

Brett Schulz

#123686 | May 7, 2020

Testimony to **Portland City Council** on the **Residential Infill Project, Recommended Draft**

Please consider revising the language in RIP that allows duplexes, triplexes and fourplexes to instead say 2, 3 or 4 units, attached or detached. This will allow for greater flexibility in site layout and allow smaller scale structures that are more compatible with the single family zones.

Testimony is presented without formatting.

We the undersigned neighbors of the proposed zone change at 1032 North Sumner Street do strongly oppose the zoning change, from residential to commercial mixed use. The residents of this area moved into a residentially zoned neighborhood by choice. We are NOT in a mixed-use area. The proposed changes will adversely affect the character of the neighborhood in size, scope and density, directly contradicting the purpose of zoning. The code stipulates that CM2 should COMPLIMENT the surrounding neighborhood taking height and design into consideration. CM2 should be directly accessible to transit according to Portland's zoning regulations. This is not the case with 1032 North Sumner Street. The proposed zone change is incompatible with the surrounding residential homes. 1032 N Sumner Street is in the middle of a residential area that is surrounded on 3 sides by properties that are zoned CM2 just blocks away. There is no need to alter residential zoning in a residential area when CM2 zoning exists 2 blocks away along the Albina/Alberta/Killingsworth corridors.

Name	Address	Email
John Moller John and Nadine Moller	Nadine Moller 5/17/2020 5204 N Michigan Ave	JPM40447@gmail.com
Geoff Brewer	5236 N. Michigan Ave	
JASON BORUM	5226 N. MICHIGAN AV	JASANBORUM@gmail.com
Josh Evans	934 N Sumner	joshuad@gmail.com
Peter Martinez	934 N Sumner	pemartm95@gmail.com
Celina Sanchez Crowell	924 N. Gummer St.	celinasanchez@comcast.net
Anthony Crowell	924 N. Gummer St.	ezcrow@msn.com
Kamryn Williams	904 N Sumner	kaminwilliams@gmail.com
Benn & Alex May	933 N Webster St	creeyes@gmail.com
Dylan Camus	5117 N Michigan Ave	dylancamus93@gmail.com
Marley King	5117 N Michigan Ave	marley.king@olive.com
Malaca & Stanley Nicholas	5107 N. Michigan Ave	
Casey Mong	934 N Webster St	casey.mong@mc.com
Michelle Knight	5218 N Michigan Ave	zasture@yahoo.com

Nadine Moller
5204 N. Michigan Ave.
Portland, OR 97217

Due to the Covid 19
pandemic, we were
restricted in getting
to all neighbors.
Those who were
approached unanimously
opposed to zoning
change.

N. Moller

Nadine Moller

#144050 | May 7, 2020

Testimony to **Portland City Council** on the **Residential Infill Project, Recommended Draft**

Petition attached.

Testimony is presented without formatting.

190093

Jeanette Wagner <jeanettew333@gmail.com>

Fwd: letter

1 message

apmullock@yahoo.com <apmullock@yahoo.com>
To: jeanettew333@gmail.com

Wed, May 6, 2020 at 4:01 PM

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Adrienne Mullock <apmullock@yahoo.com>
Date: May 5, 2020 at 8:05:03 PM PDT
To: Drew YoungSpring <drewyoungspring@gmail.com>, Adrienne Mullock <apmullock@yahoo.com>
Subject: letter

May 5, 2020

City Council
Residential Infill Project Testimony
1221 SW Fourth Avenue, Room 130
Portland, OR 97204

Honorable Mayor and city Commissioners,

RE:

Case File LU 19-168681 LDS

PC # 19-123456

I am a homeowner and resident of the Collins View Neighborhood. I received a notice from the City of Portland regarding a hearing on a proposal on my street. This proposal involves tearing down a single-family home to build four narrow and tall condos.

I am extremely concerned about the proposed construction. I live four homes down from the home that will be torn down and I oppose this construction because adding 4 small condos with one garage each will (1) generate extra street parking on Lobelia St; (2) there is no sidewalk on the street and having cars parked in the street at the top of this steep hill will be dangerous for pedestrians in this neighborhood; (3) this neighborhood does not have adequate public transportation for high density housing; (4) increased density will overwhelm our street and the natural areas that we protect in our neighborhood.

I understand that the Collins View Neighborhood Association (CVNA), a recognized Portland Neighborhood Association, sent a letter to you on December 14, 2019 questioning aspects of the proposed plan and stating concerns about our livability. I join my neighborhood association in

190093

expressing that the plan fails to address our unique geographical and transportation infrastructure challenges. Please reconsider this plan in light of the concerns addressed in this letter.

Sincerely,



Adrienne Mullock

8816 SW 8th Ave

Portland OR 97219

I am also a homeowner at the bottom of the hill with the same concerns. There's already many issues around traffic, road conditions and erosion on our street. Adding four townhouses would add to the problems we already have.

Jeanette Wagner
8901 SW 8th Ave
Portland, Oregon 97219

 **Jeanette Wagner**
8901 SW 8th Ave.
Portland, OR 97219-4727 

PORTLAND
OR 972

07 MAY 2020
PM 5 L



*City Council
Residential Infill Project Testimony
1221 SW 4th Ave. Room 130
Portland, Oregon 97204*

97204-190021



Jeanette Wagner

#144061 | May 7, 2020

Testimony to **Portland City Council** on the **Residential Infill Project, Recommended Draft**

Letter attached.

Testimony is presented without formatting.

May 5, 2020

City Council
Residential Infill Project Testimony
1221 SW Fourth Avenue, Room 130
Portland, OR 97204

Honorable Mayor and city Commissioners,

RE:
Case File LU 19-168681 LDS
PC # 19-123456

I am a homeowner and resident of the Collins View Neighborhood. I received a notice from the City of Portland regarding a hearing on a proposal on my street. This proposal involves tearing down a single-family home to build four narrow and tall condos.

I am extremely concerned about the proposed construction. I live four homes down from the home that will be torn down and I oppose this construction because adding 4 small condos with one garage each will (1) generate extra street parking on Lobelia St; (2) there is no sidewalk on the street and having cars parked in the street at the top of this steep hill will be dangerous for pedestrians in this neighborhood; (3) this neighborhood does not have adequate public transportation for high density housing; (4) increased density will overwhelm our street and the natural areas that we protect in our neighborhood; (5) I live at the bottom of the hill in a rainy city and I have concerns about how this construction project would affect all neighbors down stream.

I understand that the Collins View Neighborhood Association (CVNA), a recognized Portland Neighborhood Association, sent a letter to you on December 14, 2019 questioning aspects of the proposed plan and stating concerns about our livability. I join my neighborhood association in expressing that the plan fails to address our unique geographical and transportation infrastructure challenges. Please reconsider this plan in light of the concerns addressed in this letter.

Sincerely,
Adrienne Mullock
8816 SW 8th Ave
Portland OR 97219



Ms. Adrienne Mullock
8816 SW 8th Ave
Portland, OR 97219-4726

CM

PORTLAND OR 972
07 MAY 2020 PM 4 L



City Council
Residential Infill Project Testimony
1221 SW 4th Ave
Room 130
Portland OR 97204



97204-190021

Adrienne Mullock

#144051 | May 12, 2020

Testimony to **Portland City Council** on the **Residential Infill Project, Recommended Draft**

Letter attached.

Testimony is presented without formatting.

Peter Wilmarth

#133815 | May 14, 2020

Testimony to Portland City Council on the Residential Infill Project, Recommended Draft

There are many worrisome aspects to the poorly conceived RIP plan to overturn established residential zoning in Portland. One of the most short sighted ideas is to: "Eliminate the parking requirements to reduce the cost of housing and prioritize greenspace" Increasing residential density, while undercutting parking requirements, will lead to clogged streets, horrific parking problems and infrastructure overload. It will not prioritize greenspace- conflating the two issues is a disservice. Urban planning is a complex, multi-faceted discipline. I'm very concerned that the "one size fits all- let the market decide", approach to our residential affordability and environmental problems will unravel decades successful zoning. There is no magic bullet for urban problems. The City of Portland needs to take a step back from the overwrought RIP concept and address the urban issues individually, effectively and realistically. The temptation to solve all problems with a vast simplistic solution obscures the irreversible damage that may occur, as thousands of property owners and developers struggle to cram the maximum number of tiny units into over burdened neighborhoods. No one will be able to stop the flood or turn back the clock, if that occurs. There are many specific approaches that can be taken to address poverty and housing affordability. but they all cost more money than we've been willing to commit. Until we are ready, as a society, to spend what's needed to address these problems it's a dangerous delusion to believe that an over-reaching zoning revision can substitute. I'm very concerned the lovely City of Portland is about to leap into an unprecedented experiment with potentially devastating consequences. We don't need to do this. Let's take time and think this through. "First do no harm" applies as much to city planning as to medicine.

Testimony is presented without formatting.

Brandy Steffen

#133820 | May 15, 2020

Testimony to **Portland City Council** on the **Residential Infill Project, Recommended Draft**

I'm very excited to see that you are moving forward with increasing density and affordability within the city. We would love to see more adus in our neighborhood. We also love the idea of a more diverse income through the use of affordable housing.

Testimony is presented without formatting.

Robert Markle

#133825 | May 17, 2020

Testimony to Portland City Council on the Residential Infill Project, Recommended Draft

I support a more phased approach to increasing neighborhood density that provide neighborhoods a slower rate of encroachment. Start with narrower R2.5 zones that phase into wider zones based on specific criteria over time. Also, the proposed policy does not appear equitable. There is an appearance that the historic preservation policy is not consistently applied and therefore gives the impression of favoring more wealthy residents. For example, why do Ladds Addition, Laurelhurst, and Irvington have narrow or non-existent R2.5 zones while lower income/value neighborhoods have wider R2.5 zones? All historic homes deserve equal protection.

Testimony is presented without formatting.

Elyssa Kiva

#133828 | May 18, 2020

Testimony to Portland City Council on the Residential Infill Project, Recommended Draft

I support the Residential Infill Project because it will increase access to affordable housing in Portland. There is no reason for it to be illegal to build one of the cheapest forms of housing. Increased infill is how we fight climate change and housing insecurity in our city. By allowing more people to live in a smaller amount of space more there is less need for car trips, tighter communities are fostered, and Portland will become a better more livable city. Please support the Residential Infill project!

Testimony is presented without formatting.

Matthew Meskill

#133829 | May 18, 2020

Testimony to Portland City Council on the Residential Infill Project, Recommended Draft

Hello, Thank you for allowing me to submit testimony. I'll keep it short. People need affordable places to live. And we can't keep subsidizing suburban sprawl. The residential infill project will only allow what already happens all over the world. And when it's done properly, the result is beautiful neighborhoods. Don't let the NIMBYs scare you with their cries that the sky is falling! Those same NIMBYs would probably visit Europe and think it was "so charming." And it is. So why can't we have that here? The answer is we can. If you allow it.

Testimony is presented without formatting.

Matthew Meskill

#133830 | May 18, 2020

Testimony to **Portland City Council** on the **Residential Infill Project, Recommended Draft**

I support the RIP. I would like to point out some of the key phrases I see in the arguments against RIP. I'll just leave them here for you to read and consider: "encroachment" "stop the flood" "turn back the clock" "woefully unaesthetic" "wold destroy Portland as we know it" "unprecedented experiment" "not in keeping with the neighborhood"

Testimony is presented without formatting.

Janet Rothermel

#133835 | May 19, 2020

Testimony to Portland City Council on the Residential Infill Project, Recommended Draft

The proposal to change zoning on this property to multi-housing would significantly exacerbate the existing traffic + pedestrian congestion on SW Boundary St - and negatively affect the liveability for all of the single family homeowners in this neighborhood. The Cedar Sinai business employs a large number of people who drive + park on SW Boundary St 24/7. Additionally, elderly residents of Cedar Sinai utilize SW Boundary St - and the surrounding neighborhood streets for walking and wheelchair travel. There are no sidewalks on SW Boundary to support existing foot traffic! There is also daily foot traffic across Boundary St between the Robison Home and Rose Schnitzer Manor. Adding additional density to this already restricted area of the neighborhood is not an intelligent action to pursue. Finally, the SW Boundary St surface has not been improved in the 20+ years I've owned my home. Moving more vehicles on this route will further + more rapidly degrade the road. Please do not approve the zoning change on this property! Thank you - Janet Rothermel.

Testimony is presented without formatting.

Sharon Wood Wortman

#133838 | May 19, 2020

Testimony to **Portland City Council** on the **Residential Infill Project, Recommended Draft**

My husband Ed Wortman and I are in favor of increased density in Portland in general and in particular the implementation of the Residential Infill Project.

Testimony is presented without formatting.

Frank DiMarco

#133852 | May 22, 2020

Testimony to Portland City Council on the Residential Infill Project, Recommended Draft

With opposition growing for the hopelessly convoluted Residential Infill Project (R.I.P.) and developers pushing for a so-called Deeper Affordability Bonus, the Portland City Council should let voters decide the destiny and density of Portland neighborhoods. The R.I.P. was pushed by ex-builder lobbyist and ex-Mayor Hales and trumpeted by developers as a way to create “affordable” housing along transportation corridors. The concept has now been perverted into something completely different: picture that great old bungalow nextdoor bulldozed and a blockhouse 6-plex plopped down in its place. Face it, developers do this and then move on. Experts have testified that R.I.P. will have little or no effect on affordability. While we still have a democracy, let’s all urge the City Council to give Portlanders a vote on this issue in November 2020. If the Council won’t do this, Portland voters need to ask why.

Testimony is presented without formatting.

190093



2

story



teresa mcgrath

#133853 | May 23, 2020

Testimony to Portland City Council on the Residential Infill Project, Recommended Draft

"That leaves Multnomah and Washington counties as the only counties that have yet to receive approval to begin reopening. Washington County applied Friday and is targeting a June 1 reopening date, while Multnomah County is taking a more deliberative approach because of its size, population density and diversity, and has yet to apply." hi, per gov. kate brown's statement above.... density is one of the culprits, so essentially what rip is proposing is now old fashioned, and outdated... myopic thinking won't help portland, and the vision here at city hall is the wrong approach... just the fact that yards, and children/pets don't have green spaces to play is a travesty... that is the future of rip and hb2001, kotek's idea is nightmare legislation... the density argument allows hot concrete areas that are not climate friendly, besides our infrastructure can't handle it.. we submit testimony frequently and to the map app... just cancel rip, rip it up, and actually tackle some housing affordability, for example, the restoration of small homes... razing an affordable home for two market-rate homes is wrong, and this will bite you back in the long run... you disrespect restore oregon, the oregon historical society, and other preservations groups, like the architectual heritage center, and other groups.... the 1953 house at 736 ne sumner was demolished last yr, and the lot just sat there... then the lot sold recently... the neighborhood is upset... why allow developers to call the shots and decisions, it only makes portland worse and the stain, is clearly on portland... is that what you wish? so many oppose this disaster plan... grow up and toss it out! thx teresa mcgrath and nat kim 3344 ne 15 97212/442 ne sumner rip the house via the web photo along with the empty lot pic, and rip the rip plans, they are outdated and create density...

Testimony is presented without formatting.

From: [Council Clerk – Testimony](#)
To: [Commissioner Hardesty](#); [Eudaly, Chloe](#); [Fritz, Amanda](#); [Wheeler, Ted](#)
Cc: [BPS Residential Infill](#); [Aiten, Herico](#); [Bradley, Derek](#); [Carrillo, Yesenia](#); [Eale, Ocean](#); [Pierce, Meeseon Kwon](#); [Washington, Mustafa](#); [Williams, Tia](#)
Subject: RIP Testimony: FW: toss the rip/added density is wrong and myopic
Date: Tuesday, May 26, 2020 9:14:36 AM
Attachments: [image.png](#)

From: TERESA MCGRATH <bone1953@msn.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 23, 2020 5:58 AM

To: Council Clerk – Testimony <CCTestimony@portlandoregon.gov>; Wheeler, Mayor <MayorWheeler@portlandoregon.gov>; Commissioner Fritz <amanda@portlandoregon.gov>; Commissioner Hardesty <joann@portlandoregon.gov>; Commissioner Eudaly <chloe@portlandoregon.gov>

Subject: toss the rip/added density is wrong and myopic

"That leaves Multnomah and Washington counties as the only counties that have yet to receive approval to begin reopening. Washington County applied Friday and is targeting a June 1 reopening date, while Multnomah County is taking a more deliberative approach because of its size, population density and diversity, and has yet to apply."

hi,

per gov. kate brown's statement above....

density is one of the culprits, so essentially what rip is proposing is now old fashioned, and outdated...

myopic thinking won't help portland, and the vision here at city hall is the wrong approach...

just the fact that yards, and children/pets don't have green spaces to play is a travesty...

that is the future of rip and hb2001, kotek's idea is nightmare legislation...

the density argument allows hot concrete areas that are not climate friendly, besides our infrastructure can't handle it..

we submit testimony frequently and to the map app...

just cancel rip, rip it up, and actually tackle some housing affordability, for

example, the restoration of small homes...

razing an affordable home for two market-rate homes is wrong, and this will bite you back in the long run...

you disrespect restore oregon, the oregon historical society, and other preservations groups, like the architectural

heritage center, and other groups....

the 1953 house at 736 ne sumner was demolished last yr, and the lot just sat there...

then the lot sold recently...

the neighborhood is upset...

thx

teresa mcgrath and nat kim

3344 ne 15 97212/442 ne sumner

rip the house via the web photo below, and rip the rip plans, they are outdated and create density...





Teresa McGrath

#144049 | May 23, 2020

Testimony to Portland City Council on the Residential Infill Project, Recommended Draft

"That leaves Multnomah and Washington counties as the only counties that have yet to receive approval to begin reopening. Washington County applied Friday and is targeting a June 1 reopening date, while Multnomah County is taking a more deliberative approach because of its size, population density and diversity, and has yet to apply." hi, per gov. kate brown's statement above.... density is one of the culprits, so essentially what rip is proposing is now old fashioned, and outdated... myopic thinking won't help portland, and the vision here at city hall is the wrong approach... just the fact that yards, and children/pets don't have green spaces to play is a travesty... that is the future of rip and hb2001, kotek's idea is nightmare legislation... the density argument allows hot concrete areas that are not climate friendly, besides our infrastructure can't handle it.. we submit testimony frequently and to the map app... just cancel rip, rip it up, and actually tackle some housing affordability, for example, the restoration of small homes... razing an affordable home for two market-rate homes is wrong, and this will bite you back in the long run... you disrespect restore oregon, the oregon historical society, and other preservations groups, like the architectual heritage center, and other groups.... the 1953 house at 736 ne sumner was demolished last yr, and the lot just sat there... then the lot sold recently... the neighborhood is upset...

Testimony is presented without formatting.