

Online Survey Responses

431 online surveys were submitted between November 9, 2017, and February 19, 2018. The 3,438 responses to the survey's 14 substantive questions are reproduced verbatim below. Demographic data has been excluded from this review.

1. What qualities make a historic resource significant?

A connection to local history; architectural integrity or rarity or ubiquity; tells a story about who we were. Could also be symbolic or aesthetically valuable.
Rare example in *original and exceptional* condition that is an outstanding representation of a style or period.
Association with developments, individuals, and events that shaped or reflect our history; distinctive architectural style reflecting a level of craftsmanship and design; the potential to tell a story about our past.
This is the most critical question. Depends who asks and who decides. Significance today is based on an argumentative approach. It's esoteric, elite, and blockaded by credentials. So significance is the eye of the beholder. Currently, most historic resources focus on architectural features or architects. But significance can and should also consider events, movements, locally specific individuals, distinct cultural traditions, or religious groups.
Historic events associated with the resource; architectural significance; neighborhood context
Architectural elements, original building features and interior features, pre-1940
Political, social and economic history and architectural style and community design
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Excellence of design, workmanship, and architectural quality of a building or district• Association with significant historical, cultural, or social events
Architectural and cultural significance. Contribution to neighborhood character and cohesion.
age, design, construction materials, style, cultural significance, builder, neighborhood
Age, architectural uniqueness, its placement with in historic streetscapes, significant events or people associated with the structure.
Historic events & people at the location. Age and state of restoration or original features.
A Story, Architecture, significance, neighborhood history
Age, uniqueness, connection to historic event or person(s)
It is usable by more than one person or family; it is beautiful or records something significant about our history but also isn't just another secret way to redline and racially/economically discriminate against density, which is what I believe most historic districts are.
A particular connection with a notable point in time
architectural interest, historic use of property, contribution historic resource made to the growth of Portland.
Age, significance in the community, original.

architectural features , significance to a time period , culture , important person
Association with a regionally important person in history or event/pattern in our region's historic.
An exemplary or unique representation of an architectural style or period, or the work of a master architect.
Has the potential to yield information, or yields information, important to our region's history or prehistory. Information that contributes to our understanding of history or prehistory in Portland and the wider region.
It is a consummate, well-preserved (or highly likely to be restored and taken care of) example of a period, or style.
Historic and ongoing contribution as a community or cultural space, or broadly acknowledged architectural/aesthetic significance.
architecture, linkage to important historical events, representation of a period
Having a significant historic story
Strong example of its kind; referenced in literature, meaning some reader might come looking for it; connected with a historic figure, again because someone might wish to view it; high percentage of original materials and workmanship, giving restorers of similar buildings an accurate guide.
Architecture, historic significance (person or event), cultural significance for community
Architectural Quality, history, place in streetscape, vistas and views, function within neighborhood
Association with an important local, regional or national historical figure; representative of a particular architectural style or type of building or object, etc. (especially one that is rare) - but also important if there are several examples of a similar style or period in one area forming a sort of "ensemble". Association with well-known or typically regional architect. Association with locally (or nationally) important event. Forms part of a historic or current ethnic grouping that considers - or could consider - itself a coherent neighborhood. If it provides affordable housing or affordable commercial rent, especially to small businesses.
Architectural characteristics - representative of a particular era or style; rarity; contributing to the historic (including social) heritage of a neighborhood or ethnic area of the city; age; connection to important family; anchoring a number of other historically-deserving buildings; offering affordable space for housing, small businesses or offices
architecture, history, age
A building, set of buildings or cultural resource that tells an important story locally, at the state level or nationally.
Age, historic characteristics, location
Age of building
I like old buildings! Things I like about them often include mixed-use character that contribute to efficient, vibrant cities, quality of construction, and attention to detail.
Architectural quality
Historical, cultural, and/or social significance
connection to the neighborhood's history, to an important person, event, craftsman style, beauty
culture, architecture, context

Exceptionally unique age that is significantly different than surrounding resources
When it was built, how the structure was used. It is important to keep and maintain the cities' oldest buildings. This is our history.
An individual property or group of properties that reflects significant craftsmanship or historical significance, without which the community would be worse off.
Design characteristics - quality- craftsmanship, community or neighborhood identity, association with significant historical events and individuals. Exemplary examples of historic cultural character.
Contribution to historic events or people
Substantial role played in community
age, provenance, design and architectural style, history, importance to block or neighborhood,
Constructed pre-ww2, distinctive architecture or outstanding representative of a building typology. Historic even or people associates with the place.
It's siting, if it contributes to public access, compliments views, creates a public space or amenity. The style, the age, the architect, the history.
Interesting or site specific details, historical significance, educational value
The structure is an outstanding example of past architectural styles or craftsmanship; The site or structure was created by a "master" architect, builder, or designer; Does the structure still convey its historic significance through the retention of its original design and materials
period architecture that is a sound example of homes/business built in the era
they are resources that illustrate the historical aspects, circumstances, connections, uses, culture, context and meaning of our shared national memory.
Association with significant events, persons, architecture or archeological information.
old and historically significant
Architecture anchored in yesteryear was designed in a much better fashion and ushered into corporeality with genuine craftsmanship difficult to find in America anymore. Civic pride and a much more intact social fabric demanded buildings be built to a drastically more exalted magnitude of aesthetic as well as structural standard. Rogue developers weren't allowed to ruin cities back then.
Age and beauty of the building, for example not cookie cutter skinny ugly houses.
Age of structure, architectural details, historical value, structure quality, rarity of resources used compared to current construction practices and materials available.
History And the fact that the neighborhood largely exists as it did when it was built. It's not necessary to have been unchanged but changes should be harmonious with existing and original historical styles and materials.
those listed by the National Parks Service
Architecture, Historical Significance, interior Authentic to time period
history, persons or events associated with property, style, innovations, beauty, unique features, art, literature/ music associated with property, shade. light protected by property, barrier
Its status as a locally recognized icon, the viability of its upkeep/rehabilitation, its age
History and or architectural integrity, rarity, or typify a type.
The structure year build
Known architect, quality of materials and construction, classic design, location
Materials, craftsmanship, age etc
Limited quantity, reflective of specific time in our city's growth, example that can't be replicated

Beauty. Historic story behind it. Maintaining the beautiful.
Being historic. Period. By definition, there cannot be any “new” historic resources, so any that are still here are significant. Historic elements of the built environment not only connect us with our history, but, critically, were part of a non-automotive infrastructure we desperately need to preserve, restore, and replicate in order to protect the environment and humanity from climate change. We are rapidly losing key components of a car-free future we desperately need.
Historic architectural spaces should be examples of high quality or represent styles, features, or methods that are worthy of preservation for future generations to remember and enjoy.
Significance in local history (e.g. a building that was the headquarters for a famous local business); distinctive architectural style.
Its ties to the past. Its physical appearance linking it to a specific style or period. Its unique beauty compared to more contemporary buildings. Its ability to remind us of our past
Evidence of quality design and workmanship in one or more buildings in a setting that respects their origin; active lives being lived today in those buildings; appreciation of the resource by a diverse community, both inside and outside the resource area.
Communication
Longevity
Human scale, (enhances the public realm) Design, quality of architecture Age, representation of a recognized style/ or uniqueness Details, fractals, construction materials that ornament the public realm (details and ornament are valuable to humans, engaging the eye, stimulating interest) The stories about Portland’s history, famous people and past way of life that the building represents (deepening our appreciation of the 4th dimension of our lives) Historic buildings have a value for current and future generations way beyond their monetary value.
History of the people who lived there, history of the neighborhood, historical details not found in modern homes, many of Portland's older neighborhoods have a character that differs from modern neighborhoods, year built
Craftsmanship, condition, period design features
A home or neighborhood that is accurate to the past.
The role the resource has played in the social or cultural life of the community. Architectural interest and integrity of design and materials are very important but attention also needs to be given to the vernacular buildings which are the ones with which the majority of the population interacts and often contribute most to the sense of place and community continuity.
Architecture, era, connection to historical events, cultural value, tells a story
One property or a collection of properties that have unique craftsmanship, historical significance, important design features, important cultural or ethnic history, are examples of the time they were built in, are important for historic Main Streets such as Hawthorne and Belmont (which bring huge economic boosts to the area).
Human scale, enhancement of the public realm Design, quality of architecture Age, representation of a recognized style/ or uniqueness Details, fractals, construction materials
Age. Significance to the neighborhood. People who have lived in it or types of businesses in it. Architecture.
Age, Maintenance level, typicality

Significance in neighborhood (Laurelhurt, Alameda, Eastmoreland, etc) having distinctive styles as a whole. Or iconic architectural style needing preservation
Architectural design character, affordability
Age, design, unique features or examples of unifying aesthetic. Value to future generations of same.
Age, connection to important person, architectural characteristics, contains affordable housing or offices, connection to transportation history, connection to ethnic histories, connection to Portland history, connection to social history, rarity, and provides context to a neighborhood.
Ties to the past give a richness to the present and a guide for the future.
age of home and style
Quality of workmanship, materials used and design. Retention of original construction materials. Designed by a significant architect or building was once occupied by a notable historical figure. Or an important moment in history occurred at that location.
History! Aesthetic appeal, harmony of structures, craftsmanship, public can walk around in or around buildings, green spaces in/around buildings
Places that have meaning to residents, such as the homes of influential cultural figures or community gathering places; architectural or design qualities that are unique or particularly well-executed, or representative of a school of design, or a time and place.
Recognizing the importance of established neighborhoods and honoring those elements, not demolishing because it's a lot you can cram ugly housing, completely out of character with the established character and affordability of the area. THE HISTORIC HOMES- their story about residents, architects and the history of the region- the city- the counties- the states- our history!
Homes of architectural significance, built with craftsmanship and materials that are artful and done to last generations, with thought to the overall feel and well being of the neighborhood and community. These homes will never be built again, and should be preserved to maintain the livability and beauty of the entire city.
the beauty, excellent materials that last centuries, the history itself, the craftsmanship need to be documented and preserved
Heritage, cultural, and like the term "race" it is what persons identify as significant rather than a set criteria
Uniqic, Beauty, craftmenship, the whole of a neighborhood that have starter homes (for couple starting out, or for couples downsizing later in life) By infilling & destroying houses the city is destroying the beauty of older neighborhoods & its history
Architecture, History, Architect, Contribution to a neighborhood, historic to an ethnic group, materials, age.
Art, architecture, materials it is constructed from
Age, materials used, historic stories
The ability to preserve and recognize historically significant neighborhoods or properties without developer influence.
Old and in good shape
Age of building, contribution to neighborhood(this can include being of the same age as other homes in the same neighborhood), character and design.
Architecture, character, quality construction.
Longevity, distinctive architecture, neighborhood characteristics
Age, architectural style, neighborhood integration, historic significance
If it exhibits craftsmanship, style or historical significance representing a historical period or movement

Vintage, character, location, and history. Such resources serve to provide history and character to communities.
Any building that has been an integral part of Portland for >50 years.
None
Design, use, architectural character,
A few different things - often not overlapping: Unique design or concept different from modern resources. In the case of a neighborhood, a high density of historically / time specific design or a unique concept that would be lost if individual properties were changed. Documentation of resources in news / photos from the past.
Integrity of structure and respect for surrounding structures. Representative of the era.
Craftsmanship, traditional materials, quality construction, adherence to an established architectural style
unique, beautiful, history
Unique architecture or neighborhood ambience
The uniqueness of the resource, the quality and craftsmanship that makes the resource stand out compared to more modern houses that are much bigger and more ostentatious. Neighborhoods with older houses that are different from each other and fit in with each other maintain the character of the neighborhood. Newer structures are often much bigger and stick out like a sore thumb.
Preservation of original qualities and access to the community at large (through programming, events, etc)
architectural significance, code standards and historical ownership history
Uniformity of design. Affordability of older houses compare to million-dollar replacement homes after destruction of original home.
Length of time it has existed, how well it has held up, & how it was initially established.
Craftsmanship, design that represents a period in local history
What happened there.
Preservation of well worked and thought out plans and designs of the past.
The historic property or properties reflect a past that cannot be restored once it is demolished. It has historical or architectural elements that current and future generations can enjoy and learn from.
An individual home or group of homes that reflects significant craftsmanship or historical design without which the community will be worse off.
architecture, history, importance
Quality construction, design, longevity
Physical attributes (architectural, era or other) that can't be duplicated or faked combined with the emotional connection to the history of these places.
The preservation of beautiful homes. Not the one that was demolished at the end of your street with the intent to maximize profits for developers.
Per national guidelines
Previous importance/activity, quality of materials used in construction, layering of the urban fabric
How much money the homes cost
Preserves the integrity of neighborhood and home. Homes of architectural significance are preserved.
Style, Construction, Condition, Familiarity as an icon to longtime residents
Social and cultural significance. Architectural quality.

Architecture of the homes No commercial development Single family homes that are set back from the street Sidewalks and lots of trees
The architecture and/or craftsmanship of a property or group of properties and its/their historic significance. Do they tell a story about the history of the neighborhood? History is worth preserving.
It clarifies a point in time, perhaps when raw materials were plentiful, and demonstrates the skill of early builders. Older buildings are history lessons.
Uniqueness, historical significance, and whether or not there are any other examples of the type or period.
It provides our most affordable housing. (In my neighborhood, Apartments in Historic buildings rent for 1/2 the price per square foot than in newer buildings). They are beautiful. They provide diversity in architecture (unlike Vancouver BC where they've demolished everything). They show us our history. They are incredible financial assets for drawing tourists to particular neighborhoods.
Unique, representative of the area/era.
Age, Quality of Construction, Preserved Original Features, Famous Architect, Owned by a Famous Portlander, Unusual or Classic Architectural Style, Building That Played an Important Role in Portland's History, Part of a Historic District like Peacock Lane
Neighborhood preservation.
Building characteristics, aesthetics, period of time of construction and historical significance
Age, history, uniqueness
Growing up in a historic District, It's important to be able to keep the history of neighborhoods intact.
preservation of old historic neighborhoods in the city
Design characteristics - quality- craftsmanship, community or neighborhood identity, association with significant historical events and individuals. Exemplary examples of historic cultural character.
Design characteristics - quality- craftsmanship, community or neighborhood identity, association with significant historical events and individuals. Exemplary examples of historic cultural character.
Architecture age, but also neighborhood character, such as houses built at the same time
An individual or group of historic properties can help bolster the look, feel and value of an area. It creates an identity which can bring communities together and build relationships between stakeholders. Historic resources create cache and credibility for a city and help to preserve not only the history associated with the resources but also natural resources that would otherwise be used for replacement of historic resources that may be demolished.
Age, authenticity
A house or a group of houses with nice craftsmanship or have historical significance and without it our neighborhood would be diminished.
A sense of history that can only happen when old homes are preserved and maintained.
Maintaining older structures in a manner that makes the historic parts identifiable to help identify which parts of a city were built at which times.
Architectural integrity, age, physical context, the story of the resource
An individual property or group of properties that reflects significant craftsmanship or historical significance, without which the community would be worse off.
The structure's traceable history and architectural adherence to its era.
A historically significant event occurring there, a historically significant person who resided there. Or perhaps it was built by a famous architect or in a historically unique way.

Proof that the house was built as part of a planned, older neighborhood and the house has exhibits most of the original floor plan.
The neighborhood and the preservation of the resource.
Architecture, history of property and significance to surrounding neighborhood.
Unusual architecture, unusual enough that people would make a point of going to see it.
Materials, craftsmanship, scale, detail, ornament, it's story (or historic use), form
Are you talking about an historical archive or an historical building or a person which historical information? The question is ambiguous.
Design, association with historic events or persons, its reflection of the story of a place, materials and craftsmanship
Current use or potential for future use. Cultural and economic impact on the community. Significant architecture.
Distinctive, indicative of a specific style not widely represented, historically significant actions taking place at location
Objective value, not NIMBY drawbridge economics
Possibly having unusual aesthetic qualities or having an association with important events or people of the past
age, design/architectural style, neighborhood context, historic connections, ethnic, not size
It tells a UNIQUE story specific to the time period in which it was built, it is essentially unchanged since it was built.
I honestly don't know. Obvious ones to me would be: age, scarcity (few other examples), historical context or story, and condition (not in such poor condition that it can't be saved).
Cultural history, a place that has held meaning to an underrepresented group or represents an early part of the place's past
Provenance that shows usefulness and/or meaning to a past local community. Bonus if significance has carried through to present day.
Age, design, representation of an original neighborhood aesthetic or design
Uniqueness
Age
Importance in history
Age; Architecture; significance to city's cultural history
Architecture and quality of materials...details
Who the owner and the builders of the property are. Excellent craftsmanship, not average homes built in the last century.
A tie to a specific period or event in time.
Age, appearance, events surrounding it, charm, style, quality
If a house is to be "historic", I feel it should not have any remodeling, modern updates ie. windows, entryway changes, garage, dormers, etc. It should reflect the way it was originally built.
Individual buildings that are exemplary of a style and era. A historic resource is a living museum of a time.
Providing a puzzle piece for illustrating a historic element of our cities history - homes, neighborhoods, small businesses, government buildings - allowing us to learn from our history - they should both stand alone and contribute to a community
Qualities include:
1. Age

2. Personality
3. Character
4. Can be renovated if in poor condition
5. reflects the building practices of earlier generations
Actual historic value, such as significant resident, architect, or historic event took place in the resource.
Architectural merit; historical significance for other reasons; association with historic personalities.
If the resource is 100 years or older and still in working shape. It should only apply to individual buildings that exhibit unique architectural design features that aren't commonly found elsewhere in the nearby area.
To me, the loss of what little diversity we had in inner portland is more important than preserving historic resources.
I think the bar should be set pretty high. If the property played a particular part in local history.
Preservation of historic entities that are being destroyed for profit.
Unique, Historically significant in a specific respect.
Age, aesthetic and cultural significance to a community
Unique art or architecture or an excellent specimen of an architectural period.
Preservation of historical aesthetics
An historical event or figure related to a building or structure. A building with architecture design from a past era at least 75 to 100 yrs old
A unique function and/or architecture that is either very rare or very particular to its area. In particular, resources that are available to or provide value to the general public rather than solely private owners should be considered particularly significant to a community.
Unique and non-replicable features, ties to a particularly significant moment or person in history.
Age alone does not make a historic resource significant (at least not in Oregon where nothing is more than a couple hundred years old at the most).
'Neighborhoods' are not historic. They are ever-evolving reflections of our city and our culture. I imagine some significant urban planning and street layouts could be significant, but when the protections ignore the planning (streets and sidewalks and trees) and apply protections directly to homes - not what is significant - they miss the mark.
Unique preservation of specific object, not a blanket application, such as a neighborhood
Architectural significance either by design or builder. Age is not determinative.
1. Integrity of home to original design
2. Social/economic design cohesiveness-does the home relate to others around it in scale and material?
3. Social/economic factors for the house/s being built-special circumstances (post WWII housing)
4. Has the original design retained usefulness and pleasing home layout over time?
Access and history and warm feeling associated with it.
There should be significant architectural features
It should be significantly unchanged, unique, and have limited inventory.
Keep Home prices stable and limiting multifamily units being built
It should actually be historic, either because of its architecture or history, meaning the significance of the people who lived or worked there. Historic designation should not simply be a means of

preventing infill or redevelopment or otherwise circumvent generally applicable land use rules and policies.
Sets the character of the neighborhood; respects the expectations residents had when they first moved in.
Age, condition, events that happened there, history of the area in general.
Year built, architecture, especially facade. Period features.
Age
Recognition of an era
A coherent set of design attributes (architectural, landscape, planning) specific to a time in history that best represents the historic influences (economic, geographic, architectural, technological, cultural, ethnic) *as understood through the lens of that period.*
One of the massive problems with the Eastmoreland proposal was a tunnel-vision focus on "style." Style should be dropped from the set of characteristics that determine significance since almost all architects decry style as a determining factor of their work. What is Frank Gehry's "style?" What is a "neo-gothic style?"
Instead, as the NPS guidelines suggest, it is the elements that influenced the design *as understood at the time* that need to be preserved, not the specific structural details themselves. So, for example, Eastmoreland was an "automobile suburb." Looking through the lens of contemporaneous automobile suburbs, was Eastmoreland (at some key point of its history) and exemplar of an automobile suburb?
irreplaceable
Significant historicity. Simply being old does not create significance.
Cannot answer. What does historic resource mean? How is that defined?
Actual historic events took place there
Important events/people. Special examples of period architecture.
Unique; someone important lived there; uniformly representative of an era; unaltered
Photos, architectural documents, newspaper clippings of the owners of the home, history of the area, street name changes.
Reliability of sources and research - codification of standards
Tied to a historic figure (i.e. the home of John Jacob Jingleheimer Schmidt), or a Home or building that is the best (and by this I mean the singular, top of the heap and only) example of a very specific building style that was important to the growth of architectural style after it was made.
Something important happened in that location, or the technique used to build the place was unique and changed how we do things from that point forward.
Timeless qualities. Will those seven generations from now consider this historic or be glad it was preserved? Craftsmanship. Cultural or documented historical value.
Unless you define "historic resource," this is too broad - do you mean a building, a tree, a whole neighborhood, a fountain? But basically it must have a value to the public and not just a value to the current owner or neighborhood. The value must relate to a culture or history that is shared by some group, represents an historic underpinning to the area, has a connection to an important historic figure, etc....
Representational of an era or period of significance. Or represents a unique cultural group that it significant.
Age, architecture, neighborhood, historical or heritage background and the surrounding trees

The architecture/character
Actual contact with historic people or events; cohesive architecture or a group of objects created at nearly the same time; a distinct style, that is no longer so prevalent.
Original architecture Continued public use Actively part of a tour or other regular for, of teaching about history
Extraordinary architecture (not just another bungalow). These buildings should be very few, not entire blocks of bungalows, or blocks of 30s mansions or 1910 mansions. Only a very few buildings are truly significant. No entire neighborhood is significant, at least not on the West Coast!
Facts
Only when it is a true historical site, no alteration and has historic event or people connected to the property
In Portland not a whole lot because NIMBYS Abuse the label
cultural or natural importance
Not sure
The architecture is in keeping with the particular nomenclature of a particular time and place.
Something that has significance in the history of Portland such as home of founding fathers, first original buildings of Portland, first churches. Significance should be to the community as a whole.
Uniqueness, quality, scarcity, beauty, history
Designed by renowned designer; associated with a famous person or key historical event; uniquely representative of a recognized architectural style.
Homes created in and contributing to a significant historical context or place. Similar time period and style of homes
Architecturally significant; premier example of a recognized historical style; period fixtures, windows and materials.
Uniqueness, does it attract tourism or local visits, significance.
Age; history; architectural detail;
Age, architect, something or someone interesting happened/lives there.
genuinely historical. NOT Eastmoreland
Keeping the neighborhood in tact. Houses may not be identical, but have a similar style that doesn't look odd.
Maintains the integrity of our neighborhoods.
A resource that is in its original state, and is of historic significance...not just old.
age, beauty, history
Architecture
Connection to nationally or regionally known historic figures or events. Very significant or singular example of historic building and architectural style
Unadulteration of historic features. Notable associated personages or events.
The quality and history of the architecture, the general character and history of the neighborhood, the likelihood of impending development devastation of that character.
Historically significant architecture and uniqueness.
age is most significant
Unique design, relationship with other homes in neighborhood
When the resource has a SPECIFIC, Portland-related history or style that is very uncommon.

It should be reserved for those resources that are a record of their time, either architecturally or socially. They could be inherently valuable to a community for an emotional reason, for example and event or person that has shaped the community in some way. Additionally, the designation should NOT be abused to protect the insignificant from progress. The resource should be able to stand on its own not be valued, not seen as this is better than what MIGHT be here in the future.
If it is an important and special representation of a particular period of history, a resource could be considered significant.
has original and unique qualities
Notable at the time of inception. Site of historic activity
Age, architecture of note, well-known architects, preservation of the integrity of original design (no significant later additions). Not just exterior but interior as well.
A structure's individual characteristics or individual history, not simply because it was built before WWII.
Major and recognizable historic significance. It should not be significant masked as a tool to usurping land use planning laws.
A resource that is unique and has architectural or structural interest often with a historic value as well.
It needs to have real historical value that a majority can appreciate. Just because a home is old, or a neighborhood has nice older homes is not reason enough to be a significant historic resource.
A building or house that hasn't undergone remodels, is in its original state and is unique in style that is no longer built.
Good representation of a noteworthy period in history.
Architecture, history of era and people
A small area with historically significant a similar issues to make it historic
It must be more than just old, it must truly be historic. The resource must have played an important role in the development of the area and one that has a long lasting recognition as a historic resource. Also, long term perspective is needed. 300-400 years from now is this resource still significant, not just because it's old but because of historical significance: ex. the first _____, a primary example of _____.
Age, beauty, uniqueness, historically relevant backstory. Being old or merely pre-existing is not enough.
Something old, at least 100 years old. Something which is rare and distinctive in style or material. Something judged so culturally significant that its loss would have a measurable negative effect.
I think truly historic old homes are significant and a collection of them could make a neighborhood significant
Significant history and architectural style that is "original to the period"
Quality of original construction; unique architectural character or a superb example of its type; aesthetic or historical (event) contribution to surrounding community
Age, unique in general or to the area, link to a historic event or person.
Extremely uncommon architecture, architecture that is unequivocally representative of a city, a resource which has had a documented (or widely understood and believed) role in an important historic event.
Outstanding architecture that speaks to people in ways they may not be able to articulate. Associations with people, places or events that shaped our community. Visible traces of economic, social, cultural trends indicating how we got where we are today.

Civic value and rarity.
A bungalow can't be architecturally significant because there are thousands of them across the city.
A private home is rarely a significant historic resource because the ability "to drive by and look at it" doesn't create significant value to any meaningful portion of the city population.
it's a part of our past, plus the buildings were built with quality materials...we can't demolish our history
Contribution to neighborhood character in combination with surrounding structures of the same period.
This should not be an evaluation of individual buildings, but of neighborhoods as they were originally planned, designed, and built.
Significance in architecture or historical activity that occurred with the building
Age, architectural style, contributions to community's cultural heritage. It is a tool for protection of individual resources and sometimes groups of buildings, but not large scale geographies, like entire neighborhoods.
How long the area or thing has been present (including trees, green space)
Unique contribution to history. Is it tied to an individual or group that has made a difference in Portland's history?
Architecture, History, State of preservation
The role the place played in history, its achievement as an architectural work, the way it can help tell a story about our past
Age 50 years old or older . Style and Character . Able to be maintained in that style and character.
Architectural design reminiscent of past eras, extensive landscaping, meandering roads, broad tree canopy of 50+ year-old trees, old brick constructed neighborhood schools, parks and tree-lined boulevards.
Architectural significance Site of an important event Association with an important figure Stylistic integrity of the structure allowing for some changes over time that would be easy to correct (ex. Loss of original wood windows). How the building contributes to a larger grouping of resources.

2. What information about an individual historic resource should be recorded and included in a citywide resource inventory?

As much as possible, including anecdotal info and photos; have a staffer or professional verify what can be confirmed, but allow citizens to access and add to records.
Hours of operation for public access. Public representative contact information. Historic date and reason for inclusion as historic resource.
Relevant dates, alterations, owners, architects, builders, architectural characteristics & significant features, unusual or historically significant details regarding design and construction.
In addition to the direct tangible features, recording should capture intangibles: like sense of place, feeling, association with cultural traditions, workmanship, the knowledge of craft, and class.
All available, including date, architect if known, general physical description, photo documentation
Address, photos
Property type, social and political history, natural resources, ethnic and cultural factors
Age of building, name of architect, architectural style (e.g., craftsman, colonial, etc.), significant architectural features, notable social/cultural/historical events associated with the building
Age, the role it played in the City's development, the significance of its architecture, its historic legacy.
year built, architect, builder, cultural use, owner, residents, use history, style, materials
Original builder information, year built and year of major additions built, architectural styles, anything odd or unique about its structure or style, significant structures removed from property, notes on the historical environment at the time of it being built and its significance during that period of time in urban development, significant events and people associated with the building, how it contributes to the overall streetscape or sense of place in the neighborhood.
Historic events. Historic people. Year constructed. Original builder/architect (if known) & original owner.
Anything about it that would make it a significant resource. See above.
When the resource was built and by whom. How much laborers were paid and whether or not they were union. What racial (racist) policies restricted who could buy or own the resource or use it in the past. If there is any evidence the land was directly or indirectly stolen.
The resource's particular connection with a notable point in time
date structure build, any identifying design features, historic use of historic resource.
Year built, renovations (if any), original color and other architectural features. Previous owners and uses.
significant person living there , architect , important activities or events that occurred there
Historic context; description of type, style, materials, architect/builder; owner(s); evaluation according to NRHP (or similar) Criteria A, B, C, and D, as well as the property's Integrity.
A description of what era or style the resource represents along with photographs, scans, blueprints, 3d models, etc. of related resources that exist but, which are not selected as the example to be protected as a historic resource.
Background of construction, any modifications over time, and history of usage.
As much as can be gathered year built, materials, who designed and built and for what purpose any specific events that occurred on the site or in the surrounding area
If known, year built, an explanation of why we believe that was its year built (the county's records of my house are definitely wrong, based on Sanborn maps from the time), architect if there was one, kit

house if known to be true, original owner. Short statement on why the property is important. Photographs(s), current and historic.
age, architect, ownership, architectural features and/or historic significance, residents
Name & location, description, architect and builder, history of use, protection status
Original owner & subsequent owners, if relevant to local history; date built (and major remodels, if any); name of architect if available; past & current use(s); original location, if different from current address; materials used, & whether they are typical or unusual for that architectural style; any outstanding or unusual features.
Age, style, rarity, original ownership & ownership/uses over time; architect (if known); unique features; modifications; information on extent to which exterior and have been remodeled; current use (especially if residential rental)
who owned it, previous uses
Who created it, why, and how. Who lived there used it how and why.
Year built, significant architectural details, any additional history of occupants and/or businesses there.
Year built designer owner use
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Quality (both original and current condition) - Size (how far does the structure depart from long-range planning for the area?) - Cultural significance - Public utility (I would prioritize spaces that, when/if preserved, converted, etc., will benefit the public not just private landowners) - How many other historic structures are nearby? (Counter to the theory behind historic district creation, I actually think a patchwork of conservation and new construction creates the best outcomes for neighborhoods, for fair housing, and for diversity)
Age of building (i.e., date it was constructed), architectural style (e.g., Craftsman, etc.), significant architectural features, notable social/cultural/historical events associated with the building
address, date built, built by who for whom, for what purpose, characteristics
who slept here, date of construction, neighborhood, architectural style, other significant features, ie, a hitching post, or mile marker. Photos, current and historic.
Date, unique attributes
Year built, details on former tenants and structural modifications.
Dates of construction, architect, builder, owner history, notable events that have transpired there, improvement projects.
Name or Descriptor Age Cultural Context Creators- designer, constructor, Owners or funders Design characteristics - quality- craftsmanship, Association with significant historical events and individuals Significant modifications Dates associated with the above.
Prior residents, architect, pertinent information about the person or events
As much as possible
Architect, style, year erected, provenance, address, neighborhood

Year built, style, distinctive features, materials, architect, if known. Anything significant about past occupants.
Date built, height, public passage/accessibility, architect or historical context if significant
Age, development of the neighborhood and socio-economic details of how and when an area was populated. Where possible architects name and builder
The integrity of the structure - that is the retention of original design and materials; Information regarding the site or structure that associates it with important historic events or historic personages that shaped the growth, development, or evolution of Portland?
Year built, architect, architectural style of historical resource
All data that capture the historical aspects, circumstances, connections, uses, culture, context and meaning of our shared national memory. If resources are lost, there should be a record of as much as possible about our environment.
Date of construction Date of substantial alterations (if known) Architect/Builder (if known) Significance evaluation, including statement of significance if significant Character-defining features (if significant) Integrity
photos
Special characteristics should be cataloged in a plethora of ways. Portland should be recreating grand structures we've lost and insisting tasteful, affordable housing be built outward from the cities center along future light rail routes to afford the city room to do this as the declination of the automobile and the disintegration of the new, shoddy housing opens up space in the city with which to carry out this fine objective.
Age, size, architecturally distinctive elements or neighborhood features.
Year of construction, style/architectural period, architect (if known), previous use and ownership, significant (but harmonious or inharmonious changes to the exterior) including entrance, cladding, roofline, additions, etc.
all recommended by the National Park Service and SHPO
Architect, Original Owner and History of Ownership, Year Built, Stories about the resource that help bring it to life, Details about exterior/interior historical significance
date of erection, improvements, owners, changes, costs builders
Age, current state of structural system, neighborhood needs
It should be 50years old or have high historicial and architectural significance.
Design year style
Notable owners/tenants/ architects/builders/ materials/designers/significance in the neighborhood
Locations, architects, photos, neighborhoods, neighboring properties, materials, craftsman ships
Year built, historic value
Date of building. Who built it. The history behind it.
Any and all data that is available. Data storage is cheap. Once lost, that data cannot be recreated. We can't know today what could be critical to someone tomorrow.
Photos, notable features or methods of construction, year of construction, etc.
The year it was built, notes on architectural style, notes about any major renovations or changes, notes on significant occupants (so long as said notes don't cause privacy issues)

Stories that connect the building to historical events. Date of construction. Uses to which the building has been put. Information about the style of the building.
Build date; builder/architect; description of type of architecture
Dates of original construction and significant alteration, architect, builder and/or development history, owner history, any events or people of note associated with the resource
Lot size, house type, #families /building
Date of construction, architect, original use and subsequent uses/ or owners, type of construction, style, special features, stories about the building's link to famous people, social and cultural events or movements, Portland's history
Year built, any significant history known, architectural style
Traditional survey information of architectural description, current photo, historical narrative.
Timeline/ events that took place there, any changes or updates over the years, connection to people of significance, architects or builders associated to the construction
architect, first owner history or most important owner's history, notable events, ethnic importance, cultural importance, historically important architectural features, year built, story of the neighborhood
Date of construction, architect, original use and subsequent uses/ or owners, type of construction
Age/year built and any history available about families who have lived in it even if not famous. Architectural style.
Loss to the neighborhood if the resource were to go.
Type of architecture, architect, materials to build, how many square feet
Each area needs review
architect, year constructed, style, builder
Those listed on previous question plus value to current residents of city and state.
Year built, architect (if known), style, address, description including materials, original and past uses, stories relating to characteristics in Q: 7 above, special features
All that is reasonably available before the history is lost.
history of ownership, and significant events that happened there.
Date of construction, architect that designed it, materials used, alterations made since construction. Photo documentation.
age/date of construction, owners, style of building, any notable features, architect/builder/designer if known, major structural changes, an "other" category for comments or features specific to that resource
Built when, by whom, for what use. Records of any significant alterations made to the property, and current ownership & use.
Age, materials used, design, historic stories of families, events, community and neighborhood development (not destruction) and the character which makes the unique style of neighborhoods!! Short sighted developers with no history or commitment to the cities and using profits as their reason to destroy our neighborhoods, cities, county and state landmarks is the cancer we must STOP! We are watching, taking names and have long memories!!
The year of construction, the styles of buildings and homes, the significance of materials used. We need preservation of our cities building to be able to enjoy our historic resources today and for generations to come. If we keep tearing down, and putting up soulless multi-use structures in their place, we destroy the qualities of the city that is supposedly drawing people here, and the reasons for

wanting to live here. It's counter intuitive. We need to preserve the human scale, for livability - and we need not to block out the sunlight and sky. It's quite simply about quality of life for everyone. It's not elitist, or about any one community trying to keep others out. It's about the overall livability of the entire city, and the attention to keeping Portland workable [ie: traffic, congestion, respect for historical structures]
most of the details about origin, historical facts, and other pertinent items...many homes/buildings in portland have been demolished, it's up to the city to preserve the rest
It should include the original function, demographic history juxtaposed with context of surrounding community history
The whole of a neighborhood, the quality of construction, the exterior of buildings
date built, architecture, history of occupants, architect, location, landscaping, original function, style, original owner, special features and materials, old address.
Period, style, material, notable architectural details
Keep original addresses on online file when the original house is razed - photos and floor plan sketches
History of property. Previous values. Culturally significant data.
What is a citywide resource inventory?
Age of building, names of all owners, work done, and details about building(for example Queen Anne Victorian)
Style (four square, Craftsmen, etc.); original owner/builder; year built; architect; construction materials (wood, stucco, etc.)
Date built, style, distinctive characteristics
Age, residence, architect, style, neighborhood type
Date built, architect, builder, style, owner history, significant events, importance to city or neighborhood development
Among important information: time and style of design/construction; history of the area and individual structure.
Historic properties are an essential part of the fabric of Portland and are worthy of preserving.
None
age, architectural style, builder, usage, architect, planned to fit neighborhood, landscaping.
I'm unclear if a "historic resource" is an individual building, a neighborhood or a scenic area/item (park or sculpture or rings on curbs etc). If its architecture, it should include date built, style (architectural points that match the prevailing style of its time), any architectural points of note, any unique differences from similar architecture of its time, original photographs, information about past occupants, if relevant to the interest of the building.
Date built, owners, any changes made
address, date of construction, style, materials, architect, designer, or builder if known
date, context of its contribution to the style of the area, historical story of how it came to exist and differ from what was there before.
Address and reason for the designation
The age of the structure, whether it has had additions or large modifications,.
Date of construction, style/design details, neighborhood historical facts & stories, modifications and photos
detailed description, history, significant changes over time and ownership history
Age, market value and condition, affordability, tree cover, design compatible with neighbors.

When it was established and the initial thought behind it.
The type of structure, size, style, how much of the original craftsmanship has been maintained
Everything relevant to what makes it historic.
The architects and craftsmen who created created all these beautiful homes, and the neighborhoods.
The history of both the building and events that occurred during its lifetime. For instance I grew up in a home which still showed the bullet holes from a civil war battle.
Date of construction and architect's name
Information about construction, inhabitants, architecture.
Date of construction, architect, builder
Any culturally significant occurrence - including but not limited to political/social/cultural contexts.
The year it was built for sure. Also the intent of the person or party of demolishing the resident house that is standing.
Dates of construction, architect, builder, owner history, notable events that have transpired there, improvement projects.
Any important events/people involved historically with the building, date of construction, any renovations that destroyed the historic fabric, current and previous owners
Detail within homes
Architects, mapping of neighborhood,
Original owners or contractors, year built, changes over time, purpose or services offered
Photograph. Date of construction. Architect if available. Original use and owner. Architectural style. Significant alterations. Name. Current zoning. Significance to community.
The age and style of the houses
Other structures such as grade schools and libraries
The architect and builder. The year it was constructed. Any notable events or occupants. The story of the home!
Age, builder, architect. Who were the laborers and where did they live? Who used the building and how?
Date built, architect, owner(s), historical significance.
Photo, year built, significant history (including ethnic and gender history), a requirement that it can't be demolished.
Age, style, architect.
Age, Architectural Features, Architect/Builder, Owners, General History
I am open to all.
see answer to no. 7
This question does not make sense to me
Year of the home, the style of the home and any unique features or history items of the home that make it unique
list of history of neighborhood and hx of architectural important houses/buildings in a neighborhood
Name or Descriptor Age Cultural Context Creators- designer, constructor, Owners or funders Design characteristics - quality- craftsmanship, Association with significant historical events and individuals

Significant modifications Dates associated with the above.
Name or Descriptor Age Cultural Context Creators- designer, constructor, Owners or funders Design characteristics - quality- craftsmanship, Association with significant historical events and individuals Significant modifications Dates associated with the above.
Date built, architect if known, style of house, address
age, building materials, historic use, architecture
Dates of construction, names of architects and builders, style of resource, notable improvements, any history relating to ownership that may be of public interest.
Dates of construction, the architect, builder, style of house, historical events that happened.
The age of the home, its architect, if possible, the size of its footprint and its style. (ie - Colonial)
Date built, original materials, old pictures, etc. Information about the original development, developers, etc.
Age, architectural style, notable features, notable owners, other historic designations
Dates of construction, architect, builder, owner lineage, notable events that have transpired there, improvement projects.
Year of construction, its original purpose/designation, any alterations made to the structure in the interim and whether those substantially altered the building's place in history.
Person of significance who lived there or built it or designed it.
Date of construction, architect and builder if available, any interesting data about a former owner or interesting event that took place at the property.
Date of construction, style, any modifications, and notable residents.
Architectural significance, historic significance, continuity to neighborhood
When built, when and how modified, why it is unique or at least unusual.
Architectural significance (see above) and the story/history of the space. Did something important happen here? How about for a specific community if not one specific event?
Location, hours of operation, accessibility, cost of admission and range of information available.
Property type, age, general materials, style... there must be a list considered to be "best practices"
Photos. Ownership history. Changes in uses over time (the most interesting from my perspective). Significant tenants/residents/events.
Era, events, and impact of such.
Significant and unique architectural feature. Not just another bungalow
Whatever qualities make it historic based on the criteria used.
architectural style, neighborhood context, photos, age, historic and ethnic history,
What makes that resource unique and relevant to the history of our city.
The full story to the extent possible: date(s) built or planted, purpose, inhabitants or owners, changes over the years, unusual or unique aspects
Important events or functions that were critical to communities that happened there. For example, the CCBA building is important because of the function it served in Chinatown, not just how it looks.

How it continues to be significant at the time it is inventoried matters too to account as recognition for subjective qualities influencing the current inventory.
Date of creation and creator (primarily for structures), activities held, groups/communities involved with the resource, significant artifacts (ie. statues, artwork, landmarks).
age, significant design features, architect/designer,
no opinion
See answer to previous question.
Year of construction,arch style photos of all four sides
Not sure
Don't know
Don't know what this means. Is it intentionally aimed at a specific audience?
I do not know what individual resources are.
year built and by whom significant tenants - utilizing the structure 5-10y plus type of structure - home, multi family, business classification - victorian, mid century modern
All information ought to be recorded, so that later generations will have as full as a record regarding a resource or site.
Why the resource has historic value. What event took place in the resource and how it contributed to the overall historic story of the city.
Does the building have unique architectural design qualities that aren't commonly found in the nearby area.
no opinion
What makes the property historic would be the main thing. What part of local history the property played.
Historic resources should be voluntarily registered by owners. To what extent of recording and info in a registry should be up to the owner.
Age, Architect, Style, Notable owners/ residents
See 7
Date built, style, family names of residents, modifications made.
historical significance/design astetics
Build date, architectural design, remodeling performed on the property.
The date and social-historical context of its creation, its current and/or ongoing uses, unique or rare architectural aspects, description of value it provides to the larger community in the neighborhood as well as the city
Year built, architect and/or planner, original owner, reason for being built. What was significant. What changes has the property or resource undergone over time.
historic significance, dates, features
Address, facts setting out architectural or historical significance.
Individual resources- are you asking about resources of residents? Your question is not clear.
All
date constructed
All external detail adn any features that can be seen from outside the dwelling.
Unknown

Location. Description. Reason for designation.
number of residents per household; race; how many cars
Age, architect, builder, events as applicable.
No idea.
Not sure
None
When it was built, any role owners played in the community, any notable facts about the architecture or description of the type of layout. Perhaps a narrative of why it's significant.
Date built (or remodeled if remodel was significant)
Notoriety of designer
% of original design intact
key contribution of design *as understood at the time*
key influences (at the time) represented in the design (cultural, technological, societal, economic)
date of construction, type(modern,new England,tudor, classic), yard and garden, garage
There should NOT be a citywide resource inventory.
What do you mean by individual resources? Money? Investments? Cars? Furniture?
Date built
Special events/people. Important examples of period architecture.
I have no idea
Plans, photos, Street name changes or street path changes or widening, names of old residents - at least the owner of record.
Qualifications of researchers collecting data and lack of vested interests
Year built, architects and/or builders who made the resource, explanation of its importance.
There should be lots of pictures of how it was in that historic moment and future owners should make sure it's a living time capsule.
Location. A summary of its historical significance. Contact info for the resource owner/steward.
Age. Historical significance. Unique beauty.
Year built, historical significance, condition, neighborhood, identifying architectures
Year of home
Everything - electrons are cheap. Photos, oral histories, building plans - whatever you have.
Only the "significant" buildings should even be included in the inventory. It should not be "every building built in the last 100 years" The information might include date of construction, name of builder, and owners only if they are significant historical figures.
I don't know
Only ones with significant historical value. NIMBYS need to stop
Abusing the label to prevent development.
Age, historic event or person, alteration
who what where and when
Not sure
location, architectural type, current use of resource
Location, historical significance
History of its creation and any special or remarkable owners or events

Age of building and/or landscape; documented changes to original design; reason of historic importance.
Date of construction, any modifications, ownership history.
Unsure
Age; history (significance to the city's history); architecture; people who have lived there
No idea
None
History of neighborhoods, architecture
Historic, unique resources and those that seek to be listed.
age, history
Not sure
Date of original construction, interior and exterior photographs, narrative of building history and uses
Age, notable historic events, chain of ownership if applicable.
the question is unclear
age, size, style, location
Overall character and history of neighborhood
Not much. There is little justification for a citywide resource, especially if it relies on public funding or public agency personnel to produce, prepare, or maintain.
Any and all information about the resource. The people and their stories are what make a city. Buildings and sites without people amount to nothing.
Year it was built, who the architect was, and what particular elements make it noteworthy.
the aspects that make it original and unique
Question unclear. What is meant here by resources?
Accurate age/remodels/additions to each structure as well as original builder/architect.
A website of all historic structures and their individual histories would be great.
Not certain I understand context of question.
Designer or builder, year built including additions and remodels, style and any information of a historic nature.
Location, why it's significant.
Not even sure what this question means. Houses/buildings should be included only if the owner requests it.
That will vary with the resource. Individual resources might warrant a good level of detail. Resources in historic districts might warrant less detail on each resource.
Condition, ability to realistically preserve structure, location (busy Street/side street)
Not sure
I believe use of city resources for this purpose is beyond the scope and need of society.
Skip
Each property should be carefully documented, records compiled showing the original design and any changes made. And include an explanation of why it should be included in a historic designation.
Old historic homes
Archive of only those rare or significant properties...
Original architect, builder and owner; quality of original construction; any and all alterations should be noted, highly altered structures should not be considered "historic" unless the original building is

more than 50% preserved and the dominant visible element; areas of disrepair should be documented and leeway granted in their replacement.
Age, significance, images (past and present)
Very little. Perhaps people of actual historic significance who were raised in a home?
Owner, builder, architect, key residents. Why it looks the way it does. What events, incidents, may have happened there that are historically significant (see above) People, institutions that made their mark on the resource over time. Notable instances of craftsmanship, artistry, or historic alterations that help tell the story of the place.
Every last detail: fencing, fenestration, floor plan, materials, colors, landscaping, etc.
from 1950 and earlier, all buildings
Include contribution to affordable housing stock or small independent businesses.
Date created, architect, builder, significance, period
Age, architect, past occupants, cultural contributions, context within an area
Age, historical significance, architectural significance
Current HRI details, plus...Any research available on original owners. Original architectural details. Original lot size. Any historical images of the house or street. Any businesses associated with the house in the first 30 yrs after the house was built. Any .pdf format research the homeowner can provide. Census, block books, original plat, original permit publication, whatever's available. Publicly available listing photos if available.
Building materials, date of construction, type of windows, one paragraph historical summary
Same as last question
Ages of homes, schools, trees, parks, etc. Homes should be relatively untouched in appearance from original design period.
Architect, builder, any associations with important groups/people. Architectural features / stylistic characteristics. Historically significant events/movements that occurred at the site.

3. Should owner consent be required for listing in an inventory?

N.B. Listing in an inventory does not constitute designation. No protections or regulations currently apply to properties on Portland's existing inventory beyond a 120-day demolition delay period.

No. An inventory is simply a list or database of information.
No, but owner consent should be required for designation as historic.
No. An inventory is a public good and should not be subject to the whims of owners.
No, especially because if we encourage more research on the social and cultural history, we are likely to discover resources owners had no prior knowledge of. The inventory should identify the full breadth of resources.
No
No
No
No. We don't allow property owners to contravene determinations that scenic or natural areas (e.g., Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area and Crater Lake National Park) are significant. Listing in an inventory should depend on objective, professionally-developed criteria.
Every local preservation ordinance that imposes restrictions on demolitions or alterations should, however, include an administrative process to ensure that any economic hardship cases that may arise are properly addressed.
Properties should be listed on inventories, but consent should be required for designation.
no, inventory is independent of owner
No, owner consent should not be required for listing. Historic buildings are a community and city-wide resource and asset, not just the current owners. Owners often times have conflicting interests (monetary benefits) that will often outweigh local community desires and are against the best interest of wider city-wide community preserving the unique build environment of the city.
Undecided / leaning toward owner consent not necessary.
No. Emphatically No.
yes
Yes, owner consent should be required. For that matter, the demolition delay period is a disgrace. If they want to preserve history, preserve the flop houses and SROs downtown, and tear down Ladd's addition.
Absolutely yes; no property should be listed without the owner's consent
Yes
No
no
No. The owner is the current steward of the historic resource, but should not be able to prevent listing. The historic resource is important for all Portland residents (past, present, and future) and visitors to the city.
Yes. A resource should be something that is likely to be preserved and made available to the public, either as part of the street scape or as a museum.
If inclusion implies protections such as a demolition delay, yes consent should be required. If it is a documentation project only, then no.
no
Yes

No, but without owner consent, there need to be some objective standard criteria that would have to be met.
yes
No
no - there is no reason for an owner to be able to block a historical survey. The public should be able to learn about all relevant buildings in their city.
no - there's no reason owners should have to agree to have a building listed. This is a part of the history of Portland which should not be "censured" by building owners.
no
No. Many significant resources are destroyed because owners don't value them. Renters should also have some say.
no, historical significance needs to be identified.
No
Not sure I am well enough informed on this point yet.
No. We don't allow property owners to contradict determinations certain areas are of scenic significance (e.g., parts of the Columbia River Gorge). That said, local preservation ordinances should include economic hardship provisions.
No
no
Yes
No
No. Owners should be informed if their property is placed on the inventory list (and new owners should be made aware of this as well).
There could be an option to appeal the listing of a property and have it removed, but the burden should be on the owner to do that. The main reason for not requiring owner consent is that the owner may not be qualified to judge the historical merit of a structure or property.
Owners should be informed of the listing, the implications of the listing, and be provided an opportunity to comment on or correct the information. The listing should be added to the Portland Maps data base. Owner consent is non-significant unless and until a level of protection is applied.
No
Im not sure
No
NO
No
No
Yes
Yes, however new owners of a property should not be able to change the historical designation without sound reason
No!
No, owner notification would be nice, but owner consent should not be required. Significance does not depend on the current owner's views regarding preservation.
depends

No.
No
No
No
No
no
I'm not sure
Absolutely not. This is an inventory nothing more.
Yes
No
No
No
No
NO!!! An owner can not determine a property's significance!!! Would you ask a plaintiff or a defendant to be a judge at their own trial??? Expert opinions, weighted towards preservation (a decision to preserve can always be reversed, but a decision to destroy is forever), and COMMUNITY interests should override ALL owner motivations.
No
Depends. For structures of major historical significance, I would say no, but yes for more minorly historical structures.
No
No
No
No
No
No
No
Yes
No
No
Unsure
NO
No
No.
No
Yes
No - Building owners have been in-listing their properties in order to demolish historic properties. This is WRONG
No
No
No.
Not necessarily.

no
No
No
No.
Oweners should be listed, so we may be able to present an alternative to senseless destruction filed by developer profits. we have witnessed numerous properties fenced and demolished without being listed 'for sale' feeling like it was sold behind closed doors in the dead of night! Way too sneaky and suspicious!
No, owner consent should not be required for designating an historic residence or building. Their interests [\$] may be in conflict with preservation.
no
No, but reimbursement for economic loss should be considered
No, But if an owner wants the property listed it will be.
STOP THE DEMOLITIONS
NO
No
They are not notified when other updates (such as nuisance filings under permits our updated criminal activity in the area) that are logged online, but notifications and communication is the adult thing to do -
No
???
no
No
No
No
no
No. If an area is deemed "historic," all structures within the area that fit "historic" criteria should be included in the inventory.
No, and we should be protecting ALL historic homes and buildings that are habitable and useable. They are what makes Portland unique. Otherwise, this will be like Anytown USA and we will have lost our soul.
Yes
Yes for individual listings
No
No
for publication, yes. for internal record of inventory, no
no
Yes
No, the inventory should just be a factual status of the building based on objective criteria. It is not a subjective determination.
No
No
No, so as to prevent owners from by passing the 120 demolition delay and notification of neighbors.

No.
No, the inventory is for the good of the public and for the good of future generations. It is bigger than the individual.
Depends. Most inventories include way too many properties, with hardly any clear, transparent reasons for being considered historic. If this continues, then yes, owners should be asked for consent. If, on the other hand, we have actual documented reasons, and there is some careful, critical application of those reasons, and owner have a chance to appeal, then no, consent should not be required for listing. For example, there is no way that neighborhood listings should be allowed to be used in a blanket way to compel individual property listings. What we've done in Portland to date is shameful, self-serving, and should not be continued.
No
No. The decision should not be made or controlled by the current owner. They should be informed only and have a way to appeal if there is some compelling reason.
No
No
No
Bo
yes
No. Owners should be informed if their property is placed on the inventory list (and new owners should be made aware of this as well). There could be an option to appeal the listing of a property and have it removed, but the burden should be on the owner to do that. The main reason for not requiring owner consent is that the owner may not be qualified to judge the historical merit of a structure or property.
No
we should protect older homes
No
..not necessarily but considerations and awareness to owners and potential owners. This may not be an area where government can require what existing owners can do
No
No
A home either is or isn't of historic significance, which is irrelevant of any owner's acknowledgement. If an owner wished to have a home removed from any formal listing, they should apply to do so.
No, but it gets dicey if constraints then apply to the sale of the building or any exterior work
No
No
Unsure
No.
Yes
no
If they are part of a historic district, yes
No
n/r

Owners should be informed of the listing, the implications of the listing, and be provided an opportunity to comment on or correct the information. The listing should be added to the Portland Maps data base. Owner consent is non-significant unless and until a level of protection is applied.
Owners should be informed when and why their property is placed on the inventory list and the information included in the Portland Maps data base.
No
no
Owner consent should not be required. Otherwise, owners would have the ability to alter the historic record for the City, which is beyond the power that should be granted to any one individual. However, perhaps the City could allow an owner to appeal inclusion of that owner's property in an inventory if it was only debatable that the property was "historic" in nature.
No, because this is valuable information for the whole neighborhood and the city and it would be for a new owner also.
No.
No
No
No. Owners should be informed if their property is placed on the inventory list (and new owners should be made aware of this as well). There could be an option to appeal the listing of a property and have it removed, but the burden should be on the owner to do that. The main reason for not requiring owner consent is that the owner may not be qualified to judge the historical merit of a structure or property.
No
YES. I believe it should be an opt in procedure.
Yes
No
No
Yes
Yes
No.
Yes.
NO
No, but maybe an inventory should be separate from the 120-demo period.
No, if designation doesn't hinder their decision making rights.
Yes. It is private property and the listing criteria is not objective or vetted so should be voluntary if allowed at all.
No, consent should not be required
no, owner consent should not be required
Yes
No - consent should not be required. But I think owner notification should be required, if it isn't already being done.
It depends. Privacy should be respected, and there are valid cultural and just personal differences in attitudes toward land. My husband's family had land taken from them to build a highway during the bad-old urban renewal days, and taught future generations not to get too attached to one's house the

way it is. That's not my experience, but I would respect if someone's experience, for any reason, made them object to having property on the inventory.
yes
No
No
No
No
Yes
Probably
Absolutely!!! My home, my decisions.
Yes
requested but not required for critical buildings in a neighborhood.
I have seen demolition by neglect that could be remedied by placing the building on a historical inventory so it could be monitored
no
Yes. Rather that a "opt out" objection process, owners should be asked to legally consent to the designation.
No
Yes, absolutely.
yes
yes
YES
YES!
Yes, unless there are no adverse economic or damaging effects on an owner.
Yes
No
Yes, if this list is used for historical designation.
Not sure
Yes.
yes
Yes.
No. If a home is within a historic boundary and it meets the basic requirements of inclusion in that boundary area OR if a standalone it meets the requirements for inclusion as a historic- either by style, as an example of a particular point in time, or other measures deemed to include a home, it should be included.
After moving to Portland from the east coast where I served on the historic board for the city of Boston I was appalled to see no similar active body working- with weekly sessions to ensure that the scale, integrity, materials used were managed. The uptick of both skinny homes and giant homes seems to be due to exclusions to building codes and someone is getting paid off.
No
yes

Absolutely. An owner should not be forced to be part of a national registry.
No
Absolutely.
only if there is private information such as income that might provide an avenue to crime
Maybe
No
Yes. I specifically purchased my home in my neighborhood because it was not a historic district. Despite my objection, the policy as currently implemented would allow my neighborhood to be turned into a historic district with all of the restrictions on my property that a HD includes.
Yes
Yes
Yes
No. If it has this status, it should be a requirement.
For inventory? No.
For listing? Absolutely.
However, enlisting owner *cooperation* to enhance and improve accuracy of the inventory should be pursued aggressively.
yes
Yes.
What?
Absolutely
Yes
Yes
No.
No
Yes, of course. Think of the complications involved in the city taking land for imminent domain. Why should placing these (perhaps unwanted) restrictions be so much easier?
No. But we should limit the number of consentless listings to no more than 1 per month citywide. Only can be used in extreme circumstances.
Yes, in the case of a neighborhood/region wide designation, but not on an individual resource level. A committee with a set of criteria with high standards ought to be able to designate a resource without owner's consent. With Commissioner over-ride possible.
Yes
yes
Yes
Owner review/participation would be helpful
Yes
No - they only own it temporarily. Removing a piece of history removes it from everyone's lives, today and in the future. A culture with no past has no future.
No
yes

Yes
Yes
YES, no doubt!
no
Yes
no
Yes
Yes
No
Absolutely
Yes
Yes
No
Yes, every time
Absolutely yes. 100% of the owners in a proposed historic district should consent
Yes
No
Absolutely yes
yes
No
Yes
Yes, if it limits the current property owners rights.
Not necessarily
no
No
Absolutely!
Always
YES
yes
Yes
Yes
Yes, definitely, for privacy purposes.
Absolute should require owner consent.And for designation of an entire area or district it should require a majority of impacted properties to opt in and consent. Today's Historic District policy is undemocratic and a form of taxation without representation.
Yes!!!
Yes. Definitely, no one should be able to place another person's property on a registry. This is where the National Historic process is very flawed. It's unconscionable to me that my neighbor can put my house on the registry and the only thing I can do is send in a notarized letter of objection and hope 50% of my neighbors do too.
Absolutely.

I believe owner consent should be required, particularly if the listing carries any obligations, restrictions or expenses for the owner. I don't believe an owner should be forced by others to list a property.
Yes
Absolutely the owner should provide written consent for o have their house listed. It is not appropriate to take away an owner's property rights.
Absolutely.
In most cases
Absolutely! Historic preservation takes away significant rights of ownership. And invites the community into decisions regarding and physical changes to the exterior of a resource.
Maybe
Yes
An owner should be included in the inventory process to ensure factual information is presented; and owner should be allowed a public process prior to listing, and an ability to dispute inventory details so that all information is accurately and transparently compiled.
Depends on if listing it limits how an owner can use the property.
With the exception of a property which has an undeniable historic significance (of which I am not sure there are more than a handful in PDX), yes.
NO
yes
if it doesn't cost, no
Included, but can be overridden and never removed.
Yes
Owner consent should not be required to inventory the resource, but it should be required to impose historic-related restrictions on its use, remodeling, or demolition.
No, if it's public information.
Yes
Definitely, but it shouldn't be something you can be removed from once you're on to prevent developers purchasing and removing.
Never
Yes
No
Owners should have the opportunity to consent prior to the listing in some capacity. If, for example, it is part of a larger district there should be a percentage of owners that approve. For individual buildings, once a property is listed, it should be difficult to delist.

4. How can an inventory of the city's historic resources best serve the public?

Make it accessible by the public, and possible for them to submit data. Also, inform decisions by city council and staff.
By facilitating public access to the city's historic resources.
By creating a record that will aid in protecting valuable resources from the changing winds of development and property speculation.
Be relevant to the public. The public participate. Work with Public Historians.
By being made publicly accessible. As far as I know, there is not even an online list of designated Portland landmarks.
Allow public to see how much is worth saving
Planning tool and baseline information for future use
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By providing the foundation for local policies designed to protect significant historic resources; and • By informing the public of the architectural/historical/cultural/social significance of specific properties. This, in turn, can engender civic pride and help motivate property owners to maintain and preserve historic resources.
Please note, however, that unless the inventory is followed up with the establishment of resource protection policies, it will be relatively meaningless. Consider, for example, that developers seeking to demolish resources listed on Portland's outdated Historic Resources Inventory have managed to secure same-day approval of the removal of resources included in the Inventory.
Buildings on the inventory could be eligible for renovation incentives and potential tax breaks for restoration.
inventory helps record a detailed history of the city and promotes preservation
We have to know what we have of value to be able to prioritize what is most important to save and fight for. There is also importance in documenting these structures for future records and research, since many of them are being demolished without any documentation being done. Also, if owner consent isn't required a community could rally together to list a structure on the HRI and at least get a demolition delay and a review of if its demolition is in the best interest of the larger community or not.
Provide history to foster neighborhood cohesiveness. Help preserve historic buildings.
As a Resource. For help determining city codes, designating historic structures and neighborhoods and districts.
If they are focused on resources that are truly available to the public in some way.
By reminding the public of the particular historic connections that the resources have
Identify neighborhood landmarks and the historic role the historic resource played in the community.
People can refer to the list (online) to discover what buildings were in the area at a specific era.
alert public to these places in order to secure that the history of an area not be lost
Historic resources are integral to maintaining the city's historic character. Portland's historic character is a big factor in people's desire to visit and spend money here. It's a big factor in why people like living here and decide to move here. An inventory may help the city negotiate the pressures of over-development in a growing city without destroying key resources to remembering its past.
Selective curation and documentation of the resources and similar non-designated structures will enhance the urban space and provide historical touchstones for those interested in our history.

Providing historical context for the places we live and work. Providing a basis for research to determine what individual structures might be best included in a more robust historical protection registry for long term preservation.
We can't protect what we don't know is there or is not officially documented.
I'd love a searchable database, where you could find resources by all of the items I listed in #8. How did that architect's style and designs change over time?
As the city continues to grow, it is important to be able to judge the significance of a building and reasons for preservation. The historic resources can be a great help.
Enhancing protection by focusing attention on the significance of our resources
It can make the public more aware of the "history" that surrounds and to some extent informs our daily lives. This leads to appreciation of the aesthetics (and intrinsic historic values) surrounding us residents, and how these buildings connect us with our past - promotes civic pride. Would increase understanding that these older buildings offer much more affordable rents than new buildings - a HUGE issue in Portland, and puzzlingly ignored by city planners and public officials. This in turn could lead to better protection against demolitions - when the public better understands just what they might be losing. (Oregon has some of the weakest demolition review processes in the country - it urgently needs updating and strengthening.) - And tourists flock to places with historic buildings/neighborhoods!
The City should advertise that the historic inventory exists, and encourage people to have a look at the historic resources in their neighborhood - as a source of neighborhood interest and pride. If neighbors become aware of the historic gems in their neighborhood, it will become a source of pride. Neighbors will see the value of such resources, and realize the loss that would occur with their demolition. Portland has an affordable housing crisis; existing buildings (including historic buildings) provide much cheaper housing than new buildings. Same is true for commercial (especially smaller enterprises) - many of them prefer the much more interesting "historic" buildings with their much cheaper rents than new buildings (see the West End). And - people LIKE older buildings! They have character, whereas newer buildings are often nothing but sterile.
have it available in libraries, bookstores, online
Help residents be aware of our amazing history and identify resources that should have some sort of protection.
education about our history, pride in our neighborhoods and city.
Education historical significance esthetic appreciation
First: Update it! Ours is behind. Second: Again, include cultural significance to under-served populations in particular. We need to remember what we have done well, and also remember how not to repeat our mistakes.
By letting the public know about the architectural/historical/cultural/social significance of specific properties, which can engender civic pride, attract tourists (and the economic benefits they provide to cities), and make the city more attractive and livable.
By making it known to the public; easily available; facilitating it's use by neighborhoods, interest groups, schools, churches, historical societies.
identify vulnerable properties for neighborhood/individual action to prevent demolition, bring public awareness to significant neighborhoods, advance tourism. preserve our history for future generations
Open, freely available
Identifying historic resources in all parts of the city (residential/commercial, neighborhoods of differing economic status, etc.) will ensure that there is more fairness in the process.

The tendency to demolish rather than repurpose or renovate is not only physically destructive, but also displaces families and drives up cost, worsening affordability.
Historic listing should be used for historical resource identification, cultural education, to support civic identity and pride, to promote reuse or repurposing rather than demolition and replacement. It is also the basis for identifying resources that are eligible for higher levels of protection, and when so “uplisted” should be the basis for providing additional incentives and protections for preservation.
Preserving history and character. Honoring the past.
Education. Appreciation of past.
It can demonstrate the city's history, both architecturally and culturally. It can build an appreciation to retain older buildings and question the practice of demolition without careful process and review.
Interactive web and map based mobile app for users to view and submit info on historic resources.
It should serve as a basis for building codes and urban design development
By helping the city determine the best way to modernize to include the protection of its past and move beyond a dynamic where developers get to whatever they want because they can afford to
By being open and transparent with relevant information available to show the historic significance of the property and to show how this significance is related to the city today
Portland has beautiful historical resources in the inner city. Many of these homes are at risk of demolition by developers that can turn a greater profit by demolishing the property and placing more residential living units on the property. These historical resources should be protected and developers should be given incentives to respect the homes and neighborhoods by restoring properties to their architectural beauty. These historic resources should be treasured as a part of Portland's history.
This is information that will add to our shared cultural memory and will be used by citizens and scholars to help future generations understand the context and nuance that is needed to make sense of where we've come from.
By being comprehensive, consistent, and clear. By being faithfully interpreted by BPS/BDS staff and the HLC.
Make sure there are no unpermitted demos.
In serving the justice supporting power of accountability and governmental/citizenry transparency the public will be well served by a robustly available and detailed inventory.
By making it abundantly clear the intent to demolish historically significant homes or neighborhood features.
To maintain the character of individual neighborhoods and the periods/aesthetic ideals in which they were built. To understand their historical context and how that differs from new buildings/neighborhoods.
Promote the preservation of historic resources as an extremely valuable economic community asset.
By telling the story of the city through architecture
on line, guide book, walks, events, maps
Provide a layer of protection for Portland's historical context
These resources could be evaluated and certain one given a priority rating for preservation. For example, the top 50 would never be demolished. Also, these buildings could be eligible for certain incentives such as lower per it costs for renovation, or grants and fee waivers for seismic retrofitting.
Transparency. This way people has a voice
Protect our community heritage

Serves as a historical record before the developers get their hands on everything.
Complete picture of what the city is comprised of
Unsure but provides interest and pridefulness.
Open, transparent, fact-based, independent of ANY influence from private profit concerns. Urban historic preservation can help solve our affordable housing crisis and provide us with tools to reduce our contribution to global climate change. It is an essential tool to enhancing and restoring the livability of our built environment and protecting the health and safety of our citizens. It can provide the key data to inform a preservation campaign to protect and enhance our environment and prevent short-term profit-taking from destroying key elements of our livability and culture.
Online availability to increase public awareness
Identify the most significant resources (i.e. which ones should be prioritized for preservation)
Some of these buildings can be used for office space and living space at lower rents than newer buildings. Public information about these buildings will help generate interest in these resources and increase public knowledge, hopefully preventing them from being demolished.
Ready data to turn to when building permits come up.
It can bring history to life for young people. There is no substitute for respecting and preserving what came before, especially when it still works. It is a way to use what we have instead of demolishing it. To preserve and continue to use these resources is to improve diversity; to destroy and replace is to ensure the homogeneity of the new community.
Alerting neighbors and concerned citizens
By using it to raise awareness of Portland's unique historic heritage that gives our city or neighborhood its character, and livability, and the vulnerability of these historic buildings. This will help generate public support to prevent demolition, or at least to prevent thoughtless demolition without reviewing all options. Protection of historic buildings is also important because they accommodate so much affordable housing. To tear down and rebuild inevitably increases rents and housing prices. The existing building is also the most sustainable building.
I would like to see it prevent the rampant demolitions of smaller affordable homes being replaced by mansions only the wealthy can afford
An up-to-date inventory is an excellent tool for planning and managing continuity and change. It offers an opportunity to identify the truly unique spaces and places in a community as well as help track the more ubiquitous. An inventory provides a useful overview of what remains and helps inform decisions about what to try to retain. Should every old building be saved? No -- the future needs to happen. Without the solid information provided by a survey, however, one runs the real risk of allowing or even encouraging the loss of buildings and other resources which may be the only remaining examples of special aspects of Portland history. Already we look back to previous eras and say, "Why did they let that be torn down?" Now, we are the ones making the decisions and do not want to be the generation which allowed Portland to lose its soul through the decimation of community character.
By showing a timeline of events, teaching us a piece of the past, education
Inventories should be made all over the city for equity. Demolishing buildings displaces people from our most affordable buildings. this list should be used to keep buildings standing. Demolishing them makes developers richer while removing affordable housing from our supply and fills up our landfills with our most affordable housing.
By using it to raise awareness of Portland's unique historic heritage that gives our city its character, and livability, and the vulnerability of these historic buildings

It helps us keep track of a limited resource that has helped define where we came from and who we are.
Protecting the ambiance that make our city what it is.
Self walking tours of architecture
A chance to hopefully save a building
Allow for review before altering or demolishing a property of significance
Provide insight into environmental quality, reflect neighborhood spirit, identify neighborhoods of high aesthetic character, provide direction for new development sensitive to environmental character.
Prevent demolition of historic treasures, inform the public of these treasures.
Be a first step in educating the public about the history of the city and the neighborhoods. Preserving the stories through architecture and buildings. Eventually making demolition processes more public and helping to bring about slower and more thoughtful demolition review. Portland has the weakest demolition review in the nation and an inventory is step one. Preserving these buildings can help preserve affordable housing and is good for business and tourism. The most affordable unit is in the existing building. Rents in older buildings in Goose Hollow and West End are 1/2 the price of rents in newer buildings.
By reflecting what's available an inventory may aid in demonstrating the importance of rare or unusual resources.
Bringing to life the historical significance of older homes and their effect on people
The inventory should be made available to public via a website.
Help build and retain a sense of ownership and community within the city, provide policy makers with better information before they make decisions
An inventory of historic resources is very important now, as we see Sonics rapid change. Having an historical inventory available to the public could help neighborhood associations, developers, individual citizens, environmental advocates, architects, etc, to make wise choices about what is worth saving and preserving.
This is a double edged question- many new residents have been lured here and have no knowledge, understanding or real interest in the history of Portland- of course until it's too late! If you travel at all, you'll immediately see countries preserving their history through architecture, museums, written word. We too have important history worth protecting, sharing with our children and children's children, but once it's gone, the stories soon follow!
As I already stated, preserving the city's historic resources serves the public in keeping the city livable. I am not trained in city planning, so I cannot speak to this issue in that language. I can only say that in the last decade, I have witnessed the increased disrespect for beautiful older structures of architectural significance, causing streets to become less appealing, turning roads into congested tunnels of sky high structures that narrow the view from street to sky. This is bad for everyone. The city was once an appealing mix of old and new, with careful preservation of the old and thoughtful creation of the new. The current situation is creating a very stressful environment and less artful and appealing.
by protecting and documenting our history, so it won't be erased.....all the info could be made available online, at the ahc, ohs, etc etc. many opportunities for education exist, and the pps could benefit with outreach for preservation
It will provide data of socio-economic impact in a given area as well as a better understanding of greed driven development that displaces economically challenged population
There are walks and runs, & bike rides through Eastmorland & other neighborhoods for people to enjoy the neighborhoods beauty. STOP THE DEMOLITIONS

Research, quick review of neighborhood composition and building histories, current information in case demolition is looming, knowing history of the city's built environment.
Historic places should not be demolished. They should be preserved for future generations.
As the city grows, gentrifies and the migration flow continues, it is good not to lose history in the mash-up of new (and old) Portland residents .
For preservation of the city's history
If it helps to protect them from demolition, the historic vibe of our community is protected, rather than lost forever.
A database of such information is invaluable. It IS the city's history. It can also serve as a tool to protect older buildings.
To inform about Portland history and to prevent demolition of that history.
Identify and preserve
By use as determination for demolition permits!
It can be an educational resource and also make sure that demolition is not approved without taking historical significance into account.
By preserving and protecting historic assets, and preserving affordable housing and commercial spaces.
Instead of spending money on inventories, the City should allocate funds to preserve our historic buildings- it is these structures that truly make Portland special. We have lost so many of these historic structures already that soon Portland will have lost it's character. Very sad - we can never get these buildings (and memories) back. Developers are slowly killing this city and our leaders are allowing this to happen. Please, please stop the demolition madness.
Open info
preserve the historic significance of the inventory and character of the city
I think preserving pockets of architecture or other resources all throughout the city and representing different ages of Portland's development tells an interesting story about our city. I think all quadrants of the city and all historic periods should have representation, even if we can't preserve everything.
Conserving integrity of our city's history and preserving the past.
by being a resource for future study of existing built fabric, urban planning, and historical styles
first, to identify resources that should be preserved because they are special and irreplaceable. second, to educate those who own them about their importance and the need to protect and preserve them.
A means to preserve Portland's charm and livability
It should inform people where all the historic areas of the city are located. It would identify size of each area, boundaries of areas, let the public know these areas have unique historic value.ce
Make it available and accessible online and in person (library, historical society)z Tours if neighborhoods
Provide detailed property significance and history to the general public
Prevent designated historic districts from being over run with demolitions of perfectly affordable and decent houses to be replaced by two million dollar mansions unsuited to the neighborhood of much smaller houses
History is something we learn from and is an important educational tool in connecting to the past and avoiding future mistakes. Because something is old doesn't mean it's expendable. We have to stop the "throw away" attitude of the modern world.
By preserving the historic character of an area.

By identifying things that really matter to the history we should all know. For example, most east side neighborhoods were established with the clear intent to promote segregation and reinforce racist and bigoted points of view. Any listings for neighborhoods ought to recognize this history in a visible, transparent way. We hide behind architecture in a way that the people who actually built the structures would never recognize.
To inform the future Byers where to go to find the kind of neighborhood they are looking for.
Having a complete inventory of all the city's historic resources gives a basis for making better decisions. Avoiding demolition of these resources is usually the better decision allowing more diversity in building stock in the city and less waste.
Identifying historic resources in all parts of the city will ensure that there is more fairness in the process. Demolishing existing homes is not only destructive in every aspect, such as the environmental impact, and affordability, it usually makes the new home, usually twice as expensive as the one demolished, further worsening the affordability situation.
No idea
Quality, value, attractability, property taxes, tourism,
Respect for the now, the past and those artists and activists and visionaries who have made this city great.
Preservation of well built historical homes and therefore preserving the aesthetics of the neighborhood.
Identifying historic resources in all parts of the city (residential/commercial, neighborhoods of differing economic status, etc.) will ensure that there is more fairness in the process. The tendency to demolish rather than repurpose or renovate is not only physically destructive, but also displaces families and drives up cost, worsening affordability.
transparency and easy access to available resources to maintain the consistency of the homes in the neighborhood
Available for public lookup, regulations for option to preserve first over demo and development
No idea
Looking to the future and not the short term. Preservation of structures.
with maximum awareness and education
Identify most vulnerable historic resources.
By being easily available to everyone in a library or other public institution
Protecting these homes allows them to remain available to be purchased by a larger percentage of home owners. They can be refurbished and remodeled in such a way that they remain accessible to more people. If they were demolished and a much larger and financially exclusive home constructed in its place, it makes the neighborhood less diverse.
The public usually enjoys the vision of historic patterns of use for buildings. For instance, the coffee shop was once a pharmacy, the restaurant was always a restaurant, this house that now has 8 apartments was once owned by a local businessman, etc. We see ourselves coming and going, rather than in a static way
By being accessible & understandable.
By preserving our buildings (so demolitions must be stopped). By teaching history that locals may not know.
Compile history.
Protect historic buildings from demolition. Only 30% of Portland homes were built before 1930 and we are losing to many of them to developers. We've lost two HRI buildings in Montavilla to demolition in the last two years. Protect our historic architecture and streetcar era neighborhoods.

Through historic preservation, of course.
publicly available on-line. Dont spend a lot of money doing this.
To preserve them for the next generation
It preserves the heritage and history of the city. Some places need to be protected for our future generations to see.
verify history needed about neighborhoods
Historic listing should be used for historical resource identification, cultural education, to support civic identity and pride, to promote reuse or repurposing rather than demolition and replacement. It is also the basis for identifying resources that are eligible for higher levels of protection, and when so “uplisted” should be the basis for providing additional incentives and protections for preservation.
Historic listing should be used for historical resource identification, cultural education, to support civic identity and pride, to promote reuse or repurposing rather than demolition and replacement.
Important historical resource
stop the demolitions of historic resources, saving the environment and built landscape of the city. Preserving neighboring property values and livability.
An inventory can serve the entire community by providing information that is available to all who wish to understand the rich history of our local community and its structural resources.
To help with the all over picture of the city. History is a very important part of our lives. If we remove all our history, we lose our heritage. There are many alternatives to demolishing properties and the landscape that goes with them.
It can educated the public about the city, and buildings and homes that give a city its character.
It would help the public learn about the city and the way it developed. It would help homeowners update their homes in a historic-appropriate manner.
If it is made available online
Identifying historic resources in all parts of the city (residential/commercial, neighborhoods of differing economic status, etc.) will ensure that there is more fairness in the process. The tendency to demolish rather than repurpose or renovate is not only physically destructive, but also displaces families and drives up cost, worsening affordability.
To show the benefits and costs to proposed developments in the historic resource vicinity.
Allowing for the city collectively (not individual neighborhoods) to have a say in what is worthy of being “set in stone” as far as historic resources are concerned. In 20 + years homes that are considered “new builds” today may in time become historically significant, showing how our city embraced expansive population growth and shifting household preferences (ie smaller yards to take care of, energy efficiency, etc.) How do we walk the line of preservation and innovation that will one day become preservation? Perhaps a percentage based system. For example, in picking a number out of thin air let’s say 30% of all housing stock in PDX can be historically protected. As time goes by, perhaps certain properties may be taken off of the inventory. This causes the retention of the most historically significant resources while allowing for innovative properties to potentially one day be seen as historically significant. All in all, I think it needs to be fluid and based on the needs of Portlanders not only in the here and now but centuries down the road.
Historical record for posterity.
Keep these homes from developer's demolitions.
By making it more important in the cities master plan.
I'm not sure that it does serve the public, except as a sort of tourist attraction.

Images available for historic preservation or restoration at other sites. Information included could be date built, materials, type, architect and/or builder, uses, etc.
Availability online.
You cannot manage a resource if you don't know what you've got! It will help identify what's important to save (protect against demolition, design guidelines) and/or invest public funds in (ie rehab or seismic incentives). Helps avoid code or land use policies that would incentivize demolition. Also helps raise public awareness of significant places - allows them to appreciate and take "ownership" of their neighborhood.
Sync it with Portland Maps so people can have access to the building's full history along with the zoning/permit/etc data.
History education of both appearance, and architecture, coupled with education of social impact.
NIMBY protectionism it that is the goal
It should be a topic of discussion in redevelopment, but should not preclude demolition.
remodelling considerations, demo restrictions, use, occupancy. More than anything, a sense of state, city, and neighborhood history
It tells Portland's story.
It can be used as the basis for online and printed maps, walking tours, education about place, and promoting place identity.
Honestly, I think the City's energy would be better spent inventorying and preserving "naturally occurring" affordable housing. I like cute old buildings, but they're a low priority to me. What good are all these historic places if none of my friends can live and build lives here? If we have to spend time and money on a historic inventory though, it should challenge the narrative of Portland as a white monoculture and educate people about both the ugly parts of our past and the bold diverse leadership that has helped us make any progress in spite of it.
It helps to preserve the story of the city and preserve the memory of groups that helped create the city but may or may not be around any longer. We need to have a good idea of where we've been to have perspective on where we're going.
Prevent demolition of historic homes. Preserve the quality of Portland's neighborhood. Support restoration and reconstruction of old homes.
No opinion
History of the city
It captures the essence of the neighborhood..provide as much detail as possible
Don't allow a group of people the power to create a historic district without 100% owner consent. Don't allow restriction placed on peoples property without consent. Don't allow historic district to change real estates highest and best use if that's what the owner chooses. Never allow a neighborhood association to be the sponsor or advocate for or against a historic district.
As a reminder that history matters
So there's a lot of people who want to drive around and see what a 1940's unchanged home looks like? This isn't the waterfront in Charleston, which is a relatively small area.
The inventory should be limited and curated, it should preserve individual gems, but it should not try to prevent the growth and inevitable change of the city.
1) Creation of historic districts or themes that could be relevant for neighborhood focus or tourism focus - increasing revenue streams by highlighting unique elements to attract new neighbors or tourists
2) Support of history elements in local education system to tie local class with actual facts

To avoid over jealous city planners from raping our community of any more historic homes and other structures.
Through creating a continuity of historic story of the city (not just to preserve space from development.)
This inventory has the opportunity to define the narrative over what is considered historic and should be applied with extreme prudence. Whatever is labeled as a historic resource increases all associated costs with the site. It also inhibits the future development of this city reducing the area that can be developed and shifting the burden of affordability and accommodation of growth to the remaining areas.
Don't know
It could come in handy for walking/bike tours. If properties are truly historic they should have some sort of public access.
To preserve Portland heritage and identity.
Being Transparent. Being accessible. Recording how common various types of structures are.
Information from a historic resource survey can form the foundation for nearly every decision affecting a city's historic buildings and neighborhoods. The compilation of information in a survey can help guide the planning, maintenance, and investment decisions of owners, city officials, neighborhood groups, and investors, and can have the more intangible benefit of raising civic awareness and pride. As has been recognized in cities around the world, historic resource information is an essential component of effective historic preservation, city planning, and community development. (Ref: Getty Conservation Institute)
It's simply a record for posterity. It serves no other purpose.
Educational historic designs/styles and evolution of neighborhoods
It can be used to direct tourists, but should not be used as zoning laws and building restrictions
The information should be transparent and easily accessible. Historic designation should NOT be used as a means to ban affordable, public housing from neighborhoods.
It really doesn't "serve the public" outside of education and record keeping. Maintaining parts of our city (buildings, streets, neighborhoods) in an outdated form for the purposes of 'history' quite often is done at the expense of the public good. Sometimes, for the most significant historical elements, that worth the sacrifice. Quite often it is not. Where documentation and records would suffice, the land should always be used to it's highest and best purpose.
history, background, research
After careful and objective vetting by an impartial judge/agency, advertise and make historic assets available to the public on regular hours for viewing.
A place in time, a reverence for what has come before. Examples of building methods for s period of time to meet the needs of the occupants along with a pleasing facade and integrity of materials and methods.
Expose people to the past and allow them to see it's value.
The inventory should be available for research
unknown
It should simply be an inventory, not an exemption from the rules that apply to property generally. If the city wants to preserve a structure, it should obtain the owner's consent, or otherwise provide a means for the owner to appeal the designation to his or her elected representatives on the city council, the same as any other unwelcome regulation. The owner should not be subject to the whims of unelected preservationists or nimbies (and, no, I don't consider neighborhood associations to be elected bodies).

it might help create a better sense of what matters in a neighborhood
I don't know
I think preserving the beauty and unique qualities of areas with these beautiful homes is important aesthetically and historically. Many newer homes are made with inferior designs and materials. It's pleasing to the eye to see different designs as you move about the city.
Not sure
Broad scan
I think this is the kind of thing that builds community. It's a resource for schools to teach student's about their communities.
Individual buildings and coherent developments are snapshots into a city's origins and evolution. Maintaining awareness of our roots strengthens our understanding of how we arrived to where we are today and informs our decisions going forward for the type of city we want to become.
It also provides a rich source of education, tying today back to the values that were important to folks who came before us.
keep the beautiful historic areas. Portland is ugly enough without replacing beautiful homes with tacky-tacky 2 story, garage underneath New York like row houses.
That is such a loaded question. This issue is so fraught. Listen, historic districts have their place, but not as a growth management tool
What?
Public building that are historic should be protected.
Walking tours
By not being a tool for exclusion of renters and density; by not putting a lock hold on the transformation of properties in ways that enhance urban planning goals
This question is potentially so long it could be an essay! I see it as very very valuable!!
Important information vital to archives and future planning.
By providing a view of our architectural or city history and tying it to specific places and examples.
Create an online digital tour of all properties.
I'd rather document well what was historic than require us to never demolish or determine that there's a current better use for the land and/or building.
Preserve buildings that maintain our connection to old Portland and conserves embodied energy of the existing quality built environment. At the same time, it must not create burdens on developers seeking to create housing and job opportunity in our city. These burdens raise the cost of development and the residential and commercial rent of the properties. An inventory can keep us accountable to future generations for maintaining a connection to past Portland while not inhibiting future livability.
allow the public to visit via open houses one week/year
If a building or home or collection of homes represents a historical period for the city it should document and preserve that history. It should publicly announce and celebrate that story.
Online database, public notices if it would affect the neighborhood
A homes age can made be public but no decisions can be made on the owner's behalf. The process and system has to be democratic. The system cant be severely flawed as it is now infringing on peoples rights. It needs to have balance and not be impossible stop.
Raising awareness that easy access to multiple building styles enriches our lives.

Use in education
Examples to future architects and city planners
As a history lesson, for neighborhood tours.
Be readily available
Research, keep history alive
By preserving a limited truly historic set of homes without being abused by NIMBYS to prevent development
educational
Not sure
by specifying what is important and special about a particular place in order to preserve it
Posted online
Be available for public access and research
A resource should not be included based on its age alone. Inventory should serve as education about historic person, style, or event and not as a means to prevent future nearby development.
By providing education
Opportunity to tour inside and out at least once a year
Make all homes or resources that are deemed historic open to the public for a certain set of required hours per week.
Make it available, by area of the city, so that there is a history of Portland's historic places.
No idea
Keeps neighborhoods viable.
To let people learn and appreciate Portland and its' history
They can be included in publications and periodically available for tours.
include
everyone in the survey, not a gerrymandered boundary
Access to information
Online access, google map layer, maps by city quadrant for self guided tours
Fully accessible information
Recognizing the value, location, and preservation of housing stock and supporting the differentiation of neighborhoods
delineate areas of historical significance that should be protected from demolition
By keeping a sense of history and scale
By being available for researchers.
They are nothing if we can not learn from them. They should be record of what has shaped the social and cultural history of the city. We should not mummify our city but we should learn from the past. A old, beautiful, empty, unsafe building does nothing for the city. That resource does not serve the public.
Preservation of history is important for future generations.
it depends on the project.
Be as available for education and research
To serve as an educational and historical resource

General interest
By providing a visual history of the city over broad periods of time. By preserving architectural styles and thinking over broad periods of time. By keeping the cities history alive while it continues to evolve and innovate with societal and technological advances.
?????
As something to be admired & toured, such as the Pittock Mansion.
An inventory could be available online for information purposes.
Open houses, tours, info plac
Not sure. I find it to be very NIMBY
I don't think it does.
Skip
By getting consent from all property owners. And by encouraging a flexible market driven housing resource.
Not sure
Data
The goal should be to preserve historic public resources and the very best examples of particular construction types/styles. insisting all old buildings are valuable historic resources is a joke.
Link a place to history and hopefully people will care for it more and consider the consequences when considering whether to destroy or alter it.
Any property seeking historic protection should be open to public tours on a regular basis and available to researchers.
Easily available on-line with handy-guide to help students with local history research, neighborhood historians to learn more about their communities. Consider hiring a communications specialist to build a human-friendly front-end that is designed to intrigue and inspire folks to dig into the history information.
Connect the history with photos (both current and historic) and link into PortlandMaps.com (and/or into the similar County geo database).
Note on public permit and other public transactions that the affected property is on the inventory so that the community is aware of things happening to inventoried properties, even where there is no control or protection applied.
The ranking of individual entries is equally important as the identification of notable clusters of resources that collectively illustrate the unique development of Portland. Even if "Districts" with the associated protection are not created, a tool for building public awareness of these clusters (maybe honorific signage or other recognition) should be built to make folks aware of these places where the whole is worth more than the sum of the parts.
The inventory can also be a basis for community efforts to educate the public on what the "right thing to do" is in upgrading their properties. A great example of this approach is the Chicago Bungalow program which takes a carrot, not a stick, approach to encouraging protection of their historic bungalows and attempts to inspire pride in the local communities once they understand what they have.
The inventory should be small and the bar for enrollment should be very high -- historic preservation is often a sham to preclude growth and change. Careful curation of a historic inventory is the only way

to lend legitimacy to this process.
Inventoried resources should typically be accessible to the public. As a rule, they should be easy to get to via public transit and they should be open -- as commercial or public spaces.
by identifying vintage buildings, our history is saved
By providing for sense of place, uniqueness of the city. By ending the demolition epidemic that serves the profit motive of developers destroying livability and neighborhood character. By returning the trend to refurbishing older structures.
Archive
Do NOT allow designation of large residential or other areas, without owner consent, as a way to prevent any change and re-development in a neighborhood (like Eastmoreland, Irvington, and Laurelhurst have done or are trying). Protection of historic resources should not be allowed to take precedence over other public policy objectives, like housing needs.
So the public knows what's there, what used to be there and can access the information. You never know how valuable that info might become.
By visually showing where our history exists. A clear map that shows the age and significance of our structures. As the city changes, being able to see where history remains is valuable.
Providing documentation of the history of these houses that doesn't get lost from owner to owner if one owner becomes uninterested. Sometimes, when these houses were built by someone who was maybe financially comfortable but not wealthy and famous, people take the opportunity to trace the history of a relatively ordinary stranger and tie that person and their family to a time and place that still exist in Portland and making that research available (even if not all of it is 100% professional) builds kind of a picture of what Portland neighborhoods looked like 100 years ago at the individual level.
Protecting these houses against destruction is huge.
By raising awareness of the city's history and offering an opportunity to save and retain the city's heritage through demolition delay and denial processes
Helping to maintain some of the history and character of the neighborhoods still left in the city before they are all chopped up or gone completely
It will show people where to view historic homes, structures and neighborhoods. It will protect those resources from demolition by money hungry developers.
Identifying important resources can help to save those that are important to understanding Portland's past. Our historical resources provide a richer community and better understanding of the past and informs our future. The inventory could also help guide developers to sites that are not as significant. Preserving some of our architectural heritage helps make Portland unique.

5. What else would you like us to consider regarding resource identification and inventory?

The areas outside city limits in the 1980's may not have the concentration of resources that closer-in neighborhoods have, but there are some there, and they may have more significance because they are few and far between, not just one of dozens or hundreds of subdivision dwellings put up by a builder.
Openness, transparency, and inclusiveness of the process.
Err on the side of inclusion. Once a valuable historic resource like the Ancient Order of Workmen Temple or the distinctive and integral neighborhoods built between c.1880-1940 are gone, they are gone forever, and so is another fragment of Oregon's history. Don't let self-serving arguments of the moment undermine the principles of identification.
Please invite the community of public, environmental, and social historians in Portland to participate!
Identified historic resources should receive an extra layer of protection and scrutiny
Pre-1940 is historic here in Oregon
Special attention to social history
Stay focused on ensuring that the historic and architectural significance of buildings/districts is professionally and objectively assessed.
As noted under Question 10, resource identification alone is insufficient. If the city is serious about protecting historic resources, it must adopt measures to protect them through a combination of financial/zoning incentives and demolition restrictions/penalties.
Equity must include homeowners and stakeholders. The City is so busy doing outreach to what it considers under-represented communities, that it is overlooking property owners (who make significant tax and cultural contributions to the City) without whom the City would lose its financial footing.
Add National Historic Register properties to inventory. Make inventory accessible online
A better way to know when a historic resource may be demolished (greater notification area?). Be sure purchasers (aka developers) know they are purchasing a historic resource.
Multi-use and multi-family renovation and parking restrictions
Don't let people use historic designation to shut out change and disadvantage their neighbors. If those a***** don't have the money to buy their neighbors' homes themselves to keep them from being torn down, it's none of their business.
Nothing
Look at "Modern Historic Resources of East Portland" April 2011 and market the possibility of some identified housing developments being designated as national Register District as well as within the City inventory.
? not sure
Archaeological sites should be listed alongside buildings and structures.
Over-inclusion of non-superlative examples defeats the purpose of a historic register. The historic resources code should not be used to thwart the construction of housing in wealthy areas of town.
Do not turn it into a tool for NIMBYs to abuse.
Extending the time period for demolishing historic resources or better yet, prohibiting it all together in exchange for property tax abatement of some percentage
I ask that you balance preservation with our commitments to lower our greenhouse gas emissions, and the construction of more housing. To make achieve both those goals we must allow more housing be built near transit.

I fear that we may work to preserve too many resources and not be able to hit our other goals.
What we've lost in Portland due to gentrification is diversity. To me that's more important than historic buildings. To me the priority is to build more housing in order to meet the demand with more supply.
That the city be more open and willing to preserve their architectural past. It seems that it is almost impossible to protect, preserve and upgrade significant older buildings in our race to build.
Need for speed. At the rate developers are tearing Portland down many important resources will soon be gone.
Unreinforced masonry (seismic upgrading) is a huge issue for historic buildings. These should be clearly identified, and some source of funding instituted to help owners preserve them. Any timeline for retrofitting needs to be flexible - a timeline I've heard proposed is totally unacceptable. Perhaps a fee on demolitions could be considered. Or some sort of permit waivers in return for certified preservation work such as the preceding.
Please keep in mind that older buildings have provide much more affordable housing than new buildings. Also consider identifying older neighborhoods (i.e. from the 20's) that are relatively uniform but do not necessarily have "significant" buildings but nevertheless have a unifying type of housing should also be noted. These are livable places - that are becoming all too rare.
churches
nothing at this time
Don't lose history
Nothing yet! Thanks for taking on this project - I can't believe Portland is so behind other cities and Oregon is so behind other states in having LOCAL ways to assign historic significance - the National Register is very heavy-handed.
Resource identification alone is insufficient. The city should take measures to protect historic buildings (and districts) from demolition through a combination of financial incentives and demolition disincentives and/or penalties.
Treat it like an online Historical Society. Create a website, advertise its presense and post a monthly review of interesting buildings with their historical background and what the neighborhood looked like when it was built.
activate a story-telling website so individuals may contribute to the history of a place
Consider the motivations of people on both sides of the issue. Developers will tend to oppose any historic preservation as it interferes with the rate at which they can make money.
Groups like 1000 Friends of Oregon are concerned with preventing the expansion of the Urban Growth Boundary and seem content to wage a war within it to prevent any expansion of the UGB.
Also, I would demand more research, studies and data. Much more weight should be placed on positions supported by quality data and studies. There are many talking points out there, but very little actual data.
As an example, we clearly see that demolishing homes and structures results in more expensive replacements. How is this reconciled with the idea that increasing supply (via demolition and other means) will increase affordability?
Work with neighborhoods and other geographically based groups in identifying potential historic resources. Utilize volunteers in documenting historic resources.

The value of the site. Is it of value to the community or just an individual?
Be thorough.
Reward use of existing units as versus demolition and replacement with tax incentives or other types of financial incentives.
Establish tiered protocol for historic preservation. Highest classification should only be demolished as a matter of life safety, lower tiers are progressively easier to demo. That way we can prioritize what we are willing to sacrifice, if need be.
Portland city planning appears to ignore much of its existing building fabric and public passageways/spaces in favor of demolition and building to lot lines. The super tall buildings under construction everywhere do little to enhance the pedestrian experience.
Cultural and 'sense of place' importance to sites
We have no idea what might befall our city and an inventory will help preserve our physical, emotional, social, cultural and political context and meaning.
Please bring a greater sense of urgency to this issue -- Portland is well behind every other major West Coast city in protecting its historical resources.
that's fine
The draconian austerity brought to urban life by neoliberal economy lunacy is now damaging cities in ways every bit as damnably damaging as the "urban renewal" of the 1950's and onward that murdered the city for the sake of the automobile. Gentrification is a horrid plague of inequity that ruins the city for the rich and poor alike. We should all be enriched in kind by our built environment and urban habitats. Egalitarianism of experiential riches a city has to offer helps us all be abundantly more than the sum of ourselves individually. Civilization exponentially thrives off of the generating power of our dynamic and intricate social dynamics we share collectively. We need more civic treasures... Less condos! Less freeways! More magnificent structures!! More rail!!
Double time and neighborhood notification and listening sessions for all permits to demolish and new construction requests. Provide neighbor oversight for demolition and new construction requests.
We should not be recording what was with the expectation that we'll destroy it, but we should reverence and maintain it as there's no "going back."
earthquake preparedness
Fixtures, including windows, doors, history of the land itself
what the terrain would look like is the historic property was demolished and any pollution effects from the demolition including noise, loss of shade, increas heating
N/A
Ownership of property changes. If we require owner consent, we are not recognizing the significance that our built environment contributes to the society as a whole. Please also recognize that historic neighborhoods are equally as important as single significant buildings. Possibly more so, as they are what gives our city its unique character.
Remodel and new construction must meet match the characters of the neighborhood
What was typical of all classes and all people living in our area through the years
Stop allowing skinny houses and stop allowing historic and perfectly good houses to be demolished. Portland will loose all of its character. Charge a vacancy tax for all the buildings sitting vacant
N/A
Unsure
Our city belongs to all citizens. We the people need to determine how, when, and where our city grows. As long as there are 1970s strip malls and surface parking lots, there should NEVER be the demolition of a structurally sound residential or commercial structure. EVER. The commodification

and securitization of real estate is anti-democratic and must end. We can look to Europe for endless examples of democratic control over real property that protects livability, encourages preservation, and allows our built environment to serve the needs of all our citizens, instead of only the short-term interests of speculators, developers, and financiers. Our local governments need to take control away from for-profit entities if we are to harness the power and knowledge of history in order to build a more just, equitable, and environmentally responsible future. The viability of humanity requires a radical realignment towards sustainability, and our historic built environment offers time-tested solutions to many of the problems we face. The first step, when you've dug yourself a hole, is to stop digging. Our first step in saving our city has to be that we stop destroying it.
Make such an inventory available to the public online.
Consider the cost to Portland's growth and tourist industry if its unique quality is lost
Cultural import; historic trends when a neighborhood was first built;
Thoughtful and statistically-based study of the actual outcomes of the current demolish-and-replace approach is a priority. Assessment should include comparison of effects on home affordability and on diversity of the area in question, before and after.
Offer wide variety of neighborhood types so people have choices in their income bracket
Identify those buildings at greatest risk of loss, not only from earthquakes, but also from redevelopment. Ensure that funding is made available for seismic retrofits for vulnerable buildings. Do not create a deadline for seismic retrofitting. A demolition fee could be imposed on a historic buildings that is, nevertheless, demolished, and this fee should be the equivalent of the cost of retrofitting that building. The fee could then help to retrofit other vulnerable buildings.
More incentives for rehabilitation. More DIY classes on home rehabilitation. Low-interest, long-terms loans for seismic upgrades for all buildings. Wide dissemination of information on energy conservation for buildings without destroying the historic qualities which contribute to economic and cultural vitality.
Too many buildings and houses of historical significance are being destroyed in Portland right now. We need to have a better effort to save theses structures for economical, environmental and historical reasons.
Most can see that the massive rates of demolitions have NOT resulted in affordable housing. In fact, most new units are double the price of the affordable housing that was demolished. There should be much more scientific research and data to help shape Planning Bureau decisions. There are a lot of claims being thrown around, but very few facts. When we know that most new homes built when historic buildings are demolished are incredibly expensive, then who are you serving? You should not be trying to make sure a developer gets richer, you should be looking out for residents and trying to save our most affordable housing--our historic buildings.
Identify those buildings at greatest risk of loss, not only from earthquakes, but also from redevelopment
Finding a way to more effectively keep our historic houses and buildings from being demolished. Also lobby for grants to help earthquake proof and preserve them.
Maintaining the "flavor" of the neighborhood.
An index by architect
Historic districts identified as well as individual sites
Landscaping, open space
Value to current and past residents.
If a resource has affordable housing units, consider awarding extra points for extra value. In Goose Hollow and West End, the rents in the older buildings are 1/2 the price per square foot as the price in

newer buildings. This should be a consideration. In addition, any demolition should be paired with a donation to a fund for rehabilitation and seismic upgrades for existing buildings.
?
I'd like to see a status-update on the list of buildings that were on the previous inventory. How many and which of those buildings have been demolished in the past 30+ years.
We need better research and a more thoughtful process that isn't dominated by people who stand to profit from demolitions. Preservation of views, gardens and green spaces should be taken into consideration as part of the overall aesthetic of a neighborhood or building.
Work with people who have a devoted interest in preservation and for everyone's sake, GET THE DEVELOPERS OFF THE PLANING BOARDS!!! Anybody else thinking honestly see a serious 'conflict of interest' Come on!!
Take time to consider homes and buildings - Do not be in the pockets of developers who simply are motivated by profits and lack any real understanding or connection with the aesthetics of the city. Use city planners who are knowledgeable and have studied what other cities have done right and wrong. SAVE our beautiful old buildings [ie: downtown] And renovate with keeping the best of the craftsmanship in each. Have vision and far sightedness. The city does not have to destroy itself in order to allow new residents. Think of the common good.
documenting all that is left
Talk to historical societies in a given region. Even the name "resource and inventory" are words associated with exploitation, demolition and takeover by economic rather than safety issues.
Portland is beautiful. This is why people want to move here. But the city should protect the beauty & history and stop the infills
If you are doing a new City Inventory it needs to have some meaning. Give some status to these buildings that are worth saving. Help keep them out of the landfill.
Historic places anchor a community and are desirable. Without them the city becomes a lifeless suburb.
Not sure if this is relevant to the question, but how,are developers able to raze old homes in historic neighborhood/districts?
???
Having such a tool online would be fantastic and helpful
Make sure that historic homes cannot be demolished without council review.
Scale and preservation of a neighborhood's feel
Association recommendations
importance in preserving a link to the past.
To the degree that it is possible, consider livability issues in historic areas, and the impact of infill -- noise, traffic, affordability.
Please preserve our history and our sense of place. Too much density will no doubt have a negative effect on our health and mental health, not to mention livability.
N/a
Prevent loss of historic structures and areas
With the exception of a few wealthy estate-type buildings that can stand alone as their own historic points of interest, I think its important for the city to consider steps that preserve clusters of architecture from different periods spread all over the city. It may not be practical or possible to preserve an entire neighborhood, but setting aside some cohesive areas that demonstrate architectural variation of different time periods adds to the overall affect. As the city grows and becomes more dense, I would love to see pockets maintained that feel like a step back in time - to any

of the big housing booms Portland went through. I think it would offer a vision of Portland's history that would appeal to tourists and educate our citizens.
It is too easy for developers to delete properties and build houses that do not fit the neighborhoods. Neighborhoods are architecture as much as people. Don't overlook smaller houses and structures. Don't break up significant pockets by allowing fast track development.
Once any of the historic resources are destroyed, they will never be replaced. Identifying them is the first step in avoiding irresponsible demolition.
Threats to existing architecture
Don't let people's individual values influence the inventory, it should be based on facts about the resource. What is done with the inventory is a separate question. Don't rely on someone's word, they might have reasons to be untruthful. Rely on documentation or actual observations.
Nothing comes to mind
Preserve past standards and practices and city codes and zoning in neighborhoods that wish to remain true to historical standards
Have developers justify reasons for building two million dollar houses on a lot when the city wants affordable housing other than pure profit !
The condition of the resource, landfill space, and the cost of replacing it---in general, the practicalities.
The number of historic resources, such as homes, that have been maintained in a neighborhood is important.
Listing should be unique, scarce, and rare, and not something used to perpetuate the exclusion that built most of this city. We can and must do better, and the City/BPS needs to provide leadership rather than cowering in the face of preservationist and neighborhood bullying.
Resources and amenities
Whoever does the identification and inventory needs to be neutral. Currently citizens who truly care about their city are fighting against developers whose primary care is to make money quickly and with no regard for the desirable attributes of a community their actions destroy. Developers should not have a voice in this process. Groups like 1000 Friends of Oregon should not have a voice in this process. There is a balance to avoiding unnecessary "sprawl" and destroying healthy neighborhoods already existing within the urban boundary.
Please come to our Eastmoreland for a survey of new homes that have replaced the smaller structures such as cottage and bungalows. These "mac mansions" are built on lots by removing all the trees and landscaping to accommodate them, and priced at several multiples of the demolished home.
History, livability,
Developers and motives to tear down historical homes.
Consider the motivations of people on both sides of the issue. Developers will tend to oppose any historic preservation as it interferes with the rate at which they can make money. Groups like 1000 Friends of Oregon are concerned with preventing the expansion of the Urban Growth Boundary and seem content to wage a war within it to prevent any expansion of the UGB.
Also, I would demand more research, studies and data. Much more weight should be placed on positions supported by quality data and studies. There are many talking points out there, but very little actual data. As an example, we clearly see that demolishing homes and structures results in more expensive replacements. How is this reconciled with the idea that increasing supply (via demolition and other means) will increase affordability?

Many owners don't value the history of their own properties to the neighborhoods, and many owners don't have the financial stability to take a much lower offer for their property just to preserve the historic. Funds/incentives should be available for keeping historic buildings and renovating/restoring them.
No idea
education
A full combined database that last the user pull up several resources by multiple criteria. Not just one at a time by clicking on a dot.
Keep everyone in the neighborhood aware of what's being done to preserve our history
The history or any city or town is told, in a very large part, by it's structures and their unique history. It was because a much lower price tag on a smaller historic home, that our family was able to remain in a neighborhood we loved and near a school our children had attended. Without that opportunity, we would have been pushed out of Portland. Thank goodness for old historic homes for middle class families to make their own!
The ordinary home from the 1920's has great glory, even if it's a simple bungalow like my son's on Concord. It was owned or rented by someone of humble means, it's small but made with old growth Oregon timber, and built-ins, and has beautiful double-hung windows. Each house has a story.
Reduce demolitions!!!
The public likes this information to be easy to find and easily accessible.
Consider updating the inventory with notable houses or buildings that may have been missed or may have been built since the last inventory.
Open.
n/a
any significant architecture relevant to the area
Work with neighborhoods and other geographically based groups in identifying potential historic resources. Utilize volunteers in documenting historic resources.
Work with neighborhoods and other geographically based groups in identifying potential historic resources. Utilize volunteers in documenting historic resources.
na
The value in fighting for historic resources to remain rather than allow their easy and fast replacement.
I like more thought preserving our green canopy. Too many heritage trees are being lost and our canopy is diminishing at a increasing pace. One of the lovely things about Portland is all the trees and greenery. Now I drive by all these new units and houses with either little or no trees and landscaping.
N/A
The more information, the better.
Just do it. You guys are way behind, and things are disappearing fast.
Consider the motivations of people on both sides of the issue. Developers will tend to oppose any historic preservation as it interferes with the rate at which they can make money. Groups like 1000 Friends of Oregon are concerned with preventing the expansion of the Urban Growth Boundary and seem content to wage a war within it to prevent any expansion of the UGB.
Also, I would demand more research, studies and data. Much more weight should be placed on positions supported by quality data and studies. There are many talking points out there, but very little actual data. As an example, we clearly see that demolishing homes and structures results in

more expensive replacements. How is this reconciled with the idea that increasing supply (via demolition and other means) will increase affordability?
In general, more information is better than less information because, history can be too easily relegated to a non-essential category especially when juxtaposed with 'progress' and greed thinly disguised as need.
An inventory of demolished historic homes and what replaced them.
Hire planners that value historic preservation and adaptive reuse as a significant part of making a great urban environment. Destroying the character of our neighborhoods is the wrong way to improve the housing crisis.
Just because a house is old does not make it interesting or unusual. Establishing an entire neighborhood of "historic" houses is idiotic.
Resources in a group such as a district or neighborhood are more significant than individual ones. There should be special attention paid to mixed use or commercial preservation as it plays heavily into profitability of a commercial zone by defining and preserving a City's character. I think this is FAR more important than single family home designation.
Use guidelines, citation requirements, publication restrictions, copyright restrictions.
It could be done in phases with an annual budget appointed for that purpose. It could engage the local community in their own inventory. Info should be public and available online.
Inventory inclusion should not provide a hurdle to future uses that are in the best interest of the community. For example, a small, deteriorating building should not be cordoned off from development if the future development would add needed housing or services for a neighborhood.
More information is always better. Don't infringe on owners. History matters.
Objective peer reviewed historic criteria
Nothing, thanks
historic documentation
no
Popularize it more - e.g., a column in the local paper on "historic resource of the week/month."
Do an analysis of where resources are being identified and the impacts that will have on future housing options. Then act upon the findings with equity for future Portlanders in mind.
I really like what McMenamins has done to preserve the history of its historical properties. While they've done away with a lot of the original use (classrooms in schools, etc.), they've maintained buildings' character and preserved a lot of history through art and artifact. Revolution Hall has done this as well. I like their models for balancing preservation of structures while updating their usage.
Encourage infill and construction in areas where old neighborhoods do not exist.
Cost to a neighborhood should be minimized
Anything that will protect the resource..history of particular resources
Not sure.
Again, I do not see the point to spend public money on this. Don't we have some real issues to spend public money on?
Historic districts cheapen the concept of a historic registry. Each building on the registry should stand on its own merits. If everything old is special, nothing is special.
Inputs into zoning and planning requirements - maintaining historic communities by limiting height and mass of new structures Input into placement of housing type - market and affordable that fit in height and mass with

<p>surrounding community</p> <p>Not all history is over 75 years old - identifying key architecture of the 50's through now that reflect the changing times - fun old safeway stores that stream 70's - saving a few of those would be appropriate -</p> <p>Trying to save what made oregon oregon through the ages - not cookie cutter mcmansions</p>
<p>Whether historic districts actually preserve valued resources or are only being used to throttle development and change.</p>
<p>A diverse population is also a resource.</p>
<p>Don't paint with a broad brush. Just because something is old does not make it historic.</p>
<p>Please consider Owner choice and limitation (no limitation) on what an owner can do with their property.</p>
<p>The process should be weighted to reflect the resources of the neighborhood. For example for each home inventoried in a wealthy neighborhood it should be mandatory to inventory a home in poor neighborhood. Historically significant structures exist in all of Portland's neighborhoods.</p>
<p>National and state professional standards, as well as municipal preservation ordinances, should be incorporated into the survey methodology so that information gathered is consistent and satisfies government programs and reviews at all levels. These standards will inform the survey's structure and serve as guidelines, covering issues such as the methods for gathering data, the level of research to be completed, and the professional qualifications required of surveyors. (Ref: Getty Conservation institute)</p>
<p>Sensitivity to the wishes of all residents.</p>
<p>Publication of neighborhood or building significance made available to the public</p>
<p>The listing of a property should be under the permission of the property owner, not by a third party. This affects the owner rights and property values.</p>
<p>Great caution should be taken when considering resource identification in wealthy neighborhoods. The need to balance the inequality in neighborhoods most people cannot currently afford to live in outweighs the value of preserving housing that is not especially unique in character.</p>
<p>This particularly pertains to Historic Neighborhoods . . . Consider the era of history in which you are "protecting", and how these protections serve that goal.</p> <p>For example, Irvington's historic value is in its creation as a street car neighborhood with dense workforce housing. However that street car is now gone, additional dense housing is prohibited by current zoning, and property values are at the point where the area no longer reflects it's original blue collar roots. So what exactly is the "history" that is being preserved for future Portlanders? Are we saving what we intended to save?</p> <p>Irvington is a beautiful neighborhood (I grew up there), but what about it is so historically significant that it should be frozen in its current form (not its historic form) for generations to come? These questions can be applied to Eastmoreland, Laurelhurst, the Alphabet District and so on down the line?</p> <p>What is significant about the history?</p> <p>Does the neighborhood still reflect that history?</p> <p>Are we just preserving something that we enjoy today, or that was important generations ago?</p> <p>Are historians leading the charge? Or property owners with ulterior motives?</p> <p>Can an handful of specific individual building protections do the job that listing an entire neighborhood can?</p>

What effect will listing a historic resource have on the neighborhood or city 10, 20, 50, or 100 years down the line?
none
Don't allow neighborhoods to use current rules to restrict unwilling property owners in a proposed HD. This is unreasonable interference with private property rights, is exclusionary to lower income persons and smacks of elitism and NIMBISM.
It is not just the 19c buildings that are important- while they may be a favorite. A neighborhood of well designed and maintained cottages is a snapshot in time of how the city grew and developed. These need to be persevered- once gone there is no longer a record.
?
Whole districts should have a high bar to be enacted
If there are thousands of examples of a type then that's not very special or valuable.
Unknown
The city needs to de-couple land-use regulations from listing on the federal Register of Historic Places. The process for listing property on that register is undemocratic.
Nothing
Green spaces. Nice historic homes, or any homes without green spaces lose livability as well as cleaner air, and of course eye appeal.
Not sure
If it is used to develop regulations to restrict owners choices regarding their property. It shouldnt be done
<p>Let's do a super-bang-up job of resource identification and inventory.</p> <p>One of the key points of contention in the Eastmoreland debacle was a whitewashing of the ID and Inventorying process, broadly sweeping up hundreds of homes that had no good business being identified as historic.</p> <p>This sad, cynical and self-serving approach led to a complete loss of credibility in the proponents of the district itself.</p> <p>Let's keep ID and Inventory as academic, objective and non-political as possible, if at all possible. For example, as an owner of a potentially historically interesting home, re-assure me that simply having me inventoried doesn't at all bind me to being "Listed," or in any way change my status. In this way, we can get a truly accurate accounting of what's out there that really should be preserved, whether at the individual structure or broader development scale.</p> <p>And again, let's make sure the inventory is focused on significance. What elements of the listing continue to exist *today* that embody an exemplar of the historic elements being considered? (Eastmoreland as an automobile suburb may only need to preserve the layout of streets, orientation of home to street, street trees and the like and have nothing to do with the style of homes occupying the sites themselves).</p>
have the committee that determines zoning be elected, instead of an appointed group of realtors, developers, architects and construction companies.
As stated in above box, historic districting is not a proper tool for managing growth. That would be zoning.
Your open ended questions are completely unclear. What is "resource identification"? What do you mean by "inventory"?
Qualified individual, with education on the matter, should complete the inventory. Volunteers without knowledge should not be doing survey.
Flexibility to respond to current needs.

This is a back door to exclusion of renters and other low income people from high-end neighborhoods. It's undemocratic. If people of previous eras had tried to declare their neighborhoods historic, we would not have craftsman bungalows. Our priority as a community should not be to create a museum of the single-family neighborhood for wealthy people to enjoy. Our goal should be to create a city where there is all kinds of housing for all kinds of people.
I believe the more we preserve and make easy for residents to know about their property - the more likely it will be our history, buildings and heart will be preserved.
Changes made to buildings and impact on surrounding land and neighborhood
That it be limited to specific properties. The entire concept of a "Historic District" for example, is a farce.
Consider abolishing historic neighborhoods. There are unique homes, but if everything is 'historic ' then it means that none of it is actually important. It's like if every student gets an A just because they took the class from a professor who takes bribes.
Any committee that identifies resources must be tasked to be focused future forward, not merely trying to mitigate changes they do or don't like in the present.
That Portland has historical buildings disappearing more and more, old growth trees being cut down to accommodate ridiculous unaffordable housing.
The historic system needs to be approached that a status change of a person's home cannot be assumed. It has to be voted in by the home owners it affects.
Perhaps tax breaks.
Again, do not designate whole neighborhoods, or typical houses. Only significant ones, such as the Poulson House. Employ experts in historic preservation to select the inventory and determine which buildings are truly significant.
N/A
A property can lose its historical significance when too many alterations have been made.
don't know
Why
photo(s) of the resource
Listing a group of structures/locations should only be listed through a democratic process in which a majority of title owners sign notarized forms of support for the historic designation. Also land use laws should NOT be tied to historic designations.
Protect current owner privacy and property rights
Consider landscape/sites/Places; not just buildings.
Age alone is not a criteria. The subject must be a special example of something significant.
Whether the resource being deemed historic has a negative impact on demographics. Are we redlining or creating barriers for people of color or low income?
Not necessary
Owner consent. All owners in a proposed district should consent or it should not move forward.
Please make the listings voluntary.
Historic lot size Scale of houses
The bar for historically significant needs to be high, and not hinder the continued evolution of our city.
Materials, methods and dates of construction. Designers' names (for buildings, public spaces such as gardens/ parks). Interesting biographical information of previous owners and/or designers, if found.

No opinion
Many residential homes may have been built in the early 1900's but have since undergone recent renovations which may alter the original footprint. The home should not be considered as contributing to a historic district.
The most environmentally friendly home is an existing one
There needs to be a CLEAR definition of what constitutes a significant historic resource. It seems that in Portland, anything that is moderately old (in west of the Mississippi terms) is considered "historic" regardless of how many times and how much it has been modified. This is ridiculous.
Cities are living creatures. They grow, learn and change. The bigger question is what we can learn from the old buildings that we still have. Why have they made it a hundred years? why were they never torn down in the name of progress? What about them made them worth keeping? People say they like old buildings. Surely, no insulation, no seismic bracing, inefficient windows and doors are not what people like. Yet there are qualities in these historic structures that resonate. We should attempt to figure out what these qualities are and include them in our design guidelines and zoning requirements. Our new structures should give folks that same nice feeling like the buildings of the past do. Not all new buildings are lacking, many are lovely, comfortable and well made so I know it can be done. We should not fear change. We should not impede progress or keep structures that are not worthy, but we should attempt to guide the future, lest these new heartless, cheaply made buildings will not make it another 100 years.
Public support is critical!
it needs to be taken out of the hands of neighborhood associations. They have to narrow of a view and to big of a conflict of interest. the benefit is for the the whole city not a selective few.
Again these questions are unclear
Not using untrained volunteers
Never force a property owner to have their home or building listed as a historic resource without their specific permission.
Nothing
It is crucial that those doing the resource identification and inventory are well qualified to the task.
Neighborhoods should not be allowed to use historic districts to work around the city's zoning code. The current process for National Historic Districts is unfair to the homeowners. It's unbelievable that someone can propose that your home be included on a registry and you are unable to opt-out.
Should there be no opt out option, it should be required to include a vote among homeowners. I also believe homeowners that own multiple properties in a proposed district should be allowed to vote for each property. Each property is affected and the registry will carry after sale. The home is what is registered, not the owner. Therefore they should get a vote for each property. The way the current NHD process is set up, you only get one objection per homeowner no matter how many properties you own in the proposed district.
Leave out input from the neighborhood associations which represent just a few folks that serve their own desires.
Please consider the differences between the honorary National Park Service (NPS) historic district designation and the local ones. For local districts, 50% plus one of the owners must actively consent. But for NPS designation, a single person can submit an application for a designation that might cover thousands of owners homes. In 49 states, the NPS designation remains honorary - no obligations, restrictions, costs or commitments are required of the owner of a resource in a district. But in

Oregon, land use restrictions are put in place. This is not democratic. Our elected officials are not involved in the process - any person can submit an application to the NPS.
Energy efficiency, updates, ability to add solar or further energy options,
Owners should have a say, not neighborhood associations speaking "for" their neighbors when a majority of the neighbors disagree.
It's not necessary but even if it was should be at a very basic level.
It should be completed with accurate information. Volunteers making guesses from the curb misses too much vital info on updates, current materials, and what remains of original architecture.
The requirement to gather notarized objections from 50%+1 property owners in a potential historic district, like Eastmoreland, is unfair. This is very difficult, expensive and undemocratic process.
The collection of homes as a % of total homes must be very high
Dollars spent on the past when housing and Human Resources are of critical importance. How s identification and inventory relevant?
Historic Districts should require majority affirmative consent of owners rather than the backward process of negative consent. Individuals and neighborhood associations should not be allowed to designate large groups of homes as historic without a public process that includes hearings and information on the pros and cons of establishing a district.
I am interesting in this project mostly because I am sad about the loss in historic buildings in Portland and want to see more incentives for owners to keep them intact at least on the exterior. I also want the inventory to include some of the gems of East Portland, particularly Parkrose where I live.
There's no way that Portland has thousands of homes with a legitimate historic significance. Portland has more "historic" structures than Boston and Philadelphia!
In an ideal world, inventoried resources above a certain level would be provided with some kind of durable plaque that would tell a story about why the resource is important. This is especially valuable when the resource is visually unassuming but culturally or socially important as an artifact of the past. (The now-lost Burger Barn is an example.) Portland doesn't seem to have any formal approach to plaque placement or any city funding for them, but that would be a natural step.
Another way to lend legitimacy to historic preservation efforts is to place legal limits on their density: no more than X structures per square mile.
stop demolishing our historic/vintage buidigns
Coordinate with RIP. RIP process seems independent but is having irreversible effect on historic resource inventory.
Do not allow neighborhoods to be designated as historic and subject to development restrictions through use of national historic district designation. This is not being used as a community-buildign tool; rather, histroic designaiton is beign used as a way to insulate neighborhoods that, in many cases, were also "protected" from populations considered undesirable, and now are largely white and wealthy. That's unacceptable.
Existing or recently existing green space including trees.
Please consider equity issues. History should not be the sole preserve of the wealthy.
It seems like there's a need for some level of protection in between the 120 days for demolition but less than the Historic Register level. A lot of these houses are situated on larger, dividable, lots. Having stronger protections against demolition would make it less attractive to buy for that purpose (I get that there is competition for the truly grand Victorians and they're unlikely to get knocked down for a dividable lot). I'm concerned mostly with Victorians because there are just a tiny number of Queen Anne style Victorians left. It seems like there has to be something in between the extremely high bar of the historic register, and the tiny amount of protection provided by the current HRI. My

house has some architectural significance in that it has architectural features that may be unique within Portland, and the original owners had some historic significance to Portland, but it's not historic register material. I'd like to see a level of protection that accounts for these houses that everyone in the area is familiar with and which Portland would lose something people can really point to if they were gone, but which probably aren't important enough for the Historic Register.
That's enough for a while
Protect them, meaning don't place multifamily dwellings right next door to historic homes. The context of the home's original development should be respected.
<p>Sites of cultural significance.</p> <p>Social history</p> <p>Being inclusive (race, social-economic, etc)</p> <p>Including more the more recent past in identifying newer buildings that are significant.</p>

6. How can the existing procedure for designating local historic and conservation landmarks and districts be improved?

?
by guaranteeing transparency and impartiality of process, inclusiveness of owners and making it 100% voluntary.
I'll leave that to people directly involved.
District designations are rarely if ever warranted. If every house on a street or in a district qualifies on its own, then each has a historic designation. While it might be quicker and easier to lump many properties together, never are all equally deserving of a designation. The end result of designating districts is the inclusion of non-contributing properties, which are then "protected" from redevelopment. This mostly prevents any additional housing density, which is not a result that is good for the city.
Do not let only elite neighborhoods participate. Encourage and Shepard neighborhoods that are not typically considered significant into the process— places in east portland, or north portland with mid century modern neighborhoods.
Strengthen protections against demolition. Anyone buying a historic resource needs to accept that there are restrictions on use of the property. Also responsibilities to prevent demolition by neglect
Share info on it to every homeowner with a home built pre- 1950 and allow them to know what it means
Through a city wide survey
Again, make sure that protection measures accompany the designation of local buildings and districts as historic.
Greater outreach should be done in communities that are most obviously of historic and cultural significance.
to make the process and results more acceptable to property owners, reduce the restrictions on property alterations. Make the process smoother for permits and approval for alterations so that there is less tendency to flaunt the rules.
Allow for the public to nominate landmarks and districts and not have to get 100% of the property owners to sign off on it. Half or more should be enough.
Encourage owners to participate (tax incentives?)
Increased rigor in initial qualification.
Districts need to be decided through at the very least a local democratic process. Ideally, only individual buildings and not neighborhoods should be designated. If we're going to designate a neighborhood, designate old Albina and rebuild all the old houses destroyed by urban renewal. And give the title to the land back to the families that owned it. Start there, with reparations. That's the kind of history that's worth remembering. But also, the areas should be required to allow and even encourage greater density by dividing up large old mansions into smaller apartments as was done during WWII.
Historic district designation should be more closely scrutinized to ensure that designation is not being pursued for an improper purpose.
streamline the process and hold workshops for interested residents to learn more about the process. The City should underwrite any associated costs.
I don't know enough about the existing procedures. I do hear about old houses being torn down. I believe that the old homes can be built around, with out destroying them.
not sure what the procedure is now . I have heard that it is an arduous and expense process that does not provide any safeguards

The procedure should be localized and subject to public process. We should require covenants, or deposits, from folks designating historic districts, to ensure the upkeep and accessibility (whether visually from the street or in terms of open public access) of the resources.
Broad historic district designation is a clumsy and easily abused tool that should be eliminated.
We already have too many bogus historic districts. We don't need any more.
Get advice on best practices from cities that have successfully preserved and revitalized their older architectural/district areas. And consider these older places to be assets rather than something to be demolished.
See above comments on considerations for listing buildings & districts. In some cases, active neighborhood associations (or simply groups of people in neighborhoods) can well be enlisted to help identify these. There are likely many volunteers who would like to engage their neighbors in making such designations, if they were made aware of such opportunities. And they might also have good ideas on how to strengthen demolition reviews (sorely needed).
The requirements for demolition of historic landmarks need to be revised; currently they are too weak - among the weakest in the USA. We are losing irreplaceable historic buildings right and left. Revision of this procedure is urgently needed.
make the public aware of its existence
The national process is extremely costly; a local process should be much more accessible. Local districts and resources should have demolition review.
Avoid the wasting of useful buildings
There should be a transparent, local process before historic districts are established, and rules for districts should be as unique as the districts themselves!
Make sure that protection measures and demolition disincentives/penalties accompany the designation of local buildings and districts as historic. Currently HRI listing is rather meaningless.
Allow more time for review and feedback before demolition. Advertise potential demolition to the neighborhood and the larger community well before a demolition decision is made. Include the importance of the building to the vitality and historical significance to the neighborhood before demolition. Consider demolition as a last case scenario for a buildings that neighborhoods consider extremely important to their history
regular, significant funding from our tax dollars.
Improve the quality and accuracy of data that can support this. Establish a clear position of the goals of the program and how that fits in with other city-wide goals including affordability, population growth, and land-use.
The inventory should be associated and coordinated with the Comprehensive Plan process so that it is updated at reasonable increments and document what is being added and what is being lost.
By identifying key sites and developing standards to commemorate the site. It should not take years and various bureaus to handle the process. Site ownership and maintenance needs to be defined.
Strengthen demolition review requirements and lengthen the review period. And stop putting developers interest over that of the citizenry. Portland has failed its citizens in the demolition it has allowed in the last 5 years.
Expand the methodology of contributing/noncontributing buildings beyond existing district boundaries to give a sense of what historic buildings exist everywhere, not just in existing districts. Use this tool to discourage demolition and as a pool of FAR and density to be transfered onto noncontributing properties, like a cap and trade system.

Clear urban planning guidelines. New buildings should complement the old, views corridors anticipated, enhanced public passageways and more public spaces created.
By allowing other neighborhood associations to provide input as to the effect such a designation would have upon them
Make it easier! It shouldn't be as political a process. Find a way to mediate between camps. Perhaps find ways to support historic preservation and conservation through additional financial incentives and tax breaks?
Establish a local procedure, with proper associated notification, that is not simply reliant on NRHP designation.
We need an informed public to vote democratically on the city we all have to live in. Money should not have a voice as it doesn't guarantee wisdom in the least. Please don't level The Lotus. We don't need more office buildings or a "boutique hotel." See my point? Vulture capitalism is foiling sane urban planning as it decimates decency.
faster
Increase neighborhood involvement and required time before allowing demolition. This has to be a final resort, and every effort to save the existing buildings need to be made. Fees for demo permits need to be prohibitive to discourage. The character of the neighborhoods is what gives the town and spaces their value. Remove these gems, and the places become cold with its character sold off.
city council leadership and budgetary support for staff to educate and assist with inventory process
start over and hold hearings
Perhaps houses can be addressed on an individual basis, instead of by a gerrymandered "district"
The city does nothing to encourage these. Encourage these by providing incentives such as fee waivers, grants, etc. in the past, the city was much more proactive in the preservation of resources. We need to make this happen again.
Again the approval office for new or remodeling to ensure it meets match the neighborhood housing
I don't know
Look at the overall intrinsic value to the city, tourism, and character of the neighborhood, by designating historic district
More consistent and balanced public outreach to ensure all constituents have a voice
Require owners to maintain existing properties. Prohibit demolition or deconstruction of any structure over 100 years old, without an exhaustive process where the burden of proof is on the property owner to show that demolition is the only option AND that they've done everything possible to preserve the structure. Require new development to be in harmony with the OLDEST structures in the area. Do not allow more recent development (public or private) to reduce a property's level of protection.
Make it more difficult to demolish historic buildings. Make earthquake retrofitting cost effective for building owners, perhaps with a subsidy
I don't know enough about current procedure to answer this.
Make it clear how the City will be using the data.
Strengthen the demolition review process for all historic buildings, but especially historic and conservation landmarks, and extend the review period. Impose heavy demolition fees, at least equal to the cost of seismic retrofit.
It is currently very expensive and laborious to form a historic district. Only the wealthy neighborhoods can afford it. Protections should be available to all types of neighborhoods
Don't know enough about current procedure

More public information sessions on how people can do nominations themselves. Focus group of real people who are interested in doing nominations and finding out what is confusing about the forms and instructions to people who are not preservation professionals. Landmark Commissions are sometimes a bit too demanding in what is expected in terms of information for a designation.
Unsure
Make it easier, since saving historic buildings is saving our most affordable housing/office/retail space. Provide financial incentives to earthquake proof buildings so that as many historic buildings as possible can be saved.
Not sure. The designation should not be voluntary and owners should not be able to arbitrarily remove it when it doesn't suit them.
Respecting historic zoning designations without redefining them to benefit developers.
I do not know the process.
Does it exist? If so it's not working
I do not know.
Education of all citizens, help with process. City council and planners valuing historic resources.
Review the criteria. Consider strengthening demolition review requirements for local landmark designated buildings and lengthening the demolition review period for buildings that are listed in the historic resource inventory. Portland has the weakest demolition protections in the U.S. This weakness is an embarrassment and needs to be addressed aggressively.
I am not qualified to answer this.
Make them easier to access for individual homeowners and provide grants for these homeowners
Neighborhood views should receive more respect. These are the people most directly affected by any decisions. More consideration of urban infrastructure--school capacity, sewers, water, streets, parking, solar access, air quality, who will pay for any needed upgrades, and what the full cost will be including intangible costs such as road congestion, air quality, access to sunlight, runoff and water pollution, damage to urban wildlife. The urban environment is still an environment and deserves the same thought as the rural environment--perhaps even more as more people are affected by degradation.
Not sure
As mentioned, get the special interest (\$\$\$) off all committees, planing commissions or related positions and staff with citizens interested in the preservation of what is left of Portland's great homes, buildings, neighborhoods
Get people on board who are historians and preservationists. Do not put these decisions in the hands of council members who are beholden to developers [ie; campaign donations, etc] Slow the process down to be more thorough and thoughtful.
begin by passing a demolition moratorium...
Gentrification is a well thought out process with no respect or concern for how this disrespectful process affects our neighborhoods with developers paying the city of Portland a lot of money for special allowances which dramatically affect their residents
Safety first. Rather than rushing into historic areas study the design flaws, health problems, infrastructure flaws. Infrastructure before development. Areas of historic significance are destroyed along racial divides.
Have the guidelines for what qualifies for a vote of opposition totally defined in writing. No more counting dead people and the same people configuring as many trusts as they can to get more votes. Stick to the rules.

By listening the the people that are fighting the infills.
The city is striping away the flavor of Porland
By being given authentic protection from demolition.
By making it easier to get the designation.
The HRI is useless in preventing demolitions as owners can remove their property from it and it only triggers a 120 day demolition delay.
Use it. Stop this insane demolition frenzy.
make sure that all voices are heard.
The process could be made a little more clear, and the speed of the process could be improved.
I think we should stop demolishing old buildings that are habitable or useable. Build only on empty lots.
Better info shared
Educate the public, facilitate process, control the fees and costs of the process, shorten and simplify the designation process.
I wish there could be more of a partnership between the city and neighborhoods. The city, perhaps, guiding how much of the city is preserved and ensuring that landmarks represent a variety of Portland eras as well as hold significance to a variety of Portlanders (and ensuring that the city is just bulldozed) but also making sure that other areas are increasing in density to meet the demands of a healthy, growing city. I think neighborhoods should have a say in the decisions of what gets preserved, even as difficult decisions may have to be made to change and expand throughout the city.
I don't know.
by providing more than just a skeleton staff in planning to address future historic district designation processes so progress can be made faster than the current glacial pace
Public education about the unique qualities of each of the designated entities.
Only homeowners should be able to vote on issues that affect their property. Only one vote per house.
More public awareness about the process, more public meetings held at night so people who work can attend. Contact and get input from many people in the neighborhood, don't just listen to those who are loudest or threaten lawsuits. Solicit input by email, not just having open meetings during the day when most people work.
Clarify requirements for owners, promote benefits to non-residents (historic value provides an asset to the entire city)
Set clear standards/procedures for designation and Speed up the process!
Have a fair-minded non-biased committee not filled with developers and builders to survey the residents about how they would like to see building or keeping affordable housing in the area, but also keeping the character of the area, as part of Portland as a whole.
We should give priority to the existing owners and not to future owners who may or may not happen.
To start with the city can invest the time needed and resources to promptly and accurately respond to requests from individuals and neighborhood associations. The city has failed to do their job lately.
Real and transparent criteria related to real and documented historic events.
Prohibiting demolitions
Give it weight in the consideration of city goals for affordable housing and population growth. Many historic homes are smaller and more affordable than the larger structures with which developers tend to replace them.
Prevent destruction of perfectly good homes for profit!

Prevention of demolition of historical homes to preserve the beauty of neighborhoods.
Improve the quality and accuracy of data that can support this. Establish a clear position of the goals of the program and how that fits in with other city-wide goals including affordability, population growth, and land-use.
see previous answer to similar question
I'm unfamiliar with the existing procedure beyond nomination and individual request:
Possibly clearer guidelines on who is allowed a vote.
clearer explanations of status or specific designations
Get the city staff fully engaged in the process. Not just a neutral observer. Educate commissioners and staff as to the economic importance of historic designations.
By having an open and transparent process and informing everyone about what's going on Allow each home owner to have a vote and give them an opportunity to rescind their vote if they change their mind later
They process need to be clear cut, with straight-forward guidelines and requirements.
Hmmm. I don't know the process well enough to comment
Don't know.
Make it easier. Have the city produce fact sheets so that propaganda doesn't become understood as truth in these contentious processes.
More notice to the public.
The inventory really needs to be updated by architects and local historians.
No clue.
n/a
Make the process more transparent to everyone about what the exact proceedings are inorder to become a historic landmark
direct mailings to home owners
The inventory should be associated and coordinated with the Comprehensive Plan process so that it is updated at reasonable increments and document what is being added and what is being lost.
designation needs to have some real impact on preservation, instead of mere window dressing
Improve the accuracy of information used to support the value of preserving historic resources through designation of historic and conservation landmarks and districts.
Improve the quality and accuracy of data that can support this.
It is important that all have their say, but there should be a hard cut off date.
By using some sort of process that removes lobbying association actions.
The city could more actively support historic/conservation landmarks & districts. Cities that preserve their history have more of a sense of place which attracts industry & tourism.
Improve the quality and accuracy of data that can support this. Establish a clear position of the goals of the program and how that fits in with other city-wide goals including affordability, population growth, and land-use.
I am not sufficiently knowledgeable to answer this question.
I am only familiar with the procedure for designating a historic district on the national level which is atrocious. I wish we were going through the local HD destination instead.
Get the state to get moving on Eastmoreland's historic designation. Local designation seems to have no protections.
Give it teeth. Historic status is too easy to surcomvent at the moment

Do not designate an entire district as being historic just because some of the houses were built in the early to mid 1900's. Do not force homeowners to have their properties designated. Establish some clear criteria. Don't have a committee overseeing it that approves every petition for designation, regardless of its merits.
Don't know what the existing procedure is.
Be a public process based on objective criteria, not just owner's consent. Designation becomes official with a vote of the City Council. Protections become untied to National Register and tied to local landmark designation.
Designation of historic landmarks and districts should not restrict the creation of new housing (ADUs, internal subdivisions, and at least a review of demolition and replacement). It also shouldn't restrict energy efficient improvements like solar panels. No reason you can't have a "historic" building that has solar panels.
I don't have enough information about existing procedures to intelligently answer.
Voluntary process and objective criteria.
I'm not sure, what are some options?
don't know
Owner consent. Make sure the national historic district honorary designation is not tied to local rules and regulations. The current way things work gives too much unchecked power to small groups of individuals (or even a single individual) to nominate a neighborhood and force their agenda on the rest of their neighbors.
I can't answer this because I don't know what the existing procedure is. Should the average citizen be expected to know?
Make a project works for stabilizing low-income communities and creating new attainable housing opportunities first. Then, if there's an option for a historic district that somehow supports those communities, go for it.
I am not overly familiar with the current procedure so can not comment.
Make the process readily apparent and easily accessible. Clear understandings of the benefits and restrictions. City planning which accounts for preservation of historic neighborhoods.
A clear majority of a district should be in favor of the designation. The neighborhood association should remain a neutral resource. The entire neighborhood should be included in the district under consideration for historic status.
Under goal 5 allow for smaller district of harmonious architecture
The should always be an economic impact statement required.
It is horrible that someone else can designate your home. I would never intentionally move into Historic district. I like the option of being able to make my home anything I want.
There should be no historic districts. Only historic landmarks.
Better information/resources on what limitations historic status places on designated houses - i have heard unfounded fear of not being able to change any aspect of the house rather than just external elements - I think this would cause more people to engage. Better coordination of open house information to encourage people to attend neighborhood historic building status
Remove any real estate developers from any panels or committees.
More transparency in the designation process. Guidelines published during the designation process, not after. A majority of owners (51%) must agree to the district via signed consent.
Be much more selective and stringent over what makes something historic.

Provide better protection for buildings in conservation districts.
The existing historic districts have already been identified, plus some. We should not be designating bogus historic districts in order to preserve property values.
It would be great if there was a lot less fighting about it.
Contacting owners would be nice.
The decision to apply and pursue historic designation for a neighborhood should be led by historians and planners, not by homeowners and neighborhood associations.
Where a historic designation can bring other benefits to homeowners (slower development of new homes, delay the natural evolution of neighborhoods), conflicts of interest should be eliminated from the decision making process.
If neighborhood input is to be required, the "50%+1" veto process is an absurd standard to hold to.
The process needs to be more open. Input should be considered from surrounding neighborhoods and the city as a whole.
As an Eastmoreland Neighborhood resident who is opposed to the formation of a proposed Historic District, I am concerned that this HD tactic is being used as an end run around proper city planning and the state's requirement to plan for the increased density within our city. This misuse will undermine the future value and support for historic resource designation.
Get consent from all affected residents at every stage of the process. Clearly outlined outcomes and repercussions.
Speed up Process of disputes and vote counts!
A property should not be nominated without a majority of owners signing their notarized affidavits stating their intent . Even then an owner should be able to remove their property from the designation
Questions of economic equity in areas should be taken into account when making decisions to designate districts.
Take process out of hands of biased and exclusionary neighborhood associations against Change and density. Make any designation supported by an affirmative vote of each owner.
I have absolutely no knowledge of the system here. I wish I knew what it was.
I don't know what it is so i don't know how to improve it.
It should stay the same
It should require a vote to opt in (not opt out)
Designation of a district should require owner consent, or at least approval by our elected representatives on the city council. I should not be triggered by listing on the national register, which, as noted above, is an undemocratic process that allows a minority of owners in the district to impose their will on the majority, if the majority lack the time, money, and energy to oppose the proposal. And it counts non-votes as yes votes. No other election works that way.
speed up the process and establish a better means of verifying that those voting are qualified to do so; the bottleneck in Eastmoreland is now apparently on the shoulders of the State's Dept. of Justice, which needs to be encouraged to act!
I am not familiar--wider advertisement, perhaps
Homeowners can designate their own property a historic resource, but it should not be imposed on homeowners who object to being included.
N/A
Not sure

Communication to owners from officials, not vested neighbors
<p>Hah! The current approach is so awful that it would take pages to suggest improvements.</p> <p>1) Let's get back to the NPS' approach: designation is an honorific.</p> <p>2) Designation should be an owner-desired, not 3rd party-imposed status</p> <p>3) To incent private owners to list/designate, provide real benefits to owners *that ride with the designated resource* not limited to just the original listing owner so that all subsequent owners continue to get the benefit</p> <p>4) Abolish private groups from crafting "historic districts" without due process. As Eastmoreland sadly demonstrated, any single individual, with enough money, can hire a consultant to push through an awful document and can be virtually assured of rubber-stamping up the chain of command all the way to NPS unless a massive uprising of opponents is organized. Clearly this is a fantastic example of what should never be permitted.</p> <p>5) Enforce the standards already published at the national level: Paragraphs A, B, C, D, not just in word, but in spirit. If we are to truly embrace historic conservation, then we're going to have to invest in enforcement, auditing and other watchdog elements that are viewing proposed listings through the required lenses. Again, as Eastmoreland clearly demonstrated, the proposal was hardly more than pro-forma rubber-stamped paragraphs with almost no substantiation for its period of significance or accuracy of the inventory on which the entire thing rested. However, there was no true audit of the work by any of the agencies who ultimately enforce the listing - not at the city, state or federal level. Surely that is an unacceptable process.</p> <p>6) Shift the burden from "opt-out" by individuals opposed to listing, to "opt-in" requiring individuals to desire the listing. This one shift would change the dynamic of listing from a "taking," to a passionate support for the principles behind the process. Under an opt-in approach, owners would need to be educated as to the benefits and be clearly informed of the restrictions, so that a listing truly reflects their interests. This would also reduce the likelihood of an over-reaching proposal: Peacock Lane vs. Eastmoreland, Ladd's Addition vs. Eastmoreland. In Eastmoreland's case, a small pocket of neighborhood (perhaps Reed College Place) would have been an excellent place to begin a listing, with opportunities to expand organically should additional properties merit inclusion.</p>
don't sneak through square-footage changes to existing zoning designations.
The right to opt out.
See answer 11. Keep volunteers away from classification. As demonstrated in Eastmoreland, volunteers do a bad job and classify non contributing houses as contributing in order to boost the numbers.
Not be used as an exclusionary tool for the wealthy.
Opt in not opt out
Codify definitions/standards and use qualified, trained people
Where to start? First and simplest, it should be severed entirely from the broken national process. Then it should be rooted in a basic protection of property rights, in which someone must consent to the listing of their property as a historic building. Third, the concepts of historic districts are dangerous unless tied explicitly to the consent under my second point: otherwise they risk being "weaponized" as a tool to protect incumbent property owners, lock out growth and newcomers, and circumvent city and region wide planning goals.
Make sure that no more than a set number or percentage of buildings in an area are required to stay the same.
By creating an opt-in system rather than a blanket overlay that restricts all people. Homeowners could chose to opt-in the system, but it would remove their power-over their neighbors and what they can do with their property. Historic districts reward those already bought in to the system.

Perhaps district designations can come with home resale value restrictions, like a land-trust. So that more than just privileged white land-owners could enjoy the cultural/historical wealth of an district.
Do not allow a local or national historic districts to be created without a hearing and vote by city council. Do not allow national historic districts to result in automatic historic review and restrictions unless city council has a hearing and votes to create the district
It has to be a democratic system. Decisions cant be made on how people's money will be spent.
Interesting, vivid but neutral presentations to school groups, churches and neighborhood associations.
Designations should not be a subterfuge for exclusionary policies to exclude people from wealthy neighborhoods, or to keep needed housing, including multi-family and mixed-use buildings, from being built. The consideration of all Comp Plan goals should be stressed in this designation (indeed, it should be emphasized in National Register designations, too, as 660-023-0200 calls for). Documentation of the significance of the property should be required.
Listen to the property owner, the true reasons behind creating a historic landmark may not be historical but driven fear of change e.g. new construction, property development, lot split...
More transparency
Make it open, do not have meetings in secret.
publicize them
I don't know much about the current process, so I cannot comment.
Land use laws should not be tied to historic designations. A district designation should only be allowed if a majority of title owners sign notarized forms of support. A nominating party should be required to prove they have a majority of title owners support BEFORE allowed to submit a nomination.
With few exceptions, entire neighborhoods and districts should not be considered for historical designation. Only individual properties or structures. The bar for designating districts or neighborhoods should be very high.
The process should not be able to be started with one person, and only stopped if OVER 50% of people oppose. Imagine if that's the way we nominated politicians.
Individual property nominations per current regulations. Change historic designation for neighborhoods to require affirmative vote of impacted homeowners.
There should be no historic district designation unless the area can demonstrate unique historic significance. Too often it is a tool for the haves to keep away the have nots. The best way to ensure that the tool isn't being used improperly is to require public openness of all homes in a HD for a certain number of hours every week. That way if it is truly a public good needing protection, then the public should have a right to access it. This will discourage home owners who want to abuse the designation.
It should require a majority of residents to vote for the districts instead of a majority no vote
All owners should consent or the district should not be designated
Get rid of the huge amount of red tape.
It should be a choice, not mandatory. One should be able to opt IN, not have to opt OUT.
Do not exclude large segments of the neighborhood from surveys and designations
Don't know what the existing procedures are. A zone should not be designated without a clear majority approval (2/3's) of its residents.
Eliminate the influence, direct and indirect, of developers and their agents and lawyers in manipulating the process.

It should be more democratic. It should be a majority votes yes not the majority must say no to stop it.
It would be nice if the City didn't actively work against Historic Districts And listen to the will of the majority instead of special interests
confirm property ownership before surveys are conducted
By having CLEAR criteria for nomination and listing. PRIOR to a district being proposed, the methods and procedures by which it will be governed and managed MUST be specified. For a district, affected property owners must CONSENT to the listing.
Typical standards for voting approval or disapproval is absolutely critical. Only proving more than 50% disapproval is skewed in favor of approval.
see my answer to the last question
Do not know existing procedure
Require a majority to approve of the historic district before moving ahead with restrictions.
It doesn't make sense that one person can nominate an entire neighborhood or area. It doesn't make sense that untrained volunteers can create a completely inaccurate inventory — not even recognizing new construction as new or additions that obviously wouldn't have been original. It doesn't make sense that true historical preservation can be subverted by a group who doesn't want demolitions and new construction in their neighborhood.
By changing the language in the procedures and eliminating the 100% consent assumption. Give local and state more control and take away from National Parks for administration
Disconnect the process from the National Parks Service. The process should be a local one requiring consent of property owners or the ability to opt out. The process should not be used to combat development or density issues. A fair objective procedure needs to be developed to determine whether a resource is truly "historic."
Require a vote of the people as well as the homeowner/building owner. All residents of the city should be included in deciding which areas should be designated.
Have an open process.
Allow objections to be easier . There have been groups in Laurelhurst, Buckman and East Moreland that push agendas . There needs to be better information for all people and required city approved flyers in newsletters. There is a lot of miss information.
A clear procedure that is outlined and detailed prior to applications being submitted. Fairness in approval; requiring notarized letters from only one side is ridiculously biased. Requiring information be disseminated by accurate, non-biased parties.
It's presently a joke. Historic districts should require at least a majority of supports to agree, not a majority to disagree. The burden should be on proponents to show residents want a historic district, not vice versa. It's a potential taking of property rights and the power of one with resources to make that determination is flawed.
No opinion
Get the consent all property owners prior to the creation of a historic district. Create a process of removing resources from an existing historic district. Suspend the enforcement of additional design review using preservation standards. Make it a voluntary system.
I think the new city option is a great improvement. The federal law and our state laws as a result are not meant to be invasive to the homeowner. Property rights need protection.
The current historic district process is a disaster
More public transparency and majority owner affirmative consent should be required.
I don't know enough about current program to answer.

It should be based on a common sense interpretation of "historic" and it should be applied with much consideration and require an AFFIRMATIVE vote from residents and a follow up vote by council.
These designations should grow out of the inventory process. The present "procedure" is relatively non-existent, so there is only room to go up. It's crucial, however, that the City identify some kinds of incentives, even just honorific recognition (think "historic resource steward of the year award") to go with such designation. Currently the incentives that go with local designation aren't enough to encourage folks to go that route rather than to the National Register of Historic Places.
Ultimately, it should be City-funded staff (or competent volunteer entities) that identify, nominate and review landmarks and districts for City-designation. The fact that the owner or neighborhood must bear the burden of paying for the research, writing, and nomination preparation has to be changed. Portland used to do the nominating, but gave up after "Owner Consent" came in.
50% + 1 of an arbitrary geography chosen by the applicant is insufficient for the burden imposed by local historic and conservation districts. The threshold needs to be higher.
Do not allow development restrictions without a public process and decision by the city council, and do not allow historic protection goals to override other public policies.
Letting residents know how the system works. Example: one shot, one hour time slots at community centers and the like is not sufficient.
The self-nominating system is broken. Neighborhoods should not be allowed to create historic districts simply as a means to prevent future development and change.
Charge a reasonable review fee that can be afforded by the average resident (under \$50). Do not expect the average citizen to make a complete case for designation.
Do not know the existing procedures but will
Designation should occur via city government rather than state or federal government. Cities are better able to recognize what is of historic value than states and federal government.
Make sure that community stakeholders are consulted.

7. Are historic and conservation designations the best tools for honoring and protecting our historic resources?

Only if the designations truly offer protection and/or provide advice/assistance/etc.
Not as currently implemented
They're the only tools at the moment. In the absence of historic and conservation designations, financially and politically interested parties will game the system.
Apparently not, because genuinely outstanding historic buildings can be and have been demolished, because (at least for National Register) only the exterior is considered important enough to protect, and because of the issues I listed in #12.
If it can help funnel additional funds for rehabilitation, adaptive reuse, and public interpretation/education. If it can't, then no it's pretty useless.
They are good tools, but we don't need to reinvent the wheel here. Other cities (San Francisco, Boston, etc) have proven tools that work but don't stifle development
Yes
Yes
<p>These designations are important and potentially useful, but they must be accompanied by strong demolition disincentives and design standards that ensure compatibility between new and older structures in historic districts.</p> <p>Thanks in part to its "owner consent" law, Oregon ranks at or near the bottom of states in terms of its protection for historically/architecturally significant resources. Thanks to several city proposals and policies – e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • building height increases recommended in the Central City 2035 Plan, which could well incentivize the demolition of historic resources; • the Residential Infill Proposal, which has little to do with “infill” as the term is commonly understood – i.e., as development of vacant or underused land, not the demolition of existing buildings on already developed land; and • the city’s curious definition of “demolition,” which has allowed developers to strip a building down to its foundation and call the new building an “alteration;” <p>Portland sometimes seems on track to providing the weakest protection for historic resources of any major city in the U.S.</p> <p>In short, numerous Portland policies (existing and proposed) are at odds with the city’s ability to preserve its historic and architectural assets.</p>
Yes, if incentives are provided for repurposing and rehabilitation of significant properties.
Zoning should also play a role. Instead of having unlimited height zones, restrict height for new buildings to that of the historic buildings in a zone. Design review should be tightened up for historic districts, instead of relying on a volunteer commission.
They can certainly help! At least if new buildings are built they have to abide by design standards set by the community.
Yes, do not know of another.
No they are not. I used to care about such things, but now I see them as nothing more something rich old people do to entertain themselves. The same rich old people who have the time to exert undue political influence.

No
Yes, it is one tool to use, there may be others I am not familiar with.
I don't know. I have seen several very old homes that are trashed by hoarding or lack of maintenance. Maybe the home has been in the family for generations. The house is paid for, but there is no money for fixing it.
I don't know . What ever we have had until now has not protected very much . I have felt that there really are not any "real" protections .
No. The best tool is exercising eminent domain on the most important resources and making the resources into city-owned museums.
It is a first step but, frankly, these designations don't seem to have any teeth. A moratorium or discount on local taxes if an owner preserves and/or enhances their historic properties could help.
These are important tools but ineffective without pressure on city Bureaus and City Council to resist developers' demands.
Other cities (and perhaps counties) use various tools to this end. Staff should check with jurisdictions that do a good job on this. One protection tool might be to require that developers be required to demonstrate that a historic building can't be repaired before getting a demolition permit. Another tool could be city financial assistance in removing lead paint/pipes in any building over x years old - without necessarily requiring that this be in a currently designated "historic" building.
No, not through the weak processes we now have in place. Other cities and states have much more effective procedures to protect our historic resources; staff needs to research better processes in place in other areas.
also consider signage for walking tours
Conservation districts do not offer demolition protection and are therefore not effective.
i think it is an important tool that is needed to identify places that should be protected.
I think so
So far I find updating our local register to be a more equitable way to go about preservation. In my opinion, the smaller the area the easier it should be to preserve a structure - districts, especially huge districts like Irvington, should be harder to establish and/or should have less stringent rules.
Designations are good tools, but only if they are accompanied by strong demolition penalties or disincentives and design standards that ensure that new structures are compatible with surrounding ones in historic districts.
Thanks to its "owner consent" law, Oregon ranks at the bottom of states in terms of its protection for historically/architecturally significant resources. Through its Residential Infill Project (which isn't about "infill" at all, but rather about incentivizing the demolition of existing buildings) and proposed heights for the Central City, Portland is now setting the stage for irreversible, permanent damage to the historic/architectural assets that give the city its identity. Assertions that RIP and super-tall buildings in the central city will augment the city's supply of affordable housing are seriously flawed. They are reminiscent of assertions that urban renewal (including the Legacy Emanuel Hospital project, which destroyed 300 homes and businesses in North Portland) would benefit cities and neighborhoods.
Only if they have been successful in conserving buildings that are historic to a specific neighborhood. Our current system is flawed
yes. as we know, bulldozers and commissioners care not for history.

It depends on what protections are offered. If they are too restrictive, then maybe not. But if they can be easily circumvented then that's not good either.
Yes. But it depends on the use of the inventory, implementation of levels of protections and incentives provided.
Yes. There should be incentives for private owners who preserve their property.
If they offer protection, I would say they are good tools- don't know if term "best" should be used. Surely there are ways to improve current policy.
They're a good start. More tools would be even better.
What do other cities do? There must be good examples of successful urban planning criteria.
If those designations come with actual protections
They are one tool, which does not necessarily make them the "best" tool
I don't see any other way.
Not sure about conservation districts. They often don't seem worth the trouble. Historic districts are the nationwide standard for recognizing important collections of associated historic resources. There's no reason Oregon shouldn't be able to work within that framework.
It depends on if the protections have teeth and how sharp they are; Something Portland has had much struggle with as you must be aware. We need transparency to prevent further loopholes from being wormed into our protective codes and safeguards.
good tools
Not really. They put the onus of the designation on the owner, but it should be on the community. Because all up list the value and character of the unit. Letting owners destroy the character of the neighborhood can change the character of the thing that gave it value.
yes
yes as well as tax incentives and zoning.
If they have the resources to aid individuals and communities in rehabilitation and upkeep
Yes. They are tried and true around the country.
I don't have information to answer
Not letting developers and politicians sell out neighborhoods
Yes
what Other solutions do we have?
They are great ways
A city, county, region, or state-wide moratorium on destruction of 100+ year old structures would be simpler. Whatever affords the most protection and provides the fewest loopholes.
Not sure
Not sure.
Apparently not. In Portland a historic overlay district, for example, provides no meaningful protection. It is a sad commentary that, for a neighborhood like mine, the only recourse has been for a historic district designation by the National Parks Service.
Yes!!!
Yes
Frankly, I do not know, but other cities manage to protect their historic heritage better than Portland does. How do they do it?

Possibly. It doesn't seem like there are other options right now to prevent all the demolitions. I'd like to see our elected officials listen to the people of Portland rather than the developers who line their pockets
Unknown
Designation is extremely important but financial resources are often the real obstacle to saving buildings. Incentives and lower fees for permits, etc.
Yes
What Oregon has now are the weakest laws in the nation for protecting our historic buildings. These buildings not only provide our most affordable housing, but also are very important economically since they draw in tourists who spend 5.1 billion dollars here annually. So, anything that takes our very weak laws and makes them stronger to prevent demolition, is a good thing.
It should be part of a bigger picture that has more teeth to protect historic resources. Maybe if people remove the historic designation then any past taxes that were kept lower would retroactively be increased and have to be paid.
Yes
Yes
Not necessarily. Seems there are plenty of ways to go around those designations. Bureau of buildings needs a system similar to design review but for existing buildings/housing
That and more sensitive guidelines that administer design quality for new buildings constructed in historic districts.
Right now it seems as if it's the only thing that can stop destruction of these resources. Elected officials placing value on these resources and expecting the same from citizens and developers might help.
I would encourage research nationwide to look for other tools and best practices in other states. There may be other ways that we could look at modifying for our local conditions that would be an improvement. What we have now is not working.
Yes, but only if they are honored by the planning commissions.
We need city codes to prevent greedy developers from demolishing are historical home
What else is on offer?
Yes. And limiting new construction permits in historic districts.
I don't know, seems they are easily circumvented if there's enough cash incentive. Sweet Tibby Dunbar's which had been the Sullivans Golf course clubhouse is a classic example, enough land to erect a hideous storage unit, Really! But it was historic and protected, we citizens watched this with horror and future understanding.
Yes, at this point I see this as the way to protect our historic homes and buildings.
if they would prevent demolitions, yes, but they don't..tighten up the laws for a change
If the current historic and conservation rules are a testament to honoring and protecting historic resources they are a complete failure
At this point yes. There is this push back about using the Historic District status to stop demolition. Isn't an HD for preservation purposes. It is the only tool at this point that protects the majority of houses in an HD from demolition. I am not against density but I am against irresponsible infill that is only making things more unaffordable and destroying the integrity of neighborhoods.
By not changing the R7 to an R5 the city has divided our neighborhood. Friends don't talk, neighbors feud. It really saddens me.
No. Preservation needs to be strengthened.

Apparently not.
Yes. The history of a city matters. And the way we are able to see this, track this, remember this - is through its buildings. Preserving older buildings for future generations is imperative to keep the soul of the city intact.
Yes...that I know of.
Yes
Not without some actual legal protections
City code is the only useful tool for preservation. You MUST change your mindset and laws.
yes
At this time, these seem to be the best tools -- especially at the local (neighborhood) level.
ALL historic buildings should be preserved.
No
Yes
I can't think of any other way - there seems to be a constant economic pressure to tear down and start over. Build bigger or subdivide to make more money - which is understandable. I lived in Japan for a few years and most cities were dense and modern. There were only a scattering of old traditional houses and they were lost. Almost abandoned, not noticed or cared for. By contrast, Kyoto, largely unscathed by WWII DID have whole neighborhoods with historic designations and it was so impressive to walk into an area that was untouched, at least on its surface, from modern changes. It was a different experience from just seeing one old house tucked in between modern condos - and community clearly valued these neighborhoods and took pride in them.
I don't think so.
yes, but if planning will just create end arounds like RIP, what's the point??
It is the only tools I am aware of that attempt to preserve the special places that still exist for the sake of the community.
Could also be protected by a more robust planning process which included an element of protection for existing neighborhoods and a petition to be signed by neighbors before tear downs or major expansions could take place.
Yes unless you change the zoning rules to protect all homes within a certain zoned area that covers the historic homes.
Local zoning and permitting could also be used to protect valuable assets
Yes
Yes as without the restrictions placed on these areas, it would be a free for all with developers and builders out to make as much profit as possible. Districts are able to select the number and type of restriction implemented, best for their neighborhood, in partner with the Park Service.
No, There should also be environmental considerations.
Yes. It is disingenuous to suggest that without rules or regulations people will do the right thing. People will do what is in their best interest and investors will do whatever makes the most profit.
They shouldn't be. Why do we honor buildings while forgetting the people and ignoring the social norms and culture that created the context. I'm done with any listings that privilege bungalows over actual impacts on people and communities.
Yes
It is the only tool we have at present. It would be helpful for all older homes and buildings to be regarded as potentially useful first, not as candidates for removal first. Older homes are usually the

affordable housing we need more of. Older buildings are usually what start up companies can afford to rent. They keep a city vibrant.
Yes, yes and yes!
Sure for buildings but not culture as a whole
When all else fails? yes.
It depends on what protections are offered. If they are too restrictive, then maybe not. But if they can be easily circumvented then that's not good either.
Yes
The issue with historic designations is that it limits what can be done and in what manner so it isn't appealing to owners.
Yes
I would think so, but as time progresses historic places will grow
Yed
Yes there's no other way Demolitions are not the answer and the new homes built destroy the character of the neighborhood
Yes, in most cases as long as the restrictions aren't so rigid that they become burdensome, nor so loose that demolitions are possible through loopholes.
Yes, with constraints on how houses in neighborhoods are remodeled. No one should be allowed to tear down an old house without review.
Yes, that plus laws & regulations protecting those resources.
Not demolishing them is the number one goal. A city-enforced policy would be great.
Just one of many.
They are the only tools at the moment.
No clue. You tell me.
best that i know of. It stops the demolition of affordable and inhabitable houses. The demolition and rebuilding inflicts significant turmoil on other residents.
Overall yes, we can enjoy many historic buildings today because of previous generation's conservation.i think if the city allowed for changing our zoning to eliminate lot splitting Eastmoreland would not be in this pickle. I think the lot splitting and tear downs damage the historic character of the neighborhood. I think most people don't care about home owner remodeling
Yes
yes
Yes. But it depends on the use of the inventory, implementation of levels of protections and incentives provided.
They can be
yes
To my knowledge, yes, so long as they provide a small amount of flexibility, are not overly restrictive but also provide strong guidelines and boundaries for preservation vs. destruction.
I believe it is, but I am open to new ideas.
Yes.
I think blanket incentives for preserving and renovating structures would work on a larger scale than individual districts. Master-planned districts such as Eastmoreland/Ladds/Laurelhurst are going to maintain some character because of the streetscape and neighborhood design.
This is a very general question. What other tools are available?

It depends on what protections are offered. If they are too restrictive, then maybe not. But if they can be easily circumvented then that's not good either.
As far as I know, yes.
Certainly a part of the puzzle, and I am very appreciative that a number of resources have been honored and protected. We can look to the past to lead us into the future but with that being said I don't think every resource needs to be protected because it is historic. We need to allow innovation.
I think these designations would be big steps in preserving the beauty of the past. I hate to see old neighborhoods destroyed with out-of-place, tall apartment buildings shoved in, right next to beautiful old homes.
No, national designation is better.
I believe they are but they must not be so rigid with regard improvements made by owners.
Not everyone agrees that it is important to "honor and protect" resources just because they are old. In this country, nothing is THAT old. Rebuilding the Ross Island bridge to match its "historic" ugliness is a good example of what not to do. If something really is historic and interesting, then buy it and make it into a tourist stop.
They need \$\$ for restoration and preservation as well.
No. Preservation is the best means of honoring & protecting historic resources.
I'm not aware of another/better option.
Actual written histories, photos, and community events are better.
Without a comprehensive comparison between those tools, and other methods, it is irresponsible to answer.
This question is silly. Honoring? It will only drive up housing scarcity, costs and availability.
Compared to what? Are you suggesting other tools?
yes
~
Compared to what? I'm sure they're among the best tools, depending on what "designation" implies.
Probably not. I'm also not even sure that is the right goal though.
As far as I know
Density must be allowed in some areas to support growth. Identifying alternate candidates besides old neighborhoods will be key to protecting historic resources.
Yes
YES
They work if the owners are 100% invested. They don't work in a city like Portland when you restrict demolitions. Rich neighborhoods are the only neighborhoods that will be protected. Less rich neighborhoods will bear the burden.
Only if they provide real protection, and not just another hurdle or fee.
If a single owner wants to designate their own home, let them go for it. Individual homes are not public resources. If there is a special home the public wants preserved, let the "public" buy it and maintain it.
Strict historic preservation is a great tool if it's judiciously applied to individual properties that are superlative examples of their era. Wide-spread designation undermines the tools as property owners become frustrated with the bureaucracy and expense of maintaining a nominally-historic building.
Yes - more should be considered - it feels we are overbuilding in nw portland and losing critical historic feel and neighborhoods that cannot be reclaimed. Currently we are oversaturated with shoebox studios that are not renting and rent is falling - how do we manage the development push

and the neighborhood pull
More protection is needed
they are tools
Not necessarily if the restrictions of the district are so onerous that they result in the neglect and deferred maintenance.
No.
For individual buildings and sites, maybe. For neighborhoods, no.
Probably not. Truly historic properties probably should be owned by municipalities so the public can have access.
This is a good idea with respect to owners' choice or consent.
Seems to me that quite often, once the designation is made there is no further recognition of these historic resources. I can walk through Irvington and not know that it is a historic district. Where are the plaques? Where is the educational information? Why aren't there field trips with schools and community events celebrating this history?
Feels like too often "no change" is the end goal, not education or celebration of our historic places.
Not really. From the designations that exist the process tends to favor wealthy non-diverse neighborhoods while overlooking buildings in less affluent areas.
It totally depends on how they are to be used.
I don't know
Currently Yes
No, because it not equally implemented by each state and city.
No, I believe education and public ownership of important resources are more important.
No. They are a blunt tool to impose onerous restrictions on many properties that have no historical significance and who should not be restricted
Right now they seem to be the only tool. That said I do know that many structures and homes deemed historic or listed for conservation had their designations removed by owners or buyers and the property was demolished. Replaced by substandard materials and design.
I don't know
no
Depends on the resource and area. In Laurelhurst no as there are very few demos or outside remodels.
No. The best tools are education and subsidies, including tax breaks.
YES until something better comes along; other existing remedies leave too many loopholes that exploiters (sometimes known as developers) are quick to use
They are certainly valuable tools
No. They are being used incorrectly to prevent development and increased density.
As long as they don't prevent some common sense improvements that make quality of life better without varying too much from the original character.
Maybe
No
I'm not qualified to say. I have no idea what other potential resources there are, or other methods employed in the world to protect historic resources.
I'm not sure if it's the best tool, but it's an important tool.

yes, unless you can come up with a better one. Unfortunately Portland believes that money is more important than people. Tearing down historical and building \$600,000 row homes does not help affordable housing.
Yes, but they are NOT a tool for managing growth.
Not perfect, but they can help preserve the character of neighborhoods.
No
No
I don't think so. Sometimes it appears to just limit a homeowners rights to their home. It is worth adding another designation perhaps!
I don't know
Very important tools
No. Museums are. Cities are living things and except in the very narrow circumstances of unusually important buildings, they must be allowed to grow and change over time, not be "frozen in amber".
Not really. The best way to preserve a historic building is to tank the local economy and leave the area in poverty for centuries. You see this throughout Europe. While that creates cute old buildings, it's definitely not the best route for the lives of the people in the city.
There are already deed restrictions.
Sometimes, but also should provide incentives to voluntarily keep historic resources, and to re-purpose them.
Not if they can be torn down because a developer is offering a large sum of money
Not necessarily. There are plenty of old buildings that are not necessarily worth keeping just because of its age. Structure aesthetics and cost are important a well.
A whole lot of money would be a whole lot better, but until then...
Not when they harm the current and future residents of the city by denying them housing.
No - more visible active use and discussion
Not always, history is all around us and change isn't always bad but part of new history...
Yes
I don't know
the best is relative, but it is a good start
YES!
No
No. The best tool would be for historic preservation non profit organizations to raise money to buy important properties themselves so they own them, or buy easements designed to preserve historic characteristics
No. Creative storytelling through art is the best tool.
Probably not, individually perhaps but whole communities not really
No
If implemented correctly they can be.
For some singular houses it makes sense but not entire neighborhoods. It is too restrictive and lets nosey neighbors have too much control
Not in Oregon. It amounts to a taking of property rights without consent.
What ever works to keep the investors from tearing down lovely homes for profit.
How about setting up funds to assit those that would like to retain a historic resources? Perhaps more volunteers on staff, would allot more funds toward preservation.

Not if they cause dissent among the affected population
Yes
Not necessarily
They seem to be the only means, given the influence and mendacity of developers and the control they exert over zoning and political support for development.
No, better zoning laws would be better.
At the moment, YES
yes
Only if they are actually used to honor and protect the resources, not if they are hijacked for other purposes (which is exactly what historic district proposals are being used for currently.)
No.
that and maybe tax breaks
Do not know
No
For individual houses where the owner requests the designation and goes through the requisite process, yes. For an entire neighborhood without owners' consent? No.
Only when used appropriately and with sufficient and respectful public input.
Not the current way it is being practiced.
No. Because the pro historic groups are one sided, control the entire flawed process, not based on democracy, misused for land use planning & do not care what others think. If Oregon state changed it's policies so that the designation was honorary & not restricting property rights, I might feel differently. Nearly all of those proposed houses/buildings have been remodeled but that doesn't seem to matter since it's used more as a manner to restrict the use of land.
Not sure, they make it much harder for people to improve their properties
Historic districts should be a rare tool used to protect truly historic structures. It should not be used to thwart density and city planning. It should not protect marginal homes merely because they are old. It shouldn't prohibit marginal homes from being updated, when the true desire of proponents is to stop demolitions.
Potentially, yes. But the process needs to be more fair and open.
It depends
No. It is a superficial system that only puts value on the view from the curb. And they are primarily used to prohibit new development in wealthy neighborhoods to keep out affordable housing.
No
No
No - large swaths of mundane structures in historically white, wealthy districts are receiving designation. Designation is not applied fairly or accurately across all Portland neighborhoods.
Not sure.
No.
With over 67,000 properties in Portland over 75 years old, we can't formally designate everything. Formal landmark or district designations can and should apply to some of these properties which are currently not protected.
The value of the inventory is that simply identifying "significance" is a start, and if the communication, appreciation, education, and awareness program to build community support for their protection and

<p>preservation can be as robust as the inventory process itself, it promises to steer the million unregulated decisions of tens of thousands of owners towards appreciation and protection rather than demolition and replacement.</p> <p>The "best of the best", however, deserve specific protections in a community where growth is expected to continue for at least a generation, and development pressures to demolish and replace will remain high for decades.</p>
<p>The best tool is eminent domain. The city can purchase land at fair market value, impose any deed restrictions it desires, and sell the properties.</p> <p>Eminent domain is controversial and it's expensive, but so is the imposition of historic and conservation designation -- the cost is "silently" borne by the property owner.</p>
<p>Do not rely only on National designation. City standards should be more strict, not less.</p>
<p>Not if they involve automatic restrictions and no public process and decision-making</p>
<p>I don't know enough about this subject to answer intelligently.</p>
<p>Probably not. It seems like the designations can be largely ignored or changed.</p>
<p>I think anything that provides protection and a third party identifier through which someone say 40 years from now can look up information on the house is important. I was able to get the name of the first owner of my house from the HRI. I really think that documentation that is maintained and available and does not rely on owners to pass through a chain of ownership will keep the history of these houses available. People say information never disappears from the internet, but some pieces of information absolutely do, and information that someone doesn't know to search for (like someone who doesn't know the son of the original owner of my house had an amateur radio station in the house) might never know to search for that information. Having it already compiled is invaluable.</p>
<p>Yes</p>
<p>I hope that they will be, but there must be other designations that will also</p>
<p>Absolutely. Zoning laws are too easily amended by influential developers and wealthy citizens.</p>
<p>Designation is a start and honors the buildings, but offers little protection. Property owners should be encouraged to protect and the City should promote the protection of those buildings deemed significant. Those that are significant should not be able to be easily demolished at the whim of a new property owner. A tiered level of designation could identify which buildings are most significant and offer scaled level of protection. In order to protect significant buildings, the prevention of demolition by neglect should also be considered.</p>

8. How can designation options be more inclusive of ethnic and cultural resources that may not be architecturally significant?

Ask the public? Resources can be connected to significant events or people or things or areas or ideas or times. Architectural resources don't have to be magnificent or grand, they can just be archetypal or very uncommon.
This question is appropriate for a final oral exam discussion in a graduate level urban planning course, not a survey question. Next...
Protecting culturally, if not architecturally, significant neighborhoods can be designated a public good and standards developed to determine eligibility. Obviously, profit-driven demolitions and displacement and the urban renewal ambitions of some city planners is behind current moves to seek protection from cultural harm. Given the absence of more direct protections, I see no reason why cultural integrity should not be considered significant.
Do direct outreach. Not just notification, but work on that specific community's schedule and terms. Hire a public historian or anthropologist to help facilitate.
By researching the history of the building. Again, this is t rocket science, there are historians in Portland who are adept at this.
Know the history and protect it!
Broaden public involvement in the process, especially with ethnic and marginal populations.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By giving more emphasis to significant roles played by properties valued for their social (e.g., civil rights) or cultural importance • By providing assistance to neighborhoods that lack adequate resources to survey their historically/culturally/socially significant resources
Conduct oral histories and seek research resources within neighborhoods at risk of gentrification to determine properties of ethnic and cultural significance.
Include cultural and ethnic criteria for conservation designation.
Case in point the Gray Building (3962 NE Martin Luther King). Even though it was listed on Oregon's Most Endangered Places, the property owner who just stores derelict vehicles and piles of trash on the property for years, demolished it without any issue. There was no public process. Even though this building wasn't anything too significant in terms of its style or architecture, tit was allow to deteriorate. This building had been the site of cultural pride for the African American community, and an important site in the struggle for civil rights in Northeast Portland
Include locations of historically important people/events
Reparations. Maybe paid for with a land tax. But also, monuments would be one way. Plaques. Living history--funding the kinds of placemaking that's so popular with yuppies in inner portland but with real resources for people of color to collectively designate those physical spaces or resources they with to remember. Not going after things like the historic lodge next to the rebuilding center with punitive fines, but instead offering hardship waivers and loans when truly appropriate.
Unknown
Look at the original purpose of the building, it may be a box type building that served as a community meeting place. All buildings do not have to be architecturally significant, what was the original purpose of the building.
I don't know.
At the very least - some kind of marker could be placed to indicate the former use of an area by an ethnic group . Placards etc.

The city should seek to acquire and manage the most important of these resources.
By fighting gentrification so we can actually have more ethnic and cultural groups in the city.
Consider community and personal history of a property. i.e. Was a church in what was Albina the epicenter for Portland's civil rights movement?
By stressing history and place in the community
A start would be to include neighborhood characteristics. See above comments on enlisting neighborhood groups to help with the surveys. Some areas that consider themselves to be "neighborhoods" have active groups that get together. This could be ethnic groups, or multi-ethnic groups (far east side). Their not-too-historic neighborhood may be cohesive in architectural style (e.g. mid-50's) and/or ethnic structure. Some of these groups feel very strongly about preserving their "neighborhood" feel - and this is very important. These groups could also help identify cultural resources that are not particularly architecturally significant.
Develop "neighborhood" and "cultural" characteristics criteria to include in the survey. Architectural criteria are not sufficient in of themselves. Encourage neighborhoods to define their own characteristics.
signage
Understanding our history and recognizing that those stories are important should help.
Respect those qualities!!
Actually inventory them is a first step! Unfortunately in many areas I know many of these places are already gone.
By recognizing significant roles played by properties valued for their social or cultural importance.
Expand the list of criteria to be included in decision making to include dwellings where significant ethnic and cultural events occurred.
as stated above, "who slept here." There is one HRI in Buckman that revolutionized the laundry industry. Who would know that from just looking at a brick building
Perhaps investing more resources and effort in neighborhoods that lack the resources themselves to promote the identification and celebration of historic resources. Those that live in or own historic resources should have some obligation to help others if they need help.
This will require incentives for neighborhoods and communities of interest to assemble a list for consideration for designation.
Outreach and historical research to identify key structures and sites.
Use local history resources to generate maps and evaluate sites based on the viability of preservation and didactic value of the resource.
This should be a note in the survey.
Through the use of experts in such resources
democratize the system! reduce the hierarchical structure that is required for approval and bring in archivists, historians, and others with strong understanding of current issues, social and cultural bias. Be as inclusive as possible! Consider the importance of all voices and make sure that the resources that support underrepresented populations are included.
Make sure that inventories are not only examining architectural significance, but also association with significant persons and events. Unfortunately, this is more difficult and expensive than an architecture-only survey.
By democratic vote. Perhaps buildings could obtain ratings by vote on a number of factors including social importance as well as the beauty of their architectural grace. Portland, legendary for its music

scene, is devolving into merely fabled myth as a progressive place as it loses all of its venues. We need to build the Satyricon again, Quint Keystone Archway and all. No one wants to live in a place that formerly was interesting. What a let down that is...
different problem
Not sure
The present criterion include consideration of prominent individuals associated with a resource as well as consideration of diversity issues.
who lived there, what aorganizationsmay have used the property, literature art associated with property, what did native americans use the property for, famous people
Perhaps qualifying data can move away from age and material quality and into documentation of local history or Kevin Lynch style mental mapping of nodes/landmarks
As i said earlier, the city needs to be proactive in recognizing these resources. Resouces do not need to be architecturally significant. They can be historically significant and plain simple buildings that make up a neighborhood. Use the national register guidelines. They work.
Againg keeping as close as possible the same looks
Include all neighborhoods and cultural/ethnic/ income levels
Not sure
IDK
Unsure. Perhaps by community input
ASK THE PEOPLE IN QUESTION!! Consult historians with expertise in the affected cultural and ethnic groups (past and present). Default towards preservation.
By learning the history of specific neighborhoods and ethnic groups in Portland, then tying that history to buildings in which important events took place. The building need not be beautiful to be historic
Make a concerted effort to identify significant resources - conduct historical research on the various groups present in Portland so as to better identify possible significant resources.
By reaching out to people actually living/working in such areas. Learn who they are and why they live and/or work there. Ask them how they feel about the destruction and repossession of their neighborhoods.
Rehabilitation to livable levels
By protecting buildings not only as architectural landmarks, but also as social landmarks. The significant role that a building has played in a community, its connection to significant events or individuals must also be honored by protecting the building. Memories are embedded in place; the physical context of shared community events reminds all of their shared experiences, and memories can more easily be transmitted to younger generations if the place still stands.
There should be options to declare these resources as significant too
It is past time to reinterpret integrity and allow more flexibility on changes over time. The more modest a building is, the more likely it will have been changed as the decades have passed. In cases where the building is really mostly gone and cannot logically be rehabilitated, consider some other form of marking the cultural event that it represents -- historical signage with information on how to learn more about the site with an app.
By giving more opportunity for community outreach and comment.
Many neighborhoods have deep multicultural history but no one has taken the time to dig up and write about that history. A few neighborhoods have some of their ethnic stories told: Goose Hollow, NW (via the Slabtown book), and a very small amount in the Pearl. But there's a lot more to write about. There are over 90 neighborhoods in Portland. Each has a multicultural history that just needs

to be dug up. You should provide funding and training for neighborhoods to show them how to dig up their histories, which will lead to preserving their histories. 1st step is to know our histories, then work to preserve these histories.
The definition should be broadened to include ethnic and cultural resources.
Question is ambivalent.
How do we maintain a china town, jade town, etc. gentrification forces ethnic groups out.
This seems arbitrary but could be linked to significant events or past occupants
Provide input from neighborhoods
Education of those making decisions and asking for public input. Working with communities.
By insisting that non-architectural criteria be included and be used. Be clear that architectural criteria are not the only criteria to be used. As in 7 above, an expanded list of criteria should be well described and inclusive.
By conjoining all of the history of an area, not just its architectural significance, e.g. Did a former president once live there?
By not forcing poor people from their homes through gentrification and taking into account their families history the neighborhood
This requires funding for more research and dialogue with existing communities and especially older residents. It all depends on the specific situation and to get a full picture of a particular resource requires data collection (that is, historical research and interviews, not just numbers). It might look like a pile of rocks to one person and be a sacred shrine to another.
Unsure
This is a large equation I'm not able to answer in a short survey.
In areas that have had historical significant, such as African American neighborhoods such as Albina District - the history and contribution to cultural richness in the city should have prevented demolishing that neighborhood, removing businesses and homes and displacing people. It have been nothing short of criminal, and we all lose some of our collective humanity when this is done. That is why I suggested Historians be on these committees. And people of diverse ethnic backgrounds as well.
they are significant, you have to show more effort..the burger barn on ne mlk was just demolished...the possum incident took place, and the racism would be a teaching moment..sadly it's gone now despit folks trying to save it as a museum...
These questions are too late the city of Portland has allowed greedy developers to overpopulate all in the name of money
Money drives development and minorities are factored out by those factors. Economic development should be equal, therefore common good and sense rather than greed
It is the responsibility of the Dept. of Planning and Sustainability to research these resources and protect them. As a whole these neighborhoods and houses are part of the big picture and deserve recognition. Some of this works has been done through the Corner Stones Project that documents black neighborhoods and houses. The city has supported this effort. It is time to stop ripping these neighborhoods apart and give them some protection. If the city does not have the staff to do this offer grants for other historic preservation groups to help.
Our county was born on immigration. Include
The community could be polled
More stories told through film and walking tours (like Vanport, Albina, black churches, eminent domain issues with Emanuel hospital).

It is not what a building looks like that matters as much as the history and impact on the community that does.
???
Identify these places as historic resources.
By paying attention to the input of associations and cultural groups.
cast the information gathering net wide to be sure that these constituencies' views are taken into account
Judging by recent activities in Portland, it appears that well-organized and well-funded neighborhood associations are able to pursue designations. The city should provide funding to neighborhoods that lack financial strength to pursue designations.
See above.
N/a
Educate the public, simplify and reduce costs of the process.
This is very important to me. I don't want to see historic preservation just be something rich white people do to protect their assets. There are beautiful old neighborhoods that are architecturally significant and some pockets of those should be preserved - but identifying resources that tell a diverse history of Portland are very important. This is where I see the city having a role to make this a priority, and the neighborhoods having a role in identifying what their resources are and how they tie into the fabric of Portland.
There is no good way unless we change from being capitalists.
by identifying any unique characteristics found in predominantly ethnic neighborhoods. these could be as simple as material finishes or as complex as multiple building programmatic traits.
I don't know.
By adding a designation for cultural or ethnic resources
If public input provides facts to demonstrate historic significance due to cultural or ethnic reasons then that should be considered. Make those considerations part of the criteria for historical designations. You should develop criteria for all designations that will help identify when a resource falls into the designation regardless of whether it is due to historic or cultural value.
We should identify similar ethnic and cultural designations and find ways to promote and preserve rare communities, even if they have already been destroyed. For example, legacy African American communities in Portland could be celebrated by identifying locations of key buildings (even if the originals have been destroyed). Their locations could be marked with a plaque, or similar designation. Monuments and historical markers could be placed in the area. The history could be documented and preserved and the content made accessible through the historical society (to the extent it's not already there, city web site, library, etc)
Don't have input
Not sure I understand the question.
Who decides what is "architecturally significant?" All buildings have architectural significance, even those that are plain, simple, and "ethnic."
Ethnic and cultural sounds like a nice way of saying that we need to stop gentrification. Many parts of Portland have become gentrified. Developers buy up and tear down old homes and businesses, replacing them with expensive apartments and houses. If the city was seriously interested in affordable housing it would put a cap on rent and direct the development of new houses to be more affordable. Or incentivize maintaining old affordable homes.
By not focusing on architecture. Come on! If your only tool is a hammer, all your problems look like nails. Is history really about architecture? Really?!? Ever?

It can not. Isn't the whole question of preserving the existing neighborhood? Ethnicity has nothing to do with that.
Give weight to the desires of current residents about their resources or lack of. A neighborhood of older homes needing repairs should get incentive for loans and programs to let the residents do those repairs if desired. Currently they are blocked by banks from getting loans and then powerless to developers' plans to obtain their homes cheaply.
By keeping smaller and much less expensive homes available for new families, rather building structures that only the rich can afford.
Get out and frigging talk to folks who have been here longer than you and provided you with culture and entertainment for generations
It is not about ethnic and cultural resources. It is about money and profit.
Perhaps investing more resources and effort in neighborhoods that lack the resources themselves to promote the identification and celebration of historic resources. Those that live in or own historic resources should have some obligation to help others if they need help.
Restrict new construction or significant remodel to appear in buildings of similar character
By pairing with local communities to identify those elements of their culture in town that are significant
Interesting question
Just make it inclusive and perhaps vote....
Engage the neighborhoods
By preserving their structures in a historic district
A. Neighboring historic communities should assist neighboring communities without historic architectural features by opening green spaces and other community spaces to these more culturally and ethnically diverse neighbors. Also, history is constantly being created. Let's designate funding toward renovations and construction of quality homes and buildings which can become historic in the future.
Find ways for each original community to tell a story via what remains of it's buildings, even if the building is plain. I think of buildings along Williams to tell the story of a thriving community cut in half by the freeway. Or maybe a happier story of the things that did survive.
Add those criteria.
Make sure that this is a City goal
Absolutely need to preserve older neighborhoods and structures in neighborhoods of color.
Include any buidings/homes/neighborhoods of historical significance not just those that are architecturally significant.
No clue.
why do they need to be?
not sure
This will require incentives for neighborhoods and communities of interest to assemble a list for consideration for designation.
Neighborhood character is important to consider. The history of the neighborhood and how it came into being
architectural significance can take those values into account.
To provide resources to areas that may be worthy of designation but do not have the resources necessary to seek the designation. Designation should encompass not only historic buildings and landmarks, but also incorporate important historical events and communities.

Some areas are historic, even if they are not architecturally significant. That should be taken into consideration also.
While diversity is important, it should be considered in the context of neighborhoods in the city, not just one.
With public art, monumentation, special street signs, etc. Creating and preserving a sense of place is just as important.
More could be done to support designations such as Chinatown - or wherever it is now. There are other ethnic centers in the city that could be supported, like Little Russia, etc.
Perhaps investing more resources and effort in neighborhoods that lack the resources themselves to promote the identification and celebration of historic resources. Those that live in or own historic resources should have some obligation to help others if they need help.
Again, this goes beyond my current competency.
Open up a dialogue of how to best honor ethnic and cultural resources. For example, festivals? Statues? Art installments? School programs?
Perhaps preserving these resources, updating them for safety and designating them with signage and inclusion in the historical record.
Study the history of who was there.
Just elevate their importance. Duh
I'm don't know what a non-architecturally significant ethnic/cultural resource would be.
History/use of space should be considered.
By avoiding any and all references to identity politics.
Designation should be based on significance, which is equally about historic persons/groups/cultures or events.
Community spaces can be used for events that honor and educate about the history of a community's diverse residents.
Can't.
This is bound to get subjective
Ask people who identify with those ethnicities and cultures whether something is significant.
demo restrictions, remodeling and replacement restrictions
The story behind the resource needs to be given equal importance as is given to the structure. A neighborhood of 1000+ homes built for upper middle class citizens in the 1920s - 1940s, with many of the homes similar in style, is not as relevant to telling Portland's history as (perhaps) some simple structures in working class neighborhoods that truly are unique.
Good question. If architectural significance is the main criterion for designation then it would be difficult. The solution would be alternative criteria that include ethnic and cultural significance as part of Portland's history.
Put being inclusive of cultural resources as the first goal of a historic resource analysis, after broader social goals for keeping the city ethnically and culturally diverse with regards to people who do/did/will live here. Throw out aesthetic priorities. Cute/pretty buildings are nice, but not worth city resources. People can go to SHPO; Portland has other fish to fry.
Murals, art installments (especially educational sculptures). I really like what Vancouver has done with their crossing by the Fort of Vancouver. It has some beautiful tributes to and artwork about local Native American tribes. Bronze sidewalk plaques that commemorate previous buildings or groups who lived in an area.
perhaps another category for cultural significance?

No opinion
Focus on the history
Have a new program that protects the culture of the community and tell the story of the neighborhood through the building and the culture.
By defining what's important and not using terms like "architecturally significant" but instead saying "culturally significant."
Is historical limited to architecturally significant?
The historic districts being proposed in Portland are largely in the richest, whitest parts of town. Allowing a historic designation in a neighborhood that was redlined and subject to racial covenants is just another salvo in the battle against integration.
Mixing physical and electronic medium - OPB did a fabulous show on the African American Jazz Culture in Portland that highlighted existing structures and their historic uses - I still look at the building north of the Coliseum and ponder its early jazz roots! Offering grants for similar publications of key structures that would be available for public and education services would be helpful
Not sure what this question means.
Connections with local ethnic and cultural organizations should lead to awareness of valued resources.
By not designating more historic districts.
I think the architecture is less important than the role the property played in local history.
Invite and inform. No secluded groups forcing the issue.
Reaching out to those communities for input would be a great start. If a former cultural resource has been developed, there could still be educational plaques denoting what was there and the significance.
Preservation is nice when possible, but education is far more valuable. Just because something is not physically there anymore doesn't mean we can't honor it and learn from it.
The process should require outreach. No single neighborhood should be considered by itself without considering the greater context of the city as a whole as well as less affluent neighborhoods.
Include them as a criteria
I'm sure every building has a story.
Designation and delineation of exceptions
As long as they historically important they can be significant. Like log cabins and forts.
More public community spaces and funding for cultural events and education, especially within historically marginalized communities.
Through thoughtful zoning and permitting by government
A building that has ethnic and cultural significance holds a community together. That significance can be far more important than the architecture.
?
There should not be too many restrictions
Sad to say, most of those resources are already lost, not ever to be recovered. But you can stop making the situation worse by preventing neighborhoods that are wealth and white because they were historically off-limits to racial minorities from turning themselves into historic districts as a means of blocking infill an redevelopment. That will continue the legacy, if not worsen it. It will re-segregate the city.

don't know
By creating cultural categories
Some homes may be overlooked due to the lack of upkeep. Designating them as historic may reduce property taxes, providing financial relief for the owner.
Leave it out then
Dont do them
See my answers above to listing/inventory.
An expansion of the definition.
well la de dah. Hitting the PC correct requirements. Why do you assume that ethnic and cultural advantages don't exist in expensive historical areas.
I don't know.
The term architecturally significant seems to be based in a definition that benefits wealthy, white people. Maybe ask people of different ethnicities what they think is significant.
They shouldn't be used this way. This is conflating two separate issues.
I am thumbs down on this. Can't we just stick with history. If there is an ethic and cultural connection to an owner, builder, or architect, or someone else who significantly was part of the House, let's document it. If not, it isn't part of the record.
Research the history of the neighborhood and find out what the significant places were. Create signage and photoessays. Artwork is a great way to create the legacy. Maybe without locking in on a specific building existing forever.
Not sure what is meant by options.
Here's the crux of the matter: museums can teach us about complicated and odious historic actions (like slavery, as an extreme example) by placing them in the appropriate context and thoughtfully and considerately explaining their place in the flow of history. Portland's housing and architectural history is defined in large part by a history of redlining and exclusion. This creates a situation where, almost by definition, historic resources will tell the story of white, wealthy Portland landowners and homeowners, while leaving out the African American, Asian, and poor from the story. A museum is therefore the appropriate place to tell this story.
Limit the number of buildings any rich or old white person can designate.
Require that a percentage of historic buildings designated must be equivalent to the ratio of the minority population.
Asking those communities participating in ethnic and cultural resources and giving their needs and desires equitable weight.
Engage with those ethnic/cultural communities from the very beginning in doing an inventory or designation; ask their input and implement it.
Stop letting the highest paying developer develop condominiums or dwellings that are out of the reach financially for the native Oregonians.
Its not important.
Ask ethnic and cultural groups what they think. "This was where we used to dance" "This is where we bought our food." If it's not a place, or if the structure is gone, try video kiosks, London Blue signs, organized tours, guide brochures.
By designating properties that have significant connection to current or past ethnic groups, and/or relate to significant events or cultural practices in the past, including historical events that harmed specific ethnic or cultural groups.

Involve the people that lived there before you moved on it. Move beyond the plaque to make history a feel alive
Honoring ethnic and cultural resources by not creating historical neighborhoods but individual properties that links to the ethnical and cultural significance.
I don't know
What is the problem? The ethnic and cultural significance should be obvious or forget it.
dont know
Find out and listen to the story.
Solicit community support
Create new designations.
Commemorate key cultural events, as identified by other ethnic/cultural communities themselves.
Focus on historical context and involve community
Unsure
No idea
Not sure.
Include all segments of the community in votes and surveys
By considering the current needs of that culture / ethnic group as well
This is not a clear, and probably, not an honest question. it is a value opinion disguised as a question.
I have no answer for that.
By considering the overall history of an area
I do not believe they can be.
Not sure
apply the same criteria in terms of it being original unique to the city with additional criteria. Cities change over time
Do not know
Consult with academics at PSU or Reed on local cultural history?
Better research.
Clear policy and mission statements and proper oversight from a diverse citizen review panel.
????
Require voter & individual building approval. I have yet to see "architecturally significant" mean anything. For example, there is absolutely no rational for why one home vs another home is designated in Eastmoreland. Houses selected were based on whatever a small group thought would pass as historic. Their opinions of what was historic was decided without homeowners' knowledge or consent & with virtually no recourse.
Allow honorary designations at the local level. Do not place land use restrictions on the resources, but encourage them via placement of signage, online information, etc.
Tax breaks
I believe this is an important issue and validate the concept. I can't offer pertinent ideas; it would need to be handled with care, fact-based research, and clear goals.
Difficult question. I would find these resources much more open to protection but again through a fair process.
Vote by citizens
I have no idea. It sounds like a form of redlining.

Leave it to the Historic Society and Portland State...IMO the current structure to support this is slanted to promote historic preservation and opposed to other city priorities, SHPO, SACHP and the Landmarks Commission, ONI...not transparent or democratic
Not sure
Ethnic and cultural resources that serve the very communities that have been historically excluded from the primarily white, wealthy, residential zones should be proactively preserved via community controlled design districts IF a majority of the neighborhood (including renters) votes to protect it (NOT using negative consent).
Not sure.
Focus on small areas. Stop using them as a tool to prevent new homes.
<p>It is important to reach out to the general community to ask the question "what is important to you to make your place seem like 'your place'?" The challenge is exemplified by the Black churches that have been demolished by their Pastor who wanted to build a new church that reflected his importance -- over the objection of the older members of the congregation who saw their old church as "their" place. Still, ongoing dialog and listening in these communities can be helpful.</p> <p>I wonder how shifting demographics can be accommodated in this process. I think of the on-time effort to put some kind of cultural/historic designation on SW Stark Street in an area that once had many Gay bars and businesses. By the time that proposal was made, most of the businesses had gone, and even the people who had frequented the area had no particular attachment to it any more. Similarly, when the South Portland Renewal District wiped out the Italian and Jewish neighborhoods in that area, the folks moved to the suburbs. There are a few surviving buildings in that area which mark their presence, but there is no longer the same close-knit Jewish community or Italian community in that area, and precious little to put a historic resource protection tag on.</p> <p>Still, there is nothing visible in that South Portland area to even mark the passing of the old communities. That is where a combination of physical markers possibly now with scanable codes that would allow the curious to use their smart phones to learn more of the history of the place might be a way to bring the history back to life.</p>
Architectural significance is neither necessary nor sufficient for a place to be historically significant.
What ought to matter is that a place is old (75 years? 100 years?), and continues to be utilized and valued in a unique way by a significant segment of the city. Thousands of people, not hundreds.
Solicit from minority and ethnic communities, allocate more resources to outreach and inclusion.
Listen to whether communities of color want the resource protected, and if so, then use public monies to do so.
Comprehensive and time intensive outreach.
Talk to ethnic communities. Learn their history. Ask them what is important.
<p>Maybe just admitting that the past was a terrible place for pretty much everyone who wasn't a wealthy white guy and not a lot of architecturally significant places were owned by anyone else? Is maybe part of the problem with things like the HRI that you're cataloging architectural significance? Almost by definition you're cataloging the homes of at least the upper middle class of the time. Almost all of those people were white men. The past is brutal. I'm not sure that pretending it wasn't helps.</p> <p>I realize this is specific to my house, not a district, but as an example, looking at the 80s HRI, it listed a woman as the original owner (it does this a lot). I thought, 'Oh, wow, cool! That must be a story, a</p>

woman was the sole owner in 1907.' Except someone was just being sweetly politically correct and I wasted a bunch of time looking for this woman who is basically documented on two censuses and her death because she wasn't actually the owner, she was the Victorian housewife of the owner, and back then, that's not even technically an owner. It doesn't help to pretend the past was better than it was. It seems like it might actually be kind of insulting to the people who were excluded to pretend they were included after the fact.

Is it possible to document the ways people were excluded? I'm not sure if the HRI goes up to the days of RedLining, but it seems like that would be a really important thing to look at. It's not the architecture of a single building, but almost an abstraction layer on top of the neighborhoods people were diverted to.

Sustained outreach to those communities so that they can be identified. Even without architectural significance, a designation is useless if the building cannot be seen as tied to the era in which the important events occurred. Would the people who made the place matter still recognize it?

Entirely honorary designations are pointless.

I am in over my head on this one

If an ethnic village was initially vibrant and a historic focus of that ethnic culture, those villages should be protected and maintained to look as they did when they were first created -- rather like a museum.

Involve stakeholder community groups in the discussion. Identify underserved audiences and ask them what is important to them. Recognize that the community groups that are associated with some of the buildings/areas may no longer live in that same area. Reach out to community and cultural organizations. take a bottom up approach rather than top down. Involve local historians / OHS in identifying stories associated with the buildings, especially for groups that may not be present anymore.

9. What else would you like us to consider regarding the designation of historic landmarks and districts?

Don't always have to ape National Register form, format, terminology, requirements, etc. Some things are important to Portland, not the United States.
How to better implement or improve existing codes and planning (i.e. RIP), rather than adding onerous overlays.
Err on the side of protection.
The needs of people for places to live. Districts simply have no place, if they do not consist entirely of buildings that would qualify on their own.
Keep the focus on significance and sense of place— this is a near universal. A solid esoteric conversations about windows, paint color, and the like— these come off as elitist and NIMBYism.
Old buildings are economic drivers! People who visit or move here want to see what makes our built environment unique. We don't want to look like everywhere else.
I see homes with historical integrity torn down in Portland every day
<p>My understanding is that the Historic Resources Code Project is supposed to consider the relationship between city planning goals and historic preservation. I would urge the BPS to recognize that the pedestrian-friendliness of historic neighborhoods is a major community asset that advances important goals in the Comprehensive Plan and the Climate Action Plan. Such goals include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “encourage[ing] building and site design that promotes a healthy level of physical activity in daily life;” • “mak[ing] neighborhoods more walkable to reduce carbon emissions;” and • “mak[ing] it easier to walk for typical errands to [cut] pollution and provide everyday opportunities for healthful, street-reducing activities;” <p>Historic neighborhoods typically have high Walk Scores and are often the kind of “20-minute neighborhoods” that encourage people to carry out many daily activities on foot instead of by driving carbon-emitting vehicles. The main reason this is so: historic neighborhoods are regarded as beautiful and interesting. Thus trip distances through them seem shorter to people on foot. As noted in <i>Urban Sprawl and Public Health</i>, by Howard Frumkin, Lawrence Frank, & Richard Jackson, M.D. (narrator of a PBS series, <i>Building Health Communities</i>): “Aesthetic factors...were identified among [the principal]...characteristics that encourage physical activity...People are more likely to get out and be active in places that are attractive and aesthetically appealing.”</p> <p>It makes little sense for the city to advocate the creation of new “20-minute neighborhoods” – i.e., neighborhoods that enable/encourage people to carry out many daily needs on foot instead of by driving – while adopting policies that incentivize the destruction of 20-minute neighborhoods already in existence.</p> <p>The city – and especially the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability – should also consider the relationship between sustainability and good design. Portland’s historic neighborhoods have been sustained for a century largely for one reason: They are considered beautiful, and people are motivated to take care of – to sustain – well-designed, beautiful places.</p> <p>The City's push for growth, equity and housing diversification must be balanced with consideration of longtime property owners who are increasingly feeling left out of the City's decision-making process.</p> <p>Demolition holds on identified historic landmarks even if they are not in historic districts. Public funding to save, restore, upgrade landmarks.</p>

Make it almost impossible to designate single family homes. Instead, designate shared spaces that can be truly enjoyed by the community.
Historic districts should not be designated absent a high level of scrutiny and owner consent.
Advertise what is being done, continue to get public input.
The key , I believe , is to make it harder to demolish a building - stricter codes and concessions from those who would demolish - require more integration and sensitivity to existing area if a building will be torn down .
Large historic districts have no place in a city. We should be far more selective. Because we know that restrictions on development tend to entrench segregation, we should be especially attentive to any effort to designate richer, more-segregated neighborhoods. In particular, we should consider the historic and material factors leading to the segregation and make sure that designation will not exacerbate those.
Portland is being ruined by rampant inappropriate development. Unfortunately, we are playing catchup to identify and potentially protect our resources. I support additional funding to identify and catalogue these resources so that citizens can work to save
Older buildings and districts often provide more affordable housing options. They also provide a rich mix of architecture, making a street or area more lively and interesting.
People flock to Europe and revel in its historic districts. These are unique from country to country, and even city to city. They give a stamp of authenticity and individuality to these places. You KNOW WHERE YOU ARE there. The USA seems to be hell-bent in ensuring that every city looks like every other city with anonymous high buildings creating inhospitable "canyons" that are people-unfriendly. In contrast, people are highly drawn to walkable, people-friendly historic districts with their often non-chain cafes and shops. You can see this in the popularity of Northwest 23rd, the West End, the Hawthorne district and other sought-after areas in Portland.
People like old buildings. This is reflected in residents being drawn to the West End, NW 23rd, Belmont and Hawthorne. Their older buildings engender homey, warm, and reassuring feelings. Older buildings are "friendlier" - more people-sized rather than domineering fortresses and sterile wind-tunnels in cities of homogenized high-rises. A community's inventory of old buildings are ready to fulfill new uses -- they are economic drivers. Our distinctive northwest architecture distinguishes us from other cities. We need to retain these if we don't want to look like just every other high-rise city in the world.
signs, pamphlets
The City is a highly political body. Politics may prevent the City from nominating resources. Residents should be able to nominate resources for protection and initiate the process.
They have value and that value will increase as time passes do not waste them for transient monetary gain by a few!!!
nothing yet!
My understanding is that the Historic Resources Code Project is to consider the relationship between city planning goals and historic preservation. Both Portland's Comprehensive Plan and Climate Action Plan tout the importance of 20-minute neighborhoods and walkability to the public health and the reduction of greenhouse gases. Historic neighborhoods almost inevitably have high Walk Scores and are typically 20-minute neighborhoods that encourage people to carry out many daily activities on foot instead of by driving carbon-emitting vehicles. The principal reason that historic neighborhoods encourage people to walk is that such neighborhoods are beautiful. This means that trip distances seem shorter to people on foot. By contrast, most of the new houses being built around Portland today are garage-dominant, auto-centric structures that are pedestrian-hostile. The

city needs to recognize the value of historic neighborhoods' walkability to the advancement of other city objectives. Over time, the RIP will yield "garage-scapes" that no one will want to sustain well into the future.
Older buildings near downtown and in the Central Core are a draw for tourism and provide a sense of history by their unique style, choice of building structure and material and are a delight to observe
Vet citizens and allow limited access to the HRI map to add photographs, context, etc. This should be a community wide effort, not just a small group of IT folk with editing privileges. This is our tool.
Creating a budget for this work.
How to include large sites such as Vanport, Japanese internment at EXPO site, and Native American sites in and around Delta Park
Develop methods and tools for retaining older buildings-they are too important now and in the future. Retain unique composition of neighborhoods. We risk having all cities look the same: boring, high-rise glass.
Trees and other natural features. Quality and cohesiveness of architecture within an area. Scarcity of given historic/old buildings - they are a finite resource and when they're gone, we can't get any more.
Planning for future growth and development should be intensional based on the feedback and codes developed for Portland by the top urban planners in the country.
I think a program, like the historic trees or the plaques they put on buildings around London and Paris, would show civic pride and recognition of our local history.
A disgustingly many of our most treasured places are already gone. No one likes anything that's been built in the last six decades at the very least. It's time to demand a higher standard of what gets built in this city and that could really set us apart from other places and reclaim some identity we were once renowned for.
that fine
We're not NYC, Chicago, Charleston or San Francisco. We should preserve what we have and not make our city look like others. We don't need to be "generic."
Protect the character of our small home neighborhoods. Inact tougher restrictions on home demolition. Increase cost of demolition and require neighborhood dissent to proposed demolition projects consideration and oversight to stop demolitions.
blunting the short term economic inventiveness to demolish historic resources during times of accelerated economic growth.
N/A
Provide incentives! And act like historic preservation matters to the city by adopting policies that support it. Dust off all the planning reports written and shelved over the years that address preservation.
Year of the homes the neighborhood
Save the beautiful old homes and neighborhoods of all levels
Stop allowing properties to be divided up that were not intended to be
How does it affect its community and what kind of support does it have
In general, they represent a piecemeal approach. We need a much more comprehensive process. Historic properties belong to all of us, and jurisdictions need to stop sacrificing public good for private profit. There could be no profit without we the people. Our interests need to come first, not last, as they too often do, now.
Remember the charm of tree-lined streets and old-fashioned buildings. This is why people move to Portland and why tourists visit. If Portland starts to look like every other small city, it will lost its appeal. Developers will still have their money, but local businesses will suffer.

Perhaps a tiered system of importance, so it's known which resources should be preserved at all costs, and which ones may be modified?
I would like you to look at the people who are actually moving into the new housing that has replaced older, yet still-viable housing. I am particularly concerned that the new residents in my neighborhood, for example, represent (1) lower, not higher, household density, and (2) significantly LESS diversity for the area. Who do you think lives in tasteless McMansions?
That everyone can't afford to buy a home and that's ok. And yes the city must address homeless situation. Maybe those who have more money could be taxed
Historic buildings, and especially neighborhoods with many historic buildings, are always a powerful attraction for tourism, if appropriately promoted. In historic neighborhoods buildings are not so tall, so the street is more pleasant, sunnier, providing a view of the sky, which makes us more comfortable in the public realm. For this reason, also, outdoor cafes and restaurants are more successful in historic districts than in high-rise street canyons. Portland is a city of trees, and its historic identity is connected to trees. Trees need light and flourish in historic neighborhoods where the buildings are not too tall. They do not flourish in high-rise canyons.
Owner consent. I believe in property rights. I don't think it's fair to put restrictions on a property improvements after an owner already owns it.
Continuing to correct the incorrect information that is disseminated about them. Encouraging people to look to the future and consider what we want to pass on to upcoming generations.
You must have better carrots and better sticks. There are many historic buildings where they may have saved at least the facade instead of demolishing all of it--IF they were forced to do so. The code must be clear that part of the history must remain. The policy must provide incentives to do so.
It would be good to make it a little easier for homeowners to do some renovations and help find some grants to keep them mindfully maintained.
Protection of poetry values over quick profits.
Any grants for brick homes to be earthquake protected?
Once buildings are lost they are gone forever. Is the new replacement structure really worth demolishing our past?
Make it easier and cheaper to accomplish. Only rich neighborhoods can do it.
Consider that older buildings are economic drivers too. They are what distinguishes us from other cities given that Portland's northwest architecture can distinguish us from those other cities. Yet "modern" architecture is homogenizing cities so they all look alike. Studies show that tourists are drawn by older architecture. So are residents, as witness in the draw of NW 23rd, Belmont and Hawthorne.
The living history of the lives associated with the district or landmark.
Don't establish the historic district and allow contractors to tear down homes that are historical. Just no longer makes it a historic district. Do not allow new construction in areas that do not fit the architectural style of older homes
I have seen a complete lack of attention to our gardening heritage and our gardening culture. Our original neighborhood zoning constituted a promise from the city to homeowners that they would live in "garden" communities. Horticulture is not just a nice hobby--it is a major economic driver in Oregon. We have a major national publisher here (Timber Press), nurseries, garden clubs, garden events, garden writers, and horticultural programs in our community colleges. Gardens are important contributors to health, happiness and the environment, but the city is happy to encourage buildings on gardens or taller buildings adjacent to gardens that block light, destroy privacy, increase runoff, and discourage gardening and walking. Some of our historic districts were designed with houses and

gardens as a single fabric. Stuffing in ADUs, abolishing zoning, and promoting taller, denser buildings will destroy what is currently a very vibrant culture that is as important as our arts or music culture. Will Portland still be the city of roses when it is completely hardscaped? Will any birds still sing?
Unsure
If it's already a historic site- PROTECT IT!! And for the sake of being redundant- GET THE \$\$\$\$ DEVELOPERS OUT OF THE PLANNING AND DECISIONS! And once a building is preserved, fill bylaw loopholes so they are truly safe? As far as what and how to determine landmark designation, county committees staffed by historians, educators, concerned district representatives and open town hall with neighborhoods is a start...
I think I have said enough. Thanks for your time, and consideration. I do hope that this process will not be weighted in the direction of greed and profit.
as much as possible, thx
Research and history has been archived by many persons interested in preservation. Give these legal precedence to stop the eradication of entire neighborhoods.
There has been a lot of comments about how voting to establish a historic district should be held. I think it should stay as it is. Those opposing should be required to get the 50 percent plus one. Either way in a hotly contested vote both sides need to educate the residents to the pros and cons. It takes a lot of door to door and group meetings. Dispelling the myths and wrong information put out about HD's is a full time job.
A HD might not have the history of the East Coast. But it is Oregon timeline history. It might be only 80-90 years old but it is a neighborhood with warmth, life, families that love older arch. Please stop the infill in Eastmoreland, Laurelhurst, Sellwood, etc
To include more than houses. Businesses, churches, trees, historic homeless camps and notorious story places (maybe work with multiple societies) create a joint website with a walking app and markers.
There needs to be a way to protect older buildings from demolition. FAR too many in this city have been torn down recently.
Cities all over the United States have ways to do so that both protect historic resources and add to economic development. Boston, Philadelphia, and many more have shown us there is a way to do this right.
I live in an historic and am tremendously proud to do so. People LOVE walking through here and looking at the older homes, of recalling history and imagining Portland's past. Other areas of this beautiful city deserve similar protection.
Nothing
Aesthetic value.
see above
Consider the will of the residents in those districts. Do not impose ideology, such as infill.
As a longtime resident of Portland, I want to see an end to the demolition madness. Sometimes I don't even know where I am anymore. After paying taxes for so many years, I think that I and other longtime residents need to be heard. STOP THE DEMOLITIONS!!!
Just say no to historic designation
City planners need to be careful not to influence the process because of their personal bias about a certain landmark or district.

Dont cave to rich developers with cash. Figure out a way to be realistic and inclusive to allow owners of old houses to modernize without the restrictions of historic districts.
allow the neighborhoods to decide their future.
If our artistic architectural past is not considered to be important, it will be destroyed. Can you imagine leveling the Greek Acropolis to make condos.
Look at the whole area, not just an individual building. The character of the neighborhood is just as important as the individual building. Changing the character of one building could affect an entire neighborhood and lower the value of surrounding homes not just in terms of economic value but also the livability and enjoyment of neighbors.
We need to be clear about the value to the city at large - not the existing residents. This is about creating a Portland that values and leverages it's history. We can look to East Coast cities and places like San Jose and LA that have done some work to preserve history. We can also look at failures if the same cities to leverage these assets.
City officials should no longer allow developers to determine what is right for a particular property or neighborhood. They are chasing profit dollars and not what is right or good for the city, it's citizens and neighbors! Developing higher rise buildings (blocking others) and building expensive and multiple dwellings on a parcel is not aiding affordability issues but rather lining developer's pockets!
That the neighborhood understands their district best. They are not trying to be elitist or exclusionary - just the opposite as they are trying to keep a very important part of historical Portland available for all with beautiful surroundings, tree cover and affordable houses for young families - not add to the very expensive houses presently being built in Eastmoreland.
Populations now living in Portland, landfills, and our throw away attitude.
Continuing my comments from question 14... I never thought of historic districts as a tool for maintaining affordable housing, but I think it is a good idea. We will need to look at all options, and exercise as many of them as possible, to address the affordability of housing in Portland.
Take it out of the hands of the architects. Why do we regard historic preservation as fundamentally a question of buildings? What are we really saying about our history when we do so? And furthermore, to what degree are a few buildings the basis for our sense of place? Do we even know what we share anymore? Consider this: Portland is profoundly a city of newcomers. Who is really benefitting from this single-minded focus on architecture? It all seems like windowdressing, and you are not helping.
Erasing the past doesn't make you wise.
Landmarks are part of what make an area unique and attractive. Older buildings are part of what allow start ups and artists to thrive. Value them beyond the plot they sit on.
Please visit the existing ones and see for yourself how they have benefited everyone.
How an "historic designation" sign does not make up for the gentrification and "re-vitalization" of districts and neighborhoods so that we who either lived here from the start or moved here because we wanted to be here and not change it, are now being forced out financially or in a snubbing way from our home.
Protection of Designated Historic Resources
commit to discipline to retain character of existing neighborhoods current owners have chosen and invested in
How the new urban fabric will interact with them as to whether complete preservation or just being historically sensitive is more appropriate

Neighborhoods that have architectural integrity need to be protected against greed or run the risk of forever losing the beauty and history.
Actively dispel the notion that historic districts are elitist and only advance white privilege. Many HRI properties were virtual slums and trardowns that have been brought back to life by individual citizen hard work and commitment to the city.
Do not destroy neighborhoods by allowing developers to tear down historic structures
It seems like the crisis part of the housing crisis is giving opportunists a chance to tear beautiful buildings down to make a buck and "say" they are helping provide more housing. Old buildings are disappearing so quickly that every time we go visit our sons in Portland, monthly, there are more tear-downs and ugly new buildings. Some old houses can house many families. I'd like to see a shift away from the demo version of providing housing
Do whatever it takes to stop demolishing our history and our most affordable rental units.
Stop demolishing amazing older homes and putting cookie cutter out of place condos in their place.
Please stop opposing neighborhoods seeking historic status.
The destructive impact of not preserving this city's past. A city my family has lived in for five generations.
Anything that would stop the demolition
I think it is important to make sure that those opposing the district are not doing so just so that they can make money with development
Creating a budget for this work
protection of large, intact districts. This has been very successful in places like New Orleans and creates a city scape that cannot be confused with mc-anywhere USA
The proximity of these landmarks to other districts and other historic buildings
The best way to preserve structures is to make the economics for demolishing them not work.
Figure out a way to make it so that there is some sort of design review for work that happens to them.
You probably do this already, but identifying how cities that are showcases for successful historic preservation approaches differ from ours, would get my vote.
PLEASE intervene in one way shape or form before one more neighborhood (Eastmoreland) becomes set in amber and shifts the responsibility of adapting to the changing landscape of our city to other overburdened neighborhoods. Just because the homes were built over 40 years ago does not make them all historically significant resources. Please stand up for us so we can amicably work towards a local historic district designation which I see as a way to honor history while potentially (hopefully!) embracing technologies that will make our homes more livable in the next few centuries (ie energy efficient upgrades)
I think Portland needs to prevent the destruction of its beautiful old neighborhoods. I think designating something "historical" may prevent developers from tearing down so many beautiful homes and replacing them with really unattractive housing, resulting in the destruction of neighborhoods.
Less developer involvement.
Allow flexibility especially in districts so that homeowners won't be so against the creation of these districts.
The recent Eastmoreland Historic District designation was driven not by people who had an interest in historic preservation, but by people who did not like the increased density, smaller "skinny" houses, or larger replacement houses that blocked someone's morning sun. The process should not be available to people like that, to use "historic preservation" as a tool for preventing one's neighbors

from building an addition or adding a second floor to a garage or installing solar panels or replacing old leaky windows with energy-efficient triple-pane vinyl windows.
This is far more important than individual homes and the city/state should invest in these commercial districts. See Donovan Rypkema and Ed McMahon publications.
There is support for changing the process!
Not everything is historic.
Property owners rights.
Please don't use the designation to preclude demolition. We need to allow the city to change.
demo restrictions, restrictions on removal of designations, tax incentives and retroactive tax penalties for removal of designation or demo
Owner consent. There should be a super majority of residents in a proposed district that agree to the designation via notarized letter before the designation can move forward.
The whole project should take a backseat to other needs. If it must persist, focus on cultural resources important to underrepresented communities
Preserving the "character" of an historic district. For example, Historic Parkrose (between I-205 and 122nd) used to be considered a "main street" area in the 50s and had lots of mom&pop shops. If mixed use development goes in, it should include small business space and try to aim for a similar look/feel.
Portland is undergoing a huge loss of historic structures. Please promote and ease access to preservation tactics.
Factual information and transparent communication is essential to the success of the process.
Add local districts and possibilities in addition to the federal options
Just because it's old doesn't make it historic. Make the people writing the reports do a better job. AECOM's information for Eastmoreland is not good enough.
It's important that our city retain neighborhood history and individuality, or we will destroy the charm and energy that makes a city.
Make a process that is really accurate, ie, the home really is historic. Have it done on an individual basis, by the individual or buy the house and have it be a public resource.
Exclusionary zoning is racist. Using historic districts to preserve the legacy of exclusionary zoning does not become our city.
Historic Landmarks and districts can support development by tailoring the new development to expand and enhance the overall neighborhood drawing more people to their services
The overall affect of restrictions on the current homeowners and the overall health of the neighborhood.
Be very strict over designating something as historic. Limit it to buildings, not large areas such as neighborhoods. Not everything should be considered historic because it's old. It should exemplify something very unique about the era or architectural style. Otherwise, it will be abused by homeowners who are interested in maximizing their home value at the expense of the general public.
Strong demolition protections.
I do not oppose historic preservation, but I think we've gone far enough in that direction in Portland, and we have a real crisis of housing affordability and homelessness that are more pressing problems.
Pay more attention to the historical significance of a property than the architectural significance.
Repeating I know, but owners' choice and consent. A vote perhaps.
Consider the lasting impact of these decisions. What does the city look like in 50 years if every building older than 50 years is deemed historic? The history of our city can not be separated from the

ways in which it has grown and evolved over the years, and if we're limiting that growth and evolution we are disrespecting our shared history.
The city should be permitted to consider whether historic designation is simply being used as a tool to promote gentrification and exclusion. No neighborhood should be excluded from development or density. Other measures can be taken to preserve historically significant structures without locking down entire sections of the city to new growth.
The City must coordinate an effort similar to what the Getty Conservation Institute has supported in Los Angeles.
That the current process is backwards and divisive. It should be more democratic.
They should be voted upon by the general public, not by small parties with other agendas. Many neighborhood groups aren't rep. their members but are pushing zoning laws to keep others out.
Neighborhood affordability and public access to resources should always be weighed in making decisions to designation places and districts as historical.
I have said it above.
I want information on how to nominate s district.
?
It is too easy to enact a historic district, this raises home values and restricts people from moving in.
They should be smaller - lumping 600, 700, 800 homes in an area is overreach.
I'd like you to consider the need for speed. Stop dallying. If you don't do something soon, every upscale neighborhood in the city will have turned itself into an historic district.
too many agencies are involved, which in Eastmoreland has contributed to a slow death for the process
Not sure
If you set up regulations that dictate what kind of window replacements I can use.....thats over reach
<p>As I hope the Eastmoreland debacle underscored, the listing and designation process must be inclusive, not elitist if it is to achieve the high goals and aspirations preservation wishes to achieve. Yes, the forces of capitalism, development and "progress" will always need to be addressed and neutralized, but sadly, those weren't the forces in play at Eastmoreland.</p> <p>The lessons-learned from the Eastmoreland experience have more to do with vigilantism, self-serving political corruption (on the part of the ENA board), bungling and naivete on the ENA Board, and asleep-at-the-wheel (bordering on corrupt) attitudes at the state level that failed the process.</p> <p>What is frustrating to those of us who were willing to engage in an open and free conversation about the merits of a designation, as well as a fair and proper inventorying and assessment of properties to be considered for the designation is that *no such conversation has ever happened.* Not a single open meeting was held to actually engage in any of the steps of the process, from the moment the ENA board hired a consultant to the moment they filed the proposal. Not one. (In spite of massive mis-information sent out by the ENA board and as can be attested to by lack of records of any attendee lists, number of attendees at any meetings hosted by the board, agendas of those meetings purported to be in service of the above principles, or the like.)</p> <p>In brief, the process for designating landmarks and districts *must* be run like any other public process: multiple workshops hosted and facilitated by disinterested professionals interested in establishing an accurate understanding of the stakeholders' interests and sentiment.</p>
keep the developers out. How about taking out the golf course and building low cost housing and apartments with parking.

There has been a lot of bad blood spilled. People are upset about mismanaged growth, and residents have turned to historic districting as a tool to quell the mismanaged growth. But it's the wrong tool. The right tool is sensible zoning from the city. Failure of city leadership on this one.
Property rights of owners. Restricting what one can do with their own house is wrong. Especially if their house is non contributing but within a boundry.
There are many important historic resources around the city yet districts tend to be created in wealthy areas in order to exclude.
I live in a 100 year old house (75th and Stark) and appreciate you sending this survey out. It has taken me a fair amount of research to uncover the original owners. I only have seen one picture of my house from the 1950s. As I remove the yucky aluminum siding I would really like to know how it once looked! Thank you for caring!!
Don't allow the use of historic district designation serve as a tool for exclusion of renters and low income people. There should be no enclaves of wealthy, protected homes in the city if we are to live up to our values. I don't see inherent value in old buildings if the trade-off is that the neighborhood becomes more more exclusive and basically gated. That's not the Portland we want
Significance to cultural and social history and history of the city
It is only valuable if you limit it to a few vitally important examples. If it is abused and too much is called "historic" then it loses its potency.
Stop rich neighborhoods from creating historic districts as enclaves for the rich only.
Focus on the seventh generation. Will they care about architectural beauty? no. They will care about the affordability of their neighborhood and whether it feels like home. Defining home is what we need to focus on.
Do not allow them (including the national historic district) without a publicly -driven process. Do not allow them to block growth and infill, including via measures to restrict demolitions
The regulations do not need to be so restrictive! Plan reviews and requirements are not forth coming on the time suck and finances one maybe faced with. An example of this is for a home owner to change out windows to be more energy efficient. The home owner has the burden to pay utilities. No one has the right to impose additional financial burden on the home owner dictating what kind of windows can ir cannot be put in.
A new owner should not be able to easily un-designate them, just because it is no longer convenient.
Designate only individual properties, not districts. For instance, in a "district" such as Laurelhurst, it may suit to pick out a few significant buildings, which are not within a 1/2 mile radius of a light-rail station, so that more housing can be constructed in that radius without harming designated resources.
Listen to the property owner not associations that is afraid of change.
N/A
Do not make it cost prohibitive for individuals and a money making project for the city.
dont know
Pay attention to how much is being destroyed by developers.
Neighbors should not be allowed to abuse historic preservation to further economic and racial bigotry
Balance historic designations with housing affordability. The more properties are excluded from potential redevelopment, the more density and redevelopment will have to occur in neighborhoods without designations.
Previously modified homes and owners who have modified homes that would not currently be allowed under a HD structure should not be able to vote for a historic district or make that case.
Opposition voices

Abuse abuse abuse.
I got a notarized objection to the east moreland district because our neighborhood isn't historical. A small group of older residents decided to spend a ton of the neighborhood association money without taking the pulse of the neighborhood.
require 100 % of property owners to consent.
Once again, it should be the owners choice to opt IN. Setting up funds to assist with preservation would certainly be ideal.
Improve the fairness of the process. A 100+ year old home was excluded from the designation and the vote and the surveys
Balance with current needs of residents, neighborhoods, consider any covert reasons for seeking designation (local power /struggles, personality agendas.
Some consideration of length of tenancy and accounting for actual owner/inhabitants, not stand-ins, relatives, absent landlords monied interests seeking to manipulate the process etc.
The true intention of the designation should be understood. Is it really an area worth preserving or is there and underlining issue that should be dealt with differently. If it is an landmark or district truly worthy than yes, freeze it in time.
A less complicated process
Historic districts should sunset after a specific period with required renewals. Rules governing historic districts should not compromise other city goals, such as energy efficiency (e.g. making installation of solar panels or energy efficient windows burdensome) or seismic vulnerability (restricting exterior modification needed for retrofits.) Historic designation being pursued in Portland is not actually historic preservation; it is NIMBYism run amuck.
Common voting for approval and disapproval is a better method than what exists.
they should be use this for landmarks and districts of historic significant not as a means to stop in-fill development.
Homeowners and neighborhood residents should have input and standing in designation process
Ensure that property owners must proactively approve of their property being listed instead of being forced on them against their will.
I hope the process will be changed for Historic Districts. I've lived in Eastmoreland for 25 years and we are completely divided. My house was built in 1925 but added onto on both ends in 1950 — does it make sense to freeze that in time and not allow future improvements? The normal process was hijacked to achieve a different goal than preservation of significant architecture. It hurts the work of true historic preservation.
Insure a HD is not being promoted to create exclusion zones or treads on the property rights of owners without due process and compensation. As a resident of The Eastmorland neighborhood I feel completely railroaded by the process and by the absolute failure of the neighborhood board to engage in meaningful debate and discourse. Besides squandering funds on chasing this designation the efforts have divided the neighborhood and destroyed what made it truly a great place to want to live and raise a family. The behavior of this board is representative of the broader style of governance that is manifesting itself at a national level. If there is a historic district established here the ground rules for engagement and oversight need to be completely overhauled.
What could possibly be considered historic about an entire neighborhood of homes built between 1900 and today? A neighborhood is a process developing over time. To freeze the process is a sad commentary on the motives behind this movement for historic designation. In addition, it is critical that there is consent from a majority of property owners in the proposed district. And lastly, does anyone really have the right to tell someone they can't put a dormer on their house

(their largest financial investment) or they can only replace their old leaky wood window with another wood window.
Do not allow a small group to decide the fate of an entire neighborhood by being labelled historic without the owners' consent. It's virtually an impossible feat to stop it by having to gather 50% + one in order to stop the process. At the very least, those pro historic district should be required to gather a majority vote before any process moves forward. And the state of Oregon should stop piggy backing land use rules on the National Parks Historic honorary designations.
Require that all processes be open and fair, based on elected representatives and democratic processes. Do not allow an honorary designation to link to land use restrictions. Use carrots, not sticks.
Reduce fees, timelines and make it possible for people of all incomes to restore and do maintenance, like fixing nonfunctional windows, adding safer handrails, correcting steep entrance steps and reducing energy use by installing things like solar panels and solar roofs
Historic districts should never be used in place of City or neighborhood planning. They should not be so broadly implemented that lesser structures are required to have the same restrictions as truly historic structures just because they dwell in the same area. "Like for like" material requirements are not always necessary to maintain the look and quality that is desired by some neighbors, and can put undue financial pressure on families. It also can inhibit the best practices for energy efficiency and environmental sustainability.
Na
Na
If a property owner wants to partner with historic preservation works voluntarily, fine. But Historic preservation shouldn't be limited to the exterior... I would like to see the interior preserved as well. The original kitchens, bathrooms, wallpaper, and room layout. these are elements that make the house into a home. And homes that still have these original features are becoming very rare in all neighborhoods more than 50 years old. An antique car with modern running gear and electronics are considered less historic compared to one which has the original engine, original wheels and tires, radio, etc. We should apply that ethic to homes.
Once all NE and SE neighborhoods jump on this bandwagon, the city will need to build an empire to regulate when what we really need are answers to housing and the homeless issue.
The current process for designating national districts is divisive and in many ways corrupt (full of lies and slander). It must be changed as our sense of neighborliness within proposed districts (and in some current districts) is destroyed.
More incentives for maintaining our historic resources.
To my knowledge, Portland has never had a "historic context statement" to lay out the key themes, cultural transformations, and evolutionary stages that the city has gone through and which can be read from the physical fabric of the city. The current plan seems to be to jump immediately into an inventory without the context statement.
That might lead to an unfocused and random approach, especially as the vast sprawl of early 20th Century neighborhoods is being surveyed. No such over-arching context concept was used to inform the inventory of the 1980s, with the result that that inventory remains a fragmented collection of individual resource descriptions with little to tie them together. That glaring lack of a cohesive, historic view of the developments that shaped the city in the existing Inventory argues for redoing it in its entirety, not just focusing on parts of the city which were annexed subsequent to the inventory's completion.

An example of a "context" element would have to be the emergence of the electric streetcar as the dominant means of transport in the period from 1890 to 1930 in Portland. Portland was an early and extensive adopter of this technology -- being the site of some of the very first electric interurban railways and one of the highest per-capita trolley riderships in the country. This led to the creation of our streetcar suburbs and our now-highly-prized streetcar commercial strips that are increasingly under threat. Without this sense of the context, the thousands of modest homes and commercial buildings that resulted from the streetcar boom would individually fall below the level of "significance" required for any kind of historic designation.

Decisions about historic designation shouldn't be made in a vacuum.

Preservation is expensive in time, money, and energy. These costs accrue to the city, its residents, and land owners by placing a significant burden on property owners and limiting opportunities for areas of the city to grow and change.

The only way decisions about historic designation can be made in a balanced way is to ensure that the ultimate determination is made by a group with a broad mandate. I suggest that either the planning commission or City Council would be appropriate bodies.

These decisions are hard and significant and they need to be made in the context of the needs of the city as a whole. Individuals can care deeply about preservation as an end, but that kind of focus makes it very challenging to consider issues in a manner that best serves the city.

No neighborhood-wide historic districts. Neighborhoods containing over 1000 homes should not be designated and "protected" from change.

Maintaining existing trees, green/open space when permitting new construction. Even consider expanding green space with new permits to make up for the 30+% of trees lost since the 1970's in Portland.

This needs to be more than a way for NIMBYs to prevent change.

done

The homeless need to be housed, but not in historic neighborhoods where they cannot afford to live and maintain the historic character of those homes. The working poor and homeless should be housed near the inner city and transit routes.

Think 50-100 years into the future and how should Portland reflect its rich history. Consider how to prevent demolition by neglect or through the use of saying that seismic retrofitting is too expensive (an easy out for a brick building to be demolished). Take the Workmen Temple and the Gray building on MLK (demolished?) as learning experiences. Both over 100 yrs old and offer either architectural or cultural significance. Demolition of significant buildings should be difficult and challenge the demolisher to prove that their project is worthy of the loss of a building that is important to the cultural heritage of Portland. Tiered approach to the designation (recognizes that not all eligible buildings are of equal importance and helps to identify those that should require more protection).

10. Are additional zoning code incentives needed?

Yes!
encourage affordability, diversity and density discourage scale, height and small setbacks
Such as?
Probably, but I don't know what this means. I'd like an example.
Yes, geared toward retention and reuse.
Yes
Yes. Building height and size limits should be considered. RIP recommends a limit on the size of houses, but the proposal takes a one-size-fits-all approach and doesn't recognize differences between and among neighborhoods. In addition, demolition incentives embodied in both RIP and the Central City 2035 Plan should be reviewed for their potentially harmful effects not only on the preservation of Portland's historic resources but also on affordable housing units already in existence.
On the other hand, the city should make it easier and less expensive for property owners to carry out internal conversions of historic houses (to help out with the city's affordable housing crisis) and to create Accessory Dwelling Units that are well-designed and compatible with their surroundings.
Not sure what this question intends. Does it reference Residential Infill? RIP rezoning violates public processes and fails to take the concerns of existing residents and property owners into account.
Zoning changes are needed to protect historic and cultural resources in areas that are not historic districts.
Yes.
Yes
Yes, allow for more ADU/internal divisions of historic single family homes.
probably, not sure due to my lack of knowledge of any existing zoning incentives.
Probably
yes
Yes. We need to make sure historic buildings are not destroyed when they could be safely and effectively preserved.
No. On the contrary, we should stop trying to use zoning to preserve old buildings. We should pick the best ones, that are special, and allow those to be protected or acquire them for the public.
I am not sure but the RIP is proposing zoning codes that are ruinous to our neighborhoods. Making current codes more stringent for historic resources might work just as well.
No! Additional zoning incentives are needed to build more multi-unit dwellings, not to protect historic resources.
yes
Yes
As noted above, there needs to be matching grants for seismic and other code upgrades to historic buildings. It would be very useful to prioritize these for affordable housing and affordable (often small) business rentals. Could also make exemptions to certain regulations in return for certified historic preservation work. Especially need to work on strengthening requirements to prevent demolition of qualified historic resources.
Don't know.
yes

Perhaps
Not sure yet - I DO think more work needs to happen by the City to advocate for building code changes that would make adaptive reuse more feasible.
Yes. Historic and "interesting" buildings need assistance with earthquake prevention improvements.
Yes. Building height and size limits should be considered. RIP includes these, but they take a one-size-fits-all approach and don't recognize differences between and among neighborhoods.
Yes. Transfer of FAR rights. Additional density when remodeling a resource.
I'm not sure what this means. Incentives to meet the code, change the code, or something else.
For the base inventory, mapping and data linking but otherwise – no. For “districts”, design guidelines and an implementation structure is essential. At a minimum this will require neighborhood contact, notifications, guidelines and a response to the guidelines that will accompany the permit process. At this level city design review (BDS) is not required.
Where demolition disincentives, financial incentives for preservation, incentives for affordability, sale of air rights, sale of façade rights, etc. a great deal of code work will be required.
Zoning could provide protection. Incentives will always be needed to protect development from eliminating resources.
Yes. We need to encourage seismic and other types of upgrades of historic resources. Portland needs to study its demolition policy, which is too lenient and irresponsible.
YES!
Yes from earthquake improvements and providing public/pedestrian friendly spaces
Such as what? Perhaps less incentives are needed. It all depends on what is trying to be accomplished through designation as a historic resource district.
Yes!
yes
Preservation always benefits from additional incentives. Parking, curb cuts, setbacks -- all can be made more lenient to encourage preservation.
Proper regulations are needed. People need to be prioritized ahead of profit. Quality, above quantity. Also, subterranean space needs always to be incorporated into the blueprint of any structure for the sake of efficiency.
no carrots needed
Don't knsw
maybe
yes
I don't know, I'm just beginning to learn about this subject
Not sure. Maybe.
No
I don't know
No
IDK
Incentives? Try requirements. Require new development to only occur on non-historic properties. (We've got TONS.) Require owners of historic properties to maintain them. Subsidize low-income

property owners' maintenance costs. Prohibit demolition of anything over 100 years old without an difficult and expensive process. Encourage the restoration of properties to their original, pre-automotive purpose. (Walkable neighborhoods require grocery stores and other services. Historic storefronts should be incentivized to serve a function the neighborhood needs.)
Obviously they are, since historic buildings are being torn down every day.
Perhaps a lower property tax rate for significant historic resources, if that isn't already the case.
This question is unclear. It is not evident to me that any previous efforts to achieve results through zoning changes have been productive with regard to preservation - FYI.
Yes. To protect a neighborhood with a large number of historic buildings it would be wise to limit the height of new construction (to not much higher than the historic buildings) so that there is less incentive to tear down. This would also support the attraction of that neighborhood for tourists, as well as local residents.
I don't know what this means. Please use language regular citizens, not planners, understand
Zoning is very difficult for people to understand in an era when people have forgotten why their ancestors created them in the first place. Distribute t-shirts with "Euclid vs. Ambler -- saving you from living next to something really smelly and dangerous since 1926."
Yes
Yes, there must be code incentives to help encourage developers to save buildings, to keep that history visible. The stories of our communities are in our historic buildings. There are many great success stories (PNCA, the Brewery Blocks). How can you incentivize developers to do this instead of demolishing our grand, historic buildings?
Yes and those houses that are abutting the industrial and mixed use areas should be more protected from being torn down.
Yes
Yes - the concerns of neighborhoods are being ignored in favor of a few developers making major changes to the landscape of the eastside (while they all reside westside, Lake Oswego...ie they don't care)
Only if they would stop demolition of historic buildings.
Yes. There needs to be dedicated money used as a matching grant to help fund and encourage seismic upgrades of historic resources. This could initially be restricted to buildings with multiple affordable housing or affordable office units. Money could come from a hefty fee on building demolitions. Portland has the weakest demolition protections in the U.S. and this needs to be strengthened by adapting best practices from around the nation to our local conditions.
Not sure. Current zoning changes planned will only hurt what might be historic resources.
I'm not sure.
Yes to prevent modern architecture from destroying historic architectural significant neighborhoods
Specific examples of what this means? Incentives to do what?
Yes
Yes! Re-zoning an area so the beautiful Italian marble Masonic Hall can be dropped because a parking lot is needed, must stop! Developer monies should not be the catalyst fulling the zoneing decision. Are they close, vacant lots also available? Just do the honest homework!
Perhaps
yes for preservation, not upzoning...again, a demolition moratorium...
For what? Depends on what you want your goal to be. I want protection for our old neighborhoods all over the city. If it is zoning codes that give them protection, I am for it. The city planners should

have this in their DNA. One does not need to destroy what makes our city unique. People come here because this is a very beautiful city. It is diminishing. Not all neighborhoods can afford to go through the Historic District nomination process. The planners should know where these resources are and help protect them. Once they are gone there is no turning back.
Yes
Yes
Yes! Great idea.
No, but clearer definitions of existing zoning (or maybe overlay zoning for ADU availability, etc)
Needed for what?
No
Yes
YES
Probably.
Maybe...but this is not clear.
See above comments. Save our city from developers and greed!!!!
No
Probably
YES. In partnership with the neighborhoods themselves, I think every neighborhood in Portland should identify some high density areas but also some historic density areas. I am opposed to the city imposing this, but I would love to see the city giving the neighborhoods criteria to work with and let them set themselves up. Maybe just a pipe dream?
Yes
yes
I don't know.
No
Zoning should not be changed to allow for smaller lots. The zoning should maintain the existing character of the neighborhood, not allow for changes to density or bigger dwellings than what currently exist.
Yes!
Yes
No. However there has been no explanation given for reducing zoning codes in eastmoreland and not in the Reed neighborhood. Seems very arbitrary.
No, they need to be corrected so that they accurately describe a particular zone.
I don't like the idea of incentives. If there is money to be made, incentives do nothing to stop developers. Too often I see where developers request a variance. Nearby home owners have to vigilantly watch for notices and doggedly fight against the requested variance. With no guarantee that their issues will be given serious consideration. Incentives don't work. Regulations work, so long as variances are not allowed.
No.
Perhaps
Zoning code changes are often put in place at the request of developers after predatory red-lining practices by banks have left areas "run down". In this example something needs to break this cycle of mis-using zoning codes.
No

yes
!?!? . Incentives to meet the code, change the code, or something else.
Tax breaks for owning/restoring just like there is for building in plighted areas that aren't as profitable.
Yes
seems not specific or too broad
Yes. Eliminate review fees.
I'm not sure.
Yes to make certain multi family dwellings are not allowed in historic districts
Yes
Yes
Yes, to prevent demolitions and to incentivize building owners to save buildings.
Yes
I don't understand this question.
Not for me.
yes. stop the tearing down of single family homes to be replaced by two or three skinny houses.
Also, no more apartments unless adequate parking is provided. It is ludicrous to expect these new units will be satisfised with existing street parking. Dumb!
Yes
For the base inventory, mapping and data linking but otherwise – no. For “districts”, design guidelines and an implementation structure is essential. At a minimum this will require neighborhood contact, notifications, guidelines and a response to the guidelines that will accompany the permit process. At this level city design review (BDS) is not required.
Where demolition disincentives, financial incentives for preservation, incentives for affordability, sale of air rights, sale of façade rights, etc. a great deal of code work will be required.
I think taht might help clarify potential issues with some people.
no
no
Perhaps, depending on how the incentives would be offered and for what.
Yes, there are, but it is hard to get this rezoning, so it is not the most efficient way to preserve a neighborhood.
Yes. The underlying lot lines issue is completely confusing and should be overhauled. Also, consider incentivizing converting large houses to duplex/triplex if the structure is maintained.
Yes
I'm not sure what this means. Incentives to meet the code, change the code, or something else.
Don't know enough to answer this question.
Sorry, can't finish.
Yes, make it worthwhile to have a historic designation.
Absolutely! Incentivize internal conversions to multi unit that preserve not replace existing housing stock
Needed for what? To protect homeowners from increased density they don't like? No.
Yes. Probably.

YES!!!
No.
Yes
No
I don't know, what is
yes
~
I have no idea how to answer this question since I don't what the existing zoning code incentives are.
Yes. For affordable housing, apartment-izing big mansions, etc.
yes
Low income housing should be required. historic neighborhoods should be allowed different zoning.
Yes
No
No
Incentives for what?
In the city/area? I think you need to figure out what kind of community you really want and design codes to encourage that. Are you just creating knee jerk laws to say, "not in my backyard", when 20 years from now you have created a neighborhood no one can afford or would spend all the money it takes too live in an old home.
Yes - currently it feels that the developers do not have respect for historic status and seek to exclude it. Additionally City Council seems to be courting development and has to be held to criteria an not allow "historic give aways"
Not sure.
Yes. Teach the current city planners how to read and how to apply zoning codes to the benefit of the community and not to the developers.
No. Designating historic resources should not be incentivized by the zoning code.
No! Zoning and code incentives are needed to encourage more housing, in order to make it more affordable.
probably not.
Zoning code incentives for what? If limiting demolitions is the goal, removing parking minimums would help. Allowing internal conversions up to 4 units as well as ADUs would help. Eliminating the absurdly expensive historic review fees would help, but that's not a zoning issue. When soft costs for the smallest change are sky high, you leave homeowners with no choice but to do massive changes (demo and rebuild) in order for anything to make financial sense.
Again, I'm not sure what you're hoping to use the zoning code to incentivize, but I do think that is a very dangerous and slippery slope. Our zoning code should have nothing to do with historic resource designation. When they get mixed up together, they aren't accomplishing what they were put in place to do. They're wholly separate and one should not be perverted as a tool for the other.
Perhaps. I need ore info here to make an educated decision.
Sure! There should be incentives to promote affordable housing across Portland. Affordable housing projects should enjoy fast track permitting and exceptions to parking requirements.
Yes
No

No
Yes, we need more public input to city's zoning practices and changes!!
Yes.
Yes!
No
no
No
No.
changing R5 residential to R2.5 was clearly motivated by a desire to cram more people into the City limits, at the expense of neighborhood integrity; this was a serious mistake!
I don't know
No
I'm not qualified to say. Perhaps a "cap and trade" approach is possible, where a landholder can negotiate a proxy designation for another piece of land in exchange for permission to develop a specific targeted property.
Or perhaps a zoning exemption for a protected property would allow for a mixed use project (increasing the property's value to the landholder) as long as the target property is protected.
If this question is regarding recent zoning plans for RIP-SAC, then let's engage our communities in these conversations, as the city has been doing, to get appropriate densities, appropriate FARs and creative thinking around cars, parking, street trees and setbacks. Let's make sure that large-footprint neighborhoods, such as Laurelhurst, Eastmoreland and the like are treated sensitively, but are not excluded from the conversation nor allowed to excuse themselves as we continue to build out the future of Portland
Dont know
Ha HA Ha. Try up-zoning instead of down zoning. Also, apt buildings need elevators with 2+ floors. And take the city government parking structures down for housing and make the employees ride bikes.
Yes
Yes - flexibility to respond to current needs.
No
I don't know
I don't know
Not sure what this means. Zoning codes are meant to preserve the character of a neighborhood and its population
No.
For every building put on the list a less important one needs to be taken off.
Yes
For those few buildings to be protected, then institute exceptions to maximum household size, to max. unit numbers, to parking requirements, etc.
Carpenters think the solution to every problem is a hammer, right?
Perhaps individual house zoning that preserves historical properties rather than neighborhoods
Yes

no
I don't have an opinion about zoning except that historic districts and historic resources need protection, so if zoning accomplishes that, I'm on board.
May be helpful
Yes, more relaxed zoning codes are needed to allow the construction of more types and more units of housing in more areas, such as duplexes, triplexes, quadplexes, etc. We need more missing middle housing that is currently illegal under City zoning ordinances
Allow more units and do not require parking when historic resources are protected.
Probably, to make up for the serious limitations on home improvements
I'm not sure
Nope
Not sure.
yes
No
I do not understand the question. I need more information.
Possibly
Yes.
Yes
Yes. The entire code used for governing historic districts needs to be in place prior to designation.
yes
Maybe
yes
Yes
Perhaps.
Incentives are always preferred over forced regulations
Possibly.
No - the system is broken and needs to be fixed before more incentives are added. Most designations are not historic!
No. We need to consider the needs of the future of our city, as it grows and changes. Do not constrict our future by placing restrictions on zoning.
Possibly
No
Probavly
No
Enducements and incentives to promote voluntary cooperation, yes. Not mandatory design review and enforcement.
Beyond RIP?
Yes
There should be permitting discounts for retaining existing structures to incentivize their preservation. More flexibility in the application of codes should be allowed when renovating rather than building new.
Yes.
Yes, we need zoning that allows more multi family housing in ALL neighborhoods.

Portland has tended to come up with dozens of reasons to offer developers "bonus" height or FAR to the point where transfer of FAR or height from protected sites to other locations had little value. The new Comp Plan seems to offer some better opportunities for height and FAR transfers from protected areas, but likely it will be necessary to allow more distant transfers than has been contemplated in the past and to allow such transfers to take new buildings higher and bigger than any other bonuses for things like bicycle parking might allow.
There are already some zoning code provisions to allow great unit density in historic zones than the underlying zoning might allow, but these seem to have been rarely used. There might be value in allowing conversion of single family residences in R5 or other single family zones into multi-family with restrictions on minimum sizes for such splits, and provisions for off-street parking to avoid overloading areas with narrow streets and already-congested traffic.
Historic designation limiting development on a piece of land should be balanced by additional automatic intensity (FAR, allowed building envelope/lot coverage) on surrounding properties.
Communities that abuse preservation tools should incur a cost.
Yes, current RIP proposals will ensure an even higher rate of demolition.
No
Transfer of development rights is one tool I'd like to see more widely used
Yes, FAR transfers are too geographically limited to be useful
no
yes - not enough incentives to protect what is important. See the destruction of the Workmen Temple this year.

11. How can demolition and design protections be more relevant and effective?

Need to inform more neighbors (not just adjacent ones) of a pending demolition. Need more stringent guidelines on who can get on the Design Review Board -- not necessarily requiring architects, who can have atrocious taste and judgment (look at what they are designing these days!), but seeking people with some discernment. Or how about asking the neighbors what they think of the design of a new house going up? After all, they will be the ones looking at it every day.
apply them more stringently to developers and short-term property holders, less-so for long-term property holders. Enable protections to prevent inappropriate height, scale and setbacks.
The default position should be that demolitions are undesirable for environmental and cultural reasons and permits are hard to obtain. Landlords should be heavily penalized for allowing buildings to deteriorate to facilitate demolition. Design should be subject to architectural review.
Relevant to whom? We now have battles between those who want to see no change, and those who realize that people (and climate refugees) need to live somewhere, and Portland has become a popular "somewhere."
Right now they just are a way to slow the process. Add a mitigation fund. Every structure demolished funds a program of interpretation and restoration of other resources.
By recognizing that 'highest and best' use doesn't only mean largest/tallest building you can build under existing code. Importance to the community has to be considered.
Look around you, the city is becoming hideous
By being more inclusive and responsive to neighborhoods
The city should develop clear, easy-to-understand design guidelines. It may make sense to develop district-specific guidelines.
Clarity, transparency, notification that allows community response without financial hardship.
Disincentives for demolition are not that effective. Limited tax reductions, reduced permit costs, reduced SDC work better.
We gathered over 5000 signatures, staged protests, went to the neighborhood association several times, and conducted extensive historical research on the property we were trying to save and none of that was enough to prevent demolition. We need more ways of preventing greedy land developers from destroying our cherished historic buildings and cohesive urban streetscapes.
Better notification area requirements -- signage at the sight perhaps. For example, the first church built in St. Johns is under demolition review... I wouldn't have known had I not seen it in our neighborhood paper (St. Johns Review), even though it is ~.5 mile from me & I go past it almost daily.
Get rid of the demolition protections. I saved, and live in, a house that by all rights should have been torn down. It was a hot mess. Its fine that I saved it, but if I could do it over I might not. It's small, and it's within 2 blocks of a MAX station. My land should be zoned for a 3-4 story apartment building and have at least 4 units on it. Anything else is a waste of city resources and contributes to further displacement.
Tear down a one story house, replace it with three three story houses, NO. Make the new structure blend with the existing structures in height and design.
Demolition and design protections should not be imposed without the owner's express consent.
most take into account the effect on the surrounding area and neighborhood - from a style , height , setback and perhaps even an economic viewpoint .
These tools are far too subjective, and tend to undermine any attempt to integrate our city economically and racially. They should be used far more selectively or not at all. Eminent domain is a far better tool.

Avoid myopic focus on maintaining historic purity. Allow modernization and addition to structures that lets them be woven into structures that meet current and future needs in addition to preserving some historic features.
It would be helpful to have at least one person versed in historic preservation on the review team! Historic preservation, like the environment, seems to be regarded as an optional luxury rather than a critical criteria that should be met.
In view of Portland's completely inadequate protections against demolition, there should be a hold on demolitions until new, protective regulations are developed. Design review provisions also need to be improved and strengthened. Too many times design review committee "recommendations" or even "requirements" are ignored by developers once the project is approved. Better regulations are needed to ensure that new construction adjacent to historic buildings/resources does not diminish the latter. Availability of sunlight, view corridors and assessment of glare from totally glass-sided buildings (which can at certain times of the day greatly discourage walking in that area) must also be considered. Size and human scale is vitally important to making an area human-friendly and inviting.
Demolition review should be required in local historic and conservation districts. Discretionary design standards particular to each district should apply to historic districts. Design standards could be less restrictive for conservation districts.
height restrictions, set backs, shade issues, preserve views (water, bridges, mountains, hills)
Do not allow a few to destroy for monetary reasons recognise the value
Codes need to be upheld; and assistance to owners of historic and or "interesting" buildings need to be available. Destruction of these dwellings should be made more difficult and community input should be considered as an important resource.
Any HRI listing, not only ranked, get the 120 day delay. Making certain the people at the plan review desk understand the significance of these properties and take appropriate care in issuing demolition permits.
Demolition should be a last resort. It should be very difficult and probably expensive, especially for developers.
Demolition Delay at 120 days is not sufficiently effective. Except for marginally profitable projects, it simply adds to the cost of doing business. Along with the delay the developer/owner should be required to provide schematic designs and proformas for alternatives: relocation, adaptive reuse, third party sale.
The appeals process needs to be redone to eliminate loopholes. Whether demo or design, there needs to be a process that does not penalize personal gain. Adding cost to either only makes the affordable housing more unaffordable.
Portland needs to put a hold on additional demolitions until a better code can be agreed upon. In addition, design review must have stronger and better guidelines for new buildings that help complement and enhance the existing context. Sunlight and human scale needs to be considered in areas that have a lot of older buildings that are on the historic resource inventory.
Expand demolition protection to more structures and allow transfer of development rights. Facilitate incentives to preserve URMs and move small houses to other locations.
Follow an urban planning guide
By focusing on truly significant architecture and design in a neighborhood, and not applying a blanket to an entire neighborhood which may have a significant amount of non-conforming structures.
As much as possible, keep old houses from being torn down.

Developers should honor the neighborhoods in which they are working. Expansive homes with small setbacks are unfair to existing home owners. At times it feels that a small group of developers are controlling the future aesthetic of Portland's historic neighborhoods.
A party proposing demolition of any resource identified as significant should be required to present a robust feasibility study to BDS staff and/or the HLC.
The public needs ownership over the decisions. We need to acknowledge the fact that Portland looks and works worse every single year.
stop the destruction
Let's make sure design protections work and that demolitions—in protected and culturally-relevant neighborhoods—are minimized. Design protections need local input from neighborhood associations and others with relevant expertise.
By having neighborhood listening sessions for each demolition project. Some houses should be demolished. But it will be obvious which ones should go by listening to the community, not just the owner and/or developer.
increase the developers costs to demolish and decrease costs to preserve historic resources.
portland could actually have a permit system that would deny a permit for demolition and design changes. No permit has ever been denied in Portland. Give the city money you can do what you want
I don't know, I'm just beginning to learn about this subject
There should be demo prohibitions on certain highly significant resources. Then there should be long demo delays for other resources....6 months to a year. I would argue for design review to be required across the city. In all areas of inner Portland, both residential and commercial.
Perhaps keeping same front walls. To match size of general homes and landscape
Keep the giant new houses out and make it easier to save the old ones
Yes
Demonstrate why a demo is necessary
Place the burden of proof on the would-be demolisher. Maximizing owner profit is NOT a reason to demolish! Demolition should be a last, expensive, and rare option. Property owners should not be allowed to neglect their properties today so they can demolish them tomorrow. Owners of non-historic properties that go against the citizens' needs (auto-centric development) should be required to offer them for redevelopment. New development must conform to HISTORIC area norms, consistent with creating walkable, transit-oriented neighborhoods that consider the needs of cars last, not first. Building permits should be rejected when they are incompatible with the historic character of a neighborhood or the regions' sustainability goals.
They need to be relevant to our population now. Do people like to walk or bicycle through the neighborhood? Go to coffee shops there? Why? What makes the area appealing? If it is the buildings, let's try to keep them.
Not sure.
Make demolition the most costly and unattractive option available to developers, the option of last resort. Next least-viable should be approval processes for significant (especially exterior) alterations. Hard hits to the financial bottom line for developers is most important.
Don't allow those extra big houses
How can demolition and design protections be more relevant and effective? By valuing buildings not only for their architectural design merit, but also for their significance in the social/cultural history, and for their contribution to making the public realm more hospitable, interesting, and livable.
Expand them. Enforce them. Stop letting developers determine policy (i.e. RIP)

Demolition delay provides breathing room. Look at the design protections in neighborhoods like Cedar Hills where three generations of residents have largely agreed with one another as to what should be regulated and what should not.
It needs to be more difficult for developers to be able to demo and there needs to be more incentives for developers to rehabilitate old homes and buildings. Longer public comment periods.
Demolition delays are nothing. They do not prevent demolitions, as we've seen repeatedly. They are a useless farce. The only way to prevent the destruction of our cultural/ethnic/ architectural history is to stop demolitions. Demolitions should be very expensive and very hard to get for buildings that are on the National Register or HRI.
They need to keep places from being torn down. We can't replace them. The rules seem to be on the side of developers and those with money. Neighborhood associations need to have more say in what happens. It seems like the city just goes through the motion of "listening" to people but already have their mind made up no matter what is said. I haven't seen any demolitions being denied.
Respecting codes without clandestine modifications.
Tree's should be preserved/worked around, older structures should be deconstructed instead of bull dozed, adjoining neighbors should have a say to protect their own investments (instead of having a three story monolith towering over their yard/blocking natural light, blank walls built along their window wall, etc)
Provide both subjective (review by committee) and objective design guidelines. Provide more objective guidelines to stop demolitions and design review.
Whatever is done, code needs to be more effective in holding on to these resources, recognizing them as both important historically and economically. Portland needs to put a hold on additional demolitions until a better code can be agreed upon. In addition, design review must have stronger and better guidelines for new buildings that help complement and enhance the EXISTING context. Sunlight and human scale needs to be considered in areas that have a lot of older buildings that are on the historic resource inventory.
Be enforced. Value space and trees. Historic neighborhood values, not turn Portland into New York.
By giving more weight to the concerns of the residents of the area when making the decisions and by not presenting completed plans which will, of necessity, be defended by those invested in those plans.
By not giving contractors an out-of-state investors incentives to do so. Charge out-of-state developers more to purchase lands and Destroy them.
Demolition should be a last choice. It is bad for the environment and doesn't promote affordable housing.
Demo permit applications should have to prove the structure is no longer inhabitable.
When a bungalow hose was dropped across from us several years ago, there was black mold, abestos, and open sewer pipes. No hazard protection for the neighborhood children, residents or workers was provided!! Fiber Glass insulation and garbage was blower be the wind all over the neighborhood, the developer thought dumpsters were not attractive REALLY!! Toxic chemicals were used, solvents and sprays without warning on hot summer days when kids were outside playing and homes had windows open! The demolition needs to stop, houses are bought, demoed and then the site sits empty for a year or more. Could developers be allowed only so many vacant lots at any given time? I don't know, the subject of demo is such a angry subject for many of our townspeople, it should have its own separate survey!
I have witnessed bull dozing in my neighborhood, without thought to the health and safety of workers and the community. The asbestos and lead abatement was not considered. Nor were the irreplaceable elements in the structure [ie; stained glass windows, wood features etc] saved and

repurposed. No home should be bulldozed. I know it's done because it's cheaper and quicker - but it's wrong in so many respects.
demolition moratorium
Put some teeth into the Historic Resource Inventory to help save houses and older neighborhoods.
Conflicts of interest in Neighborhood Associations and city hall need to be addressed. Follow the money. Make developers pay for needed infrastructure before development.
Stop the demos
- Buildings in good shape should not be allowed to be demolished unless it is shown that the building itself is in poor condition and no longer habitable. Homes in good condition should NOT be permitted to demolished simply so a new, larger home can be built.
- New buildings should fit into the existing area. This is particularly true in areas with older homes.
Current big shot developers should have to follow existing rules (like the rest of us?)- Availability for home owners to deed restrict their properties against possible future demolition.
They are effective now. No changes necessary.
The current national historic districts are too costly to pursue. We need a local designation that does not require neighbors to pay.
First, actually enforce current protections. Add prohibition of demolition for truly significant, not just delay.
USE THEM
Be sure that historic values are taken into account before considering approval of a demolition permit.
Demolition should not take place, unless absolutely necessary. Period. There should be a high cost for demolishing existing structures that are functional.
See above
Stop the demolition
Better demolition notifications. Less restrictive design review
I think there should be portions of neighborhoods where demolition should need to be agreed upon by a third party/ outside authority and replacement designs should have to fit within historic guidelines for size and style - but I don't feel its prudent to do so in entire neighborhoods. We clearly need more density. We can't protect the whole city, and we shouldn't only protect the high end, wealthy neighborhoods. I do love the idea of allowing for ADUs behind existing historic homes or the (style matching) conversion of detached garages into ADUs as a way to increase density while maintaining the history of a neighborhood.
Stop fast tracking demos. Encourage developers to look at structure of neighborhood. Restrict height of new houses.
by providing remodeling or building upgrade funds through grants or gifts to those unable to afford upgrades/maintenance
The results are in the eye of the beholder. If the end result is measured by \$ profit, to my eye, we end up with ugliness that we live with for a very long time. Aesthetics are very important, but sometimes hard to agree upon.
Demolitions should include a sign off of the neighbors impacted
Give neighbors veto power over plans for new houses. Do not allow lot splitting and building multiple houses where there was just one house unless majority of neighbors agree to it.
We need rules regarding demolitions that require some sort of historical review. If a building is to be demolished. There should be a significant financial disincentive to demolish building if historical value

(to compensate the city for lost historical assets). Any replacement structure should reflect the historic character of the neighborhood
Plan changes provided to neighbors within one block of change. and Neighborhood Assoc. approvals
Limit size of designs- presently on corner lots in Eastmoreland where two large houses are being built with very little yard, overlooking neighbors privacy. Two tall skinny houses are not a good design either by the fact that again too much house square footage is being pushed vs any yard.
They need to fit in with surrounding designs.
Protections need to have teeth, don't allow any wiggle room.
By reserving them for actual structures deserving of protection, and not whole classes of buildings (egad, deconstruction for anything built before 1908. Why not 1907?
Demolition can't be relevant.
The full cost of a demolition if it is granted should be born by the developer. It seems they often cut down trees they agreed to keep "by mistake" and improvements they agreed to make like an open space for park or wetland use are never made. They should be charged more for deviating from design protections as obviously it is cheaper for them to pay the slap on the wrist and ignore them. I have witnessed this behavior many times and not just Portland. The future owners and current residents are left with the problem and the developer is long gone with the funds to fix the problem.
Demolitions are not effective. Protections always are!
You should not incent builders to tear down affordable housing
Demolition should be a last resort. It should be very difficult and probably expensive, especially for developers.
The 120 days is a good start- but even then any structure that is demolished historically should be deconstructed and the historic elements stored/given to a stock pile of those eras so that it can be used to affordable fix/alter/add onto nearby historic structures that may been work.
Taking into consideration energy conservation oducts
Guess more rules and restrictions that would be hated by contractors but I have seen seemingly hopeless sites beautifully restored
Only review street facing changes for historic compliance .
Demolitions should be a last resort and only acceptable where there are clear and provable issues of safety.
By not slowing demolitions
Can a new zone be developed that allows interior remodels but forbids tear downs?
By considering the historic significance in those decisions.
It should be MUCH harder to demolish historic buildings. Oregon is one of the few states where demolition is fairly easy. Other states realize the economic and cultural value of saving historic buildings. States in the Deep South do a better job saving historic buildings. We should at least do as well as the Deep South.
Design protections dont seem to be in effect in Pdx. Modern cookie cutter condos next to charming older homes looks ridiculous.
Do not allow developers to remove HRI status from a building. In addition to a HRI demolition delays, require a public hearing on each HRI buildings. This is how it used to be done.
No clue.
No more demolition of affordable and inhabitable houses.
They don't seem to exist today and the new ones proposed by rip seem mostly to care about density which is not in line with historic character

Demolition Delay at 120 days is not sufficiently effective. Except for marginally profitable projects, it simply adds to the cost of doing business. Along with the delay the developer/owner should be required to provide schematic designs and proformas for alternatives: relocation, adaptive reuse, third party sale.
Height and number of buildings in an historic area should be kept in line with the history of the neighborhood
The need for Demolitions needs to be proven. For example, the house is structurally unsound or on unstable ground would be good reasons for demolition. Also replacement of a demolished house should be one for one. Not one demolished for two mega mansions.
currently no protections seem to exist, except in historic districts. So much more should be done, it is a travesty.
Demolition is the last resort. The design should be of similar size, style and landscaping of the ones around it. It should be similar in value too.
Demolition and design protections should be strict and have significant penalties associated with failure to follow them.
If is important that the homeowner understand exactly what are the condition for historic designation and what it means to them in terms of change.
Just make it economically infeasible to demolish and builders will stop. They always adapt to government policies. Another idea is to offer tax incentives on ADUs, especially for homes that exceed the new SALT deductions.
Current policies do not support historic preservation - instead, they encourage teardowns. That is where the real work is.
Demolition should be a last resort. It should be very difficult and probably expensive, especially for developers.
Don't know enough to answer this question.
A community discussion to meet the needs of our growing city with reverence to our past. Allowing this to change over time as needs of the city change.
Prevent inappropriate architecture in established neighborhoods. Modern built craftsman homes can fit in older neighborhoods. Modern box on box and sharp angles construction fit in very few places.
Make the true cost of demolition part of any public notice. How much of the structure is going into the landfill vs how much is salvaged. Enforce DEQ regs regarding lead dust and asbestos so the demolition is not so easy. And replace the 25k tax on demolition of good vintage housing.
Effective for what? One rule states that the distance from a property line that a free-standing garage can be built is different than the distance that an attached garage can be built. So the builder leaves 6" of space between them, which is idiotic. If one owner has a house built within 4 feet of a property line, why should that person be able to object to the house next door being built within 4 feet of the same property line. Decisions need to take into account the increasing population of people on the planet and in the city, not on the NIMBY-ism of well-to-do residents.
Neighborhoods need to know when something is being torn down. This cannot be done by US post or tiny little signs on the site. It needs to be visible and clear and delivered in a timely manner.
Adopt a policy to prevent "demolition-by-neglect." For districts, ensure clear design guidelines that reflect the character of that particular district. Lower fees. Make it easy to add ADUs or sub-divide large houses.
They shouldn't prevent the addition of new housing to a neighborhood. ADUs shouldn't need to conform to past architectural elements.
Include historic property uses.
Not sure they should be. They are over the top already.

Demolition and design protections should be loosened to allow Portland to accommodate our housing needs.
for some properties require retention of property
~
For design protections focus on the look over the materials. For demolition protection, focus on making it stronger (but flexible where the situation really warrants demolition).
I would replace design review with a focus on ped-friendly environments, green design, and affordability impacts. But that's just me. We need to get developers on bigger projects so they aren't just doing 2-bit lot confirmations and demolishing (or flipping, or airbnb'ing) viable housing, but are able to build multiple units with more multi family projects.
not sure
Yes. historic homes should only be demolished if they are too damaged to be used.
Size and set back limitations must be determined by the nature of the surrounding community.
Prohibit demolitions altogether
Don't even try.
Enforcement.
Again, are you dictating set personal preferences? I wouldn't move into a neighborhood like that. I lived in Lake Oswego years ago and it was horrible. A board telling you what plants to use in your landscaping, color of home, etc. Why I moved.
Providing simple guidelines to testifying and providing written input into the process would be helpful - too many people do not feel empowered or heard so a simple how to on the website would be helpful. Demolition reviews need to be strengthened so they do not slip through. Playing chicken with affordable housing projects that require demolition and zone adjustments and then do not deliver should be fined - going through the process and then building market rate housing should be illegal.
Not sure
Demolition and design protections exacerbate housing affordability by limiting the supply of new housing.
We need a strong disincentive to demolishing individual houses, and removal or reduction of that disincentive if the house is replaced with multiple dwelling units.
have municipalities own historic buildings and have them open to the public.
It seems to me like current design protections for historic resources are very robust. There is a reason anti-demolition advocates see historic designation as their most effective tool right now. The question is not how can demolition protections be more effective, but what are we protecting and why? If certain buildings are "special", they must be protected. If every house in a neighborhood is considered "special", then really nothing is.
How about having demo and design protections at all. There seem to be very little restrictions as to what developers can do in our zipcode.
Demolition exclusion should only be used on a structure by structure basis. There should not be exclusions on entire neighborhoods or class of building regardless of what neighborhood they happen to be in.
.

Instead of restricting all demolitions, you could consider the true (unemotional) significance of the structure. Old does not always mean good, or appropriate for the area. Considering the proposed replacement may be important as well.
I think change is required in our neighborhoods, many properties do not meet the req. to be designated. The process to accept design is biased and flawed. The people accepting the design are the ones who benefit from it.
A board approval of design/build strategies of developers
Local guidelines developed by neighborhood in context of least restrictive zoning laws.
If a building is demolished- the buildings MUST be taken apart and the material reused. There is no longer an abundance of clear wood for building- esp the houses of modest means. Chip board is NOT a way to build a house.
?
They should not change
They should include reasonable modern upgrades - window types, material, solar facing the street to name a few.
There shouldn't be "protections," if you mean rules against demolitions or alterations. The city should offer suggestions, or incentives, which the owner can take or leave.
height restrictions and restrictions on matching existing designs have been implemented in other cities; there are plenty of models to draw from
Not sure
<p>I shudder at the notion of "design" protections. Who is the arbiter of good taste? Do we freeze our neighborhoods in time to some perceived style - a Disneyland-esque mainstreet that never existed? Time and time again, design overlays truly stifle innovation and prevent properties from moving forward, not only in technological terms (improved energy efficiency, etc.) but even in cultural terms (see Frank Gehry's Washington St home in Santa Monica - what would we have lost if he had been prevented from building that structure?)</p> <p>If demolition really is a problem, then let's make the bar for demolition high enough that an owner must provide substantive rationale for the structure's removal. Even here, I struggle, because developers will always have the resources to demolish, but individuals will only be harmed if the bar is merely financial. Further, projects will find loopholes to avoid "demolition" when in fact they are virtually demolished.</p> <p>Consider: I purchase a property for land value because the home that is on it is rotting and structurally unsound, contributing nothing to the valuation of the sale. I demolish the home to improve the property, returning it to a level commensurate with the surrounding neighborhood. Should I be prevented from demolishing this home? What evidence must I provide to assure stakeholders that the demolition/rebuild will be financially less risky than remodel/rebuild?</p> <p>But what if the zoning allows me to replace the single-family home with a multi-family structure. Clearly the economics will drive toward higher density in that case. What impact will that have on the character of the adjacent neighborhood? Back to the zoning question above.</p> <p>If design protections are enacted, they should be extremely light-touch - limited to notions of scale, orientation (with plenty of options), and easily arbitrated characteristics. NOT style, character or general "fit" with the adjacent structures. These arbitrary characteristics create uncertainty and raise expense while not achieving desired outcomes.</p>

Good question
try homes with gardens
Listen to what people want. People don't want oversize houses on small lots.
Remove demolition delay
Not my field
I don't think we need more protections as much as more education!
I don't know
Weigh the benefits to more than a developer's pocketbook. Provide incentives/tax credits to homeowner's to repair older homes and preserve character of a neighborhood
By limiting them to truly exemplary buildings and not broad swathes of the city.
Every building should require deconstruction.
Use demolition restrictions and incentives as a tool to slow/mitigate gentrification in neighborhoods of color or lower income, not to preserve the neighborhoods of the wealthy against change and more housing.
Allow more community involvement when it comes to contractors and their building plans
By picking for protection, significant buildings that are also representative of a type (such as Victorian worker cottages, Hooverville shacks, 2 or 3 bungalows, a couple of large Victorian businessman's houses, etc.
Enforce them - no permits for repeat offenders.
The way we live today is completely different then 100 years ago, houses and neighborhoods have to reflect that but perhaps there is a middle road to be taken, allow x amount demolitions in a neighborhood per year
Stop demo!!! PRESERVE!!!!
Make the city council do its job in issuing permits.
Demolition should NEVER be the first choice and should be allowed only if there is no chance at all of the restoration of a resource.
Need to be truly historic to be protected however safety must be paramount. If a structure is unsafe, there must be allowances and protections should not be financially binding
Focus on proper asbestos and lead paint abatement. Provide incentives for deconstruction rather than requirements, mandates and taxes. Such as expedited fast track permitting.
Make them reasonable. Adding square footage to a 1300 square foot cottage is vastly different than demolishing a 2400 square foot home to put in a McMansion.
Absolutely don't put design or demo review in the hands of Neighborhood Associations!!!! They aren't democratic in nature and the NA system is easily abused.
Just stop skinny houses
That is a slippery slope. Some structures truly need to be demolished, at some level. Some level of size and esthetic should be incorporated.
give more opportunities for citizen participation
Scale of project to compliment neighborhood
Consideration of the environment
I think the demolition and design protections are needed for the not designated structures then people would not fear change. Have you heard the saying, It is not good because it is old, it is old because it is good.

Preserve old trees, build new houses that 'fit' size and scale of existing neighborhoods. Historic homes exist in part because they were built to last. Require both more sustainable building materials AND methods and nontoxic materials that can last for generations.
True enforcement, closing loopholes and exceptions.
Concerns over asbestos and lead need to be more stringent. Designs should fit the scale of the neighborhood
By having clear and objective standards. Just because it's old doesn't mean it's good. Demolition is not necessarily to be avoided.
restrict demolitions until all empty building spaces are filled.
Maybe consider allowable percentages of home replacement....
to much power with neighborhood associations
Zoning with input from neighborhoods
At the local level instead of through an "Historic District"
?
Sometimes it's time for a home to be torn down. Demolition protections for a home poorly maintained and structurally unsound make no sense. Demolitions should be done in an ecologically sensitive way.
As for design protections, "beauty" is subjective. Do we develop design panels to determine "good" design? Who would be qualified to sit on those panels?
By limiting the size of houses on city lots.
The rules should not change after someone buys a house. We chose to buy in the city because we didn't want restrictions that are imposed by home owners' associations. It appears that some folks are trying to do just that with the inner city by calling everything that's old historic.
I disagree with the use of demolition and design protections. They are being used to mark off certain neighborhoods from the issues faced by the city as a whole.
Limiting structure heights relative to neighbors, requiring some green space (not allowing the structure to take up the whole plot of land).
Have local builders, allow homeowners to make changes
Demolition require the new homeowner to decide that, not the construction or home building company's choice
Current efforts have been effective.
If a given structure is demolished by a private party because the structure has negative value, ie. a vacant lot has more value, then what business is it for neighbors to complain? Every home in existence was built after destroying what was there previously. It may have been a pasture, forest, or another house. Something was demolished.
When you review guidelines from Lad's Addition and Irvington you can see how ridiculous, time consuming and costly they are for home owners. It is common knowledge that there is no consistency in decisions made for home owners. Politics plays a role in the BDS.
Demolition of truly historic homes should be greatly restricted
More weight should be given to context - scale and setback, while not restricting contemporary architecture. We need to continue to move forward as a City, and not look backward for design ideas. Prescriptive roof pitches, eaves and window openings are silly. Encouraging respectful scale, protection of solar access, green building, adaptive reuse and quality construction is more important than requiring new homes to look like old ones.
How do we make it easier to move resources to another location?

1 to 1 demolitions should be very very difficult to get permits for.
Demolition review should be extended to contributing properties in historic conservation and locally designated historic districts.
Design review must be weaned away from 33.846.060G by the development of a standard residential protection guideline covering properties built between 1880 and 1960 that could apply to most new and existing residential districts. Updated guidelines for Grand Avenue and other street-car era commercial strips could be useful in protecting those strips even where not yet designated.
The city could apply some of the same rules for historic resources that it is legally required to apply elsewhere:
Historic design review should not be permitted to artificially reduce the development intensity allowed by the underlying zoning.
Demolition reviews should be conducted by a body other than the landmarks commission -- one with a broader mandate regarding the needs of the city.
No design review required currently. This must be changed. Cheaply built homes completely out of scale with surrounding neighborhoods are ruining neighborhoods and causing a housing affordability crisis.
Make them more focused on specific resources and structures. Engage with entire community, not just those wanting historic protections. Use historic protection tools to prevent gentrification and economic displacement, to protect cultural resources, to promote reuse of historic buildings in areas facing dis-investment, then provide the buildings for use by local residents and businesses.
By implementing my earlier suggestions.
I think they need to be prevented for what they are. In the case of demolition, it is a cooling off period where neighbors can be made aware of impending change. The expectation shouldn't be that this will lead to saving a structure, but rather helping people transition to the idea that change is coming.
Making more information and resources for design history available.
Increase public notice, include renters, and increase the radius of notices. Have an email notification list so that people can sign up to receive ALL demolition and design review cases that are not staff approvable.
one can only hope this will work
Consider more incentives to protect. Talk to developers, property owners - what would it take for them to protect the buildings. Work with preservation groups to encourage more permanent protection (deed restrictions) of the most significant properties. Consider how to encourage seismic retrofitting in designated structures and limiting it as an excuse to demolish.

12. Should certain alterations be exempt from review?

On a historic resource? Only interior or not visible from the street.
Exempt alterations that do not affect scale, height, setback or privacy (i.e. fences and hedges).
Yes, if standards are established by people with expertise and no financial or political interest in the result.
If you have a Historic Register designation on your house, then alterations (including interior, in my opinion) should be subject to critical review. If a building does not have a designation, then most design review is unnecessary popularity contest.
Yes, again dependent on the situation and location.
Generally I'd think internal alterations should be allowed, except in cases where the internal features are part of the protected features. It should be pointed out to renovators of historic structures that these are period buildings. If you want contemporary design, buy a contemporary building.
Yes
No
Yes. The city should focus primarily on preserving historic streetscapes in historic districts. Alterations to buildings that are not visible from the street (or that are minimally visible/disruptive to neighbors) should be easier to carry out, if not exempted from design review altogether. Some examples of alterations that might warrant a lighter regulatory touch: side/rear-view windows, side/rear doors, back decks/porches. Interior alterations should also be exempt (unless a building's interior is specifically designated as historic – but that is a relatively rare situation).
Don't let the excellent be the enemy of the good.
Windows not visible from the street.
yes, reduced restriction on window replacement, paint colors, lighting are needed
Some interior alterations should be exempt. Don't overburden the owners when it comes to the inside if it is not a publically accessible building.
Restoration, necessary safety updates assuming no structural changes.
Yes, let people do basic things like paint, change the siding, upgrade for environmental reasons, and *divide internally into ADUs by right*. Also external ADUs should be allowed by right even in historic districts.
Weatherization and energy efficiency changes should be exempt. Interior alterations should be exempt, exterior alterations should have flexibility unless it changes the architectural integrity of the building.
Yes
? I think some review aspects could be streamlined
No. Historic designations should be exceedingly rare, and should come with strict mandates to preserve the resource for the public. The review process should make accessibility and similar equity-related alterations as easy as possible while also preserving the resource as well as possible.
Pretty much anything should be exempt from review.
No
No. This would be a gateway to abuse and degradation of the resources.
Solar panels.
no
Maybe safety considerations like seismic retrofit

Internal conversions up to a certain (relatively high) density cap. Mixed living and commercial uses of most historic structures.
No
Yes. Stick to street facing alterations. Give a handbook of acceptable design elements, like front doors, so that the review process is less costly and onerous. Eliminate the fees for landmark reviews.
This question is overly open ended: If limited to review by development review staff: Interior alterations with exceptions where that resource is specifically protected should be exempt. Where side and rear elevations are substantially invisible from the street, the review should be limited to contextual response to height and massing. Otherwise the exceptions in the code for national register properties are all reasonable. Exceptions for affordability sound good but are unreasonable to enforce the accompanying long term affordability covenants.
Yes
no
Internal partitions to create apartments in existing buildings when the alternative might be demolition - e.g. single family structure on a property zoned for multifamily.
No but review should be timely
Yes
Yes!
yes
Sure. Potential examples: alteration to secondary/rear elevation windows and doors; alteration to accessory buildings (such as garages); reversible alterations (such as rooftop antennas).
No.
usually
No, of course not. Alterations must respond to code and to the requirements for historic status. But code needs some flexibility. Recently I paid a huge amount of money for seismic retrofit, but the code enforcement officers wouldn't sign off until I provided photos of my smoke detectors. Why???? This is overreach. It's bureaucracy run amok. I'm sorta sorry, but I don't pay taxes to employ the code enforcement office, politicians or any other bureaucrats to act in extra-legal, extra-judicial ways. Why can they act properly? It's egregious. Who do they work for? The bureaucracy or City residents?
dont know
Yes but the devil is in the details to prevent inappropriate permanent alterations.
no
I don't know, I'm just beginning to learn about this subject
Yes, alterations that cant be seen from the public right of way. Paint colors, interior changes that dont affect the exterior.
Yes if is all inside changes
I don't know
Yes
IDK
Invisible ones, unless they will impact a building's sustainability or contribution to regional goals. (For example, convert a residential building into more affordable units? Maybe. LESS affordable? NO!)
No

Structural upgrades for earthquake-proofing (I assume "exempt from review" means it doesn't have to go through a lengthy review process)
Yes.
No
Yes, such as internal alterations
Paint color. Most things to the rear. Basement windows that are not visible. Solar panels.
No
Seems like the current system is overly labyrinthine. When you can't see the changes from the street, it seems like standards should be relaxed. When the changes are complementary to the historic design, it should be relaxed. We have to allow the fullest use of these buildings or we will lose them completely.
Yes. I think people who live in their homes should have a few more exemptions. I am not familiar enough to give specific suggestions. I know someone in Lair Hill who wanted to put a third floor on their house and it was denied. Yet, someone else was allowed to build a skinny type duplex in a driveway between two houses just one block away.
Depends. Integrity of the neighborhood is more important than written details.
Owners modifying their own homes, that they are living in (or have their business in), should have a different process.
Yes - if well defined so as to not impact design quality of the building.
No.
Minor changes only, some energy upgrades.
No.
Yes certain things should be grandfathered in
Yes of course but the devil is always in the details. In this case "certain" is undefined.
No
Again a separate topic to be covered under the demo survey
Such as? Not sure how to respond to this.
no
I think there should be more flexibility with solar panels for one. They are not permanent to the house and could be removed. I also think with the materials now available for windows that seem more compatible for houses in HD's that there should be more flexibility. I think that more flexibility should be given to garages. In older houses it seems that the garage is often the one feature that gets less care over the years and many need repairs or to be replaced. This often happened in contributing houses.
Again, conflict of interest should not drive exemption from review. Monetary gains are the current driver of exemption from safety for neighborhoods. Safety, infrastructure design must be forefront
For handicapped
Interior and non street facing work
I would need more information, examples to be sure I'm going the right direction.... but I know of a family that was building an addition to the back of their house and the powers that be were making them change window heights and all sorts of ridiculous not-picky bs.... TO THE BACK OF HOUSE -
Maybe.
Major alterations, such as adding an extension or story, should disqualify a house from historic designation. Window and roof replacement should not.

No
Yes.
No, but the standards of review should be flexible-- needs to be determined by historians, not developers
Certainly, there are some alterations that should be exempt. Those that do not materially alter the character of a structure, or those that improve efficiency should be exempt.
Minor alterations that don't detract from the original character and minor changes to the rear.
No
Yes
Internal alterations, but I'm for review of all external alternations on resources within areas designated as historic / protected
Yes. Like new windows. People reject historic districts because they can't afford wood windows.
yes
Maybe, but the specifics are critical.
Interior and alterations not affecting the street view
Yes, alterations that still maintain basic character of the house should be exempt. Changing windows, roof, additions to back of house or second story could be exempt
Sure. Interior and any necessary work to preserve the future of the building (like seismic retrofits, electrical upgrades). We should also make accommodations for expansion to existing space - allow it but require renovations March the original design intent. This this end ADUs could be encouraged
Probably, if small in nature or indoors or out of sight of street view. Immediate neighbors should have rite of refusal if it materially affects their quality of life and home ownership!
That should be decisions made by the neighborhood association in conjunction with NPS.
Yes, it the alterations improve efficiency.
Im not familiar with the limitations on alterations, so not sure how to answer this question. But I think alterations that maintain the style of the structure should be allowed. Remodeling or adding on to a structure should be allowed so long as it maintains the original style.
Yes, all of them. The cool thing about Rome is that every era of their history remains in play. They are currently trying to figure out how to make the Coliseum contemporary. Why do we approach preservation as a need to cover things in amber. Consider this: will using windows based on 100-year old designs and materials really make the structures better able to remain for another 100 years? Always?
Yes
Any alteration that makes a building safer, up to current codes, more accessible or greener should be given preference for exemption from review.
Those not affecting the style and the integrity of the dwelling
Yes. Safety should come first as perhaps should be when maintenance creates a financial hardship.
Ones that add compliant ADA access, building owners should have the option to not replace windows in commercial properties up to full energy code if it is historic
Possibly a list of acceptable options instead of one option
possibly when it affects current efficient operations and livability
Yes. Non street facing modifications
Yes when financial hardship is present.
No

I'd need to become more familiar with this topic to render an opinion
Yes, minor or safety-related ones.
Yes, slight alterations.
Unsure
No.
Without a doubt.
Back yard things that arent visible from street and public access
This question is overly open ended: If limited to review by development review staff: Interior alterations with exceptions where that resource is specifically protected should be exempt. Where side and rear elevations are substantially invisible from the street, the review should be limited to contextual response to height and massing. Otherwise the exceptions in the code for national register properties are all reasonable. Exceptions for affordability sound good but are unreasonable to enforce the accompanying long term affordability covenants
Yes
windows and roofs. Improvement in roofs that add fire proofing should be allowed. Energy efficient windows should be exempt from review
window replacements should be exempt, or any change that is less than 5% of the square footage of face of a house. Any change that is not street facing should also be exempt.
Yes, safety come first.
Yes, particularly those that are done strictly for safety purposes.
Perhaps - there needs to be special exemptions based on specific alterations.
Yes. Interior alterations should be exempt. Also, anything that changes less than 20% of the structure. These are the sorts of changes the anti-historic district groups are saying will be impossible.
Yes, interior alterations, anything not visible from the street and solar panels
Yes. Safety should come first as perhaps should be when maintenance creates a financial hardship.
I don't feel competent enough to answer this question.
Any alteration that makes a home energy efficient should be exempt. As great as a model-T car is, there is a reason we are not all driving them today. Car technology has improved. Likewise, home building materials have improved and will continue to do so. Unless the City of Portland wants to pay for my alterations, I should be allowed to make alterations to my home if I am footing the bill.
Maybe interior areas.
Yes
Replacement of windows, removal of an old chimney, installation of solar panels, tearing down a tiny old garage that the owners cannot even fit their current vehicle into.
Yes, otherwise buildings will remain vacant (see Unreinforced masonry issues)
YES
Solar panels. ADUs and internal conversations.
No
Yes. Alterations to a private home are an owner's right.
Sure, if this has the effect of easing redevelopment.
perhaps some that are not facing the street and some interior alternations
Window, doors, siding, porches, retaining walls, driveways, and garages should be exempt from review.

Probably so - some minor alterations should be exempt. You as experts probably have the best idea on that question, having seen thousands of case studies.
For the love of all that is holy, why are we spending any city resources (even if it's fee-supported) on reviewing windows in Ladd's Addition and whining that more serious attempts at inclusion zoning would be too onerous?! I have several friends who lost their rental housing this year, and we're finally making some progress, but it's not enough. Planning energy is still too mired in bougie priorities. My friends need affordable rent in diverse welcoming neighborhoods, not wooden window edges.
not sure
no, neighborhoods should be allowed design review to ensure the neighborhood stays in tact and grows in a way that does not destroy its character
Yes. Necessary repairs and upgrades (i.e. windows).
Yes, roofs if the same material
YES
Of course
If a home is historic there shouldn't any alterations? An "altered historic home"? Is that like fake news?
I support reviews for all structural and external physical changes So no review for internal cosmetic changes
Alterations that improve energy efficiency, health, and safety should be exempt.
Yes.
probably
Yes.
Accessory buildings, like garages, should be exempt. Paint colors, should be exempt. Internal conversions should be exempt. Most importantly, anything related to the sustainability of a building should be exempt. Old buildings are energy pits and reviewing the addition of solar panels, new efficient windows, etc., quite often is so expensive that it makes them too expensive to install.
Only when considered on an individual basis.
Need to take into consideration the complete context in which the resource is deemed significant
Yes, especially energy efficient ones.
The should be no fees for the review. This burdens the home owners. The process also allows nit picks based upon retired indiv, where unbiased gov agency should be used. Also, no building materials are going to last forever. Replacement should be allowed.
Yes, interior design changes and possibly back of the house
Yes. Non structural changes or like kind/same size windows
Only on the back of a home. Nothing that can be seen from the street should be allowed to be changed
?
yes
See above
Yes. Any alteration that increases density, such as adding an ADU.
interior alterations and exterior changes that can not be seen from the street should be exempt, as they are now

Yes. Modifying a home for disability necessities should be exempt. As should alterations for environmental or energy efficiency.
Yes
I am hugely concerned about the criteria for review, therefore the question of specific alternations is moot without considering the design review process in general. Currently, the notion of "street facing" as the criteria for evaluation reduces the notion of historic significance to a superficial Disneyland parody.
Yes
Yes, but sounds like a contractor's heaven.
?
Yes
Yes
Probably. Especially those that all out for the creation of more housing.
No.
Alterations should tasteful and done in the context of the architecture of the house
Yes. All should.
Require historic residences keep their historic kitchens, baths, and electrical.
yes
Yes. Painting.
Upgrades to increase energy efficiency such as solar panels, wind turbines and storm windows should be exempt.
Which? Have to be more specific.
Ofcause none structural and
No
No
Who will do the review?
yes
Yes
Yes, insulation and weatherization. Non structural alterations
Yes.
Yes. Windows, doors, garages, dormers....
Windows and energy efficient options
Yes.
Absolutely. Those required for safety and convenience of the owners
Yes
Yes
No
Of course, based on design considerations and cost.
Yes. Only street facing changes need matter
Absolutely! New solar panels, regardless of whether they are visible. New energy efficient windows and doors.
anything that does not visually alter the property -- ie: new windows that may not be the same material but look the same as original

Yes
Likely, some basic alterations like window replacement should be exempt/
yes, energy upgrades, seismic,
Do
Not know
Yes
Anything except demolition should be exempt.
Replacing windows and doors, any non structural changes, solar panels, changes to porches and decks. And if you are asking about design review, no alteration should be subject to review.
Yes, replacing windows, siding and roofs.
Safety should be the priority. After that, commercial businesses shouldn't locate in a neighborhood. For example, a Home Depot doesn't belong. However, residential should include all - renters, duplexes, apartments, etc.
Yes. Alterations that cannot be seen from the outside front of the building.
Yes
Yes, windows, doors and solar
Yes. If I want to make changes to my house I should be allowed. If I want to add solar panels a neighborhood shouldn't be able to prevent me from increasing the energy benefits to the Dockery and environment. Old white men should not be able to tell me what to do with my house that I own
No
There should be no mandatory historic review. It should be an honorary designation with enducements toward preservation.
Obviously
Yes
Solar panels, garage alterations, alterations to the rear of structures in historic districts.
Internal and not seen from the street.
New homes.
Of course. And there are already 22 defined exemptions. One example would be detached back-yard decks which have gone back and forth at BDS between regulated and not (currently not). Photo-voltaic roofing shingles should be treated as unregulated roofing replacement when replacing standard asphalt roofing shingles.
The theme of my answers is that "historic preservation" is often code for increasing the time and cost required for land use intensity and/or housing density to increase in an area. The result is that the value of resources is exaggerated.
Exemptions should include things that defeat this particular inclination, including alterations that increase the built floor area of a site over a zone-specific threshold (or over a percentage of existing).
No
Probably but I am not informed enough to say what they should be.
I'm not aware of alterations being reviewed for the HRI is that a thing?
Only paint and small repairs (replacing the pane of glass in a broken window, but still review replacing the window or inserting double pane into an existing window)
Yes

If there was a tiered approach there might be a very low level requiring no review. Otherwise, have the review, but make it easier for applicants to apply (look at cost barrier for some groups) and have appropriate standards for each level of designation. Depending on the rank, location, building type, etc. some buildings' rear elevations may not require as much stringent application of the rules. (Allow for some change over time and change of how we interact with buildings, especially in residential areas). Ask the question is it easy for property owners to get advice / informational help? Are property owners even aware that their property is currently listed? If so, do they have the information needed to make informed decisions. The review process is a good way to make sure that the applicants are aware of the significance of a change they are making and have thought through the available options. Some people may not know what options are even available to them. For example, many people who aren't aware of historic preservation issues, may not think anything of replacing their wood windows with vinyl. All they may know is from the mass amount of advertising about replacing old with new.

13. How can Portland protect the integrity of historic resources significant for reasons besides architectural merit?

If, for example, a house was the birthplace and childhood home of a locally famous, great contributor to the community in some way, that house facade should remain substantially the same as it was when that person lived there. If it also is a house museum, then the interior, too. Benson bubblers is a different kind of example. MOST IMPORTANTLY, PREVENT DEMOLITION OR DESTRUCTION BY NEGLECT.
taxes, planning, regulation, enforcement (stupid answer for a stupid question)
Documentation, funding historical research, establishing a category of cultural significance - people with expertise in this area would have to hash out its feasibility.
Protection depends on the reason for designation. If a cultural landmark, then those of that culture need to be heard.
First you have to identify them. Then add protections to keep places from being knocked down. Then offer mitigation funds to help restore and promote the cultural and social significance— do oral history projects, documentaries, archival to public art displays, and walking tours.
Include them in your surveys
Owners of single family homes with historic significance should have the opportunity to place the home as significant
Community engagement
Through outreach to neighborhood associations, fliers on doorhangers, media outreach. (Preservation gets little positive attention from media outlets that are heavily supported by development interests.)
Offer tax, permit, SDC incentives for resources that are determined to be cultural and ethnically significant
Conduct the research and document it would be a good start. It is really hard to connect the dots on historic significance once everyone associated with the building has passed away. There should be a rating in the HRI that accounts for cultural significance.
Again, list resources based on historic people / events & provide incentives to the owners to maintain the property or location.
Not sure what you mean. Give grants to resources that represent actual history where appropriate?
Historic contribution the property made to Portland and its development.
It shouldn't.
While I believe that is a worthy goal - not sure how to do that . I've mentioned plaques .
By owning them and converting them into parks, museums, or other public resources.
Unless the historic use is continuing, don't bother. Absent architectural merit there's little reason to preserve functionally obsolete structures. Document them and let them go.
By recognizing neighborhoods that no longer have their original populations, such as South Portland and Albina
Answered above
By giving importance to their historic/cultural/social merit.
A good start would be to introduce additional non-architectural attributes into code.
Cultural resources could be protected via cultural districts.
historical merit, cultural merit, religious merit
Involve historians in the valuation and question intentions of get-rich-quick investors

Don't let districts in particular have the unintended consequence of worsening segregation in our city - this makes conservation a target for (valid) Fair Housing complaints.
By recognizing the importance of these assets to the entire city as they create a uniqueness that informs and draws interest, funds and delight.
Do all that I have said above.
Better documenting our history and how various resources fit into that would be a good start. Using examples throughout the city to highlight Portland's history (via a walking or driving tour) and whether those are important locally, in the state, or nationally would be a good start.
As described above in documentation section. Are you asking about trees, lighting standards, horse rings, street improvements? These are best protected through district design standards.
There is nothing left of Vanport. The memory and significance are strong. Providing site awareness ,whether by markers and site awareness structures can provide context and commemoration.
Gather really good, comprehensive ethnographies. Use PSU, OHS and other sources and get maps made.
Codify
By developing criteria which focus on the relevancy of reasons besides architectural merit.
Get together a panel of historians and archivists!
Neighborhood merit. Many citizens have chosen to live in the close-in older neighborhoods because they have an affinity for the character of older homes and neighborhoods. Entire neighborhoods should be looked at for their architectural merit.
By recognizing that these properties can often undergo a greater degree of change (compared to an architectural landmark) without losing their historic significance.
By appreciating historicity and committing to that appreciation out loud. We're a city where the fronts of ugly buildings sometimes have pictures of what used to be there back in more glorious times (architecturally speaking at least), that has revolving pictures at bus stops of times gone by, that celebrates our old buildings on banners during repairs to Pioneer Courthouse Square...And continues to destroy the city itself in real time with swarms of demolitions...There's a huge problem with disconnects-I think-at many levels. Restore Oregon, The Architectural Heritage Center and more organizations need more funding to teach the public about these issues so that we have a better educated and enlightened tax-paying citizenry.
different issue
Well, architecture isn't all of it. Some Portland neighborhoods are representative of the "City Beautiful" movement, some represent early commercial districts, some are representative of the early minority neighborhoods. Some, on the Willamette River, seem to be representative of early industry (ship-barge building, etc.) and they appear to be ready to expire without even an interpretive plaque. Can the City work with state and local historians on interpretation? Would industrial owners in the South Waterfront provide space, or will multi-story apartments for the wealthy take most of the available space? How do we want to recognize Portland's past? Or we become NYC lite?
Character of the neighborhood, proportion of size of home (too large in comparison with neighbors), similar size home to what the neighbors already have. Keep the neighborhood architectural heritage where possible
Follow the guidelines of the National Park Service and do the necessary outreach to target communities who need assistance to participate in historic preservation of their neighborhoods and significant historic resources.
ethnic neighborhood artistic significance, importance to the liveability and environment

See previous comment about Kevin Lynch
Same way as for architecturally significant.
Have a neighborhood committee
Save our working class neighborhoods
Need to look at the overall value of what an "area" brings to the city- people come here for neighborhoods. Not for specific houses. Once neighborhoods are destroyed they won't come.
An inventory is a good start—properties and neighborhoods might be historic for reasons other than architectural
Architecture is only one of MANY factors that should be considered. The RULE should be preservation. No reasons needed! Destruction should be the rare EXCEPTION.
Protections need to be broadened to permit the inclusion of buildings that have historical meaning to certain groups--perhaps churches, schools, houses that belonged to historic figures.
Not sure.
This is a question of immense scope. I would suggest one simple idea to at least focus people on the issue: Make people aware of the viable areas currently under protection of the National Park Service historic designation. Let them see for themselves that people of many ethnicities and income levels live happily where there is respect for historic resources.
Include these criteria in codes. Introduce form-based codes into historic neighborhoods such as the West End to protect the character of streets and enhance the existing historic buildings by creating architecturally compatible urban fabric (not historic details).
By making protections broad, allowing people a way to apply to protect structures
Social media campaign highlighting buildings which appear commonplace but greatly contribute to the overall fabric of the community. People don't read much anymore so short summations of history to accompany photos.
Stricter policies for those responsible for the stewardship.
There must be strong code to account for ethnic/cultural reasons for preservation--Chinese stories, Japanese stories, African American, Native American, Jewish, etc. There's a multicultural of stories in our architecture. We must have strong code to protect these historic resources, and we must have stronger anti-demolition protections to keep from losing buildings like the Burger Barn.
I think the location and the age of the house should be considered along with the history of the neighborhood.
Make the officials making these decisions directly responsive to the citizens. That is to say no appointed people.
Review boards consisting of 'local residents' who understand the merits of historic Portland
Have a process which considers other merits.
Write the expanded criteria into code.
Talk to people in the communities. Care about these resources. That is a start. Not give in to developers just for the money.
By including those reasons in the review process from the beginning.
They should charge contractors a lot more to destroy historic homes and always require deconstruction instead of demolition
If the resources have no architectural merit, that means that their value lies in the history of their use. So the way to protect them is to document and communicate that history. Also this question again reveals the single-track focus on buildings over spaces. Do gardens and green spaces have "architectural merit?"

Stop the Residential Infill Project and don't allow historic building lots to be split. Don't mandate URM retrofit regulations without providing financial assistance (grants) to building owners that can't afford it (I.e. not the McMennemin Bros)
Using intelligent, educated, concerned citizens with interest in preserving history
Set up codes, and perhaps set up a committees to preserve historical resources. Maybe the Historical Society or Architectural Assoc. should have more say.
it's history, and the soul of a city runs thru the protections of homes/buildings
Through the City Historic Inventory if the inventory actually has some meaning.
Infill is a danger when infrastructure goes wanting. Historic resources will naturally be protected if safety is addressed first rather than an afterthought
Stop the infill
Neighborhood assessment, history of the area, history of ownership of the building.
Write a new Portland Architecture book (ok, website) and note how many more historically significant houses/buildings has been lost and then show what was put in their places-
???
Include criteria such as cultural significance.
Stop demolishing them. This survey is aggravating, and the answers are simple. Money is not god in these situations.
Establish cultural districts.
Not sure I can answer this.
Moratorium on demolitions.
Na
Historic or cultural usage, Planned and preserved neighborhoods, areas
Work with neighborhoods and citizens to identify and document those resources. Make that information public. I find that folks are more willing to protect a resource once they understand its story - its place in history - resources don't have to be beautiful to be significant - but if no one knows they are significant, its easy for them to disappear.
By financing loans to renters so they can have pride in ownership. This would also help in ethnic neighborhoods.
I don't know.
Make specific criteria to cover those classifications
If public input provides reasons for it then solicit more input from other members of public and experts on cultural resources. If input provides strong reasons then make cultural designations that would protect cultural areas from significant changes to the character of the area
We must document the history of these neighborhoods and their context in the growth of our great city. It's not just about aesthetics. We should absolutely encourage access to these neighborhoods so that all can enjoy the beauty and absorb the history. For example, the city should reassert ownership of the median in Reed College Place and promote it as a park. The Parks department could partner with the local neighborhood association to giv walking tours, and other programming
Not sure
Keep the beautiful areas of Portland and it's history in tact, with its historic tree cover, well kept yards and increasing value, which provides higher tax revenues.
Take into consideration ethnic histories of a building.
Offer a tax break

This should have been your first question. And, it's a sign that using zoning to determine what we want preservation to mean is misguided at best.
How the neighborhood has functioned in the past and how it continues to do so.
Local neighborhoods often have a wealth of historical information already collected. Gather that information. Offer grants to let them create ways to promote their unique history with festivals, tours, websites etc.
Home affordability, preventing environmental negative impact and the over-all cohesiveness of the neighborhood.
Property taxes, and the desires of those paying them
Better documenting our history and how various resources fit into that would be a good start. Using examples throughout the city to highlight Portland's history (via a walking or driving tour) and whether those are important locally, in the state, or nationally would be a good start.
Unsure
Awareness, education, restrictions
A city hall commitment to preservation. Not the current lip service.
Be celebrating the unique history of our neighborhoods, the people who've lived there and their stories. Also, the aesthetic beauty of these neighborhoods that go beyond architecture to include green spaces and gardens and community areas. Highlight these areas through promotion; biking, walking, driving tours, so they can be enjoyed and appreciated by everyone.
By not changing zoning codes
Protections can be designed for historic merit. Review the tear down of any structure older than 50 years
By including those "other" criteria in decision-making.
Our ethnic stories deserve protection too. The buildings may not be grand but they are important to Portland history.
Cultural importance.
Add them to the inventory.
Population density. Increases in parking and crime.
for the sake of your residents. We are the citizens that pay taxes. take heed of residents who dont want more demolition and more density.
As described above in documentation section. Are you asking about trees, lighting standards, horse rings, street improvements? These are best protected through district design standards.
Build literature around the history of these places so kids in school can learn about how portland used to be.
The character of the older neighborhoods should be maintained
stop letting every developer buy on spec and tear them down. Institute a fee for demolitions that would remove the fast money to be made on adequate properties.
First, by researching and highlighting resources that are worthy of protection based on history and cultural significance.
Architectural merit should be first, then proximity (to parks, landmarks, etc.), not to freeze history, but to enrich a city which can only be done by sensitivity to history of a place.
Placemaking and place preservation
Can't this be part of the deed record? Can't the county and the city work together on this?

Better documenting our history and how various resources fit into that would be a good start. Using examples throughout the city to highlight Portland's history (via a walking or driving tour) and whether those are important locally, in the state, or nationally would be a good start.
I don't know about the mechanisms by which this can be achieved, but I think buildings that tell an important part of the city's story, such as the Columbia Villa Development (1960s/50s?) in North Portland should be considered for inclusion as a way the City addressed subsidized housing in the past.
Information needed at that site as to why, perhaps a placard.
Cultural merit is historic and should already part of the guidelines
I do not know what this would include.
Include the history of the building in the consideration and include the neighborhood in the conversation.
Demolition denial. Incentives for rehab and/or interpretation of the site.
Study history.
What reasons? This is bound to be used as a NIMBY weapon.
Establish criteria, put things on a list and prohibit demolition, I suppose.
public recognition: guide books, maps, plaques, tours
~
As I've said, I think that's the only value a historic resource can bring. Focus on people's history, not what fancy dude designed the building or fancy materials or whatever else strikes the eye. This means you have to do really deep community interviews and find people who care about places that have supported Portland's communities of color, queer subcultures, and other groups who have typically been marginalized in city planning efforts. Then ask them what they need to protect those important memories. You have to ask them, not me, but I know that it might not look like preserving a singular building or releasing a set of design guidelines. From what I've heard in past processes, it might look like dedicating resources to helping people return to a neighborhood, holding events to honor the past, plaques, keeping a building affordable for elders, or who knows what. Just don't start with the same old assumptions from past inventories and be ready to work your butt off engaging outside of neighborhood associations (and have somebody run interference there ??). You need like 50 outreach interns or allies already embedded in culturally specific groups (not just the friendly ones either, the rabble-rousers too).
This is a very sweeping comment so could encompass a lot of things. I guess it depends on the resource.
cultural importance. general relevance to a neighborhoods original design (ie a 1930's neighborhood should protect all the 1930's structures).
No opinion
Architectural merit is the PRIMARY reason for protection. To preserve the history and essence of the neighborhoods
Cultural merit.
By defining them, so they can be measured and considered fairly
If it is in the public interest and what the public wants to spend their collective money on, buy it and maintain it. Make it like the Pittock mansion.
Significant Marches, Festivals, celebrations
Media presentations Podcasts

By limiting the registry to a limited set of special resources and disallowing en masse designation of neighborhoods.
By focusing on actual historic significance. The city has focused too much only on architectural merit, allowing the system to be misused as a tool to make an end run around zoning changes.
The city should purchase and maintain it.
A very good question. We've gone too far in considering architecture only.
focus on the story of the property. what role did it play in history.
Photos, archives, and education.
Not sure. Owners choice and consent is very important.
Allow for specific cultural application. Allow review of historical status of individual structures based on cultural as well as architectural merit.
Economic incentives
Why would you?
Local histories of owners cataloged along with changes to the structure w/dates & times
It should not intrude into this quagmire.
Well obviously you are not doing it as I read about and see fine examples of various periods destroyed on a regular basis.
?
We should not
You should designate individual resource and provide a tax break as an inducement.
Buying them. Or offering tax incentives to owners who preserve them. If preservation is important to the public, the public should pay for it.
it probably can't; architecture is not just buildings, it is a picture of how the community sees itself; to destroy it is to destroy an existing culture; why do you think Portland's Chinatown was abandoned after the Pearl District was built?
Not sure
See discussions above. It comes down to defining historic significance in terms deeper than superficial styling.
Not sure what other reason there would be
By expanding the definition.
Just do it. Set up some designations and then apply them.
Buy them
Don't know
Can't
I don't know
I am not sure at this time.
Keep in mind that infrastructure and services must be provided and that character can be easily maintained with thoughtful and responsible planning
They can't and shouldn't.
Historic should include things from more modern eras too. Not just things from the era today's rich neighborhoods love.
not sure to what you are referring
A careful vetting process should identify such sites in the city, and consider purchasing those properties, which may have higher market value. Particular attention should be paid to sites

significant to the history of ethnic minorities, native peoples, women and LGBT communities for these purchases, unless the owner consents to the designation.
Need an example. There aren't really very many "founder/famous person" museums in Portland. Check out the Eugene Field house in St. Louis, Mo.
Diversity Equity Inclusion training and lens
Good question. I don't know.
Make the city council do their job with some thought and planning.
Again, listen to the stories of a resource. Make sure the stories are made accessible to the widest possible audience.
Unsure
Via incentives rather than requirements and mandates.
More funding for storytelling through art.
No idea
I think that should be up to the private sector to figure out and fund, not the government,
Honoring the history of the original design
Sorry, again I need more information. Do you mean a "place" like a park or a street? or a statue or a mural? I think if things are valued by a community they will endure, most times without a designation.
Keep mature trees, support restoration rather than replacement of older homes (79 years and older).
Again, this is unclear and an opinion/value disguised as a question. Push - polling.
Not sure
I don't think they should.
determine parameters and set up uniform standards for conserving historic resources
Beyond architectural merit, maybe social merit might be a consideration.
Do not know
It's up to the individual owner.
?
Why do we need to? What would such a resource be? Because George Washington slept there, or it is the first Christian Scientist Church in Portland?
Develop a rating system that looks at the significance of the resource and determines its importance.
Tax incentives and tax credits.
Portland should not be in the business of protecting historic resources unless the owner requests it.
Create a process that requires consensus building, have a clear list of "non-architect" reasons that would prompt protection, and have the limitations not encompass un-related buildings. It should not require unnecessary regulation on one situation just because those regulations apply to other designations. Thoughtful case by case review of rules is needed.
Na
Innovative merit like the first electric house or first house that is sustainable energy wise are extremely historically important too
City and community officials should step up and recognise these resources.
Create a culture that celebrates our history. Give enducements and provide support to promote historic preservation.
This would be a privilege and should be done by a nonprofit.
Not sure

I'm not clear what you are getting at - preserve old structures without architectural integrity to limit other development? If the building/areas you are vaguely referring to are in areas of cultural importance, then create some type of cultural design overlay that incentivizes adaptive reuse without requiring "preservation" of dilapidated structures. Support community financing to enable neighbors to guide the redevelopment of these areas.
Better architectural design standards for all new construction in the City. A beautiful building next to an ugly building detracts from the beautiful building.
Architectural merit is a silly reason to displace people and cause sprawl. Portland should focus on preservation of resources with commonly understood historicity only.
Is there really all that much difference? The question is what did the resource look like, what were the things about it that stood out to people when the cultural, social, community events occurred or when the significant residents or institutions occupied it. Where things get difficult is where the resource was in poor physical condition at the time it was gaining its historic significance. Will rehabilitation and possible re-purposing of the resource destroy the resonance that it has for the people to whom its history is "their" history? Still there are ways to preserve the signature aspects of the resource while stabilizing and rehabilitating it.
eminent domain
Put more restraints on speculative development. Developers don't live in the neighborhoods they build in, and have no investment other than profit motive.
Focus on protecting communities facing involuntary economic displacement; protect culturally significant resources.
As above.
Identify a clear mechanism for determining cultural significance. Give more weight to marginalized communities than to affluent groups.
Integrity is inherently tied to the architecture of the building. Procedures should not be different. Stand on the principle that the people who made the place significant should be able to readily identify it.
Yes
A tiered or scored approach in which those reasons can be weighted. Identify those resources and provide for grants or incentives that protect them. Building awareness beyond architect/architectural style.

14. Do you have any additional comments?

Capturing uninventoried areas is just a first step (but very important). You also need to plan to continue into the future, doing updates periodically (not waiting three decades!), maintaining the data, improving things, expanding, etc.
no
Maybe, when we're finally done restoring it, my house will be worthy of preservation. Until then, it is being rescued because we want to rescue it. If someone with less patience had purchased it, given up, torn it down, and wanted to build a small apartment, then good for them.
Please add a mitigation fund that helps promote the larger cultural and social history.
Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I'd like to see protection of historic resources strengthened
No
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dedicate revenues from the imposition of demolition fees to a fund for seismic upgrades of historic buildings. • Invite experts from other cities – i.e., ones known to have successful historic preservation programs – to Portland to share insights, lessons learned, and solutions relevant to challenges facing our city. • Reduce the fees for design review. • Examine the merits of form-based codes for certain areas of the city. <p>Portland seems on a fast track to losing what makes it special. Most of the new buildings constructed in the last 10 years – e.g., “cereal box” buildings along Division Street and other East Side corridors – range from nondescript to ugly. Few of them are well-designed. Virtually none of them are beautiful. “The Yard” monstrosity at the bridgehead on East Burnside has been described as “a building you might be sent to, not willingly go to.”</p> <p>Given the inability or unwillingness of today’s builders/architects to build well-designed structures that people will likely want to preserve/sustain decades hence, if the city is serious about sustainability, it should do more to protect the unique, beautiful, and irreplaceable assets it has been lucky enough to inherit.</p> <p>While I am critical of certain features of the CC 2035 Plan and the RIP, I regard Portland’s Historic Resources Code Project as a positive initiative and appreciate the good work of those involved in it. Thank you for reaching out to the community through the recent roundtables and this survey.</p>
Preservation should be a bigger priority in this City or we risk becoming a bland, big box run by special interest groups with little interest in the past and some eagerness to destroy it in the rush to level the playing field.
Historic district designations in some cases have helped preserve neighborhoods and central city districts. Specifically in neighborhoods, historic designations have driven up the property values, preserving ownership for those living there, while not re-assessing property values for tax purposes. This has shifted property tax burden to other areas of the city unfairly.
Yes, don't allow historic districts. Don't allow this process to be captured by the 1% any more than it already has.
Continue the outreach efforts to get more residents involved in the processes.
Yes; no property should be subject to demolition or design review absent owner consent. Design guidelines should not be developed after a district is designated. Design guidelines, if any, should be developed before designation.

I believe this is a very important effort that is being made that concerns all of Portland . I would like to see established neighborhoods stop being ruined by tear downs of perfectly functional houses with those that have no regard for the texture of the neighborhood - I like the idea of not allowing any new house in an established neighborhood exceed the size of the largest on the block by more than X amount . Height and set back restrictions more in keeping with the dominant architecture of the neighborhood . I see lots of areas where it seems there are contradictory goals - Protect trees but allow new houses to have next to no yard or place to plant trees - areas of dense development and no parks added or any trees that are of any significance . Don't want Portland to become a concert urban jungle .

A building is a continuous act - it stays and effects those in and around it for decades - should be more carefully considered - the building and the tearing down .

We should always be asking whether the neighborhood character we're working to protect is the character of exclusion, bigotry, or hatred. If so, we should be working to destroy that character, not preserve it.

Any discussion of a historic district should start with a review of the HOLC maps and analyses to understand the historical reasons for why richer areas seem so "nice."

Yes, the RIP should be put on hold until this project is complete as well as the Environmental Zone inventory and review. The cart is ahead of the horse but works well for the developers who are pushing the RIP and the misguided folks (many of whom do not own property or have not invested in their city for years as I have) who believe that the RIP will result in improved affordability. The market will drive housing prices. And there is no good reason that Portland must destroy itself to accommodate anyone who wants to move there.

Current central city huge building height increases now being approved by Council will destroy much significant historic building.

It is indeed sad that Portland is sitting by and allowing irreplaceable buildings to be lost; and that increasing building heights seems to be considered tantamount to increasing "housing." There is not much of a shortage of high-end housing (at least downtown - many new, expensive apartments are empty - other than being used by short-term rental operations). Affordable housing is what is desperately needed to be preserved - and much of that is also downtown and in Goose Hollow. High-rises do NOT provide affordable housing. They are extremely expensive to build. The cheapest housing is housing that is already built. Some may perhaps need help with rehab, but preserving the livability of our neighborhoods is a bargain compared with demolition of loved older buildings. Make Portland again a leader in urban planning. We have sadly lost that position in the past several years. Seek best historic preservation practices from areas that are the new leaders.

It is critically important to protect our historic resources before its too late. Demolition review will be required to accomplish this.
no
So sad to see perfectly livable and beautiful homes being trashed and replaced with too big megamansions that have no value beyond the riches they provide developers in a market that could implode in a down economy. Cannot get that utility and livability back and it is not providing homes for anyone but the super rich.
Once these historic and interesting dwellings are torn down, our city becomes inconsequential.....
Make this meaningful. Do not drink the lemonade being poured by anti-preservation groups. Someday they will wonder what happened to the Portland they remember, not just us old folks.
No, thank you.
As one person in a NA mtg. once said "There are unoriginal feelers in Portland, yet many are aware of the historic significance of Native Americans contributions. We can honor the history of a structure if it isn't feasible to preserve the structure. The City cannot have it both ways by requiring infill development by committing to add 20,000+ housing units when land is scarce and many underprivileged and structures within large lots. There needs to be a reality check.
Use all available tools to reduce cost burden on retrofitting existing buildings for new uses. The greenest buildings are the ones that already exist!
Portland's growth is haphazard and the downtown is losing its appeal.
Carefully tailored design guidelines for large districts will go a long way towards removing uncertainty and angst from the process both for property owners and for the City staff/HLC.
We need to recognize that the economic forces at play today are abysmal and abnormal. We need to be pioneers in accepting this fact and acting accordingly with creativity, ingenuity, grit and perseverance. We need to build a better city by devising protections against unfair, laissez faire capitalistic greed and the developers of urban blight intent on degrading our once wonderful city until it's nothing but an almost unsalvageable mess of low quality row houses, soviet bloc condos (calling themselves luxury or leisure living) and a ruined city trashed by desultory planning that only followed the whims of the dollar in the economic winds. We need to build the city that we all want to live in, the city that's in almost every story book and movie that celebrates the city e.g. lamps and lanterns of sodium light, cobblestone roads, hole-in-the-walls, nooks and crannies, plenty of easy transit, no space squandered on megalithic parking garages or obscene glass, steel and concrete high rises, more urban trees and canopies, more parks, more houses with yards and gardens, more places to be creative instead of a cog in the corporate machine etc. We're becoming a city that is being sold on being modern and current as that modernity is rapidly being refuted, refused and thrown away as a fictional and hyped (marketing pitch) passe... A lie peddled by those who know nothing about society and urban planning and care no more about either past what they need to in order to exploit it for myopic, selfish gain. The interloping business criminal full of hubris is not a sane friend for a reasonable city to think it has. We know better than to believe the browbeating insistence that the more they build, the more affordable the city will be even though that dishonest supply-and-demand argument is an over-simplified ruse since they don't build anything that's affordable for most residents and try to turn our beloved town into a playground for the rich. We demand our city not be crassly commodified! We ned to be ahead of the curve on creating a city with a charismatic sense of place in line with the coming zeitgeist of egalitarian values and the warm embrace of a more humane era that values social capital!! It's time to be humble enough to enlist the lessons and ways of the past with the courage balanced with humility to build a better tomorrow for us all instead of the private riches of a few.

yes
Be careful of what you do because there's no real going back. Once it's gone it's gone! Remember the Alamo! And all the rest!
Historic Preservation has been a significant reason why Portland is a successful city today. The burden is on the Council to insure that Historic preservation is not sacrificed for short term political or economic gain.
District elections for city council, port and tri met. Portland needs a government that's not of by and for developers
N/A
please redo the 1982 historic resource inventory. It is woefully out of dat and incorrect. This has got to be the starting point for getting historic preservation back up and running in Portland.
Yes no modern architecture structures that is different from the rest. For example all concrete walls big glass windows out of the normal neighborhood building designs
No
The city of PDX needs to get out of the developers pockets and think of the long term health of the city. The greed is rampant and disgusting
No
Our region, and all of humanity, face radical challenges. Business as usual will destroy everything we value and should NOT be an option. Consider the needs of our citizens and our environment, NOT the profits of those who have CREATED these threats to our very existence! All of our efforts should be focused on the needs of We the People.
I see that Portland is losing its way. It has forgotten why people used to like it. It will still be OK, but it won't be any different from a lot of other cities in the US
It's my hope that we can find a way to increase affordable housing in Portland without the wholesale destruction of our more historically significant structures.
I understand the significant competing pressures for the City, not least the regional density goals. I must express my great disappointment in the City's failure to develop any meaningful response to the issue of historic preservation.
The value and livability of Portland has everything to do with its wealth of historic buildings, and its predominantly compact human scale. Destroying its architectural heritage and its human scale will kill its livability. We are already on the verge of doing that. It is essential for Portland to upgrade its ability to protect our architectural and urban heritage.
Thank you for your strong and effective efforts to improve the Historic Resource Code and update it to be more effective in the current day.
We need stronger laws to prevent demolitions. Cities like DC and Boston celebrate their historic architecture. We tear ours down. Unless our laws are as strong as DC and Boston, then we will keep losing our historic, cultural, and ethnic stories in our architecture.
I just hope this is not a futile survey that will not be taken seriously. I am deeply saddened at the loss of so many old, original Portland houses in the last couple of years. Five generations of my family have lived here. These new developers only care about making money and don't care about our history. Someone needs to protect our historic housing stock.
I think to date we have done a terrible job but the developers and those to whom they contribute seem to have done well.
Street parking is being lost for each single family home being demolished with two homes built in their place. In these cases the new homes should only be allowed one curb cut/driveway that they share - thus maintaining current street parking for the neighborhood

We need support at the mayor's level for these resources.
I suggest all city staff in BDS and PPS be required to watch the video of the ULI's Ed McMahon talk at the University of Oregon. It can be found at the Architectural Heritage Center website. There are so many lessons in that talk about best practices, both national and international, that Portland is ignoring. Portland no longer is a leader in urban planning.
No.
Stop allowing multi storied high-rise apartment building to be built in neighborhoods next to single-family dwelling homes that have existed there for over a hundred years and boxing them in and making their property worthless
Our historic buildings and neighborhoods are part of an urban environment that supports air and water quality, plants and animal species. That environment should also be studied, evaluated and understood before it is thoughtlessly destroyed by huge housing developments and relentless infill.
It's awful seeing so many perfectly good old buildings removed to be replaced with buildings that cover the entire lot and don't fit in with the character of the neighborhood.
To many to list, let's have a townhall forum! I know, by talking with many citizens that the politicians encouraging demolitions will see their political careers in jeopardy unless they start listening to other voices!
no. Thanks.
please refrain from rewarding the developers that do damage to our history...tourism suffers too
Everett custom homes stole 4ft. Of my property and my neighbors property we hired a lawyer who took our money and the wealthy developer won again if we would have had a lot more money for a lawyer we would probably have won under adverse possession law
Yes. It has become apparent to me and others, that the policies for no parking required for new infill apartments particularly is going awry. The city has assumed that because we have Max and buses that we can get anywhere we want to and don't need a car. This is a wrong assumption and will, and is hurting our small businesses all over the city. I met an owner of a small restaurant yesterday, that has an establishment off Division and 52nd. There are so many new apartments going up around there that there is no parking. He relies on his customers coming from distances. How will he survive? I told him that a business rally to city hall protesting these policies might help. His comment was that the city does not care. I have heard this from businesses in Sellwood and Westmoreland. There is a saturation point. It is killing these businesses. The transportation network is only as good as it serves, not in theory. The Tri-Met representative came to our neighborhood meeting two months ago to explain how they were cutting back our service to just a bus that would go by the local high school. Do you two agencies talk? Isn't transportation one of the reasons that you are advocating density in our neighborhoods because the transportation is so great. Wrong, it is a constant battle to preserve what service we have. So you say to take Max. We do take Max downtown. But to do so we drive to a station further away from our neighborhood because the parking around the closest one is terrible. We are getting older and to help stay in our neighborhood the transportation network is very important.
Portland has been a nightmare of development. My community of Portsmouth, St. Johns area is near complete destruction. If a European country did what Portland has allowed all history would be inside a computer or a book rather than a "living" neighborhood that allows one to walk into the past. Portland is in extinction level when it comes to preservation of history.
The city created these problems by taking away green space, Stop the infills
It is absolutely imperative that Portland do something to actually save historic buildings. The fact that only buildings that are on the national registry can be saved, is inane. This city matters and so does it's history. Progress does not equal tearing everything down and replacing it with poorly built,

overpriced homes that only wealthy people can afford. Every time a moderately priced home is torn down, it's one less place that someone just starting out can buy.
No. The questions wound me up and made me sad all at once. Good luck with your project.
No
No
Stop Demolishing Portland. Please.
no
Please save Portland before it's too late.
No
no
Don't tear down nice houses in affluent neighborhoods when there are vacant lots and abandoned houses in historically insignificant areas. Don't confuse high density with affordable. Tearing down a \$500k house to build a \$1M house might meet the letter of the law but not the spirit.
no
It is important to provide housing within the city and increasing density can be one way to do that, but it must be balanced with protecting the character of neighborhoods and allowing people to enjoy where they live. Many people in historic neighborhoods live there specifically because of the character of the area. Changing that character devalues not just their homes but also their whole way of life and enjoyment of their homes.
Please - Portland is a great city. Let's view these neighborhoods as an asset, not enclaves for our wealthy residents. At the same time let's be smart about forced density. It's also not right to turn these amazing assets into high density neighborhoods.
The city needs to develop a proposed plan of future development that has it's citizenry well represented and better control the out of control development that is ravaging our quality of life in Portland.
I have heard the arguments for affordable housing and how historic districts do not allow for affordable housing. None of the new homes built in historic districts, or neighborhoods seeking historic designation, are affordable. Even when a couple skinny homes go up they are not "affordable".
Your questions lead me to believe that you have brought no new ideas, critical thinking, creativity, or innovation to this task. I feel sorry for our failure to really serve the history of the city. What a mess.
Look for the future, not just to please the prevailing currents.
Portland should work to promote and preserve as many neighborhoods and buildings as possible. Obviously there are buildings that have been altered or abused to the point of no return. Sometimes a new road or district needs to be inserted, but the local residents should be offered plenty of opportunity for not just input but power to determine the final outcome as it impacts them.
No
History is important, don't let developers get rid of it to pursue expensive housing please don't let our city be destroyed!
No
The number if historical homes in Portland is finite and when gone, they are gone. I moved back to eastmoreland for the beauty of the older homes, the surroundings of Reed College and Crystal Springs.
Thank goodness for Brandon. The first major step in real preservation committment.
No

Builders, many from out of state, are working with housing advocates in the State Legislature on a mission to tear down old buildings in Portland. For some, efforts to protect something old and beautiful are seen as racist. This convoluted thinking is causing hostility to preservation efforts and playing in to the hands of builders who want to demo. I'd like to slow it all down. Old buildings can house new cultures.
Nope
Stop the demolitions of our cultural heritage and the most affordable rental units in the city!
Please value our historic buildings. Once they are gone, they cannot be replaced.
Not at this time. Thank you.
No more demolitions. Stop pushing for more and more density. Maybe everyone cant live in Portland. There are limits.
This should not take this long to come up wtih a designation. It's crazy.
I am concerned that developers in general have put a lot of money into opposing historic districting purely out of greed and that they influence city hall.
I would like to see more affordable housing being built instead of mega mansions.
No
I believe in historic preservation and incrementally increasing density (adding living units to large houses)...I can't really tell that to anyone in Eastmoreland right now.
I am very disappointed with Portland's disregard for its historic areas and its neighborhoods with character and the disregard of protections in place, such as the Industrial Sanctuary. Zoning changes have whittled away at everything that is protected until the protection is meaningless.
No, only that the survey was perhaps a bit on the long side. Thanks for your efforts in collecting this information.
Thank you for seeking public opinion. It is nice to be heard. I love Portland, but I am so disappointed by the NIMBY ism. I love historic homes (that's why I moved to Eastmoreland) but at the end of the day people are so much more important than the structures. People > structures. Truly think we have to get creative in honoring our past yet respecting that we are forging new trails. Still hopeful Eastmoreland will not be a national Hd and instead will have a chance to work with the City of PDX and become a local HD.
Protect neighborhoods, not just occasional homes.
Thank you for finally giving folks who love the character of our old neighborhoods a voice. If I had wanted to live in the suburbs I would have moved there in the first place!
I really think you should give serious thought to the idea that "protection of historic resources" is not something that everyone agrees is beneficial. I would rather see modern, energy-efficient houses of varying sizes and designs rather than subdivisions of nearly-identical houses. I would like people to be required to park their cars in their garages or on their driveways rather than parking on the street for convenience and thereby leaving a roadway too narrow for two cars to pass. I would like the city to enforce the requirements for not having vegetation encroaching on the sidewalks. I would like the city to spend the money to repair the sidewalks damaged by the required street trees. I would REALLY like the city to pass and enforce a law that prevents neighbors from having trees, hedges, etc. from encroaching on their neighbors' yards, especially things like huge laurel hedges and bamboo. I would like the city to give residents a way to deal with dog owners who do not scoop their dog waste. I would like the city to enforce the laws that say people should not pile their leaves in the street until 48 hours before the scheduled pick-up. I would like the city to enforce the rules that require homeowners to shovel snow from their sidewalks, and fix drainage problems that result in inches of

standing water that all the pedestrians have to navigate. All of these things are more important to me than having an ugly ranch house built in 1940 designated as "historic" and worthy of "saving".
No one wants stagnation because of preservation but in order to maintain a sense of place and character, something so very special to this small city, we have to be rigorous about keeping built history and making it useful again.
No.
Applying protections does NOT equal freezing in time or exclusivity. Added density, infill, etc simply need to complement district character and reflect its story. More outreach to communities of historic significance who don't have resources to apply for designation is called for... grant support is an option.
The wording of this survey forces people to make assumptions. Your data will be irrelevant.
Please honor the rights of private citizens on private property that pay taxes and try to make Portland a home.
Thanks for gathering feedback!
neighborhood context, age, completeness, etc, and protection are as important as individual properties.
~
I'm not overly familiar with the historic resource process, so I felt limited in my ability to give feedback. All I know is that East Portland is starting to see a lot of development activity, and we need to start identifying historically significant areas soon before we lose them.
Historic preservation does not have to be pitted against increased density. A very small portion of our city is historically relevant. We should keep it that way and keep the high rises in the areas of Portland where they belong
No thank you.
Preserve and protect existing inner city neighborhoods. I personally resent that all this concern affects only eastside neighborhoods. Why aren't inner west side neighborhood being re-zoned
Ironically, in this neighborhood, there are very few homes that have not been altered. Most have had additions, bump outs, dormers, porches, garages added, etc. We don't Of those that haven't been altered over time, quite a few are in such poor shape they should be torn down. Ironically this was set up as a subdivision by a developer. Maybe the dreaded new homes will be "historic in 80 years".
I believe that Portland does not take its historical districts seriously - Compared to historic cities on the east coast we are losing significant swaths to "progress". Not all needs to be saved but I believe it is important to protect what has been designated and add key neighborhoods to capture the flavor.
No
Historic designations create barriers to new development. This is extremely short-sighted considering the housing crisis this city is in. There is not enough housing for everyone in the city and making it harder to build housing for the growing population is going to shift the collective wealth of people living here from those renters, low-income people, and people of color, to existing landowners who will benefit from the restricted supply.
I am all for discouraging demolition and replacement with a single house, but we have a demographic crisis and have to make some sacrifices in terms of preservation. Portland is becoming an enclave for the rich.
no.
To reiterate my earlier comments. Cities change and grow and evolve. Portland's history is fascinating, but it is inseparable from that evolution and change overtime. Some of our most

interesting historic neighborhoods have been changed beyond recognition, and yet they're still rich with history.
Freezing currently "nice" neighborhoods is disrespectful to the memory of other neighborhoods that didn't get that treatment in the past, and it also does little to preserve any meaningful history. Irvington of today bears little resemblance to the "Historic Irvington" of the early 1900's and yet here we are with an urban neighborhood frozen in time for the benefit of the few homeowners who have been there for 20 or 30 years at most. Is that really accomplishing what the historic district designation intended to accomplish? Do we consider that a success story?
Portland is at risk of being locked in amber by wealthy interests. We risk losing our diversity and culture through the very tool that was designed to protect them. Firm steps need to be taken to stop sham historic designation of entire neighborhoods.
No
No
These questions are biased towards increasing the HD's. My desire is to stop the one sided nominations and protect the home owners rights.
As said above
A city that does not protect it's past, has no future.
No
The current national registry process is undemocratic and local neighborhood associations have too much power. A person or small number of people can force a registration and require a dissenting group to have to spend a lot of time and money to fight it. This is unfair and should be stopped.
Please hurry with this and the RIP. The housing crisis isn't going to wait for the city to screw up its courage and act.
No
Please continue to go deeper into the notions of historic significance than simply relying on "architectural forensics" or other stylistic shortcuts.
Designate an official, impartial body to run these processes. The debacle in Eastmoreland shows how having neighborhood associations do it creates deep fissures
yes, Portland is corrupt. Too many appointments. Using city streets as garages is self defeating. Main street businesses will go away. Can you picture mom riding a bike to the grocery store, hardware store, restaurant. You are zoning for those under 40. Just too bad if you are a senior citizen. Unless of course, if you own a taxi company.
Thank you.
This survey assumes that the participant understands all the terminology. It is difficult to provide answers to question that are not understood.
Not every bungalow is sacred. Fetishizing old buildings at the expense of responding to real needs is perverse.
Nope
No.
This survey seems to assume I have a lot of knowledge that I don't have. If this is a survey for the general public it would be helpful to offer options rather than open ended only. I'm sure I have opinions about much of this, but the wide open field of the question makes that one that seems to only be accessible to people with expertise or who have spent a lot of time reading and thinking about these issues. Consider more carefully who the audience of us public survey might be. Consider that I am a highly educated middle-aged person with minimal but some Fluency in these concepts.

And I cannot give thoughtful answers to most of these. The city has a goal of inclusive engagement in its public process. The survey like this that provides no context and does not offer any options for folks to think about is basically allowing for only those who consider themselves activists in the space to make thoughtful thorough commentary. Public inclusion fail, city of Portland.
Don't kill character at the expense of profit. Encourage people to recycle and improve with modernization that works and looks good rather than tear down and make cookie-cutter dwellings.
No.
Don't let Laurelhurst or Eastmoreland further their historic segregation by creating sweeping districts designated as historic.
ran out of time for this last part. Thanks for reading!
Don't cave to those neighborhoods that use this and want to use this to block more housing and more people and more density in their neighborhoods.
Much of today's push for Historic Preservation in Portland is really a desire to keep "renters" (especially minority or low income people) out of neighborhoods, to prevent increases in density by ADUs or apartment construction, or Mixed Use building construction. The city should be aware and vigilant to these ulterior motives, which subvert the Historic Preservation cause, and call into question the sincerity of those supporting designations, especially designation of wealthy enclaves with mundane architecture whose primary attraction is that commercial and multifamily uses, and by extension minorities, were kept out by deed restrictions, by Federal Government HOLC loan restrictions and later by suspiciously similar zoning patterns that reinforce the economic exclusiveness even today. Forbidding Historic Districts in these cases can be start toward righting historic wrongs to disfavored groups. Such questionable motives also extend to commercial areas, where using historic designations to restrict height along corridors "to fit the historic neighborhood commercial center" have the effect of prohibiting much housing that could be put in 4-6 story Mixed Use buildings on these corridors. While such housing might not be low-income, it adds to the supply and helps relieve price increases, and could also include Affordable Housing, as Portland now requires in many cases. Restricting heights in the Central City in Historic Districts seems to be mostly motivated by existing residents seeking protection for their views, although they claim kinship with the low-income renters in shorter buildings that don't block their view currently, and this too should be questioned.
No
no
no
Preserving what is unique or special to a specific time and place is what makes a city interesting to live in.
Don't let historic preservation get in the way of Portland being able to build adequate amounts of new construction housing units in order to keep housing prices affordable. We need to plan to build enough new housing units each year to fully accommodate total population growth, in order to keep prices in check.
Nope
Eastmoreland should not be a historic district. There is nothing historic about it and roughly half the property owners do not want it. To proceed, 100 % of the property owners should consent
Please, please make historic designation voluntary. It should not be entire neighborhoods. Let those seeking the designation choose to do so, and those that wish to abstain have that option. Please.
Please study the process by which certain streets and homes were excluded and prevented from voting on the outcome of the designation

Somewhere between strict preservation and demolition is a place where old buildings are invited back into the conversation. Sometimes to exist in the city today they need to regain their utility. They show the challenges of the current system. I was sad to see the Ancient Order of the United Workman's Temple go but at the same time the building was essentially empty for 40 years. It was in disrepair and as a URM it was unsafe. To make that amazing building part of the urban fabric again it needed to be financially feasible to do so. The math just did not work. A program that would help make that type of project an option would be wonderful. I would not support returning it to its 1896 look but I would support making it a functioning resource in the downtown core. A contributing resource that is NOT contributing is sad.
Without changes to the federal designation process and state laws regarding federally-listed resources, the local process can be undermined and devalued.
Support 'granny' additions, protect oversized lots to preserve neighborhood quality, if Portland is growing too fast, expand the UGB.
I wonder about the integrity of this survey - who designed it, for what purpose. How about some transparency.
No
Just because it's old doesn't make it good. The primary use of historic districts in Portland in recent years has been barely disguised Nimbyism. The reliance on the NPS designation process is deeply flawed. The lack of actual rules prior to the establishment of a district is blatantly unfair.
Thanks for asking!
to much power held with neighborhood associations
This is not a very effective survey as most residents are not aware of all the many regulations, rules, complexities of zoning and establishment of historic entities
Please ensure property owners consent to having their property rights restricted.
No
Keep the federal government out of city and local oversight. States rights and city rights matter. Insure diversity on design and citizen committees.
Before I learned the implications of what a historic district was about, I thought it was a good idea. Now that I've learned more & seen the process in action, I can't imagine why anyone wouldn't have a problem with the way the process is driven. Everyone should be concerned about the restrictions to properties without owners' consent.
I believe that for neighborhoods designated as historic districts under the National Park Service (NPS) process, which not undemocratic and not based on any decisions or process developed locally, the City of Portland should mirror what the NPS does - treat the designation as simply an honorary one. Refer to the NPS guidelines for how to care for a historic resource, but (like the NPS) do not make it obligatory. I think that limited local obligatory restrictions should only be placed on a resource or district that is designated under a local process, with fair and open communication and majority owner consent. I also feel that neighborhood associations should not have the ability to, at no charge, weigh in on or protest changes that are approved by the city. This allows a very small minority of individuals to add potentially a significant burden to the process owners go through, and makes it easy by making it free.
Neighborhood associations need to be held responsible for fair and ethical practices when they are given so much power and leeway in our city structure.
No

I am against the eastmoreland historic district and the old white men telling me what I can and can't do with my house
No
The National Park Service set up an honorary designation of "Historic" but Oregon and Portland have made it into something entirely different. In my opinion the process has been hijacked by nimbys to keep a neighborhood locked into a certain quaint style. It's a vacuous curb appeal driven by nostalgia and real estate agents. If we want to preserve a "resource" let's make it thorough and comprehensive and get buy in from the people who own it.
The Federal Historic Preservation Act is archaic and is being used incorrectly. The state and SHPO process for regulating historic designation is a mess. They cannot answer questions on their own process. They are not following the law, but making decisions and creating a process that intimidates and exposes people's privacy in voting, decision making and freedom to own property.
Nope
Please do not allow the overly-vocal, Stop Demolishing Portland historic proponents to railroad this conversation, as they are attempting to. Most of Portland's residents are on the fringe of this conversation but deserve to be heard.
Major strides have been made in the last few years to slow the demolition of our historic resources. Thank you.
I'm very concerned that this process will be hijacked by anti-growth efforts and that program changes will result in new rules that are even more easily abused than the national historic district process.
Disband Landmarks Commission. No other public policy has it own, single purpose board. Let the Planning Commission and City Council integrate historic protection into all decisions, as they do every other public policy.
Good luck!
not at this time but I hope to become involved as the process to develop these changes happens
It would be helpful to have resources or grants for lower income property owners to maintain designated structures so those with qualifying income levels don't have to choose between neglecting their property or moving.