

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

Members Present

Albert Chen, Ben Rousseau, Bryce Magorian, Everett Wild, Liz Start, Kim Travis, Matthew Bibeau, Rebecca Hayes, Sara Busickio, Stacy Johnson, Stephan Lashbrook

Members Not Able to Attend

Celestina DiMauro, Daniel Eisenbeis, Howie Oakes

City of Milwaukie

Mark Gamba, Mayor; Lisa Batey, City Councilor
David Levitan, Mary Heberling, and Tay Stone; Planning Department
Alma Flores, Community Development Director
Joseph Edge – Planning Commissioner

Angelo Planning

Matt Hastie

Conversation and questions/answers are summarized by agenda item below. Raw notes are attached as an appendix to this summary (Appendix A, respectively).

WELCOME – OPENING REMARKS

- Mayor Gamba – Welcomed everyone here.
- Matt Hastie – Provided an overview of the agenda.

APRIL 18 TOWN HALL: WHAT WE HEARD

- **Everett Wild** – Noticed on the survey at the town hall and didn't ask if they were a renter or an owner. Might be a good question to ask for future surveys.
- **Mayor Gamba** – noticed at the town hall that people were nodding their heads to garden apartments, but then would say later they didn't want apartments.
 - **Matt Hastie** – Probably due to the usual scale of garden apartments, which are more single, two-story scale and look/feel more like single family housing.
- **Matthew Bibeau** – Did we find out what percentage of people were renters versus housing?
 - **Matt** – No we failed to ask that question at the town hall.
- **Lisa Batey** – Did find the report out was more positive tone than what I was hearing at all of the tables. For example, I think only one table in the report out mentioned parking, but I heard it a lot of at the table discussions.

- **Bryce Magorian**– My table was more concerned about the regulatory barriers. For example, one person had to convert a triplex to a duplex due to housing code regulations. They also talked a lot about housing on wheels.
- **Everett Wild**– My table talked more about tiny homes and ADUs.
- **Albert Chen**– Wish I had asked more about what housing solutions they had. Try to get them to the point about more housing. One person wasn't excited about denser housing because traffic is already bad. Some had ideas about using the borders of the zones as more of the denser housing.
- **Denny Egner**– Our table was very into the cottage cluster housing ideas. Lots of support for ADUs as well. Wanted more increased intensity of housing where transit was located.
 - **Lisa** – I also heard a lot of tables that liked the cottage cluster housing concept.
- **Matt** – Our table was more about scale of housing and not wanting things to change too much. More comments around these areas are not always equal for all development.
- **Rebecca Hayes**– Our table definitively wanted apartments on transit lines and corridors.
 - **David** – I agree with that. They also were okay with treating all of the yellow areas and orange areas the same.
- **Stacy Johnson** – From the comments here at this meeting, I feel that we're judging their views at the town hall. I feel that we're supposed to be listening to these comments.
- **Stacy** – I don't think the City has much in terms of historic preservation and that does play into character and scale. We do have older homes here and without policies to preserve them. Some will probably be demolished to develop the lots.

Online Survey:

- **Matt** – Did notice that about 1/3 of the results from those who have currently responded didn't really want to see much change or were not supportive of different housing types.
- **Matt** – Higher priority: See Bridger's list.
- **Matthew B** – Think that even though the survey is not statistically significant, we can still try to understand the data. For example, there is a question where 1 was chosen, but 2 was not. Interesting to look at.
- **Bryce** – For future events, would we be able to put the video from the town hall at the beginning of the survey, give them some more context?
- **Sara Busickio** – How can we better communicate that people take this survey? I will be telling my NDA leader about this and share.
 - **David Levitan** – Yes, I think it would be good for you all to help share the survey. It works better from community members than city employees.

REVIEW AND COMMENT ON FIRST DRAFT OF PROPOSED HOUSING POLICIES

- See raw notes from Appendix A.

NEXT STEPS

- David outlined the schedule for future meetings:

Housing Block		Block 3	
Tuesday, May 21	Joint PC/CC Meeting		
Thursday, May 23	Final CPAC Housing Meeting (Review updated policies, make recommendation to PC/CC)		
		Monday, June 3	Block 3 Meeting #3 (Review draft policies)
Tuesday, June 11	Final PC Work Session on Housing Policies	Tuesday, June 11	PC Work Session on Block 3 Policies (as PC agenda permits)
Tuesday, June 18	Final CC Work Session		
		Monday, July 1 (likely to change)	Final Block 3 Meeting (Review updated policies, make recommendations to PC/CC)
Tuesday, July 16	CC “pins down” housing policies		
		Tuesday, July 23	Final PC work session on Block 3 policies
		Tuesday, August 6	CC “pins down” Block 3 policies

APPENDIX A: RAW NOTES FROM HOUSING POLICY DISCUSSION

ALL SECTIONS:

- Define the difference between attached (internal) and detached (external) ADUs
- How's and definitions of terms like "vulnerable populations", "cultural differences", etc.
- Performance guidelines, metrics
 - Need to define what they're supposed to be doing, make them measurable
 - Bake in a review procedure, not just this section, all
- Need to know how these different housing types are defined
- How can aesthetics cause gentrification?
- All policies need to be scored against the 4 lenses, be intentional and specify priorities
- Deed restrictions – many of the housing in Milwaukie have deed restrictions, they may block some of these housing efforts
- A review procedure should be baked into comprehensive plan to assess if policies are meeting goals. Be explicit about metrics.
 - Each policy should be scored based on how they achieve various goals related to the 4 lenses
- Where do age considerations fit in?
- Stephen: Say it as a regulatory statement if it is what we want
- Stephen: we say we're going to do certain things in these policies. I find myself asking "how" a lot
- Bryce: the policies need more specifics. What are the strategies attached to these types of policies?
- Joseph: we want to try and have the policies address all of the lens goals

EQUITY

Other:

- #1 - Change "all neighborhoods" to "residential neighborhoods"
- #3 - "reduce (or remove) barriers" versus "do not create barriers" – worried that may cause legal troubles in the future
- #1 - "Provide a range of housing types" Get rid of "provide"
 - Substitute with "allow"?
- #1 – add "such as" before "duplex" and "cottage cluster"
- #3 - "Vulnerable populations" – needs to be defined
 - Call out people of color
- #6 - "cultural differences and values" – what does that mean?
- #7 - "Employ strategies" – what strategies?
- #3 - Zoning and code requirements "should", change to "will"

- #4 - “Use city housing funding” – don’t think we want to tie housing to funding in this part of the plan, if do use, tie them to specific policies
- #1 – doesn’t seem like it reflects what we’ve heard from the survey so far
 - Will need to reassess once online survey is completed
- #2 – Not sure what it means, make it more clear, explain bulk and form
 - Add design considerations too
 - Lisa: generally supports form, but how do we regulate compatibility (4-plex and 5,000 sq ft. lot is different than on a 15,000 sq ft lot)
- Goal statement: what does “special attention paid” mean?
 - Maybe change to “focus on”
 - Do we also want to mention seniors?
 - Too specific? Make it inclusive, “all ages and abilities”
- #6 - “Cultural differences” – what are the differences? Larger homes for multi-generational housing, etc. Could we be more specific?
 - What does this look like in practice?
 - Is there a legal component/issue with this?
- #4 - “Use City housing funding and other resources” – not sure we can...it would be difficult to swing this with City Council without figuring out what funding tools looks like
 - Talking about leveraging funds and retaining existing housing
 - Mention more about how there could be a variety of ways, versus just using funds
 - Talk about what we’re trying to achieve
 - What are the tools we can use?
 - Take out “city housing funding and”
 - Would this fit better under affordability versus equity?
 - CET is only source of affordable housing funding and it cannot be used to ensure that existing housing remains affordable. It’s only for producing housing.
 - Mark: How can you help keep existing housing affordable?
- How do you do the compatibility piece? Large lots compared to small lots and what is allowed. For example, a fourplex allowed on a 5,000 sq ft lot versus a 10,000 sq ft lot.

Try to use affirmative language in all sections, not just equity

AFFORDABILITY

Missing:

- Brings maps showing frequent transit lines

Wrong Direction:

Other:

- #3 - “Close proximity to transit” – don’t think it’s going to be enough. Need to consider frequency (as defined by the regional transportation plan) ← or not since the RTP is pre-recession so it may not be reflective of current “high frequency” times (20 min. versus 15 min.)
 - This needs to be more prescriptive
- #2 – “lower cost” → define what this means. Lower cost for who?
- #7 - “Support tiny homes (including those on wheels)”
- #8 – reword
- #3 - Encourage, “enhancing transit and make it more frequent”
 - How can we enhance transit so that this is more feasible?
- Can we mention rent control in this section? What do we mean by “lower cost?”
 - “rent control” → state is doing this now, so cities don’t have that freedom anymore to set this for themselves
- Feel that all of the policy statements are vision statements versus policy, define what is close proximity to transit – ¼ mile? ½ mile?
 - Refer it to what the transportation agency defines frequent transit
- #6 - Manufactured homes – is there a way to talk about preserving mobile home parks?
 - Is this really an affordable option? (can pay for the home, but then have to lease the land it’s on)
 - Add “and preserve” before “manufactured homes”.
 - Bring in mobile home zoning like Portland? Just because there’s only one mobile home park in the city limits doesn’t mean we shouldn’t try and protect it
- #7 - Concerns about tiny homes and manufactured homes – would only support with a property maintenance code
 - Could there be a distinction that they are allowed on single properties? Versus concerns over clusters?
 - Need to show the distinction that tiny homes could have wheels or not.
 - Does this also include RVs?
 - Ben: Need to be clear about what the root of the concerns are
- #3 - “lower development costs to allow a reduction in parking standards...” – confusing, re-word

- #4 - “Provide opportunities for property owners to create income” – worried this goes against equity goals/policies, feel it would encourage more short-term rentals
 - Say for “long-term rental income” instead?
 - Change in process or reduced fees?
 - fix language – “allowing for simple and straightforward processes”
- Cost of construction – for example, tiny homes are not cheap
- #4 – add “(ADU)” after “accessory dwelling unit” for clarity
 - #4 – not actionable, but this is a very important policy based on community feedback
 - this could conflict with equity goal though since it could incentivize the development of short-term rentals, which are primarily owned by white higher-income homeowners who don’t need supplementary income. Policies need to center the right communities
 - Everett: want more specific policies – what is close proximity to transit? As written it seems too much like a vision statement
- need to be cognizant about classist bias when considering different types of housing
- Americans move too much to create a sense of community
- #5 – do we have partnerships? (alma responded but the response wasn’t documented)

SUSTAINABILITY

Missing:

- Live-work type housing
- Reuse of existing properties, adaptive reuse
- Incentivizing solar
- Charging stations for electric vehicles with new housing

Wrong Direction:

Other:

- Goal statement: we need to be intentional about what we mean by “economic sustainability” since it can be used nefariously
 - Should we just emphasize the environment since we address livability and equity elsewhere?
 - Liz: No, social sustainability is important
- Where are trees to be planted? Same site? Different site? Both?
- #1 - Add tree canopy goal
- Reuse of existing properties, adaptive reuse

- Would like stronger language on #1 to be more committal. In its current form, it doesn't seem to align with equity or affordability goals.
- Need to make sure they are addressing the equity and affordability goals and balanced together
- #1 Make sure wetlands are protected
 - Include floodplains
- Keep community informed on types of trees that will be planted in the public ROW. This is supposed to be happening, but there are instances where it hasn't
- #3 – encourage local business owners, to help create a sense of community
 - “resident-owned” local business owners? Milwaukie-owned?
 - Make it clear if this is to reduce driving for residents of Milwaukie AND business owners
 - Add “that employ Milwaukians” after “promote economic opportunities for local businesses.
- Goal statement: Should the whole section only be focused on environmental sustainability
- #2 – re-word, confusing (especially the preamble)
- #2 – include renewable energy production
- #3 – re-word, confusing, need to make it clearer about encouraging more walking versus driving
- #2 too many of the word “existing”
- “Marketing” – getting muddled
- Economics = economics of affordability – make sure it's defined this way
- Joseph: stronger language about preserving natural areas. Keep housing awa. How do we protect these areas when we also want equity and affordability?

LIVABILITY

Missing:

- Deed restrictions – many of the housing in Milwaukie have deed restrictions, they may block some of these housing efforts
- Encourage universal design of accessibility

Wrong Direction:

Other:

- #3 – include community gardens with light and air
- #2 include wording about bicycles, pedestrians, non-motorized vehicles – “active transportation”
- #3 – add community gardens after “open space”
- #6 – get rid of “as necessary”