

HOUSING TOWN HALL FLIPCHART NOTES - KEY THEMES

APRIL 18, 2019

- In general, people tied housing affordability to transit access and were more willing to have higher density housing if it was near transit stations – especially the MAX. This has the added benefit of potentially reducing parking minimums since people would have access to transit.
- Having new development have access to services and amenities was a value held by most tables.
- There should be more consideration for intentional housing types like senior living, transitional housing, intergenerational, co-housing, etc.
- Increasing density/number of apartments and condos in the centers makes sense since it's already high density. However, some are concerned about parking constraints.
- There's concern that future development will alter the character of the neighborhood.
- Multiple tables mention design concerns like height, scale, and aesthetics of future buildings.
- Affordability and livability are the two most cited values by participants
- Mixed use development was largely welcomed in transit hubs and corridors, however, there were locational concerns as not all development near transit corridors is multi-family oriented at this point.
- Cottage clusters were largely supported and were seen as a means of homeownership for lower income residents that were also livable. There was mixed support as to whether those should be in largely single-family areas
- People were interested in the concept of courtyard apartments in single-family zones, though there was some skepticism on how well they (or any other multifamily development like triplexes, rowhouses, etc.) would integrate into single-family neighborhoods
- People felt that increased access to homeownership is an important tool to address affordability and neighborhood stability
- There were mixed opinions on increasing density in predominantly single-family zones. Some had opinions that were in contradiction to each other with some supporting an increase of mixed housing types, while others described how much they value the suburban feel of their neighborhood and their fears that adding mixed housing types would impact that.
- People were most interested in diversifying the housing mix in hubs and corridors zones.
- Some people mentioned concerns about development happening too quickly and cited their preference for development to occur gradually
- Multiple tables perceived increased density being an asset to support/grow local businesses
- Multiple tables agreed that many of these options are already allowed, but that construction costs are restrictive to development. They suggested that the city needs to make it more affordable to incentivize development of mixed housing types – particularly noting ADUs

RED #1 – Tay Stone and Matt Hastie

- Questions about when changes in code could lead to development
- Brief discussion about voting/advocacy to have voices heard by city
- Apartments are most affordable
 - Can put near transit
- More mixed use in centers
 - Want to see more business coming in
- Increase the number of apartments in centers
- King Road has mixed use housing already. Increase the density there
- What are benefit of cottage clusters over 4-plexes?
 - Design might be more fitting in certain neighborhoods on larger lots
 - May help sustain neighborhood character
 - Unsure of practicality of cottage clusters though
- Single family homeowner likes the suburb feel of neighborhood
 - Why they moved to milwaukie
- Mixed feelings about increasing density in predominantly single family neighborhoods
- The exercise is too general to decide by color versus more specific locations
- Makes sense to add apartments, townhomes, and increase density near Max, but doesn't mean that this should also be in other hubs/corridors areas around Lake Road
- Duplexes are fine in any part of the city
- If you buy single family home and development code changes to allow more density could lead to exodus
- Young homeowner wants more diverse neighborhoods but not very tall buildings that block sun/change neighborhood character
 - Concerned about allowed designs
- There is a difference in housing you occupy over a lifetime
 - Young = apartments, then eventually you buy homes. You don't go back and add more density/homes of different styles just because you like the neighborhood feel
- Centers - not just about more apartments, we also have to consider transit access
- Mixed use buildings okay near hubs/corridors

RED #2 – Mary Herberling and Kim T.

- Transit lines could be moved in the future
- ADUs – think about specific lot
 - Setbacks?
 - Too close to neighbors
- Cottage clusters – need large lots
- Types of housing depends on lot sizes
- Fees for ADUs – too high to develop
- Apartments in neighborhoods do not fit

- ADUs are okay in neighborhoods
- Empty houses in neighborhoods
- Want to know neighbors
- Livability – look before density
 - Could get livability through NDAs
 - Need parking
 - Livability – think of about all factors/ development
- ADU – keep 1 parking spot per ADU
 - Depends on where you are, close to transit, may not need parking
- People still have cars, even if they take transit
- Require people close to transit to get bus passes
- Oak St. Mall should be mixed use
 - Senior housing on top
- Mixed use – hard to see in residential
 - Along transit lines is okay
 - 32nd Ave!
- Need to do infrastructure improvements, sidewalks, streets to accommodate traffic/pedestrians
- Slow traffic in neighborhoods
- Duplex or triplex
 - Need to be designed to be attractive/design review?
 - Fit character of neighborhood
 - Current code – think they will happen
 - Focus ideas on other housing types
- Need to fit neighborhood character – all types
- Want to move renters to be homeowners
 - Townhomes/row houses may be a good option
 - Want to reduce house flipping
- Condos – good lower price option
- Rent increases faster than homes
 - Need to think about renters
- Need city to facilitate ways to encourage “intentional communities”
 - Senior housing, etc.
- New development cannot pay for new infrastructure
- Tax breaks for increased density goes to homeowners/property owners vs. the developers
- Low income housing as community places (cottage clusters)
 - For homeownership vs. just renting

GREEN #1 – Bridger Wineman

- Immediate need for shelters and temporary housing in the short-term
- Avoid stigma for low-income housing like cottage clusters
- Apartments need outdoor spaces
- Plexes blend in well with single-family housing
- Equitable housing is needed in low-income areas
 - Plexes can save money for services
- Clean and develop brownfields
- Mixed use near commercial uses
 - Albertsons
- Access to schools with mixed income neighborhood
- Downtown is maxed-out
 - Needs more parking
- Connect social infrastructure for families and transportation along with cottage clusters
- Downtown – mixed income
- Incentivize development of affordable housing
- Support renter protections
- Incentivize (smaller) landlords to provide below-market rentals
- Provide incentives funded through hospitality tax
- Mixed-use can cause displacement
- More apartments are needed in the hubs adjacent to neighborhoods with green space
- Work with Trimet to coordinate transit and housing
- More apartments are need but avoid stigma
 - Perhaps with plexes
- Cottage clusters near transportation, hubs, and open spaces
- Housing near Tacoma MAX station
- Rowhouses near transit
- Tiny houses and small ADUs
 - Allow in single-family – emergency shelter
- Plexes and rowhouses in hubs/corridors
- Build interest and ideas about tiny homes
- Cluster cottages with preschools – intergenerational
 - Intergeneration housing – in-house ADUs
 - Basement apartment
- **tiny homes and ADUs and pods
 - Overnight shelters = equity
- **apartments near services

GREEN #2 - Celestina

- Hubs and services need density to thrive
- Invisible density
- Compatibility is important
- **What about RVs and tiny homes?
 - Need to make these an option
- What about parking?
 - Tuck under
 - On-street okay for some development
- **Construction costs are high
 - Barriers
 - SDCs & frontage improvements
- Pre-existing non-conforming issues
 - Should be protected
 - ADUs and apartments
 - Simple way to legalize
- **Height & scale inform preferences
 - Form-based
 - Shadow and lights – conditional use
- Universal design
 - Age in place housing

GREEN #3 – Alma Flores

- Advantages/disadvantages
 - Apartments near thoroughfares isn't great, but provides access to other modes
- Mixed use– north end – MUTSA - transportation-oriented development, centers the same
- path to Tacoma station
 - higher density
- increase density along 32nd, including apartments
- increase density along corridors, hubs, and main street
- tall apartments on hubs and corridors (mixed feelings)
 - destroy life if all along orange areas
- ADUs in corridors/hubs and single-family areas
- Does rental housing impact the livability? Neighborhoods start to suffer
- Homeownership needs to be encouraged with programs
- Cottage clusters and mixed use in hubs and corridors
 - Cottage clusters spurs homeownership
 - Mixed use for modal development for amenities
- Want more ADUs in centers versus mixed use
- Dispersed options

- Cottage clusters, ADUs, 4-plexes, and courtyard apartments
- Mixed use between DO zones and hubs/corridors
- Hubs/corridors
 - Apartments, ADUs, rowhouses, cottage clusters, and mixed use
- Centers
 - Mixed use, ADUs, and apartments
- Townhomes
 - Yes with active uses behind (no parking)
- What about house boats?

GREEN #4

- Concern about congestion because of density
- Density should have access to grocery store
- How many rowhouses are allowed in a row?
- Infill versus new construction to make sure rate of change in neighborhood does not happen too quickly
- What situations would courtyard apartments fit into different zones (high density)?
- Cottage cluster best fits within existing single-family neighborhoods
- **scale of housing should fit into existing neighborhoods
 - Appropriation to neighborhood
 - **characterization on neighborhood
- Location to services is important (e.g. schools)
 - Higher density closer to hubs
- ** density option to build wealth, apartments
 - Cottages, townhomes
 - **ownership with density
- Limit short-term rentals
- Spread density to share density burden
- Homeownership, slow change/ gradual = livability
- SPREAD DENSITY
- Transportation impacts/transit
- DO – low – cluster, courtyard, plexes (4 and under), ADUs okay
- Hubs/corridors – med – rowhouses & townhomes okay
- Centers – high – apartments, mixed use okay
- Historic value of areas
 - Can negatively impact density
 - All need to play part and take some burden of density

BLUE #1

- Concerns about affordability
 - Even with new housing types, not guaranteed to be affordable
- Like the focus on transit corridors as it ties in with transportation costs as well
- Concerns that current zoning prohibits most of these things
- Brought up “intentional communities” model, such as Bridge Meadows
- Agreed that ADUs are important source in all neighborhoods but need to address affordability
- Interest in allowing housing at Milwaukie Marketplace, given its difficulty filling retail space
- Concerns about increasing zoned capacity too much, too quickly
- Like concept of focused/clustered density (4-plex, etc.) in exchange for maintaining or increasing tree canopy
- How do we allow for more affordable housing developments throughout the city?
 - General support for allowing more housing types if tied to affordability
- See centers as natural area to address affordability, given access to transit
- Think courtyard apartments fit into DOs
 - Communal spaces increase livability
- Concerns about impacts of SDCs and other costs on affordability
- On city-owned land, need to ensure more affordable housing units
- Support increased density along hubs/corridors in exchange for more amenities (livability)
- Capitalize on/expand SAFF program; increased walkability → better sustainability
- Support mixed use in hubs
- Support increased density as an incentive to providing more affordable units
- Manufactured homes as affordable option

BLUE #2

- Center
 - Apartments, mixed use allowed today
 - Appropriate for higher density
 - Rowhouses appropriate
- Neighborhoods
 - Cottage cluster
 - Good concept
 - Provides variety and diversity
 - Both rental and homeownership options
 - Idea for putting CCs near schools

- Walking options
 - Some interest in courtyard apartments
- Hubs/corridors
 - 2.5 story mixed use in hubs
 - Apartments and mixed use where well serviced
 - By transit/services (e.g. Wichita)
- Advantages
 - Purposeful culture/sense of place not homogenous
 - Lack of crime – livable
 - Strong neighborhood relationships
 - Commitment to neighborhood through ownership option
 - Gardens and soils
 - Neighborhood parks
 - Promotes local/neighborhood small businesses
 - Affordability of smaller homes and access to transit
- Disadvantages
 - Parking and limited supply concern
 - Be close to transit
- Affordability
 - Capacity of schools and systems
- Who benefits
 - Existing and new residents
 - More revenue for small businesses
 - Need some density to support neighborhood coffeeshops, etc
- Who doesn't
 - Next door neighbors
 - Concern about fit and design
 - Low income folks may not benefit

YELLOW #1 – Janel Hull

- Considerations
 - Parking/transit options need to be considered when putting in new, denser housing types
 - Affordability is a huge consideration
 - Don't want to get taxed out of neighborhood
- Hubs/corridors
 - ADUs – currently expensive to do
 - Mixed use
 - Cottage clusters
 - Like the idea of ADUs! Could go anywhere
 - ADUs might not work downtown
- Centers

- Mixed use
- Apartments
- Would work well near Max
- ADUs
- Dispersed Options
 - Apartments – could work along railroad
 - Cottage clusters
 - ADUs
 - Triplexes
- Considerations
 - Neighbors may be affected by ADUs
- Who benefits from this?
 - People looking for homes
 - More money for property from rental unit
 - Multi-units benefit low income people – rental income
 - Smaller houses/apartments more accessible for low income people
 - Code changes could allow 2-story garages to convert to living quarters
- Who doesn't benefit?
 - Taxpayers, more taxes for more services
 - More traffic
 - Lose privacy
 - More pot holes
 - More crime?
- Would you have problems with these units in your neighborhood?
 - Lose privacy
 - “no problem for me”
 - Can be a challenge if you don't like your neighborhoods
 - Would love more retail shops to keep businesses in Milwaukie
- Would love more dispersed retail throughout Milwaukie
- Convert strip malls into mixed use retail
- Develop housing around current parking
- 2 takeaways?
 - 2-story garage
 - Easy code change without parking issues or disturbing neighbors
 - social aspect is important
 - like the neighborhood hubs, turn strip malls into multi-use
 - feels wasteful to have 1-story retail
 - affordability is important
 - don't want folks priced out, want great grandkids to be able to buy homes

SPANISH

- Ubicar viviendas de alta densidad en los centros de los vecindarios (hubs)
- Centros
 - Mixed-use apartments, not higher than 5-floors, ADUs, courtyard apartments
- Ventajas – reducción del tráfico
- Opción económica para familias
- Acceso a las vías públicas, escuelas
- Promover la economía de empresas en tus lugares
- Desventajas
 - Aumento del tráfico
 - Menos estacionamiento, podría ser que
 - El costo de las viviendas aumente
 - Pérdida de espacios verdes, aumento de la inseguridad
- Corredores viales
 - Aceptación de todo tipo de vivienda

SPANISH (translated by Valeria)

- Locating high-density housing units in neighborhood centers
- Centers
 - Mixed-use apartments, not higher than 5-floors, ADUs, courtyard apartments
- Advantages
 - traffic reduction
 - Economic option for families
 - Access to public roads, schools
 - Promote the small business economy of companies and home businesses
- Disadvantages
 - Increase in traffic
 - Less parking, It can potentially increase the cost of housing
 - Loss of green spaces, increased insecurity
- Hubs/corridors
 - Acceptance of all types of housing



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE: HOUSING CHAPTER TOWN HALL NOTES

Thursday April 18, 2019

Waldorf School

6-8 p.m.

Housing Town Hall Comment Form

ADVANTAGES:

1. Affordability, more community, more sustainability, vibrancy, more diversity.
Increased density can help support more business hubs.
2. Denser housing near MAX stops, "gentle density" infill in all areas
3. Equity allows balancing of freedoms, opportunity and access that is not available without supportive systems due to inherent inequalities in our systems. But when we provide equity for others we open opportunities for ourselves and greater access to participation in the growth of Milwaukie.
4. Listening to other perspectives
5. Higher density housing is needed
6. More affordable housing, increase city revenue, community
7. Reasonable goals overall. Need to apply common sense on a case by case basis.
8. Loved the group discussion around planning and mostly policy to allow for shelter (immediate), pods and alternative shelter
9. Higher density would encourage more businesses and recreational areas to walk/bike to, rather than drive to. More options of types of housing would encourage different types and ages of people to move here
10. Growth in general, can cause increased ownership, makes community more livable
11. Keep housing in areas that don't displace kids in schools. ADU's and intergenerational housing helps both families and seniors
12. It helps the area look more diverse
13. It should help more of people who are in need.
14. I would like to be able to build a duplex in my backyard instead of a single-family dwelling. I could get a house of universal design to age in = no steps and I could rent out the other side for an affordable rent. I could rent my 2-story house to a young family. Three families could live here where now there is only one.



15. Respect and non-discriminated; control inflation
16. City will be more diverse for 1st time buyers and development programs
17. By developing walkable commercial areas and increasing the density around them we can support community connection
18. Increased density through varied types of housing; cottage cluster, ADU, courtyard apts. with mixed use in traffic corridors
19. Increased density, but not too much, maintains neighborhood “feeling,” promotes smaller local businesses, no neighborhood is on an “island” promotes specific (non-homogenized) culture
20. Concerned there aren’t more discussions around how these zoning conversations directly affect shelter and emergency shelter, current zoning is a huge barrier
21. Affordability, accessibility
22. Attract diverse population, increase tax base, more flexible housing options, low housing costs overall
23. More affordable housing, denser housing often requires fewer resources
24. As long as growth is equitable and adds value such as the possibility of ownership (cottage clusters, townhouses, condos) throughout the city and all neighborhoods, support more businesses moving into the city, support more developments of parks and green spaces, support more sustainable development
25. Affordability thru increased density, livability from additional sources from increased density, diversity of communities and opinions rather than a silo of similar thinking/beliefs, community pride
26. Safe places that families can share. Respect green spaces. Parking inside of the apartment but that these apartments also include places for kids to play in so they don’t have to play on the streets or on parking lots. Along all of this, the apartments have to be affordable. The City will be more diverse and inclusive.

DISADVANTAGES:

1. Possible lack of parking. If not done right, certain neighbors could be frustrated
2. Preserves lots of land as primarily single family
3. Equity costs others money and may create inconveniences they may not be willing to readily support – but the city needs to set the tone and standard for how this community will collectively grow



4. Too hard to generalize by color code. Biased presentations.
5. Generalizing the area by color code. Example: If you intentionally purchased in a suburb you would like to see it remain.
6. Parking, traffic, crime
7. Will change the character of Milwaukie's neighborhoods. May drive down property value for home owners.
8. Would have loved more guidance on coding limitations and changes to advocate for moving forward to allow for immediate shelter, pods, and tiny homes
9. Can drive home prices down, going to have certain neighbors lose character potentially
10. Landlords need incentives to offer existing housing at affordable pricing, not grouping low income people in one area, dispersing amongst apartments and schools
11. It sounds as if the plan is geared towards gentrification of the area
12. It's people who don't drive that it hurts more
13. Lack of adequate parking space not just for cars but for boats and trailers. Too many people, too much noise, too many barking dogs. You increase number of people you can get a lot more social problems.
14. Too slow due to policy and planning which don't help immediate needs
15. High cost, traffic, reduce green areas
16. More people means more noise and likely more congestion
17. Parking is always a concern
18. Less large apartments limits growth, may be less likely for government to invest in public transit/sidewalks
19. For faith communities that want to create innovative structures to shelter unhoused residents
20. Parking, Quality of dwellings may decrease, leading to poor living conditions
21. Need to increase provision of services (police, fire, etc.), potential parking issues, tall structures next to short ones, blocking views, potential for crime
22. Possibly less parking, super dense housing can result in a severe lack of pervious surfaces and green spaces if not planned well



23. Concerned about more rentals becoming short term rentals or air bnb and not serving purpose of housing long term, concerned other cities not doing this and creating growth that is more affordable throughout the region, concentration of density in areas will create transportation issues – should be spread out – need to consider infrastructure
24. I wouldn't call it a disadvantage but resistance to change and loss of neighborhoods to feel, resistance to loss of parking from increased density (similar to previous), increased density can lead to higher prices

WHO BENEFITS:

1. Businesses, lower income people, those who like close communities. Some housing types don't support elderly or handicapped people
2. Condo owners, current homeowners, car drivers, people who don't like apartments
3. Everyone, whether they realize it or not. Power, influence and finances being the loudest voice in the room drowns out the collective good. The collective good leads to greater innovation and growth.
4. Everyone
5. Persons in need of lower cost housing
6. Existing and new Milwaukie residents, vendors, city of Milwaukie
7. Developers, apartment owners, buyers & renters
8. Homeowners may enjoy an outsized benefit vs. those looking to rent
9. People who can't currently move here may be able to, the city
10. Land and property owner
11. The rich
12. More housing for middle income folks
13. Tenants (renters)
14. People who own homes and people who could buy in the "missing middle"
15. Milwaukie as a whole will benefit with affordable housing
16. Families, the environment
17. Everyone! Groups have the money and energy to provide these shelters, just need the red tape removed
18. Low income, people of color, folks without stable housing, homeowners
19. Homeowners mostly, local businesses



20. Hopefully lower income folks, apartments built by big developers may mostly benefit the wealthy owners
21. Everyone should benefit from housing that fits into all neighborhoods, younger people will be able to afford homes and build equity and the future of the city and schools
22. Everyone, particularly vulnerable communities and elders
23. In general, the whole community

WHO DOESN'T BENEFIT:

1. People who like living in country or prefer being isolated
2. Those in control of these systems and structures previously who don't deem equity of value to them
3. People (maybe) who aren't here
4. Original home owners
5. Folks living next to construction, longtime residents
6. Current homeowners
7. Materials shown
8. Materials shown didn't address fixing the immediate need for housing the 1000 homeless people, need to address EQUITY of our most vulnerable people's immediate need
9. Renters are still at risk of being priced out
10. Some homeowners may not like what happens
11. The poor
12. Seniors cannot always do well in multiple story houses. People with disabilities cannot do steps and are some of the lowest income
13. Businesses
14. Huge developers
15. Selfish capitalists
16. Homeless persons, environmental impact, wildlife corridors, urban boundary (is there one?)
17. Houseless at risk of houselessness
18. Developers and homeowners looking for large equity gains



ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

1. Thanks for hosting this event. I appreciate the opportunity to give my ideas and feedback
2. We need to make it more feasible (financially, logistically) for homeowners to incorporate affordable options like ADUs and tiny houses/mobile dwellings. Dense housing is important, but the focus needs to be kept on affordability, and not just enriching wealthy developers. Managing impervious surfaces will also be important – incorporating green roofs, bioswales, etc. in plans for new construction, especially in apartments that otherwise lack green areas. This will also help limit the urban heat island effect.
3. Please consider either changing codes around mobile homes/tiny homes/homes on wheels in Milwaukie or turning a blind eye on these things. If we are concerned about affordability and accessibility then these need to be part of the plan. Enforcing this policy only chases people out and creates more homelessness. If the City of Milwaukie is concerned about these housing issues and wanting to do something about it – why then are they acting in the opposite manner and enforcing 30 days limits on homes of wheels and ADU conversions?
4. Thank you for the opportunity to share our thoughts with the City and our neighbors. Please don't bring homeless shelters to Milwaukie.
5. Thanks for listening!
6. Very good plans and points on page 2-5. Please have website to give extra comments later.
7. Light rail needs to have stops that are in neighborhoods. There should be a stop at the new library. Why is the only stop at the South end of town? Who can walk that far in the rain? It forces people to use cars to get to the light rail. There is a grocery store out in East Portland that has 3 stories of apartments above it. It is a good use of space and gives people an easy place to shop. Developers should have to build apartments with 3 bedrooms and a certain number in a project should have affordable rent. Development fees should be related to housing and if they are not they should be better explained. The cost of housing is part of supply meeting demand so the



- more different types of housing that are built could level out the cost.
Parking could be put under the house. Basement parking.
8. Provide incentives for housing to be built that focuses on the needs of families and single parents. BUILD behind Milwaukie Marketplace (centrally located to most schools, walking distance from shopping, heavy transit and utilities, make it look good to drive more business in the marketplace), veteran tiny homes in industrial area-access to jobs and transportation, ADUs allow intergenerational living – helps seniors and families, affordability for mortgage payers and renters, utilizes existing space and property, host programs/properties for nonprofits or organizations to build specialty housing for low income and families
 9. What about houseboats? Beautiful river views that don't obstruct others' view of the river! Livability and walkability is a top priority for me. I walk my dog 3 times a day and love to have a comfortable place to walk. Sidewalks please! More gentle density means more dog friends at the park! Middle aged people are going to be living on multi-generational homes as baby boomers age and housing is unaffordable. ADUs and plexes will offer comfortable options for multi-generational family dwellings.
 10. Reconsider the city getting involved in subsidizing or building homes to get out of the trap of market demands, i.e. the market will never keep things affordable.
 11. This was a great event. Would have loved more direct info on current coding and areas for improvement.
 12. I believe housing should fit the existing area; for example, if apartments add another, don't throw apartments into the middle of established single house dwelling neighborhoods.
 13. I bought in my neighborhood because we want to live in suburbs. I don't want my single-family home neighborhood to change. We need more park and ride spots. I would use MAX more if I knew there was a place to park. We really need a grocery store back in Market place.
 14. Tree protection standards should be sufficient to address that concern. Housing types should be separate discussion. Think regionally, Portland will only keep growing transit accessible housing is very important.



15. For affordability, it would help to minimize development cost for those wanting to add an ADU or convert a single-family home to a multiplex. Also, don't raise property taxes a lot when adding an extra unit. Allow basement conversions and garage conversions or attic conversions.
16. Attendees to these events tend toward higher incomes. No income questions?
17. Any housing built on city land should be affordable housing
18. Transitional housing opportunity for the unhoused to renter employment and stable housing. Livability. Grow in proportion to services, preserving and protecting access to sunlight, treed common spaces. Opportunities for ownership, in many forms – condos, mobile homes, land trust model, all allow for opportunity at moderate cost/purchase. Rental models do not build tenant wealth.
19. Our group also “added” the tiny home option. We explored the use of tiny homes as transitional housing for homeless and we saw the need for more apartments in already dense areas. More diverse types of housing are needed. Preschools and daycares mixed with senior living homes and preschools/daycares mixed in with cottage apartments/homes.
20. Make it more affordable to add a second story to an existing detached garage for an ADU on our property. Change the code from the required 1.5 story height to allow a 2 story ADU on an existing garage. Change building requirements to allow a closer distance to build this garage ADU next to the property line.
21. Change the zoning along the light rail line in the downtown area that is not considered in the downtown district to high density 6 story mixed use and apartment building for moderate and low income renters and businesses on first floor
22. I am for letting residential areas develop more densely if this is what natural free markets trend. But this is not possible when the urban “growth” boundary and its transportation access are not grown with the population growth. Until we (the metro region) allow building out and not just up and infill, I cannot support more denser neighborhoods via a new comp plan. Some of my neighbors are minorities, and they are glad to be in single-



detached homes. They've achieved the America/world dream of home with yard ownership. Equity is not easily defined.

23. I feel that any city owned land that is intended for housing needs to include affordable units (affordable to people with incomes at or below 60% of AMI). I think the city should exempt affordable housing from property taxes and at least some SDCs
24. Why would we want to give developers a break? We still end up paying for parking if the developer does not.
25. Need more additional shelter
26. Coding info. wasn't shared. How will the city address this?

DRAFT



EQUITY

Expand housing options and reduce housing barriers for people of color and those with low incomes using these strategies.

	1 (DO NOT SUPPORT AT ALL)	2	3	4	5 (STRONGLY SUPPORT)
1. Expand the range of housing types allowed in all neighborhoods of the City by making it easier to build accessory dwelling units and duplexes in all low density residential zones.	0	5	2	5	26
2. Ensure that zoning and code requirements are not creating barriers that prevent vulnerable populations from finding housing in Milwaukie.	0	4	1	5	29
3. Focus resources aimed at ensuring that existing housing remains affordable and available to residents in all Milwaukie neighborhoods.	0	2	5	7	25
4. Expand the range of housing types allowed in all neighborhoods of the City by permitting triplexes, fourplexes, and cottage cluster development in all residential zones.	0	5	2	10	22
5. Encourage development of homes that can accommodate people of all ages and abilities through use of accessible design features.	0	1	5	8	25
6. Consider cultural differences and values when developing code requirements related to design.	1	1	7	5	25

SUSTAINABILITY

Promote environmental, economic, and socially sustainable practices associated with housing development and construction using these strategies.

1. Encourage or require new housing to preserve open spaces, trees, and natural areas.	0	2	4	10	23
2. Require or provide incentives for new housing or improvements to existing housing to include features that increase energy efficiency, reduce water usage, use sustainability produced materials, or other environmentally sustainable practices.	0	0	3	13	23
3. Encourage more housing located close to transit, shopping, other commercial services, parks, and schools to maximize access and use, reduce impacts of driving, and promote economic opportunities for local businesses.	0	0	2	8	29

AFFORDABILITY

Provide opportunities to develop housing that is affordable to people with a full range of incomes.

1. Explore ways to lower development costs, such as reducing parking standards for new development in close proximity to transit.	2	5	4	14	15
2. Allow for and encourage development of housing types that can be built and sold or rented at a lower cost, such as duplexes, triplexes, townhomes, cottage cluster housing, and apartments.	0	1	4	9	26
3. Make it easier for residential home owners to generate rental income or house family members by expanding opportunities for accessory dwelling units or duplex conversion	1	3	6	5	25
4. Provide a greater supply of housing to meet demand and suppress price and rent increases.	0	1	7	8	23

LIVABILITY

Enhance the ability of Milwaukee's neighborhoods to meet community members' economic, social, and cultural needs, and promote their health and well-being through the following strategies.

1. Encourage creation of denser development in centers, corridors, and neighborhood hubs to support community gathering places, commercial uses, and other amenities that give people opportunities to socialize, shop, and recreate together.	1	1	8	7	24
2. Regulate the size, shape, and/or position of new housing to ensure that it is similar in form to the housing in the surrounding neighborhood	2	5	5	15	13
3. Ensure that new housing development includes pedestrian connections that make it easier for people to walk to destinations such as parks, schools, and neighborhood gathering places.	0	1	0	11	28
4. Design new housing development so that units have access to light, air, and open space either on-site or in close proximity	1	0	4	12	23
TOTALS	8	37	69	152	404