

RCPNA Residential Infill Project Survey

1. This questionnaire is to be taken by residents and business owners located within the boundaries of Rose City Park Neighborhood. Those boundaries are NE Fremont St to the north, 1-84 (Interstate 84) to the south, NE 47th Ave. to the west, and roughly NE 65th to the east. Please check one of the following:

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
I am a resident of the Rose City Park neighborhood within the boundaries identified above	93.5%	86
I am an owner of a business located inside the boundaries of Rose City Park, as identified above.	0.0%	0
I am a resident of the Rose City Park neighborhood and own a business in the same neighborhood.	4.3%	4
I am not a resident of Rose City Park neighborhood nor do I own a business there.	2.2%	2
<i>answered question</i>		92
<i>skipped question</i>		0

2. The city's proposal for Residential Infill is applied as an Overlay on all of the Single Dwelling/Low Density Residential zones that are located within 1/4 mile of 'centers' and frequent transit corridors throughout the city, see Maps. This Overlay impacts almost all of Rose City Park since the centers include a new business center at NE 47th and Sandy and the boundary of the 60th Ave. Station Area (identified only in the 2045 Comp. Plan Map) as well as the Hollywood Town Center, and frequent transit streets NE 47th and Sandy Blvd. Check all that you think should apply.

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
I agree with the Residential Infill Overlay boundaries identified in the city's	10.2%	9
I disagree with the Residential Infill Overlay boundaries identified in the city's proposal	26.1%	23
Overlay. It should apply to all Single Dwelling/Low Density Residential zoned properties throughout the city, not just near centers and frequent transit corridors.	22.7%	20
I like some of the city's proposal but the Overlay impact area should be reduced.	20.5%	18
I like some of the city's proposal but the Overlay should apply only to 'centers' recognized by the current (1980) Comp. Plan (such as Hollywood Town Center and Gateway Regional Center) since the 2045 Comp. Plan has not yet been approved (acknowledged) by the State of Oregon, Department of Land Conservation and Development.	31.8%	28
I have no opinion about the proposed Residential Infill Overlay boundaries.	5.7%	5
None of the above	1.1%	1
Other (please specify)	9.1%	8
<i>answered question</i>		88
<i>skipped question</i>		4

3. Historically, Portland's Single Dwelling/Low Density Zones allowed greater number of housing units per property. Currently, the R5 zone allows one single dwelling units plus an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU), a smaller auxiliary unit, on an average 5,000 sq. ft. lot and duplexes on corners with an ADU added, totaling 3-units. Do you want to increase the number of allowed dwelling units in our neighborhood?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes, the current housing choices are too limited in our neighborhood	22.6%	19
No, there are plenty of housing choices including the allowed rental of rooms and shared living quarters	71.4%	60
I don't have an opinion	6.0%	5
Other (please specify)		12
<i>answered question</i>		84
<i>skipped question</i>		8

4. Our neighborhood contains approximately 2860 single family dwellings in the combined R5 and R2.5 zones. The population per household, as of 2010, contains 2.44 people per unit and is higher than the city average of 2.1 people per unit. The city proposes to increase the density per property in the R5 zone (See Page 3 of Summary) from 2 units to 3 units, a duplex with an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) or a single home with 2 ADUs. Corner lots now allow 3 units are proposed to allow 4 units, a triplex with an ADU. Which of the following adjustments to the city's existing code would you support?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
No change, I like the options that are allowed under the current zoning.	47.7%	41
Some change, I would like more flexibility. This could include the opportunity for a single dwelling to become a duplex (2 more equally sized units) instead of adding an ADU in the garage or in a separate structure out back.	27.9%	24
More change, I would like increased flexibility. This could include an additional internal and external ADU on an average lot (1 house with 2 smaller units = 3 units). But, only with written consent by the surrounding neighbors.	7.0%	6
Lots of change, I like the city's proposal	14.0%	12
None of the above	3.5%	3
Other (please specify)		12
<i>answered question</i>		86
<i>skipped question</i>		6

5. The City Proposal allows the increased density of 1-unit for each affordable unit, accessible unit or internally converting an existing house (to a house with an internal Accessory Dwelling Unit, a duplex or, on the corner, a duplex with an internal ADU, a triplex, or triplex with an internal ADU). This may result in a typical lot containing up to 5 units and corner lots containing up to 9 units. Do you support a unit increase incentive for these uses? Please check all that apply

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
----------------	------------------	----------------

No, I do not support a unit increase incentive.	41.9%	36
No, keep the zoning the way it is. I support an incentive for these housing options but not through increased density.	22.1%	19
Yes. I like the City proposed incentive of 1-unit for all the housing types identified above.	9.3%	8
Somewhat. I like the City proposed incentive of 1- unit for each affordable unit or accessible unit. But, with a maximum of 3 units for a typical lot.	14.0%	12
Somewhat. I like the idea of a City proposed incentive for each affordable unit or accessible unit. But, I do not want an increase in density beyond the now permitted single dwelling unit with an Accessory Dwelling unit (2 dwelling units) per typical lot.	5.8%	5
Somewhat. I like the City proposed incentive of 1-unit for internal conversions of an existing house to allow an internal Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU). That way there can be an existing house with an ADU in the basement and an ADU as an attached structure in the back, totaling 3 units max on a typical lot.	10.5%	9
duplex instead of adding a smaller unit such as an Accessory Dwelling Unit Code, limited to 800 square feet of living area. But, no more than 2 dwelling units per typical lot.	15.1%	13
None of the above.	0.0%	0
Other (please specify)		7
<i>answered question</i>		86
<i>skipped question</i>		6

6. In our neighborhood the majority of homes on property zoned R2.5 (2,500 square foot min. lot size) sit on 2 lots, averaging a total of 5,000 sq. ft., and are located near major corridors. The internal or external Accessory Dwelling Unit(ADU) addition to an existing home in the R2.5 zone is currently allowed. The city proposes a 1 dwelling unit minimum for every 2,500 square feet of property area in the R2.5 zone. This minimum density requirement may impact these properties by encouraging an internal or external remodel with the addition of an Accessory Dwelling Unit (see page 4 of Summary) or a structural replacement with 2 town-homes(Attached) or skinny houses. It also may restrict the rebuilding of the single dwelling on 2-lots if the existing structure becomes damaged beyond repair. Do you support the 1 dwelling unit minimum for every 2,500 square foot property in the R2.5 zone?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes, I support the city's proposal	14.5%	12
No, I do not support the city's proposal	72.3%	60
I don't know	13.3%	11
None of the above	0.0%	0
Other (please specify)		7
<i>answered question</i>		83
<i>skipped question</i>		9

7. Rose City Park contains historically narrow lots in two areas in our R5 zone (5,000 square feet per lot), see the red highlights on the NE Portland Residential Infill Map. In most cases, one house sits on two of these historic narrow lots, totaling approximately 5,000 square feet of area. Currently, the city allows houses to be developed on all historic narrow lots. The city proposal would support allowing new houses on each narrow lot within the mapped area and but not on narrow lots outside the mapped area. If the existing home on these mapped narrow lots were removed/ demolished the city proposes to require new units to be attached (town home) with a common lot-line or allow tandem houses, flag lots, if the existing house is retained. See page 4 of Summary. Similar development pressures will likely apply to these historic narrow lot properties as they will for the R2.5 properties, discussed above. Select one of the options below regarding proposed changes to the historically narrow lots.

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
No change, I like the city zoning code the way it is.	49.4%	41
I support the changes to the historically narrow lots in the R5 zone as identified above in the City's Proposal.	12.0%	10
I support the changes to the historically narrow lots in the R5 zone as identified above in the City's Proposal. But, it should apply to all of these types of lots throughout the city, not just in the mapped areas	26.5%	22
I have no opinion on historically narrow lots.	8.4%	7
None of the above	3.6%	3
Other (please specify)		7
<i>answered question</i>		83
<i>skipped question</i>		9

8. The city proposes parking changes for new and historically narrow lot development. No off-street parking will be required for detached houses on narrow lots. Front-loading garages for detached houses on narrow lots would be prohibited, see page 4 of Summary. Retain use of alley access or common driveways for parking in the rear of property. For attached housing on narrow lots, front loaded garages would be allowed when tucked-under the first floor and the driveways are combined. Where no off-street parking is provided it will require the residents of these units to use on-street parking for all their vehicles. A city sponsored parking study shows that 72% of all renters own at least one vehicle. Please check all that apply.

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
I support the city's proposal for not requiring off-street parking or front-loaded garages for all detached houses on narrow lots.	15.5%	13
I oppose the city's proposal for not requiring off-street parking or front-loaded garages for all detached houses on narrow lots	64.3%	54
I support the city's proposal for attached housing on narrow lots to be allowed front loaded garages when tucked-under the first floor and the driveways are combined.	31.0%	26
I oppose the city's proposal for attached housing on narrow lots to be allowed front loaded garages when tucked-under the first floor and the driveways are combined.	8.3%	7

I have no opinion on parking for narrow lots.	3.6%	3
None of the above	2.4%	2
Other (please specify)		9
<i>answered question</i>		84
<i>skipped question</i>		8

9. The city's Infill proposal addresses scale of housing to limit the construction of new large houses out of scale to the surrounding houses. The proposal is to limit the size of houses while maintaining flexibility in form. There are 3 elements: size, height and setback, see page 2 of the Summary. Proposal is to size the house based on the square foot of the lot area. Currently, the code allows up to 6,750 square foot house on a typical R5/ 5,000 square foot lot. In 2013 the average sized house in the R5 zone was 4,461 square feet. The proposal would reduce the allowed house size for a typical R5 zoned lot to 2,500 square ft. of livable dwelling unit space. This measurement excludes basements, non-habitable attics and detached structures from size limits. Likewise, a 2,500 sq. ft. lot would limit a habitable structure to 1,250 sq. ft. of space with the same exceptions. Do you support this element of the city's proposal?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes, I support limiting the size of the residential houses to being proportional to the lot size.	77.9%	67
No, I do not support limiting residential house sizes.	11.6%	10
I don't know	3.5%	3
Other (please specify)	7.0%	6
<i>answered question</i>		86
<i>skipped question</i>		6

10. The proposed building height would be reduced for all impacted properties in the Single Dwelling/ Low Density Zones through changing the measuring method. The proposal would change height measurements from starting at the high point of the grade to the low point of the grade within 5-feet of the structure's foundation while keeping the top of the measurement the same, at the mid-point of a sloped roof line, see page 2 of the Summary. Flat-roofed houses would be reduced by 5-feet in height to lessen undesirable shading. Results: R5 zone - Peaked-roof height limit measurement of 30 feet remains the same, but measured from the lowest grade at the foundation not the highest. R5 zone - Flat-roof height limit measurement changed to 25 feet and now measured from the lowest grade at the foundation not the highest. R2.5 zone - Peaked-roof height limit measurement of 35 feet remains the same, but measured from the lowest grade at the foundation not the highest. R2.5 zone - Flat-roof height limit measurement changed to 30 feet and now measured from the lowest grade at the foundation not the highest. Do you support this element of the city proposal?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes, I support this height measurement change for all impacted Low Density Residential Zoned properties.	64.7%	55
No, I do not support this height measurement change.	20.0%	17
I have no opinion about the proposed height limit change.	12.9%	11

None of the above	2.4%	2
Other (please specify)		7
<i>answered question</i>		85
<i>skipped question</i>		7

11. The city proposes front setbacks for new homes consistent with setbacks on existing and immediately adjacent homes, see page 2 of Summary. In both the R2.5 and R5 zones increase the minimum front setback from 10 feet to 15 feet. Exceptions would apply for matching the front setbacks on existing, immediately adjacent homes. The existing side and rear set backs, which is typically 5 feet, would remain the same. Retains current code's building coverage limits of 15% for 5,000-20,000 square foot lots and 37.5-50% coverage on lots less than 5,000 square feet. Do you support these proposed set back changes?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes, I support the city proposed front setbacks.	66.3%	57
No, I do not support the city proposed front setbacks	12.8%	11
I have no opinion on the front setbacks.	19.8%	17
None of the above	1.2%	1
Other (please specify)		5
<i>answered question</i>		86
<i>skipped question</i>		6

12. The city proposed Residential Infill Proposal is scheduled for City Council hearing this fall for concept approval of Draft Proposals, see page 1 of Summary. This process is proposed to by-pass the Planning and Sustainability Commission to enable the current Mayor to review these documents. The development of the Draft Code is scheduled to follow next year, 2017. The June 15th to August 15th public comment period was established with this schedule in mind. How would you like to proceed with the Residential Infill proposal? Check all that apply.

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
I support the public review process and timeline proposed by the city.	12.9%	11
I do not support the public review process and timeline proposed by the city.	22.4%	19
I support a much broader discussion with our neighborhoods on this issue throughout the fall of 2016.	62.4%	53
I want to understand the proposal better in the way it may impact public facilities such as parks and sanitary sewer.	54.1%	46
I want to better understand the impact of the Infill Proposal on neighborhood livability, home ownership, and safety.	61.2%	52
I support stopping this proposal in its tracks and taking the time needed for public education and integration of public comments.	47.1%	40
I have concerns about how the addition of this number of new dwelling units will impact on-street parking and air quality.	60.0%	51
I have no comment on the proposed process	2.4%	2
Other (please specify)		8
<i>answered question</i>		85

13. This concludes our questionnaire. The results from this questionnaire are to be presented to the RCPNA Board at their Aug. 2nd meeting from 7:00-9:00 pm at the German

Answer Options	Response Count
	21
<i>answered question</i>	21
<i>skipped question</i>	71