



Meeting Attendees

Committee Members

Jim Brown, Alameda
Anjala Ehelebe, Woodlawn
Garlynn Woodsong, Concordia
Rachel Lee, Sabin
Leigh Rappaport, King
Mitchell Snyder, Vernon
Andy Sheie, At-Large (Humboldt)

Additional Participants

Loulie Brown, NECN Board At-Large
Dan Lerch-Walters, Sullivan's Gulch
Claire Carder, Development Review Advisory
Committee (DRAC)
Lorrie Chang, King Neighbor
Ken Forcier, Concordia Neighbor
Nan Stark, BPS District Liaison
Claire Adamsick, NECN Staff

Meeting called to order 7:03 p.m.

Introductions and approval of August and September meeting minutes

Anjala Ehelebe motions to approve the August minutes. Seconded by Andy Sheie. Motion passes unanimously.

Garlynn Woodsong motions to approve the September meeting minutes. Seconded by Leigh Rappaport. Motion passes unanimously.

LUTC Committee Business

Co-chair vacancies:

Claire discussed co-chair vacancies and the provisions in by-laws which state that at least one co-chair (or the chair, if there is only one) must be an NECN board member. Loulie Brown, an at-large board member, has volunteered to step up to the LUTC co-chair role. Loulie has years of experience as an architect and now, in her current role at Sabin CDC, as an affordable housing advocate.

Garlynn Woodsong, a two-year LUTC member and chair of the Concordia LUTC, is interested in the other co-chair spot. Garlynn shares that he has 15 years of regional planning and GIS experience.

Jim Brown motions to confirm both Garlynn Woodsong and Loulie Brown as committee co-chairs. Leigh Rappaport seconds. Motion carries unanimously.

Confirming new LUTC Rep from Sabin:

Claire reported that Sabin has voted to have Rachel Lee as its new LUTC representative to NECN. Rachel can be approved immediately as a neighborhood association referral per the NECN bylaws.

Anjala Ehelebe motions to confirm Rachel Lee as Sabin's representative to the LUTC. Seconded by Leigh Rappaport. Motion carries unanimously.

Vote on 9 p.m. end time:

The LUTC meetings are currently scheduled from 7-8:30 p.m., and often go over the 8:30 end time with speakers and numerous agenda items that often require involved discussion. To address this time management issue, Claire polled LUTC members in between September and October meetings, and all who responded indicated that an official 9 p.m. end time was realistic. Anjala felt that LUTC meetings often end closer to 9 so it's better to be able to plan for this in advance. Leigh said she was concerned about the meeting going beyond 9 p.m., but other committee members stressed that a 9 p.m. end time



would be a “hard” end. Claire proposed trying to plan only the first 90 minutes where possible, leaving a 30-minute “cushion” for neighborhood updates and any other continued discussion.

Anjala Ehelebe motions to extend the regular monthly LUTC meeting end time to 9 p.m. Seconded by Andy Sheie. Motion carries unanimously.

Combined November/December meeting (due to holidays):

Claire noted that the respective LUTC November/December dates this year fall on the day before Thanksgiving and December 24. Last year, the Committee agreed to hold a combined November/December meeting, ideally in early December. Claire will send out Doodle Poll to the group to find a new date.

Demolition: Potential 120-day delay period under consideration Claire Carder, City of Portland DRAC (Development Review Advisory Committee)

Claire Carder is a community representative on the (Development Review Advisory Committee (DRAC), a citywide committee that reviews the permitting process for the Bureau of Development Services. DRAC is comprised of 17 members representing all aspects of the development community, including developers, permits people, etc. Claire explained that BDS went through a large series of budget and staffing cuts during the recession; now it is experiencing a huge influx of residential permit applications which has driven its recent increase in staffing.

Claire says that the DRAC has been hearing from neighborhoods all over Portland about demolition concerns. She worked with another community advisory member, Maryhelen Kincaid on improving neighborhood notifications of demolitions.

Currently, developers are encouraged to provide door-hangers on nearby homes to let neighbors know about a tear-down. This is currently a voluntary process.

Currently, DRAC is working on addressing the current demolition delay notification process, and would like input from neighbors and community members about the 120-day demolition delay period.

The K1 exemption is a type of demolition permit that promotes rebuilding on lots after structures have been demolished. Part of notification in this case includes large orange signs posted on the property, which Claire as well as committee members acknowledged has not been done consistently. The Demolition Task Force is proposing that the K1 Permit be eliminated.

Claire cites that there is a new demolition web page on the BDS site which lists all demolition permits. Claire (A.) will look for this and send it to the group

Claire points out that the current level of demolitions is not different from what Portland was experiencing in 2002-2004, but notes the high volume of concerns from neighbors and other community groups around demolitions.

Currently, there is a mandatory delay of demolitions for 35 day delay. Notifying neighbors of a demolition with door hangers is voluntary at this point.

Notification letters are sent to the Neighborhood Coalition and neighborhood association chair. Claire says it's still unclear as to whether BDS can mandate that adjacent property owners be notified.



Claire acknowledges that neighborhoods don't have many tools that they can use to save properties that go into the hands of developers. She says that one "tool" is the 120-day delay, which would be instituted if a neighborhood association or coalition (or other community organization) submits a request for this extended delay period.

To apply for the 120-day demolition delay, neighborhoods would need to submit a letter that indicates that it has contacted the developer and let them know that they have other interests for the property and that they are developing an alternative plan for the property. Then, the 120 days will be broken up into 4 periods of 30 days each – milestones where neighborhoods can show their progress in developing and finding financial backing for the plan.

Claire anticipates that the 120-day delay might be enacted about four or five times a year; due to its scarce use, DRAC is considering whether to do away with the 120-day delay.

Claire acknowledges that the homes that have been "saved" (in part, through the 120-day delay process) by neighborhoods recently have been purchased at a very high price, sometimes more than the property is worth.

Committee questions and feedback:

What if a developer refuses to engage with concerned neighbors? [*No recorded response to this question*].

Jim Brown says he thinks the City sends notices to everyone within 150 feet of accessory dwelling units (ADUs), and that the developer pays for these notifications. Jim says he can't see any reason why nearby neighbors would not be notified of a demolition.

Garlynn Woodsong asks why demolitions are not viewed as a Type 1 Land Use Review. Leigh Rappaport wonder whether the discrepancy lies in the definition of demolition versus a "remodel."

In terms of improving notifications, one committee member suggested including the phone number for the developer on the notice, as well as their email address.

Garlynn asked whether DRAC could differentiate between demolition and deconstruction. Can deconstruction be incentivized? He says this was a question that Concordia discussed at its recent LUTC meeting. Claire says there are issues with older homes such as asbestos and lead paint that are make some deconstruction more problematic. She adds that DRAC is working with DEQ and OSHA about regulations around demolitions.

Anjala Ehelebe mentioned that the standard 35-day delay makes it hard for neighborhoods to respond, depending on timing, due to meetings and, in many cases, very small land use groups.

Claire says that DRAC would like to hear from neighborhoods. NECN neighbors with questions or concerns can contact Claire, or Mark Fedders, who administers the DRAC webpage. Mark can pass along public comments to Paul Scarlett and rest of the DRAC.

Proposal on multi-dwelling units and context-sensitive neighborhood development (Garlynn Woodsong, Concordia)



Meeting participants acknowledge that they read Concordia's letter prior to the meeting; Garlynn invited discussion from the committee.

Loulie asked whether the issue around demolitions is one of scale or one of style. Garlynn says that these aspects weren't the primary the impetus behind Concordia's proposal.

How many units would you need in a house in order to make it affordable? Garlynn said that 3 units is the minimum in order to make the house affordable.

Garlynn said that a number of Concordia's recommendations are up for discussion – there are definitely areas that still need study or attention.

Loulie suggested that the proposal be laid out as a "carrot" – more of a density "bonus" than a density restriction.

Mitch asked about skinny houses and lot splitting in Concordia; he is concerned about developers using the model to maximize profits. Ken says that demolitions will likely continue to happen in our neighborhoods. One hope with this proposal is that the massing would potentially be different in a flatted house.

The general idea of the proposal is to create an overlay zone in areas near transit corridors.

Garlynn says that general sentiment from a number of community members is still focused on trying to halt demolitions. Jim sees the merit in this proposal in terms of focusing on effective infill development.

Andy asked what the process is for fleshing out the proposal, including considerations around number of units in a flat.

Garlynn asked whether the committee would support the proposal. He then proposed that LUTC members could work on tweaking the proposal.

Nan says that the proposal asks for a change in the zoning, not one to the Comp Plan. It's an implementation measure. Figuring out how to fold this proposal into proposed Comp Plan policies would be the most effective approach.

Present committee members agreed to ask their respective neighborhoods for feedback and bring that input to the next LUTC meeting. Claire suggested a small work group could take on the legwork of finalizing an NECN letter.

Comprehensive Plan Q&A with Nan Stark, Bureau of Planning and Sustainability

Nan says the Comp Plan comment period has been extended to March 13. Only written testimony will be accepted after November 4th.

Nan mentioned Mixed Use Zones workshops coming up on November 4th and 5th. Claire will share information on the workshops with the LUTC list.

There are two more Comp Plan public hearings: one on October 27 at PCC and one on November 4th. At BPS. Nan emphasized the power of (in-person) testimony – though she says that all comments will be reviewed fairly.



Right now, BPS staff has received 1200 written comments and expects twice that by the time the comment period closes. November 18th is the first work session for the Planning and Sustainability Commission, which will begin to review bureau and citizen feedback at that time.

North Portland “Health Overlay” proposal

Committee members reviewed a Comp Plan proposal from NPLUG, the North Portland Land Use Group based at NPNS (the North Portland District Coalition).

Meeting participants said they had questions about the application of an overlay zone which seems place-specific. Loulie said she thinks of the “H” overlay as inclusive of properties directly in the flight path of PDX airport. She likes the concept of the letter and feels strongly that citywide, this is something that we need to be looking at, particularly in terms of health equity issues.

There are pockets of really bad pollution – pollution “plumes” around the city. Ken Forcier said that Mary Peveto, a speaker from whatsinourair.org, came to talk about pollution concerns in NE Portland, and she reported that there is currently less air sampling taking place.

Dan said that he recently heard a story on public radio about the relationship between tree canopy and air quality.

We should be concerned in NE, particularly with the designated industrial growth areas north of Columbia Blvd.

Jim thinks more DEQ monitoring needs to be encouraged.

Andy asks about how to address air pollution issues such as cars and wood stoves rather than single polluters.

Anjala identified that this is a racial equity issue, particularly for the NECN neighborhoods in close proximity to I-5.

Loulie asked whether committee members wanted to take the issue back to neighborhoods, and people generally agreed with that proposal. Garlynn says he thinks there’s a place to weave this argument more strongly into the Comp Plan.

Nan said she’d reach out to her North Portland liaison counterpart to get more background on the proposal and how it could fit with Comp Plan feedback.

Neighborhood Updates

Concordia: Ken shared Concordia’s concerns around skinny house development. Ken is currently working with a Land Use lawyer to determine whether a LUBA review is a viable option. Ken says there are discrepancies in language in the current code in terms of lot size and what is built there -- i.e. there is not a “land use decision” around skinny houses.

Ken has reached out to other neighborhoods that are predominantly R5 who’ve expressed support for Concordia’s efforts; Woodstock, Brentwood/Darlington, some in North Portland.



Land Use and Transportation Committee
Wednesday, October 22, 2014, 7:00pm–9:00pm
Northeast Coalition of Neighborhoods Office
4815 NE 7th Avenue, Portland, OR
Minutes

Mitch Snyder asked Ken to share his view on attached duplexes; he referred to Table 110-6 – single family homes/F, “non-conforming”.

Garlynn says that the 20s bikeway does not include diverters for the section north of I-84. He says that Concordia’s concern is that cars will use the bikeway as a quick through-way off the main arterial (like NE 33rd). Dan says he shares similar concerns in the Sullivan’s Gulch neighborhood.

Garlynn would like to have the LUTC consider a diverter letter at its next meeting. There are various types of diverters so these would need to be considered.

King: Leigh reported that PDC has convened a working group to discuss the development site at the intersection of MLK and Alberta. She reports that the King Neighborhood Association is concerned about the design of the building. For example, right now, there are no outward-facing windows onto Alberta or MLK.

KNA’s proposal is to change the entrance so that it’s oriented toward the Alberta Street side. Another concern is traffic increase; there is no proposal to have PBOT do a traffic study. King is holding an emergency meeting to discuss this and write a letter to Majestic and PDC asking for a design review if these two aspects are not addressed.

Leigh says that King will likely be asking the LUTC for support depending on how PDC/Majestic respond to King’s concerns. Claire offered look for public-facing information on the PDC community advisory meetings to share with the LUTC list.

Woodlawn: Anjala announced that TriMet has reached a decision to not have a permanent layover site in Woodlawn. A new layover site has not yet been pinpointed, but Anjala says this decision is a big victory!

Meeting adjourned 9:02 p.m.

Next meeting: *Tuesday,* December 2, 2014