meeting, because I'm obviously in-league with the developers. This resulted in an in-my-face, spittle-flying, rage yelling session directed at me for supporting decisions that literally happened before I'd even moved to Portland.

After multiple sessions of similar behavior I stopped bothering to host these sessions for by-right developments. It's a huge amount of effort, never created change, and only reached a small audience at a singular point in time. From that moment forward I just talked to the developers via email exchanges; got more and better info from asking questions, giving them time to respond, and then posted their content on our neighborhood associations website. This

30839 Matt Otis

matt.otis@gmail.com

3828 SE Clinton

Portland OR

Neighborhood Contact Code Update Project:

I feel that the following 4 points at least should be changed in the proposed update:

1) A14 day timeline for a required applicant meeting with the community prior to a development permit submittal would be far too short. The community would be misled if they were to think they could have any design input as the plans may be too far along for any real design input to be effective. Early input, as long as 60 days prior to permitting (as adopted by the Richmond Neighborhood Assn.), would be a much more effective participation for neighborhoods.

2) A community meeting should be called whenever a building larger than 15,000 sq. ft. , containing 5 units, or 3 stories tall is being considered. The current trigger for a community meeting for buildings of 25,000 s.f. ignores the impact that buildings on our typical 5,000 s.f. foot lots, containing multiple units & 3 stories tall would have on our neighborhood. A proposed building with high traffic use (e.g., an event space, UPS, grocery store, commercial space, a cell tower) should also be a trigger for a community meeting.

3) Drawings posted on proposed building sites presently have no requirement to show context with neighborhood building facades and site plans. I recommend that posted drawings show the new building to adjacent neighboring buildings to allow the community to see the new building & the site plan in the context of its surroundings.

30840 Bonnie Bray

e.bonnie.bray@gmail.com

3634 SE Clinton St.

Portland OR