

**DRAFT**  
**CNN Land Use & Transportation Committee**  
**Meeting Minutes – July 26, 2016**

<b>Attendees:</b>	<b>Resident of:</b>
Amanda Petretti (NA Rep), Nate Carter (NA Rep)	ROSE CITY PARK
David Sweet (NA Rep), Janis Stange (NA Rep)	CULLY
absent	
Josh Capps (NA Rep) excused, Jeff Mast, (NA Rep)	HOLLYWOOD
Yvonne Rice (NA Rep), Erin Middleton (NA Rep),	SUMNER
Kimberly Botter (NA Rep), Bill Edwards (NA Rep),	MADISON SOUTH
Doug Fasching	CHAIR / CHAIR CNN
(LUTOP/CNN Board Chair)	
Ted Carlston (NA Rep) (Bob Price-NA Rep) both	ROSEWAY
absent	
Jim Howell (NA Rep), John Sandie (NA Rep)	BEAUMONT-WILSHIRE
Tamara DeRidder (RCP), Rochelle Burney	OTHER NEIGHBORHOODS/GROUPS
(Sumner), Barbara Strunk (UNR and RIPSAC)	

<b>Staff:</b>	<b>Representative of:</b>
Nan Stark (Bureau of Planning and Sustainability)	CITY OF PORTLAND
Alison Stoll (Staff)	CENTRAL NORTHEAST NEIGHBORS

*Minutes prepared by Alison Stoll*



**1. Welcome & introductions**

Attendees introduced themselves

**2. Meeting called to order at 7:08 by Doug Fasching, Chair.**

This is a special meeting of CNN LUTOP with one thing on our agenda. We will discuss and vote on the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability Residential Infill Report and the 8 Proposals in this report.

Our CNN LUTOP committee is an advisory committee and will recommend to our CNN Board a position to take regarding the 8 Proposals.

I would like to conclude this CNN LUTOP meeting at 8:30pm this evening. If we are not finished at that time we will vote on continuing the meeting or stopping at that point with what we have finished and ask the CNN Board to just support what the LUTOP committee has decided when the meeting ends.

Everyone agreed that taking a vote at 8:30 was acceptable. Doug further stated that he would like to go through each Proposal one at a time. There was discussion and it was agreed to move forward with discussion on each Proposal. We can review the "draft". Once the LUTOP gives a recommendation to the board CNN Executive Committee to adopt a position and send a letter to bureau and city council.

Discussion about what we can and cannot change. Everyone agreed to try to finish the meeting by 8:30pm. We can review the "draft". Once the LUTOP gives a recommendation to the board CNN Executive Committee to adopt a position and send a letter to bureau and city council.

**Proposal 1 Limit the size of houses while maintaining flexibility in form.**

BWNA core of what evolved to UNR, trying to manage what was being built after an existing house was demolished. Managing what was built and have it fit into the neighborhood. Scale and mass and try to affect what was built.

This Proposal is what BWNA can support because it was the core issue.

Rose City Park was mixed on this one. Support for managing and bringing down scaled size. Need to have multiple units in same area. 2500SF did not suggest a different number.

Basement and attic not included in the 2500SF BWNA felt graph fair. RCP felt differently

Cully a floor area bonus in footage for affordable housing so that they could bid against for profit developer. Like corner lot could build 4 units vs. 3 units. 800SF for detached ADU. This includes sheds

*Motion to agree the first Proposal 1 as a group will support proposal. Moved by John 2<sup>nd</sup> by Jeff Mask. Discussion about voting and how we will comment as individual neighborhoods and comments. MSP unanimous*

Some discussion about voting on each proposal vs voting on all. Continued to vote on each individually 800SF for detached ADU. This includes sheds.

**Proposal 2 Lower the house roofline**

The biggest is the 3 ½ story house with garage. This capped the low point. Though this can allow some very tall houses. RCP agrees and it will be covered with code.

Cully states that this will prevent some developers building up the grade.

*Motion to agree the second Proposal 2 as a group will support the proposal.  
Moved by Nate Carter 2<sup>nd</sup> by John Sandy MSP unanimous*

**Proposal 3 Make from setbacks consistent with setbacks on existing, immediately adjacent**

BWNA concerns about what about farther back or closer. Wanted it to be measured by the houses on each side. City needs to move more towards what exists on the block. Increased or reduced to match.

Rose City Park concerned about how far back it can be built.

BWNA wants two step process a setback and then what is on the street. Cully might not be so good to allow to match the adjacent but for a huge setback it does not make sense. An extra five feet is ok.  
BWNA at least 15

*Motion to agree to the third Proposal 3 as a group will support the proposal.  
Moved by Amanda 2<sup>nd</sup> MSP*

No John Sandie and Jim Howell (BWNA)  
Abstained Yvonne Rice and Erin

**Proposal 4 Allow more units within the same form as a house near centers and corridors**

Everyone is looking at the map and ¼ mile of any center or corridor. In the yellow area a 2500SF or triplex could be built there.

If you maxed out  
In a 200feet by 100feet you could put 12 dwelling in the block. Currently you could put 8 units in that same space

Cully important to note that in the same space you can build 8 and this proposal allows 4 more.

RCP why does it have a relationship to a busline that could stop. Or a neighborhood could add a bus line

Roseway and Rose City and Madison South could fall into this category.

BWNA all neighborhoods are all different. Only way to redevelop is to take down and build. This is about 85% of Portland. When you buy you consider that rules will not change without due process. A lot of this will create lots of rental properties. This change will drive the rental properties. Can we make it more affordable? But by rezoning 80% of neighborhoods. Density has made

preservation a bad word. Do you want to have this happen or is this a step too far. Smaller scale. See how this happens. Do not trust the market to do the right thing. Start small and go from there.

Madison South our 2.5 zoning is only 4% and increasing by 85% will not preserve. How much does this create what is preserved?

RSP price x and take down then it is more than twice the price that is taken down. Taxes will go up and not affordable.

Cully 1959 did allow duplex, garden apartments then the areas were rezoned as single family. Buckman, Irvington, Ladds Addition. People want to live in neighborhoods that are walkable. Affordability the modest house that sits on a lot sits on a very valuable lot. The lot will sell for more than the one that sold. Affordability. If it is blue then they can not. See his handouts.

Doug talked about the characteristics of the different neighborhoods and how people liked the variety. He gave some reasons why people are drawn to different neighborhoods. Some parents live in Alameda because of large older homes and good

schools, and some enjoy, north Portland neighborhoods because of restaurants and parks, Buckman he does not like houses and other reasons and he did not choose to live there, because. But it is a revitalized neighborhood and he understands that there needs to be different types of housing but without destroying the unique neighborhoods that Portland has.

Vital urban spaces need rental housing. We need to be really careful and try to encourage and not see all new housing as negative.

Everyone agreed that it feels like the market has gone out of control. Market and price keeps going up. Greed is part of this. Prices go up every 90 days. Not family friendly at all, families cannot afford and developers do not care.

BWNA answer to David now code allowed on every corner lot to build 3 housing units.

And many developers take advantage of what codes are now. Many of the new ADUs are being built as Air B+B rentals.

Some suggested trying out new code in a smaller area. Suggest that we narrow the out of control development down. This trial could be based on a trial and not this huge area. Suggested to cut it in half the area.

RCP that they do not mind duplexes or triplexes, not brand new but converting existing housing stock. What will it look like, what will happen about parking,

sewers, safety. Moving this fast could overload our systems. Huge need to provide housing that people can afford.

Do not destroy the village to by demolishing the homes, save the houses. People who own their houses have an investment.

Cully does encourage home ownership.

Cully handed out handouts that show where families cannot afford to live. Different demographics are shown. See handouts. Most parents want their adult children to own a home and do not want a system where average family cannot afford to buy here. This would not be something where people will come bulldoze neighborhoods.

BWNA does not want too many changes, that would change the character of their neighborhood. Commissioner Novick said that it could take 500 years till all the houses in Portland could be torn down but when 15 houses are demolished in a small area then it does change a neighborhood. BWNA agrees conceptually but what is the pressure to make this happen all or nothing. We need to plan and move but not in one big step. If market keeps going crazy then it will happen quickly. And will change the landscape.

*Motion to support Proposal 4 and strike the words near centers and corridors moved by David Sweet and Bill Edwards 2<sup>nd</sup>.*

Yes David Sweet (Cully) and Bill Edwards (MSNA)  
No John Sandie and Jim Howell (BWNA), Jeff Mast (Hollywood), Amanda Petretti and Nate Carter (RCPNA), Kimberly Botter (MSNA)  
Abstained Yvonne Rice and Erin Middleton Sumner

*Motion to Oppose the Proposal 4 altogether based that it reaches too far. Moved by John Sandie (BWNA) no second.*

*Move that Proposal 4 is supported only in the internal conversions of existing homes Amanda Petretti (RCPNA) moved and Nate Carter (RCPNA) 2<sup>nd</sup>. MS Failed*

Yes Amanda Petretti and Nate Carter (RCPNA)  
No Kim Botter and Bill Edwards (MSNA) David Sweet (Cully)  
Abstained John Sandie and Jim Howell (BWNA), Yvonne Rice and Erin Middleton (Sumner) Jeff Mast (Hollywood)

*Move that we support Proposal 4 as written David Sweet (Cully) no 2<sup>nd</sup>.*

RCP different rules listed for internal conversion and that will maintain the existing neighborhoods and this addresses the distance issue and fitting into the neighborhood.

This means no tearing down.

This would be the entire city. Cully says this would not be equitable and would be on all neighborhoods.

### **Proposal 5 Allow cottage clusters on lots larger than 10,000 SF**

Cully Puget sound and wood village has adopted cottage cluster codes. Planned development and only one developer in the city. Proposes to allow cottage clusters.

BWNA concept supported but again restricted and try it out, but not everywhere.

Hollywood on cottage cluster what is the average SF

Cully typically 1200SF or less. The drawing is an example. Develop the code and then can develop the specifics. Often separate parking areas.

Cully development where he lives is a cottage, Cully Grove, Ely Spevac

Does this means that you can tear down. Yes it does mean this unless the property is not developed .

*Moved to support Proposal 5 David moved 2<sup>nd</sup> Bill Edwards (MSNA) MS Failed*

Yes Jeff Mast (Hollywood), David Sweet (Cully), Kimberly Botter and Bill Edwards (MSNA)

No John Sandie (BWNA)

Abstained Jim Howell (BWNA) Yvonne Rice and Erin Middleton (Sumner)

Amanda Petretti and Nate Carter (MSNA)

Motion to support the cottage clusters within 200 feet of the corridors and centers discussed.

### **Proposal 6 Establish a minimum unit requirement for R2.5 zone lots.**

This zone was not created for single detached houses. On a 5000SF lot the will be 2 houses on 2500SF lot one.

Explanation of R2.5 zoning by Nan Stark.

It will be required to build two dwellings in R2.5 so that this proposal will work.

*Motion to support Proposal 6 as written moved by John Sandie (BWNA), 2<sup>nd</sup> David Sweet (Cully). MSP*

Yes Jeff Mast (Hollywood), John Sandie and Jim Howell (BWNA), Kimberly Botter and Bill Edwards (MSNA), David Sweet (Cully)

No Amanda Petretti and Nate Carter (RCPNA)

Abstentions Yvonne Rice and Erin Middleton (Sumner)

**Proposal 7 Allow new houses on historically narrow lots near centers and corridors within the R5 zone**

BWNA Wants Truth in zoning these historically narrow lots are 25 feet in an R5 zone which does not allow these small lots, do not try to make it something different from dotted lines on old plat maps.

RCP in general supported without limitations

Hollywood either accept or not and not just in centers and corridors so agree with no restrictions

Cully says the lot cost is a huge part of the development cost, if you can build on a small lot then you can increase affordability

*Motion to approve Proposal 7 striking the words near Centers and Corridors David moved and Jeff 2<sup>nd</sup> MSP*

Yes Jeff Mast (Hollywood), Amanda Petretti and Nate Carter (RCPNA)

David Sweet (Cully) Bill Edwards and Kimberly Botter (MSNA)

No John Sandie and Jim Howell (BWNA)

Abstained Yvonne Rice and Erin Middleton (Sumner)

**Proposal 8 Do not require parking and do not allow front loaded garages for detached houses on narrow lots and historically narrow lots.**

RCP may be allowing parking pads to allow as parking and not allow ugly garages

Important to have off street parking and thinks that they can look nice, need to have when apartment houses have no parking and then you have no parking for your house. Garages could be made to use as a bonus room.

Front loaded garaged be allowed if shared driveway and built on a narrow lot.

Cully remember that this provision is for houses only on 25 foot lots. The ones without garages out front are a lot nicer looking. (RIPSAC toured and actually compared) Attached skinny houses allow parking garages with a shared driveway.

*\*Motion to accept Proposal 8 as written, Jeff Mast (Hollywood) moved, David Sweet (Cully) 2<sup>nd</sup> to accept Proposal 8. MSP*

Yes Jeff Mast (Hollywood), Bill Edwards and Kimberly Botter (MSNA),  
David Sweet (Cully), John Sandie (BWNA), Nate Carter (RCPNA)  
No Amanda Petretti (RCPNA)  
Abstained Yvonne Rice and Erin Middleton (Sumner).

Doug Fasching LUTOP Chair again asked that everyone send him  
comments from their neighborhood associations so that these  
comments could be included in the letter from Central Northeast  
Neighbors to the bureau and city council. All agreed.

*\*Nate Carter (RCPNA) moved and Amanda Petretti 2<sup>nd</sup> to adjourn  
MSP unanimously*  
Meeting ended at 8:55pm

**Adjourn**