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MEMORANDUM

TO: Interested Parties
FROM: Susan Feldman
RE: Corbett Terwilliger Lair Hill Policy Plan

The purpose of this memorandum is to clarify which portions of this plan were adopted by the City Council and therefore must be addressed when criteria require compliance with the Comprehensive Plan or adopted neighborhood or area plans. You must address the following:

A. Preserve the existing residential neighborhoods (Lair Hill, Corbett and Terwilliger) by maintaining the existing dwellings and stimulating compatible housing development and supporting services.

Recommended Actions

Rezone portions of the Corbett Neighborhood from AO and C2 to A2.5 exempting the half-block wide strip on the west side of Hood from Grover to Lane, and the 100' X 100' parcel on the northwest corner of Curry and Front Ave., as shown on Map 4.

Rezone the area bound by the Salem Freeway, Corbett Avenue, Hamilton and Bancroft Streets, from M2 to M3, as shown on Map 4.

Rezone a portion of the Corbett neighborhood, generally described as the southern portion of the block bounded by SW Corbett St., SW Lowell St., SW Kelly St., and SW Bancroft St., from C2 (S) to AO, as shown on Map 4 (amended) on this handout.

B. Restrict vehicular traffic through residential neighborhoods.
C. Control development and improvements in the Macadam Corridor.

Public hearings were held on November 16, 1977 and January 25, 1978.
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Though the Planning Area is treated as a whole for some purposes, such as traffic planning, for other purposes such as land use and zoning, the division into neighborhoods facilitates discussion of specific problems.
The Planning Process for the Corbett/Terwilliger/Lair Hill neighborhood began in the fall of 1972 in response to three major factors.

1. The effect of urban renewal in the South Auditorium Area and its potential impact on the future development of the Lair Hill and Corbett neighborhoods.

2. The construction of the Johns Landing development and its effect on the surrounding Terwilliger residential neighborhood.

3. The possible improvements to Macadam Avenue and their effect on business in the Macadam Corridor.

The three neighborhoods have historically had a common identity based on their geographic location, situated between the river and the foot of the West Hills. Common transportation factors, especially with Corbett Street connecting the three areas, and similar ethnic backgrounds have also bound the neighborhood together. The original residents were primarily of Italian and Jewish heritage.

Industry located along the river has always been an accepted neighbor of the residential areas west of Macadam. This factor made it relatively easy for industry and residents to form a coalition in response to threatened urban renewal changes which made both interests fear they would be squeezed out of the area altogether.

In the summer of 1973, a Planning Committee was formed which was representative of the various land-use interests within the neighborhoods: home owners, tenants, developers, business people, and absentee owners. This committee met bi-weekly for approximately 20 months throughout the development of the Corbett/Terwilliger/Lair Hill Plan. The Plan was presented to the Planning Commission in January, 1975. A resume of the full history, development and activities of this committee is in Appendix A.

Later that year, a staff report was submitted identifying specific actions recommended for adoption. The Planning Commission approved this staff report on December 6, 1976.

The staff now forwards to the City Council the policies and actions recommended by the Planning Commission and a summary of the planning goals for each of the three neighborhoods with the recommendation that the report be adopted.
Two major rezoning actions have occurred since 1959 -- the 1967 rezoning of a portion of the Terwilliger neighborhood, and the 1974 rezoning of a portion of the Macadam Corridor for the Johns Landing Development. Both are indicated by dot-tone in the map above.
II. PROFILE OF STUDY AREA NEIGHBORHOODS

A. CORBETT

Corbett is composed of older homes, many with historic significance, mostly built around 1910. Residents tend to be either retired or young and the neighborhood has achieved a reputation for its artistic colony.

The neighborhood is zoned primarily AU for high rise residential development. This zone does not reflect the actual use of the land, and there has been no high rise residential construction in the area since it was zoned AU in 1999. The land use breakdown by general categories is 47% residential, 12% commercial/office, 4% utility (PUE), 14% public, and 23% vacant.

By early 1974, the land was frequently held in large parcels by investors and populated by tenants. Sixty-five percent of all residential buildings were non-resident owned, and over half of the land was consolidated into parcels of over 10,000 sq. ft. The conditions of the existing residential structures became quite deteriorated since investors expected to develop the land. Yet the market demand for high rise apartments was insufficient to generate any construction since 1959 due to high interest rates and cost of land, and a rent structure that could not be realized. In addition public financing programs have been virtually non-existent. Until recently the most obvious land use trend was the conversion of old residences to office buildings or the construction of new buildings through conditional use permits. To date 14 such buildings have been converted or constructed.

Since the planning process has begun in the neighborhood, and especially since the Planning Commission actions of 1976, a transition in ownership patterns has emerged. Nine full blocks which had previously been held by investor owners have been sold to resident owner occupants. A tremendous market has developed for the houses in the area and intensive rehabilitation activity is currently observable in nearly every block in the neighborhood.

Out of a total of 170 residential structures in the designated area, 23% have been, or are currently in the process of being rehabilitated. Much of the labor is in the form of 'sweat equity' and low interest HCD loans, and many of the new owners are former tenants. These people have made an investment in the area based on confidence in the Planning Commission actions that the City will adopt land use controls which will protect the existing development and character of the Corbett neighborhood.
An outstanding problem in Corbett has been the traffic and circulation problems generated by the Ross Island Bridge approaches which route traffic through residential areas. The South Portland Transportation Study currently underway is addressing the specific problems associated with the west end approach ramps to the Ross Island Bridge.

The general goals identified by the Corbett neighborhood are:

1. Preserve the mixed balance of predominantly residential uses and businesses and offices now existing.

2. Retain the existing number of low and medium income housing units through tax incentives and government assistance as it becomes available.

3. Ensure pedestrian and bicycle accessibility to public transit and the Central Business District.

4. Encourage the retention and rehabilitation of existing dwellings.

5. Change the zoning in accordance with Planning Commission recommendations.

6. Adopt recommended capital improvements.
This map shows the conditions of housing structures and any rehabilitation activity which has occurred during the last three years. Ratings were made based on the estimated cost of needed rehabilitation. Excellent requires less than $500, Good requires up to $5,000, Fair between $5,000 - $10,000, and poor would require over $10,000 of repair work.
Lair Hill is now a small area which was once part of what is now the South Auditorium Urban Renewal Area. Urban renewal coupled with construction of the freeway and the Marquam Bridge not only eradicated over 400 acres of older residential land, but also isolated the neighborhood from the downtown, other neighborhoods and the river.

Residents developed bitter feelings over the destruction of their neighborhood. In 1970, faced with the prospect of extended urban renewal, they organized themselves and convinced the City to limit further urban renewal activity. There exists a strong spirit of wanting to preserve and improve what is left.

Lair Hill's visual strongpoint is the physical reminder of its past, its Victorian architecture. The craftsmanship that early residents brought with them from Europe is evident in the architectural details of these structures. In fact, structures remaining from the years 1876 to 1894 form perhaps the richest collection of Victorian residential architecture in Portland.

Yet the condition of these structures has become quite deteriorated. In 1959, the area was zoned A1 for medium density apartments. Since then the land has increasingly been held in large parcels by investors who hope to maximize their return by developing the land. The anticipated development has not been economically feasible for private development, and accordingly, maintenance to existing structures remains at a low level.

Many existing single family houses have been converted to multi-family use. Three acres of vacant land zoned A1 are consolidated in an area north of Lair Hill Park.

The age and condition of existing structures requires that improvements be made in the near future if they are to be saved and rehabilitated. This situation coupled with the unfavorable economic conditions of new construction, indicates that some means of public action must be sought. There has been virtually no new construction in the area since 1952, yet 31 residential structures, representing 2% of the total structures in the neighborhood have been demolished since 1960. In only one instance has another structure replaced any of the demolished structures.

In the summer of 1977 the City Council approved a Planning Commission recommendation to designate Lair Hill as an Historic Conservation District. Designation of the area as an historic conservation district is a zoning tool to help preserve the special character of the district, specifically geared to those features
which are unique in terms of urban design, architectural style and historic significance. Existing zoning does not change with historic designation, but restrictions governing new construction are added to insure that the new buildings will be in keeping with the general character of the district. In addition, demolition permits can be delayed pending actions to save historic structures. (For complete details see Historic Conservation Zoning, July 1977)

Goals identified by the Lair Hill Neighborhood are:

1. Encourage the maintenance of the present broad mix of people in terms of income, age, life styles, and race.

2. Preserve light and air by limiting building height to three stories.

3. Improve pedestrian and bicycle linkages with Corbett and the Central Business District.

4. Create sidewalks along both sides of Barbur Blvd. and pedestrian access across Barbur to Dunhway Park and the YMCA.

5. Encourage mixed use residential, including the possibility of public housing, and commercial uses in the area north of Lair Hill Park and along First Street between Hooker and Porter Streets.
The Terwilliger neighborhood is relatively stable compared to both Corbett and Lair Hill. It has a much higher percentage of resident home ownership (65% compared to 35% for Corbett and Lair Hill) and has experienced less difficulty with traffic impact. Its close proximity to the river makes it an attractive location and many of the residents have lived in the neighborhood their entire lives.

Terwilliger is the only neighborhood in the planning area which has had a net increase in residential units. Forty-three single family homes have been constructed and 176 multi-family units since 1960. The land is zoned primarily for single-family residential (RS) and in 1967, there was a rezoning of the portion of land between SW Virginia and SW Macadam from RS to A2.5. The intent of this rezoning was to "...act as an incentive to land owners to remove blighted dwellings, build new residential buildings and maintain existing dwellings which are presently in good condition." (Terwilliger Neighborhood Proposal, Portland City Planning Commission, 1967). Since this rezoning was enacted, virtually no new development has taken place; rezoning to a more intensive use has not promoted the intended new development, although one project is presently underway.

The last major rezoning occurred in March of 1974 when the zoning of a large strip of land between SW Macadam Ave. and the Willamette River was changed from M2 to M30. The purpose of this rezoning was to permit the construction of the Johns Landing commercial and housing development.

When faced with the prospect of the Johns Landing Development and its attendant changes, plus the need for some type of improvement to Macadam Avenue without creating a barrier to the river, the neighborhood decided that a plan was needed to coordinate these changes and requested planning assistance from the City.

The Goals identified by the Terwilliger Neighborhood are:

1. Retain and enhance Terwilliger as a primarily low (single-family duplex) density residential neighborhood; do not expand A2.5 zone.
2. Encourage construction of housing for the elderly.
3. Encourage retention of existing business interests to provide local employment and services.
4. Minimize the impact of Johns Landing development on the existing neighborhood.
5. Minimize the barrier that Macadam and its proposed improvements create between the neighborhood and the riverfront.

6. Provide safe pedestrian and vehicular access to Willamette Park.

7. Discourage through traffic in the neighborhood.

8. Discourage zone changes or conditional use permits in residentially zoned lane for parting lots or structures.

9. Retain Terwilliger School as a K-6 school.

10. For geologic stability and as a buffer to the Salem Freeway, keep land between Corbett and Freeway as undeveloped open space.

11. Adopt recommended Planning Commission traffic and circulation goals.
D. MACADAM CORRIDOR

The Macadam Corridor, zoned primarily M2 and M3, runs along the river the length of the planning area. The principal development factor in this area was the "insertion" of the Johns Landing Development, which provided the stimulus for additional non-industrial uses such as La Bien, a new tennis center and Willamette Park Improvements. Limited new industrial activity has taken place north of Johns Landing.

Currently there are 8.5 acres of M2 land in this corridor. Land owners will be considering alternatives for development of this land within the near future. Already the possibility of conversion of industrial land to commercial and higher density residential use has become a problem for industry. The Johns Landing Development is the first example. The land and improvement values are expected to increase in the near future which will in turn create pressure on industrial land to be converted to a use that will generate more income than its present use; current employment opportunities in the area might be lost. Already 3 major riverfront industries have left the area. It is expected that there will be zone change requests from M2 to M3 in the future. This is due to the fact that M3 and C2 are the only zones which accommodate a mixture of commercial and residential land uses. M3 is the zone which Johns Landing requested and received with the addition of a "D" (Design Review zone) designation.

The Macadam Corridor has been predominantly industrial since the 1950's with well established and generally well maintained businesses. South of Johns Landing there are some vacant and blighted structures and there is some problem with poor buffering between industrial and residential uses, but on the whole there has been a compatible relationship between the two.

However, a shift in land uses along the river can be expected. The Willamette Greenway Plan, which will be a component of the Comprehensive Plan, is currently studying this part of the river with the intent of proposing that the land along the river, south of the Marquam Bridge be eventually converted to residential, commercial and recreational use. (See Appendix F)

The goals and actions in this report which are directed at the Macadam Corridor should be viewed as part of an interim strategy.

Goals for the Macadam Corridor are:

1. Maintain a viable industrial community in the areas where sound businesses now exist, especially those along the river.
2. Retain heavy industry along the Willamette River north of Johns Landing to Gibbs Street.

3. Encourage redevelopment for commercial, recreational, and residential use when the land becomes available in the area bounded by the Marquam Bridge, Macadam Ave., Gibbs Street and the Willamette River.

4. Retain manufacturing between Willamette Park and Macadam along the east side of Macadam from Nebraska St. to the Taylors Ferry Rd. intersection.

5. General office buildings and some compatible manufacturing are preferred along the west side of Macadam.

6. Commercial "drive-in" facilities shall be discouraged in order to avoid the traditional "commercial strip" development.

7. Adopt recommended Planning Commission traffic and circulation policies.
III. RECOMMENDED POLICIES AND ADOPTED PLANNING COMMISSION ACTIONS

This section contains policies recommended by the Planning Commission for City Council adoption.

Each policy will be followed by a statement of intent, the reasons for the policy recommendation and recommended Council action(s) consistent with the policy and the reasons for the action(s).

A. POLICY:

PRESERVE THE EXISTING RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS (LAIR HILL, CORBETT AND TERWILLIGER) BY MAINTAINING THE EXISTING DWELLINGS AND STIMULATING COMPATIBLE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT AND SUPPORTING SERVICES.

1. Intent: The intent of this policy is to preserve and promote a low to moderate density residential neighborhood for those people willing to invest the time, effort and financial resources and to stimulate new development compatible with the existing neighborhoods.

2. Reasons:
   a. The existing housing requires immediate rehabilitation if it is to be preserved.
   b. The existing housing represents a needed resource that neither the public nor private development can afford to completely replace.
   c. Federally-underwritten rehabilitation loans at less than market rate interest are now available.
   d. Preservation and rehabilitation of the existing housing is needed before compatible private housing development can be built. Staff studies, Appendix B, HOUSING ANALYSIS, have shown that one of the primary factors inhibiting private development in the planning area is that the rents obtainable under current physical conditions are insufficient to justify new investment. Accordingly, if the physical environment of the neighborhoods is improved through private rehabilitation of the existing housing, new private housing development will be encouraged.
   e. If new private housing is eventually built, the development of commercial services required by the neighborhoods will be encouraged.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

1. REQUEST THE PORTLAND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION TO PREPARE AND PRESENT TO THE CITY COUNCIL THE RESOLUTIONS AND DOCUMENTATION NECESSARY TO DECLARE THE CORBETT, TERWILLIGER, AND MACADAM CORRIDOR NEIGHBORHOODS AN "URBAN RENEWAL AREA".

Reasons:
   a. Capture the remaining tax increment available in the John Landing and La Bien developments as outlined in Appendix E, Tax Increment Revenue Analysis, See Chapter IV, Urban Renewal and Tax Increment Financing, in A Plan for Corbett-Terwilliger and Lair Hill for a detailed explanation of the tax increment
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2. REZONE PORTIONS OF THE CORBETT NEIGHBORHOOD FROM AO AND C2 TO A2.5 EXEMPTING THE HALF-BLOCK WIDE STRIP ON THE WEST SIDE OF HOOD FROM GROVER TO LANE, AND THE 100' X 100' PARCEL ON THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF CURLY AND FRONT AVE. AS SHOWN ON MAP 4.

Reasons:

a. Preserve the existing dwellings by helping to remove the inflationary pressure on land values.

b. Preserve the existing dwellings as residential structures by stopping their conversion to offices.

c. Extend the utility of the existing combination sewerage system by controlling the amount of impervious surface. (See letter from Bureau of Sanitary Engineering, 23 Sept. 74, in Appendix F.)

d. Encourage the purchase and rehabilitation of existing single family homes.

e. Secure public investment in the present structures by discouraging their re-sale for conversion or redevelopment.

f. Make the zoning in the existing C2 zone compatible with the residential uses on the block bounded by Lowell, Corbett, Bancroft and Farbur Blvd.

g. Prevent any further commercial development on the block bounded by Lowell, Corbett, Bancroft and Farbur that would require curb cuts and impede traffic flow on Farbur Blvd.

h. The land exempted from the recommended rezoning is most suitable for commercial offices due to the high traffic volume and noise levels on Hood and Front Avenues.

i. The land along Hood and Front Avenues is recommended for exemption rather than rezoning to C2 in order to permit conditional use offices while excluding other uses permitted by C2 zoning.

j. This land is separated topographically from the adjacent residential areas.

3. REZONE THE AREA BOUNDED BY THE SALEM FREEWAY, CORBETT AVENUE, HAMILTON AND BANCROFT STREETS, FROM M2 TO M3, AS SHOWN ON MAP 4.

Reasons:

a. Encourage higher quality development in this area such as offices or housing by precluding the possibility of development of incompatible and industrial uses.

b. This land is geographically isolated from other M3 land along the river.

c. Access and circulation problems in the area make it unattractive for heavy industry.

d. The land is ill suited for industrial development due to steep slopes and small irregular land parcels.
This map illustrates the rezoning actions adopted by the Portland City Planning Commission at the hearing held on October 18, 1975.
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Planning Commission Actions
Adopted October 18, 1975
map 4
B. POLICY:

REDUCE VEHICULAR TRAFFIC THROUGH RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS.

1. Intent. Improve the environment of the residential neighborhoods by lessening noise, congestion and air pollution caused by traffic.

2. Reasons:
   a. Reinforce the public investment in neighborhood rehabilitation.
   b. Encourage higher quality development in the neighborhoods.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

1. REFER THE IMPROVEMENT OF MACADAM AVENUE TO THE ARTERIAL STREETS PROGRAM FOR INCLUSION AS A MT. HOOD TRANSFER PROJECT.

   Reasons:
   a. Improve safety and traffic flow on this important arterial at the periphery of the planning area.
   b. Reduce the use of Corbett Avenue, an important internal connector, as a commuter route.
   c. Improve neighborhood pedestrian and vehicular access to waterfront development and Willamette River.
   d. Improve the probability of obtaining funding for this project.

   Note: The funds for this action have already been appropriated and the project is being addressed by the South Portland Circulation Study.

2. SUPPORT THE REDESIGN OF THE ROSS ISLAND BRIDGE RAMPS AND REALIGNMENT OF RELATED STREETS.

   Reasons:
   a. Provide direct vehicular access to Portland's east side without having to pass through the Corbett neighborhood.
   b. Enable southbound traffic originating in the CBD to by-pass the planning area. (See Map 5c, Proposed Public Improvements Projects). 

   Note: The action is currently being addressed by the South Portland Circulation Study.

3. SUPPORT THE SELECTED STREET CLOSURES ILLUSTRATED ON MAP 5, PROPOSED PUBLIC IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS.

   Reasons:
   a. These closures will effectively limit points of entry at the periphery of the planning area but retain free vehicular movement within the area.
   b. Facilitate funding of these projects through the Capital Improvement Program.
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C. POLICY:

CONTROL DEVELOPMENT AND IMPROVEMENTS IN THE MACADAM CORRIDOR.

1. Intent. Retain industrial uses, and thereby potential employment, within the planning area and mitigate the economic pressure toward strictly commercial development on the riverfront, and when businesses in the corridor relocate—especially those between Macadam Avenue and the Willamette River north of Johns Landing—a mixture of residential, recreational and commercial uses should be encouraged. Also preserve the existing residential "Miles Place Colony" on the Willamette River south of Willamette Park.

2. Reasons:

  a. Protect the existing businesses
  b. Assure the possibility of residential waterfront development
  c. Ensure quality development in a scenic entity corridor to the CBD
  d. Minimize the traffic impact on the adjacent neighborhoods, and on already-congested Macadam Avenue

Note: The Planning Bureau staff is now preparing alternative Willamette Greenway Plans for public discussion and eventual review by the City Council. One of these alternatives features a change in industrial use along the southern part of the Willamette River to river-related commercial, recreational, residential uses.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

1. ALLOW NO CONDITIONAL USE PERMITS FOR PARK USE ON LAND NOW OCCUPIED BY THE EXISTING RESIDENTIAL "MILES PLACE COLONY" ON THE WILLAMETTE RIVER SOUTH OF WILLAMETTE PARK.

Reasons:

  a. This is a unique residential area. It is the only single family housing on land on the Willamette River within the City limits.
  b. The owners have invested time and money in rehabilitating their homes.
  c. Incremental purchases of land by the Park Bureau will slowly destroy this community.
  d. If the Park Bureau is put on notice that no further conditional use permits will be allowed in this area, it will not purchase additional property.
  e. Preservation of this property will not interfere with public access to or through Willamette Park.
IV. PROPOSED PHYSICAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

This section proposes an improvement program for Corbett/Terwilliger/Lair Hill and is based directly upon information and documentation presented in "A Plan for Corbett, Terwilliger, Lair Hill", prepared by the Corbett, Terwilliger, Lair Hill Planning Committee.

The proposed improvements in Table 1 are grouped under five subheadings:

I. Street, Pedestrian, and Bicycle Path Improvements
II. Rehabilitation
III. Parks, Open Space and Landscaping
IV. Distribution Undergrounding
V. Others

A number of the projects listed have already been completed or are currently under study (the South Portland Circulation Study, for example). New projects, proposed in Fall of 1977, are listed at the end of the Table.

A map showing the location of the proposed projects may be found on the next page.
These proposed physical improvement projects include those projects listed in Table 4 and the projects funded under the Housing and Community Development Act (HCD). The whole study area is eligible for low interest rehabilitation loans.
These proposed physical improvement projects include those projects listed in Table 4 and the projects funded under the Housing and Community Development Act (HUD). The whole Study Area is eligible for low interest rehabilitation loans.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STREET IMPROVEMENTS</th>
<th>COST ($)</th>
<th>POSSIBLE SOURCES OF FUNDING</th>
<th>BUREAU COORDINATION</th>
<th>STAFF EVALUATION OF FEASIBILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L Close 2nd St. at Arthur Blvd.</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>C.I.P.</td>
<td>Traffic Eng.</td>
<td>+ now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Close 1st St. at Barbur Blvd.</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>+ being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Close Woods St. at Barbur</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>+ tested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Sidewalk on East &amp; West Barbur from Archer to Hamilton combined with bicycle path</td>
<td>50,000ea.side 100,000 total</td>
<td>UAP (OSHD) HCD (T.I.)</td>
<td>Street &amp; Struct Eng. P.C. P.D.C. (west side)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Pedestrian path under Front St. at Gaines (W/bicyclo ramp)</td>
<td>6,000-10,000</td>
<td>C.I.P. HCD (T.I.)</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T Pedestrian path along Custer to waterfront</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Same (Possible maintenance project)</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$18,000

$110,000

Legend: L = Lair Hill C = Corbett T = Terwilliger M = Macadam Corridor

- + = Feasible
- ? = Undetermined
- U.S. = Under Study
- UAP = Urban Arterial Program
- OSHD = Oregon State Highway Division
- BOR = Bureau of Outdoor Recreation
- UMTA = Urban Mass Transit Administration
- HUD = Housing and Community Development Act
- TI = Tax Increment
- CIP = Capital Improvements Program
- PPDC = Portland Development Commission
- FAU = Federal Aid Urban
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STREET IMPROVEMENTS</th>
<th>COST ($)</th>
<th>POSSIBLE SOURCES OF FUNDING</th>
<th>BUREAU COORDINATION</th>
<th>FEASIBILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C  Construct on-ramp to R.I. Bridge from Macadam</td>
<td>600,000+</td>
<td>OSHD, FAU, T.I. (%) (St. Bond)</td>
<td>Traffic Eng. Street &amp; Struct. Eng.</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C  Construct off-ramp from R.I. Bridge to Hood St. divert Grover from Corbett to R.I. Bridge</td>
<td>200,000+</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Highway Div. Street &amp; Struct. Eng. Multnomah County</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M  Improve Macadam to a four-lane divided boulevard w/planted median, turning lanes, &amp; planted parking strips</td>
<td>8,000,000</td>
<td>Interstate withdrawal</td>
<td>Traffic Eng. Street &amp; Struct. Eng. Planning (Design Review Transp.)</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M  Improve Sellwood Bridge access</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Mult. County</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T  Improve traffic signals on Macadam at Boundary, Pendleton = 100,000 Nebraska &amp; Nevada</td>
<td>25,000 each</td>
<td>OSHD C.I.P. Private Dev.</td>
<td>Highway Div. Traffic Eng.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDESTRIAN CROSSINGS</td>
<td>COST ($)</td>
<td>POSSIBLE SOURCES OF FUNDING</td>
<td>BUREAU COORDINATION</td>
<td>FEASIBILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at Bancroft (add sidewalk) under the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem Freeway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T Pedestrian overpass across 100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>HCD (T.I.)</td>
<td>Traffic Street &amp; Struct Eng.</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbun at Raasumussen Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P.D.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Pedestrian controlled</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>YMCX</td>
<td>Traffic Street &amp; Struct Eng.</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crossing Barbun &amp; Meade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIXE PATHS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Barbun Blvd. between</td>
<td></td>
<td>OSHD (UAP)</td>
<td>Street &amp; Struct Eng.</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur &amp; Hamilton in comb./w/sidewalk</td>
<td></td>
<td>100,000 (incl. (UAP) above)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T Old Slavin rd. and old</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>OSHD</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>access Rd. from Raasumussen Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Highway Div.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>south to View Point Terrace with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>link to Carolina Canyon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Street &amp; Struct Eng.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Between Macadam Ave. &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td>OSHD</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River -- along River</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>where possible</td>
<td></td>
<td>Private Dev.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Sec. I Sub Total</td>
<td>5,438,105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reqd. Tax Increment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(For projects w/hold funding)</td>
<td>839,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### XI. REHABILITATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rehabilitation</th>
<th>Cost ($)</th>
<th>Possible Sources of Funding</th>
<th>Bureau Coordination</th>
<th>Feasibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Interest Lender’s Program (PIL) for low interest home rehabilitation and 3/2 Program (Federal)</td>
<td>548,984</td>
<td>Local Financial Institutions</td>
<td>P.D.C. Bureau of Planning</td>
<td>P.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative cost for PIL</td>
<td>85,000/yr for 2 yrs = 170,000</td>
<td>Federal Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>170,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Requ. Tax increment</strong></td>
<td>170,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### III. PARKS, OPEN SPACE, AND LANDSCAPING

#### PARKS AND OPEN SPACE

1. Acquire vacant land btwn Salem Freeway, Boundary and Carolina (6.8 acres) No maintenance required. 100,000*

2. Willamette Park
   - Extend into neighborhood for public access
   - Improve launching facilities & provide comfort stations & parking
   - Improve water line from launching ramp up-river
   - Install picnic facilities '75
   - Play equipment '79)
   - Tennis courts w/ltg '80
   - Irrigation system '80
   151,000

3. C.I.V.
   - B.C.D. (T.I.)
   - Fed. Grant–Open Space
   - State Marine Bd. (50%) Marine Board
   - B.O.R. (Fed.) (50%)

*Exact cost to be negotiated by PDC
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARKS AND OPEN SPACE (cont.)</th>
<th>COST ($)</th>
<th>POSSIBLE SOURCES OF FUNDING</th>
<th>BUREAU COORDINATION</th>
<th>FEASIBILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C Convert the fill area btwn Slavin Rd. &amp; the Salem Freeway to minimal maintenance park -- or housing if programs are available</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>C.I.P. HCD (T.I.)</td>
<td>Park Bureau P.D.C.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Acquire Lot 4 and parts of 15,000 Lots 2 &amp; 3, Block 161, South Port Addn. to Caruthers (at Lane &amp; Water Sts) as open space to complement pedestrian path &amp; as a buffer to Front St. - no maintenance required.</td>
<td></td>
<td>HCD (T.I.)</td>
<td>Park Bureau</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Landscaping along west side of Front St. btwn Arthur &amp; Hooker</td>
<td>1,500-2,000</td>
<td>OSHD</td>
<td>Highway Div. Park Bureau P.D.C.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Landscaping-Ross Island 25,000-50,000 Bridge Ramps</td>
<td></td>
<td>OSHD</td>
<td>Highway Div. Park Bureau P.D.C.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Improve landscaping btwn Hood St. &amp; Salem Freeway</td>
<td>15,000-20,000</td>
<td>OSHD</td>
<td>Highway Div. Park Bureau P.D.C.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>254,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regu. Tax Increment</td>
<td>215,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### IV. DISTRIBUTION UNDERGROUNDING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTRIBUTION UNDERGROUNDING</th>
<th>COST ($)</th>
<th>POSSIBLE SOURCES OF FINDING</th>
<th>BUREAU COORDINATION</th>
<th>FEASIBILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T Along Virginia from Carolina to Taylors Ferry</td>
<td>114,000</td>
<td>HCD (T.I.) P.G.E.</td>
<td>City Eng. Service Pub. Utilities P.G.E.</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STREET TREE PLANTINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>As shown on map Proven Physical Improvements</em> (Fig. 17)</td>
<td>7,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total Reg. Tax Increment</td>
<td>529,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### V. OTHERS

**WATERFRONT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WATERFRONT (cont.)</th>
<th>COST ($)</th>
<th>POSSIBLE SOURCES OF FUNDING</th>
<th>BUREAU COORDINATION</th>
<th>FEASIBILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSIT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement light rail transit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corridor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single track</td>
<td>6 million</td>
<td>Tri-Met</td>
<td>Public Utilities Comm.</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>double track</td>
<td>15.7 million</td>
<td>UMTA</td>
<td>Tri-Met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comb. single/double track</td>
<td>8.3 million</td>
<td></td>
<td>Highway Div.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L,C,T,M Bus shelters</td>
<td>1003,800 each</td>
<td>Tri-Met</td>
<td>Lake Oswego City Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(as indicated on Fig. 12) = 38,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tri-Met</td>
<td>P.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Traffic Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEWERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L &amp; C Sewers for Lair Hill Corbett (required)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Special Assessment</td>
<td>Sanitary Eng.</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L.I.D.</td>
<td>Street &amp; Struct. Eng.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C.I.P.</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. GENERAL FINDINGS

A. Zoning History

The City of Portland was first zoned in 1924. Most of the planning area was placed in Class 3 (Business) permitting commercial and manufacturing uses.

On February 25, 1937, the Planning Commission approved a rezoning of the Terwilliger neighborhood from Zone 3 to Zone 1 (Single Family Residential). Appendix D contains the detailed reasons for the rezoning, but the primary reasons were "...to stimulate development, redevelopment, and the desirability, or value, of its homes." In March, 1937, a rezoning hearing was held by the City Council. The only remonstrance concerned the corner of Pendleton Street and Corbett Avenue which was designated to remain in Zone 3. This remonstrance was overruled and Ordinance No. 59617 was passed unanimously. This rezoning established the basic present pattern of zoning in the Terwilliger neighborhood by retaining Zone 3 along the east and west sides of Macadam Ave.

The primary reasons for the rezoning which are documented by the Planning Commission Report and the City Council minutes were:

a. Preservation and maintenance of an existing residential neighborhood;

b. The fact that only a small portion of the land (6.28) within the rezoning area had been developed for industrial use since the area had been zoned for that use, i.e., the neighborhood was overzoned for industrial use;

c. To enable the value of existing homes to be maintained;

d. To enable homeowners to procure home improvement loans from the FHA and banks.

Also important was the fact that maintenance of vested interest over long periods of ownership, especially in cases where the remonstrator had not developed the land for the use intended by the zoning, was overruled as a reason not to rezone and in such cases the rezoning was not viewed as confiscation or "taking" by the local government.

After World War II, other deficiencies in the ordinance and map became apparent. On May 12, 1951, a new proposed zoning code and map prepared by Clarence Mills, a consultant to the City, was published in the Daily Journal of Commerce for public review. A series of public Hearings were held on the proposed ordinance and in the fall of 1954, the proposed zoning code and map were transmitted to the City Council. The Council created a Citizen's Advisory Committee to further review the proposals. In a report to this Committee the Planning Director stated, with respect to the
planning area, that the proposed zoning map sought to correct over-zoning of Zone 3 in the Corbett and Lair Hill neighborhoods as far south as Hamilton Street. Accordingly, in 1956, the Lair Hill and Corbett neighborhoods were proposed to be zoned A1 under the new classification system. Another round of public hearings was held and on May 28, 1959, the City Council adopted the present version of the basic zoning code. In this final version, the Corbett neighborhood was zoned A0. There are no formal records that indicate how or why this change was made.

Another major rezoning occurred in the Terwilliger neighborhood in 1967 which changed the land zoned A5 between S.W. Virginia and S.W. Macadam to A2.5. The intent of this rezoning to a more intensive use was to "...act as an incentive to land owners to remove blighted dwellings, build new residential buildings and maintain existing dwellings which are presently in good condition." (Terwilliger Neighborhood Zoning Proposal, Portland City Planning Commission, November, 1967). Since this rezoning was enacted, virtually no new development has taken place; rezoning to a more intensive use did not project the intended new development although one project is presently under study by a developer.

The last major rezoning occurred in March of 1974 when the zoning of a large strip of land between S.W. Macadam Avenue and the Willamette River was changed from N2 to M30. The purpose of this rezoning was to permit the construction of the Johns Landing commercial and housing development.

8. Building Activity. Building activity in the planning area is summarized in Table 2 on the following page.

Of the three residential neighborhoods, the only one which had a net increase in residential units was Terwilliger.

*(Shortcomings of the Present Portland Zoning Ordinance, A Report to the Citizens' Advisory Committee, Lloyd Keefe, Planning Director, January 9, 1956).*
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Conversion</th>
<th>Demolition (Loss)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lair Hill</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corbett</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terwilliger</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL UNITS</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Portland Bureau of Buildings

Net Gains or Losses, 1960-1970
derived from above data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SF</th>
<th>MF</th>
<th>Comm/Whse.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lair Hill</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>-28</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corbett</td>
<td>-55</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terwilliger</td>
<td>+10</td>
<td>+159</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL UNITS</td>
<td>-69</td>
<td>+122</td>
<td>+38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There has been no new high-rise apartment construction in the Corbett neighborhood since the AG zone was adopted in 1959. An important reason for this is documented in Appendix B, Housing Development Analysis in A Plan for Corbett, Terwilliger and Lair Hill. Basically, no new high-rise apartments have been built because cash flow analyses show an inadequate return on investment. A major reason for this negative cash flow is that the rents achievable under current physical conditions in the neighborhood do not generate sufficient income to offset land costs, construction costs and interest rates.

Accordingly, the principal building activity in Corbett has been the conversion of single family residential structures to offices under a conditional use permit. To date, there have been 27 such conditional use permits issued as shown on Map 7. This type of conversion was approved for many years as the only means of preserving the existing structure and thus the existing "esthetic character" of the neighborhood. However, the proliferation of these offices has caused parking problems for neighborhood residents and, more importantly, has reached the point where the residential nature of the neighborhood could be shifted toward predominantly commercial use if it were allowed to continue.

Not included in these figures are the 23 efficiency units presently under construction at Water and Lane Streets in the Corbett neighborhood and the 76 residential units constructed in the Macadam Corridor in the Johns Landing development.

Another major development in the planning stages is the "La Bien" project along the willamette River. The project will cover approximately ten acres and will be strictly commercial -- offices and restaurants. It is important to note that this developer maintains that he is unable to program any residential units due to the cost of land. If this type of development continues, and businesses and industries continue to leave this area, the riverfront would be developed entirely as commercial.

C. Building Conditions. In June, 1975, the Bureau of Planning staff conducted a "windshield" survey of residential building conditions. In May, 1971, this survey was updated to document any upgrading trends which have occurred since HCO rehab loans have been available, and since the Planning Commission actions which have indicated a commitment by the city to support the neighborhood stabilization goals.

The most outstanding change has occurred in Corbett in the area which was designated for rezoning. Out of a total of 170 residential structures, 29% have been or are currently in the process of being rehabilitated, and the number of neglected dilapidated structures has changed from 50 in 1975 to 10 in 1977.
The nonconforming uses that would be created by the recommended rezoning are all commercial office uses. The existing residential nonconforming uses are single-family structures on substandard lots. The two existing medium density apartments will become conditional uses upon rezoning.
Offices of less than 10,000 sq. ft. are allowed as conditional uses in an AO zone. This map illustrates the location of both single family houses which have been converted to offices and newly constructed offices in the Corbett neighborhood.
Industrial and commercial building conditions in the Macadam Corridor vary greatly, but generally the structures south of Johns Landing are in greater need of repair than those north of Johns Landing.

D. Utilities. The principal concern is the capacity of the existing combination sewer to accommodate increased storm water run-off generated by the potential high density development allowed under the existing A0 zoning in the Corbett neighborhood. Appendix 6 contains a letter from the Bureau of Sanitary Engineering, dated September 23, 1974, which evaluates this problem. The key paragraphs state:

Pending detailed plans of specific areas it can be assumed that the existing combination sewers may be utilized for the proposed revitalization of existing residential units along with some new developments. Most of the area is zoned for high density usage. The development of the Corbett area to its present zoning (A:0) will certainly call for increased sewer capacity by the installation of a separated sewer system.

A subsequent letter from the same Bureau dated January 9, 1975, states that the estimated cost of increased sewer capacity is approximately $1,250,000.

There are no other apparent problems in the planning area requiring additional storm or sanitary sewer construction.

The Water Bureau reports that its revenues are sufficient to accommodate any required additions to the existing system.

E. Transportation and Traffic. Many streets in the planning area are major transportation routes connecting the GOU with the southwestern suburbs. Bordering on the west by the Portland West Hills and on the east by the Willamette River, the planning area is virtually a funnel for commuter traffic. Though only 1/4 - 1/2 mile wide, the planning area contains, listed from east to west, the following transportation routes that run its entire length (See Map B):
TABLE 3
MAJOR TRANSPORTATION ROUTES AND TRAFFIC COUNTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Average Daily Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Macadam Avenue</td>
<td>18,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corbett Avenue</td>
<td>5,500 ADT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 5 Freeway</td>
<td>77,000 ADT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Salem Freeway)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbur Boulevard</td>
<td>32,000 ADT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>133,200 TOTAL ADT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These auto facilities carry an estimated combined traffic volume in excess of 133,000 vehicles per day. The principal problem is Macadam Avenue. Presently it is operating above capacity (1,000 vehicles per lane per hour) resulting in level service "D" or "E" during peak hours. The lanes are narrow (9 1/2 feet), left turns are hazardous, and its intersection with Virginia Street and Taylor's Ferry Road has the highest accident rate in the City. Corbett Avenue is also a problem because in addition to being the only internal connector linking the three residential neighborhoods, it is used by commuters seeking to avoid congestions on Macadam Avenue.

The other outstanding traffic and circulation problem has been generated by the Ross Island Bridge approaches which routes traffic directly through residential streets. These issues are currently being studied by the South Portland Circulation Study.

U.S. Census figures indicate that the percentage of persons utilizing public transportation in census tract 59, encompassing most of Corbett/Terwilliger Lair Hill, is 13.4% (City 10.8%). This is down approximately 9.8% from 1960. These figures, however, do not reflect a city-wide increase in bus ridership of 50% during the past year.

There are thirteen Tri-Met bus lines serving the Planning Area (ten along Barbur Blvd. only). Map 8 shows these bus lines.

F. Planning Area Profile. Figure 1 illustrates selected characteristics of the planning area for 1960 and 1970. In this figure, a straight line connects the two points to facilitate comparison; there are no data for the intervening years. The most dramatic changes illustrated are those in renter and owner occupied housing; owner-occupied housing decreased, renter occupied housing
The major North-South transportation routes through the Planning Area are -- from East to West -- the Willamette River, the Southern Pacific Railroad, Macadam Ave., Corbett Ave., the Salem Freeway, (I-5), and Barbur Blvd.

The bikeway shown is part of the Willamette Greenway Program and the study area shown is the SW Circulation Study area from the Arterial Streets Plan.
increased and vacant units remained relatively constant (the Johns Landing housing development is not reflected in these census data). Coupled, and probably associated with these shifts in occupancy, is a significant decrease in the enrollment of Terwilliger School.

However, since the 1970 Census was taken, the enrollment of Terwilliger School has gone up and there has been a dramatic change in ownership patterns in the Corbett neighborhoods. Since the Planning Commission Actions in 1975, over three full blocks of housing in Corbett which were formerly held by investor owners, have been bought by new owners who plan to rehabilitate the structures and live in them.
1960 and 1970 Planning Area Profile

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau (Census Tract 598) and School District No. One
APPENDIX A

1965
Terwilliger Community League formed for the purpose of providing a channel for residents to keep informed and have more effective input on decisions concerning zone changes. The League boundaries are Census Tract 59. During 1966-67 a staff person from the Portland City Planning Commission worked with the League in preparing a zoning plan for the Terwilliger area. The purpose of the plan was to maintain the residential character of the area and provide a buffer between Macadam businesses and the single-family homes. The plan was accepted by the City. The League began the Corbett-Terwilliger newsletter and has coordinated its publication ever since.

1970
The Hill Park Association was formed in response to an urban renewal proposal for the Lair Hill neighborhood. Both resident and absentee land owners were involved in the Association. The Association and its members did not want the area designated for urban renewal. They were upset by the lack of citizen participation in the planning stage of the proposal. In 1971 two rulings from the federal Housing and Urban Development (HUD) had significant impact on the situation: (1) a guideline making citizen involvement mandatory in the planning process of urban renewal projects; and (2) a statement that there would be no more money granted from the federal bureau for clearance projects.

June, 1971
The Corbett-Terwilliger Neighborhood Council was formed by residents of the neighborhood (including members of both the League and the Hill Park Association) in response to the Tri-County Community Council’s Inner City Committee and United Good Neighbors (UGN) contract-for-service plan. The Council’s primary focus was to identify problems and find solutions in the social service area. However, in the winter of 1972 the Council decided a priority for their time was physical planning. The fear was if we didn’t preserve the neighborhood through good land use planning there would be no neighborhood left to plan socially for. In November, 1971 the Council hired Sarah Smith as its community agent.

12/1b/71
Refer to Appendix A - Letter from John Gray ...

Jan. 1972
Macadam-Corbett Property Owners’ League formed in response to the announcement of the Johns Landing project and the fact that existing neighborhood groups did not adequately represent the interests of business and absentee owners.
Corbett-Terwilliger Neighborhood Council formed an Ad-
Hoc Land Use Committee composed of members of the 4
organizations mentioned above. The purpose of the
committee was to identify land use issues and prepare
alternative solutions. Members of the Committee met
regularly with Mr. Gray and Mr. Storrs of the Johns
Landing Project and with City personnel from the
Planning Commission and Commissioner Ivancie's office
in support of the City's proposal to appoint staff to
the neighborhood for the development of a Comprehensive
Plan. The Committee continued to work until the
formation of the Planning Committee when several of its
members were appointed as representatives.
DATE  EVENT

12/16/71  Letter from John Gray to City Council regarding going before the Council with a basic concept for development of Johns Landing in the Southwest Macadam area.

2/14/72  Letter of Keeve to Ivancie regarding Johns Landing Council Call 4420. "The Council has decided to allocate to the Planning Commission two additional positions in the 1972-73 fiscal year. It is our intention that these two positions be assigned to district planning similar to the Northwest Area Project. The next district to be planned might well be the Terwilliger neighborhood. When these additional positions become available, the Planning Commission can then participate in the preparing of necessary plans to parallel the Johns Landing Project."

3/1/72  City Council adopted report of the Directors of PCPC and PDC to meet in the area and discuss proposal for determining the interest in proceeding with plans for the entire S.W. Macadam area.

4/13/72  Area residents' meeting at Terwilliger Grade School. Purpose of determining community interest in the preparation of development in that area. Approximately two hundred residents in attendance.

5/9/72  Report by Commissioner Ivancie, recommending that the City Planning Commission proceed with plans in cooperation with PDC for Terwilliger area.

Spring, '72  Residents of Corbett and Terwilliger neighborhoods form Corbett-Terwilliger Neighborhood Council. The Neighborhood Council hired Sarah Smith as its neighborhood coordinator and began systematic publication of an area newsletter and regular meetings. The council was at its height of activity during the spring and summer of 1972. Basic funds for the council were provided by a grant from the American Red Cross.

Sept., '72  Planning Bureau appointed Alan Fox as neighborhood planner in cooperation with the Corbett/Terwilliger Neighborhood Council and the Corbett/Terwilliger/Lair Hill Ad Hoc Land-Use Committee. Planning boundaries include the Corbett, Terwilliger, Lair Hill neighborhoods as a single planning entity.

11/14/72  Letter to Glenn Jackson from PCPC of the Oregon State Highway Commission giving current status report of S.W. Macadam Avenue.

Feb., '73  A series of land-use workshops for planning area residents conducted by Alan Fox.
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3/26/73 Community meeting held at Terwilliger School. A citizen participation planning process for the area was ratified by majority of approximately one hundred and fifty residents present. Corbett/Terwilliger/Lair Hill Planning Committee established to work with Alan Fox in an advisory capacity on the development of a comprehensive plan for the entire area.

4/2/73 Letter from Gray to Mayor regarding possible Urban Renewal Project under state law with tax increment self-financing plan. Requesting PDC to prepare preliminary renewal plan for Council consideration.

4/5/73 Letter from Mayor to PDC requesting staff to lend assistance in preparing feasibility study for Johns Landing.

4/5/73 Letter from Mayor to PCPC requesting planning analysis for tax increment Urban Renewal Project.

4/13/73 PDC Legal Counsel's letter to PDC Executive Director on legal aspects of tax increment designation.

4/25/73 Meeting of resident owners to elect six representatives to the C/T/LH Planning Committee. First elected were John Mol, Russell Sacco, Les Hopkins, Dale Meyers, and Robert Kass.

4/25/73 Meeting of area business interests to elect four representatives to the C/T/LH Planning Committee. Elected were Elean Brook, Bob Berry, August Archer, Jan Morris.

5/6/71 Meeting of tenants to elect three representatives to the C/T/LH Planning Committee. Elected were Sue Steiner, Linda Cologero, and Marilyn Crandahl, and three alternates--Michael Auch, Dennis Anderson, and Julie Wycoff.

6/12/73 Meeting of non-resident owners to elect four representatives to the C/T/LH Planning Committee. Elected were Bill Wright, Harry Elingier, Robert Bitar, Simon Stanich, and Dean Trumbo as alternate.

Jon Griggs was appointed to the committee as a representative of the Johns Landing Development.

6/12/73 Community Clean-Up in North Corbett. Dump box provided by PDC.

6/27/73 First meeting of the Corbett/Terwilliger/Lair Hill Planning Committee, with meetings open to the public scheduled for the first and third Wednesdays of each month, at the Red Cross Building, 4200 S.W. Corbett.

7/3/73 PDC staff memo on project possibilities—Johns Landing/Corbett/Terwilliger.

August, '73 Impact review procedure established. Requests reviewed on first meeting of each month.

8/15/73 Ratification of Planning Committee by-laws.
6/24/73 Meeting between PDC and C/T/LH/PC to discuss PDC resources for neighborhood planning and plan implementation.

9/7/73 Recommendations submitted to C/T/LH Planning Committee regarding Macadam Avenue improvements in form of a traffic goals statement.

10/3/73 Meeting between PDC and C/T/LH/PC to discuss specific tax increment financing techniques and the neighborhood plan.

10/19/73 Community Clean-Up in the North Corbett area. Dump box provided by PDC.

Nov., '73 Study: The Impact of the John's Landing Development on the Terwilliger Neighborhood - by Alan Fox and Lee Haggerty.

11/19/73 Memo from Alan Fox to Ernie Bonner regarding proposal for incorporating urban renewal into the C/T/LH planning area.

11/26/73 Memo from PDC to Bonner regarding Johns Landing T/C Tax Increment Project (A Possible Approach).

Dec., '73 Planning Committee studies "Community Goals" questionnaire that had been mailed out to the area in October, 1973.

12/5/73 Letter to PCPC from C/T/LH/PC announcing their approval of Johns Landing Development. Application for zone change from M2 to M3 east of Macadam, with conditions.

12/22/73 Letter to residents and property owners from C/T/LH/PC, notifying them of plans for zone change from M2 to M3 east of Macadam, with conditions.

12/24/73 Memo from Sam Galbreath, PDC, to Alan Fox regarding possible housing rehabilitation Program for C/T/LH.

Feb., '74 Non-resident property owners meeting to elect new representatives. Elected were Louise Lumpakis, Mike Diamond, Donald Robbins, Goulda Hahn, and alternates--Marlin Woebel, Bill Wright, Alta Andrews, and Frances Christiansen.

Feb., '74 C/T/LH PC approve the Macadam Corridor Task Force Report.

Feb., '74 First land-use goals report submitted to C/T/LH PC by Fox from information derived from "Community Goals" questionnaire.

2/6/74 Memo from Sam Galbreath to C/T/LH/PC regarding Outline of Section E (dealing with Tax Increment) Comprehensive Plan for C/T/LH.

2/14/74 Memo from Chuck Olson, PDC, to PLC regarding C/T/LH survey. The Neighborhood Planning Committee unanimously voted for the survey to determine feasibility of utilizing the PIL Program.

Apr., '74 PIL questionnaire mailed out to all tenants and property owners in the planning area.
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Apr. '74  First draft of the comprehensive neighborhood plan completed and approved by C/T/LH PC.

4/17/74  Letter from Alan Fox to C/T/LH residents regrading draft of comprehensive plan asking for review and comments on the plan.

Apr.-May, '74  Block meetings throughout all three geological sections of area to review first draft of the comprehensive neighborhood plan with area residents.

6/10-17/74  Survey by PDC of ten sample blocks (selected by the Planning Committee), with emphasis on home rehabilitation interest of area residents.

6/24/74  Memo from Ray Bowman to Thomas Kennedy, both of PDC, regarding analysis of C/T/LH Rehabilitation Survey—ten target blocks.

June-July, '74  C/T/LH PC reviews comments on Draft I Plan from block meetings and June 10-17 survey.

7/17/74  C/T/LH PC authorized PDC to prepare an Urban Renewal work program for projected presentation to City Council in January, 1975.

Aug., '74  C/T/LH PC prepares Draft II of the comprehensive neighborhood plan.

9/16/74  Six geological area meetings to review Draft II of comprehensive neighborhood plan with area residents.

9/25/74  C/T/LH PC review of residents' comments on Draft II Plan at September 16 and 19 area meetings.
APPENDIX B
HOUSING DEVELOPMENT ANALYSIS

INTRODUCTION.

This appendix presents a generalized analysis of four alternative development schemes on a typical 200' x 200' block in the Corbett or Lair Hill neighborhoods. The purpose of the analysis is to investigate the general economic aspects of development, given four alternative zoning categories and their respective constraints on the type and amount of income-producing space. Included in this analysis are:

a. A statement of assumptions including such factors as land values, type of development, size of rental units, projected rents, cost of construction, and operating expenses.

b. Calculations of development costs, monthly revenues, capitalized value, financing, cash flow and return on investment.

c. A summary analysis of the four development schemes.

The analysis is intended to provide a general indication of economic aspects, and is not definitive with respect to any particular site, project, or developer. The calculations were made for only the first year after construction and therefore the analysis does not consider the effect of time on the cash flow. Further, the rental structure and unit type distribution assumptions were based on the consultant's experience, which, though sufficient for this general analysis, would be substantially refined by a detailed market study in a more rigorous analysis.

This report, the analysis model, and the assumptions for it were developed by David C. Leland, the Leland Company, Economics Consultants, with the assistance of Alan J. Fox, City Planner, Portland Bureau of Planning.
ANALYSIS ASSUMPTIONS.

For the purpose of evaluating potential development in the Corbett and Lair Hill neighborhoods, a series of alternative developments were projected. These alternative projects are based on:

* Land area of 40,000 square feet, or approximately, a standard city block.
* Varying zoning classifications, and therefore, varying densities and land values.
* Types of construction and projects appropriate to the specific zone, land value, density and applicable building codes of the City of Portland.

In order to determine land values for this comparative analysis, research of recent land sales by zoning category was conducted in the study neighborhood by the Bureau of Planning.

A summary of present, raw land values (without improvements) by zoning classification is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZONE</th>
<th>LAND PRICE PER SQUARE FOOT</th>
<th>LAND PRICE: 40,000 SQUARE FOOT SITE 1/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A0</td>
<td>$ 4.50</td>
<td>$ 180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>$ 3.00</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.5</td>
<td>$ 2.00</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use (C2/M3)</td>
<td>$ 3.00</td>
<td>170,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1/ At present there is not a cleared 40,000 square foot site available in the study area. However, such a site could be "assembled." This hypothetical site is maintained in all the following analyses for comparative consistency.
These sites and land per square foot values relate to cost per dwelling unit prices for land only by zoning category (maximum allowed density) as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZONE</th>
<th>MAXIMUM UNITS PER ACRE</th>
<th>LAND PRICE PER UNIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A0</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>$575.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1/M3 (Mixed Use)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the study area is characteristically a low-income neighborhood (median family income $5,416), the influence of Johns Landing presumably will attract over time, more median and upper income families. Therefore, market rents for these analyses are based on the assumption that rents somewhat over prevailing neighborhood rents can be achieved. These are discussed in the following alternative project descriptions and assumptions.

The four alternative, hypothetical projects examined are described as follows:

a. **A-0 Zoning: High Density Apartments**

In this analysis, a 480 unit apartment project was examined. The project would include a 13-story structure of which ten floors are housing and three stories are parking.

The unit distribution and projected size and rental rates are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIT TYPE</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>SIZE (SQ. FT.)</th>
<th>MONTHLY RENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Bedroom</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Bedroom</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2/ A0 density is based on a sliding scale -- the large the parcel, the greater the density.

3/ Requires zone change for mixed use involving housing.
Tenant parking is structured and a monthly parking charge of $15.00 is assumed for a 350 sq. ft. covered space.

b. **A-1 Zoning: Medium Density Apartments**

In this analysis, a 40 unit apartment project in a two-story frame structure is assumed. Parking at 70 sq. ft. space would be provided on grade. The project assumes some landscaping and site amenities.

The unit size and price distribution assumptions are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIT TYPE</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>SIZE S.F.</th>
<th>MONTHLY RENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>$165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Bedroom</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Bedroom</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tenant parking at 350 a.f./space is unstructured and is provided without additional charge.

c. **A2.5 Zoning: Low/Medium Density Apartment**

The A2.5 zoning project analysis assumes a 30-unit rental apartment project. Because of lower density and the ability to provide more open space and therefore, amenity, a slightly higher quality (per unit) and price range is assumed, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIT TYPE</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>SIZE S.F.</th>
<th>MONTHLY RENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Bedroom</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>$170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Bedroom</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Bedroom</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tenant parking at 350 a.f./space is unstructured and is provided without additional charge.

d. **Mixed Use Development (C2 or M3 Zoning: Commercial and Housing**

The mixed use development project includes a combination of retail commercial uses and apartments. It is basically as A-1.
development above one story of commercial space. Because development design assumes that apartments would be located above the commercial space, the projected rents are slightly lower than in a typical A-1 development (project alternative b).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIT TYPE</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>SIZE S.F.</th>
<th>MONTHLY RENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>$145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Bedroom</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Bedroom</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>$2.75/s.f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tenant parking at 350 s.f./space is unstructured (on-grade) and is provided without additional charge. A portion of the apartment parking (equal to 5% of the commercial parking requirement) would be available to shoppers during the daytime hours when tenants are away.

Below is a summary table of additional assumptions.

**SUMMARY OF MAJOR ASSUMPTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Assumption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>A0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost</td>
<td>$25/sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Efficiency</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Structured/Unstructured</td>
<td>Unstructured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Parking</td>
<td>$12/sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Work</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevator Elevators</td>
<td>2 Cable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td>40% of Gross</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other assumptions are footnoted in the appropriate calculation tables.
This section contains tables required to calculate cash flow and return on investment for the four alternative developments based on the assumptions described in the previous sections.

Table A shows the basic construction cost assumptions used in this analysis. The development costs are shown in Table B, Table C summarizes the projected monthly income for each of the alternative projects, and Table D shows the estimated mortgage amount by capitalizing the various income streams. Table E shows the cash flow and return on investment for each alternative project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIT TYPE</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>$/p.f.</th>
<th>COST ($)</th>
<th>PARKING SPACES</th>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>$/p.f.</th>
<th>COST ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>116,000</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3,248,000</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>60900</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>730,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bedroom</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>102,000</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2,856,000</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>47600</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>571,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bedroom</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>448,000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>84,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>480</td>
<td></td>
<td>234,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,552,000</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>115500</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,386,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+15% = 269,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>4,250</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>76,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bedroom</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7000</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bedroom</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>8,750</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>157,500</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>459,000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14000</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+17.5% = 29,962</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bedroom</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>45,600</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bedroom</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>133,000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4200</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>2,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bedroom</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>79,800</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,600</td>
<td></td>
<td>258,400</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8400</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bedroom</td>
<td>Same as A1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bedroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>29,962</td>
<td></td>
<td>599,240</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>+270,000</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+5% 750</td>
<td>31,462</td>
<td></td>
<td>869,240</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>22050</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>11,025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table represents basic construction costs for various unit types and configurations. The costs include parking spaces and area, with calculations for cost per square foot (p.f.) and total cost (COST ($)).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COST ELEMENT</th>
<th>A0</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2.5</th>
<th>MUD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>$140,500</td>
<td>$120,600</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apt/Comm</td>
<td>7,534,800</td>
<td>539,316</td>
<td>258,400</td>
<td>869,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>1,186,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>11,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Work</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevator</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$9,275,800</td>
<td>$681,316</td>
<td>$317,600</td>
<td>$1,015,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency (5%)</td>
<td>463,790</td>
<td>34,066</td>
<td>15,880</td>
<td>50,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$9,739,590</td>
<td>$715,382</td>
<td>$333,480</td>
<td>$1,066,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/E (5%)</td>
<td>486,979</td>
<td>35,769</td>
<td>16,674</td>
<td>53,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title Ins.</td>
<td>6,523</td>
<td>1,675</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$494,502</td>
<td>$37,844</td>
<td>$18,255</td>
<td>$55,501</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Development Cost: $10,234,092, $753,226, $351,735, $1,121,529
Mortgaged Amount: $5,152,168, $511,920, $209,974, $822,278
Equity: $5,081,924, $241,306, $142,761, $299,251

1/ Derived from Table and Mortgage Amount.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIT TYPE</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>RENTS/NO</th>
<th>INCOME</th>
<th>ADJ. GR./  \</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$43,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bedroom</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>29,750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bedroom</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P Parking</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4,950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$82,400</td>
<td>= $78,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bedroom</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bedroom</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>2,350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,900</td>
<td>= $7,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bedroom</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>680</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bedroom</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>1,560</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bedroom</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,245</td>
<td>= $3,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bedroom</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bedroom</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial 15,000 s.f. at $4.75/s.f./yr. =</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,938</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,688</td>
<td>= $12,094</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1/ Assuming a 5 percent Vacancy Rate.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2.5</th>
<th>MUD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Gross Income</td>
<td>$ 78,280</td>
<td>$ 7,505</td>
<td>$ 3,078</td>
<td>$ 12,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minus Operating Expenses (40/38%)</td>
<td>$ 32,960</td>
<td>$ 3,002</td>
<td>$ 1,231</td>
<td>$ 4,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equals Net Income Before Debt Service and Depreciation</td>
<td>$ 45,320</td>
<td>$ 4,503</td>
<td>$ 1,847</td>
<td>$ 7,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Net Income (x12)</td>
<td>$ 543,340</td>
<td>$ 54,036</td>
<td>$ 22,164</td>
<td>$ 86,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitalized Value</td>
<td>$ 5,724,631</td>
<td>$ 568,800</td>
<td>$ 233,305</td>
<td>$ 913,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortgage Amount</td>
<td>$ 5,152,168</td>
<td>$ 511,920</td>
<td>$ 209,974</td>
<td>$ 822,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Debt Service (Principal &amp; Interest)</td>
<td>$ 43,000</td>
<td>$ 4,300</td>
<td>$ 1,755</td>
<td>$ 6,602</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1/ Based on capitalized value calculated utilizing a capitalization rate of 9.5 per cent.

2/ 90 per cent of capitalized value.

3/ Based on a 25 year loan at 9 per cent interest.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE E</th>
<th>CASH FLOW ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Gross Income 1/</td>
<td>$78,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minus Operating Expenses</td>
<td>32,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equals Net Income Before Debt Service and Depreciation</td>
<td>7,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minus Mortgage Payment 2/</td>
<td>43,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equals Subtotal</td>
<td>45,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minus Depreciation 3/</td>
<td>40,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equals Income Before Taxes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minus Income Tax 4/</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equals Income After Taxes</td>
<td>2320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Monthly Cash Flow =

N.I.−(P+I+IT) 5/ = $2,320 $203 $92 $336

Annual Cash Flow =

Equity 6/ = 27,840 24,376 141,706 295,257

Return on Investment

− .55% = .10% = .7% = 1.35% or .5 of 1% or .1 of 1% or .7 of 1%

1/ From Table C
2/ From Table D
3/ Based on 40-year life and double declining balance
4/ Assumes 50% tax bracket
5/ Net Income−(Principal + Interest + Income Tax)
6/ From Table B
The cash flow analysis shows that all projects will generate a net positive income; however, when the income is compared to the amount invested (equity) all projects show a very inadequate return on investment and are therefore considered unfeasible at present rents, development costs, and financing (interest) rates. The type of project most closely approaching feasibility is the mixed use development (M.U.D.) at 1.35% return on investment. Though 1.35% is inadequate, a sensitivity analysis (not shown) utilizing slightly lower construction costs indicates that this project may be feasible in the future with efficient design and improved interest rates.

Another factor this analysis points out is that the return on investment does not necessarily improve with increased density of development. A much more definitive study involving rigorous market analysis, sampling of land values, and other factors could (intuitively) yield more positive projects.

Implied in this analysis are several significant factors affecting development of medium and higher density housing.

1. In the case of A-0, high density, multi-story apartment development, the low land cost (and therefore) savings per unit is more than absorbed by the costly requirement to provide structured parking, and also, the high cost of non-frame, type 1 construction.

These constraints (parking, high construction costs, structured parking, rent ceilings) in the Corbett-Lair Hill area are supported by the fact that no major multi-story non-subsidized rental apartments have been constructed in the close-in urban area since development of Portland Center
(urban renewal area) approximately 8 years ago.

2. The land cost per unit in A-1 and A2.5 zones is considered too high relative to the rents that realistically can be achieved in this area. Land cost should be in the range of 8 to 9 per cent of the total cost of the apartment project. In the case of the hypothetical A1 project (using this criteria) the land cost should be in the range of $1,430 to $1,000 per unit and in the case of the A2.5 project -- 1,670 to 1,880, land cost per unit.

The implication is that given the densities permitted in the various zones, land is substantially overpriced in the Corbett-Lair Hill neighborhoods with the rents that realistically can be achieved.

Local land has been selling for the prices indicated on Page 2 of this Appendix; however, housing developments have not been started -- rather conditional use permits for office developments on land zoned for housing (A-0) has typically been the case.

3. Not included in this analysis, is development of housing for sale (rather than rental) -- in which per unit land costs can economically be higher than for rental apartments. In today's lending market, $100 per month rental equates to housing purchase ability of units in the approximately $30,000 range given a reasonable down payment. A for-sale housing project at this price ($30,000) could stand a per unit land price in the range of $2,500 to $3,000.

Therefore, if the neighborhood and City determines to conduct further analyses of housing development potential, for-sale
housing (i.e.: attached/condominium) should be examined as a housing prospect with greater likelihood of economic success.

4. Also implied is a very difficult development situation in which, if housing is to be developed in the Corbett & Lair Hill neighborhood, some compromise is necessary with regard to existing zoning and development standards (i.e.: density and parking). Hybrid projects such as housing/commercial (multi-use) appear to be potentially successful. However, in order to achieve such a project, a developer will need the support of the neighborhood and the cooperation of the Planning Commission to effect such a project when present zoning codes do not accommodate it outright.

Trade-offs such as reduced parking requirements or multiple use of parking spaces is one such compromise. Tightening building code requirements together with rapidly increasing construction costs will require cooperation and compromise (within safety limits) on the part of building inspection and fire officials. The neighborhood needs to recognize the substantial problems facing the average developer and be willing to work with him in a positive capacity if housing is to be achieved.
November 2, 1976

City of Portland
Bureau of Planning

Mr. Ernest Bonner, Director
Bureau of Planning
424 S. W. Main Street
Portland, Oregon 97224

Dear Mr. Bonner:

Within the near future the City Council will be considering a comprehensive land use plan and policies for the Corbett/Therwiliger/Lair Hill neighborhood. In this regard, the Bureau of Planning staff and the Commission have recommended that Council have the Portland Development Commission prepare documentation needed to designate the Corbett/Therwiliger and Macadam Corridor areas as an urban renewal tax increment project.

An urban renewal project can be undertaken only in blighted or deteriorated areas. This does not mean that all properties in the project area must be blighted or deteriorated, but the conditions of the area and the properties in the area, taken as a whole, must meet this criteria. The purpose of urban renewal is to eliminate existing conditions of blight and prevent future blight through public improvements and the development of property. In accordance with sound planning practices and the general plan of the community.

The John's Landing area, prior to its present development, might properly have been determined to be blighted and deteriorated. The conditions which existed previously in the area are substantially different from those which presently exist. It was primarily an old and run down industrial area. At the present time much of the area has been cleared and is under development in a manner which is consistent with the general plan of the City. In addition, much of the John's Landing area can be geographically separated from the balance of the proposed project area. Under these circumstances, the John's Landing area could not be said to be blighted or deteriorated and it is questionable whether it would be legally proper to include the geographically separable area in the larger proposed urban renewal project area.
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Based on staff analysis of existing conditions and after discussing the matter with Oliver Norville, Legal Counsel to the Commission, we do not feel that including the Johnson Landing area in an urban renewal project for tax increment financing is appropriate.

If you wish further clarification of this finding, please do not hesitate to call upon us.

Very truly yours,

J. David Hunt
Executive Director
Zoning Project for Southern Portland and Vicinity

The cutback in planning need in Portland today is the adoption of measures designed to stimulate development, redevelopment, and maintenance of many residential neighborhoods, and, in doing so, to stabilize the neighborhood, its population and the desirability, or value, of its homes. That part of Portland approximately between S.W. Coombs Street and the Milwaukie River, most of which was platted as Southport, and Southern Portland, is an outstanding example of the need for proper directive regulation.

The Federal Housing Administration, through its local agency, has effectively demonstrated its method of determining the risk rating of a home when application is made for mortgage insurance. The neighborhood is appraised first, then the home. If the neighborhood rating is not up to standard, the mortgage value of a home is reduced accordingly. Table schools, parks, churches, accessibility, transit lines, deed restrictions, and zoning are among the factors which determine the stability of a neighborhood. In this present project, zoning is the primary consideration.

Many residential districts in Portland were placed in Zone Three or Zone Four in 1934, when the original zoning ordinances were enacted. Southern Portland was one such district, but, in this instance, most of the district was placed in Zone Three and some of it was placed in Zone Four even though single-family homes predominate west of Woodlawn Road. The accompanying map shows present and proposed zoning for the district. This ever-zoning...

* Passed by Planning Commission 25 Feb. 1937
for light and heavy manufacturing in a residential neighborhood blights the district by reducing the mortgage value of homes and reducing the liveability of the district. The Federal Housing Administration has been forced to severely reduce mortgage insurance in many cases, and to deny it altogether in some instances because of adverse zoning. A neighborhood may otherwise stand the test of appraisal, but, without proper zoning, the stability of the neighborhood is undermined and the good qualities count for little, if anything, because the fundamental element of stability is lacking.

South Portland is Unstable

Recent zoning and recreational studies made by the City Planning Commission reveal marked losses in gross population and in school population in the entire district south of the Ross Island Bridge between the Willamette River and the hilly areas to the west. The Willing, Holman, Terwilliger, and Fulton Park Schools experienced serious losses in enrollment during the past fifteen years. Juvenile delinquency is increasing in the northern part of South Portland; however, there is no juvenile delinquency problem in that portion of South Portland included in this reported project. If inappropriate zoning is allowed to remain in the vicinity of Southport and Southern Portland, shifting of population and juvenile delinquency may be expected to ultimately follow as natural consequences of neighborhood deterioration.

In the area under consideration, there are approximately 11 acres owned by the city and 4 acres owned by the county. There are about 70 acres of vacant land. The area of the whole project is 132.4 acres. An unstable residential district is a civic liability.
Present Use of Land between Macadam Road and Oregon Electric Company's Tracts

Within the area, part of which is proposed for re-zoning, land is used as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>ACRES</th>
<th>PER CENT OF NET AREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Dwellings</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Family Dwellings</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Stores</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Uses (Including light and heavy industries)</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Land</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Net Area</strong></td>
<td>132.4</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Practically all of the commercial and industrial uses are located on the east side of S. W. Macadam Road, and between that street and the river. A few scattered stores are in the interior of the district, west of S. W. Macadam Road. Duplexes and other multiple dwellings are negligible and would remain as non-conforming uses under the proposed re-zoning plan.

Present and Proposed Zoning of the District between Macadam Road and Oregon Electric Company's Tracts

The following table shows areas in the various zones under present and proposed zoning plans:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZONE</th>
<th>PRESENT AREA</th>
<th>PER CENT OF TOTAL AREA</th>
<th>PROPOSED AREA</th>
<th>PER CENT OF TOTAL AREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone 1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>74.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 4</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>132.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>132.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Elegancy of the Proposed Zoning

Typical cities develop about 50 feet of commercial frontage per 100 persons. This ratio declines to about 25 feet per 100 persons on the outskirts of a city. In this particular project there is no possible inadequacy of commercial or industrial areas, as proposed, because the entire frontage along the east side of S. W. Macadam Road, and also that on certain short side streets would remain in Zone Three, as it is at present, and all the property between S. W. Macadam Road and the Willamette River would remain in Zone Four. In these areas remaining in Zone Three and Zone Four there is more than enough property to absorb any possible commercial and industrial expansion. The commercial frontage on the east side of Macadam Road and other frontage east of Macadam Road to remain in Zone Three is 11,470 feet. This is theoretically sufficient for a city of about 25,000 people.

Probable Effect of Present Zoning on Future Development

On the attached map it will be seen that Zone Four now embraces all the property between the river and Macadam Road north of MacKenzie Street.

Zone Four extends west to Good Avenue between MacKenzie and Pendleton Streets, and it extends west to Virginia Avenue between Pendleton Street and Taylor's Ferry Road. Existing Zone Three covers all that district between the above described Zone Four and the Oregon Electric Company's tracks to the west.

Zone Four is unrestricted; in Zone Three, all retail stores, light manufacturing and various types of industries are permitted. The present Zone Three area is now developed with residences except along Macadam Road. As a general rule, homes in Zone Three cannot secure FHA mortgage insurance because of lack of residential stability when dwelling property is zoned in that classification. On the other hand, this large Zone Three area cannot be
developed with commercial and industrial uses. There is more than enough property along McDougal Road for such uses. This condition means simply that neighborhood development in this part of South Portland will be sta-
mented. In fact, applications for residential loans have been denied in this district. The ultimate effect of such denial will be loss of faith in the neighborhood; development, redevelopment, and maintenance will be retarded. Residential zoning is the primary need in stabilizing and build-
up a district.

Many home owners do not know how their property is zoned until some time after construction of a filling station or industrial building next door. Knowledge of the intent, purpose, and effect of zoning has now come to be a basic part of every home owner's education. The residential neigh-
borhood as a unit demands special attention in modern planning. This was emphasized by FHA officials from Washington at a special meeting held in Portland on January 26 for that particular purpose.

Relating to Property Owners and Responses

In October, 1935, notices were sent to all property owners affected by this proposal for rezoning in Southern Portland and vicinity. Many home owners have called at the office of the City Planning Commission to express their approval of the project. Some written approvals have been received. One owner filled written remonstrances against the proposed change of cer-
tal property from Zone Three to Zone One. A few home owners requested, verbally, that the present Zone Three be reduced more than was shown on the original plan for the rezoning.

The communication received by the City Planning Commission in response to notices was signed by 26 home owners who wished to be on record as approv-
ing the entire rezoning project. All these communications are transmitted below.
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Recommendation

It is recommended that the proposed rezoning plan for Southern Portland and vicinity, as amended, be forwarded to the council with the request that the changes of zone be enacted by ordinance.

Respectfully submitted,

Harry D. Freeman, Technical Director.

Approved by committee on zoning

____________________ (Date)

Approved by City Planning Commission

____________________ (Date)
APPENDIX E

CITY COUNCIL REPORT

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE

The City Planning Commission reported as follows:

Thereafter, the planning board and its members received a proposed change in zone classification for a district in Eastern Portland. The district is shown in the map and the properties proposed to be changed are listed in the proposed amendment to the zoning ordinance. No 45847.

In addition to the proposed amendment and the map, there are two transmittals of maps for proposed additions to zoning or changes to the project. There are also letters of transmittal from four property owners.

A copy of the report of the select committee on the proposed change is also transmitted. The report was adopted by the Planning Commission at a meeting held February 20, 1007, and the City Planning Commission recommends to the City Council that proceedings be initiated to effect the change as recommended.

A list showing the names and addresses of the owners of property proposed to be changed is transmitted with this recommendation. See following Calendar No. 1083.
Acceptance of the Portland Waterfront Association's proposal for the purchase of the land upon which the new waterfront improvements are to be built.

Mr. Miller's remarks:

"I object to this plan. The city should not be required to pay for improvements that will benefit the private developers. This is a public benefit, and the city should not be forced to pay for it."
Mr. Walsh asked:

"How many lots are there in this section of Pendleton and Edgell which have been taken in Zone 1? Edgell runs from the intersection of Pendleton to Edgell property and runs from the intersection of Pendleton to Edgell property.

Mr. Walsh added that the corner property cannot be sold because the business is located there.

The auditor announced that the ordinance had been filed in the office of the auditor.

Mr. Walsh said:

"The 2nd recommendation of the Planning Commission was that the property be rezoned to Zone 3. At the time of the meeting, the auditor was in the process of rezoning the property to Zone 3."
Commissioner Clyde withdrew said motion with the consent of his second.

Commissioner Clyde made a motion which was seconded by Commissioner Bean that the City Attorney be instructed to bring in an ordinance making the intersection of Pendleton and Fairmont in Zone I.

Commissioner Bean said:

"Today is the official public hearing and there would be no objection in having a public hearing unless the Council had the right to make some changes. A motion has been made which will take these out of Zone 3 and into Zone 4. It is his business to be at the public hearing to tell his side."

Commissioner Staggs said:

"Suppose we adopt this report with the exception of the corner at Pendleton and Fairmont and let them stay out for the present and then send this on notice and we will have a hearing on their corner?"

Commissioner Clyde withdrew his second motion with the consent of his second.

Commissioner Bean made a motion which was seconded by Commissioner Clyde that the matter be referred to the City Attorney with directions to bring in an ordinance which will comply with the Planning Commission's report with the exception of the four corners at Pendleton and Fairmont which shall be transferred into Zone I and the owner of those four corners notified by the Solicitor that this is being done, giving him the date at which the ordinance will come in, May 13, 1927.

The motion being put to the Yeas, Commissioners Bean, Bennett, Clyde, Hily, whereupon said motion was declared carried.

2906

The Commissioners of Public Works reported as follows:

Your Commissioners of Public Works calls the attention of the Council to the fact that a request has been made for a permit to erect a one-story Cross Vi large garage at Northeast Caffield Avenue and Northeast Polling Street, on lot 27, block 4, Atlantic Homestead Addition, which is located in Zone II. Under the provisions of the zoning ordinance a permit is to be issued under mapped out procedures, which states that the application will be approved by the Board of Buildings if more than 50% of the property within two hundred feet of the property in question is represented by a petition opposed to the permit and a majority of such petitioners are represented by someone in business or are entitled to the issuance of a permit. Going to the fact that a school district exists in the side of the Polling School lying within the project area, it is immaterial for the request to be at a majority project petition. Without considering the current district property, the project is approximately 50%. I have been advised that at a meeting of the School Board last night the Council and the Board expressed themselves as being opposed to the issuance of such a permit but claimed that it is their policy to remain neutral as far as asking protests is concerned. Your Commissioners respectfully in view of the above facts that he be authorized to refuse to issue a permit for said structure when and if requested. Commissioner Bean asked that he be given unanimous consent to change his report as follows: 1st. By changing the Roman numeral "II" to the Roman numeral "I" in line 8 of paragraph 1st said report after the word "Zone" 2nd. By changing the Roman numeral "II" to the Roman numeral "II" in line 8 of paragraph 8 of said report after the word "Zone". By unanimous consent Commissioner Bean was given permission to so change his report.

Commissioner Bean said:

"Under local option proceedings notices were sent out to adjoining property and those living more than 50% who protest the permit is granted automatically. This is a permit for a garage and the neighborhood apparently doesn't want the garage. I have been notified that the old school and the City park are owned by the School Board and under local option proceedings because the School Board property oversee control it really is in the position of being in favor of granting the permit."
Moser Carson said:

"I understand that an agreement has been reached and the officials of the North Bank Highway Stage and the Portland Railway Company have agreed the North Bank Highway Stage will continue the business of handling inter-city business from Milling in Portland North over the same route it now travels. It has been pointed out to me that the business of handling the Stage has been more direct stages, they will get more quicker and the same thing will apply on trains." Moser Carson said:

"Has that been agreed upon by the competing parties as satisfactory?"

Mr. Frank McColloch of the Firm of Bey, McColloch and McEachron, responded:

"We have substantially stated it and both competing parties have filed letters with the Council, through Commissioner Clyde, as to when it was referred." Commissioner Bevan said:

"I would like to ask Commissioner Clyde whether he recommends it?"

Commissioner Clyde said:

"I am not sure that letter does not count 1-hand part of that we have agreed that this should go through from Milling in Portland North. They are not to do business South or Millingworth. I recommend it."

Moser Carson said:

"Neither the North Bank Highway Stage or the Portland Railway Company, while not putting up any opposition, are being understood to waive any rights which they have held for the time being." Mr. McColloch said:

"There is a solution neither of us will resist, such solution which for the purpose of supplementing the matter, I might say the ordinance proposed by Commissioner Bevan at the last time this matter was considered fits the situation at which we have arrived." Commissioner Bevan made a motion which was seconded by Commissioner Clyde and carried unanimously that Calendar No. 2080 be ordered placed on file, and the ordinance which would carry into effect the North Bank Highway Stage and Board of Aldermen. It would continue to do the same business that has been carried on in Millingworth, inclusive, North over the same route now being traversed by the Portland Railway Company to handle the business South of Millingworth, be placed on the regular calendar.

Communication from City Attorney returning Calendar No. 2080 and 2081, in regard to changing the zone of properties in Southern Forkland and submitting a form of ordinance authorizing said change of zone, set in out in its regular order in this meeting. Those present favoring said change of zone were asked to hold up their hands and mine were shown to be present. Moser Carson said:

"I want to find out whether Lot 4 is included in Zone 1, I want it to be." Mr. A. McEachron said:

"I own a lot on the south corner of Pendleton and Corbett. It is 100 feet on Pendleton and 70 on Corbett. I bought it 80 odd years ago. At that time there was hardly a house in South Portland District. There was a building started across the way for a store building. I bought that property for $500.00 and it is a business investment for business property."

"To connect with this property I have signed up for every improvement that was petitioned for in the neighborhood, an extension of Broadway and the extension of Millingworth Road to the top of the hill. We paved the streets in the district. I never had to pay anything to anything."

"Old houses have been moved in rear to where I was. Small breaks"
have been built without any zone ordinance connected with the price of the home and I feel that you cannot take by the Council on the Cowl. I object to for the reason that I thought the community with the intention of business investment and I think the other people thought there with the knowledge that there was no code.

"I think it is a very arbitrary notion to put this out of Zone 3. The Planning Commission recommends these four areas out of Zone 3 and I hope that you will re-consider this matter and move Zone 3 on this score."

Mrs. Stahl said:
"We own property right next door to Mr. Ransom. We have a small store building there, rather a nice home. We don't want any factories next door.

"If he has held it over twenty years and hasn't sold it for business property don't you think we might have sixty years in Zone 3?"

Mr. Migliore said:
"The business corner is a rest-room, on the southeast a vacant lot and on the northwest corner a filling station which has changed hands a great many times.

"This gentlemen is the only one that wants that section left in Zone 3. The Planning Commission left it because he asked for it and because it was already occupied by two business buildings.

"This week the people insisted they wanted that particular place in Zone 3 to be non-confusing use. It leaves one building there a filling station is non-confusing use, the other two corners one has a residence and one a vacant lot in Zone 3.

Mrs. Ransom said:
"I believe I bought the property a long time ago. I owned my property and bought it with the knowledge that it was a business lot. I take a sign on there many years stating I would build stores."

Mr. Migliore said:
"On the northwest corner to any commercial encroachment of business buildings on the Postal District of the City."

Mr. Roop said:
"If this a young man than, I spent all my money in the State of Oregon. I haven't invested money in more quantities and stocks.

"This is a carline, fundamentally a business street, and if you are going to curtail the activities of small people in investing money in your city, I am opposed to it. Now I believe that is in opposition to Washington Street or account of any unnecessary that is going on. If you are going to continue with this sort of ruthlessness and allow business. I've invested for the small investors to invest we certainly feel very much discouraged. In the last few years our building loan has been four times because of the encouragement of such monoply by outright depriving our business and giving the small man a chance. If you are not going to allow some business district and small business to exist I tell you you are part of the monopoly."

Mayor Carson asked:
"If it proposed to change of that now in business use to Zone 3?"

Commissioner Cline replied:
"At the present time to have Zone 1 or Zone 3. This is a proposal to change it to Zone 3."

Commissioner Cline said:
"Of the people invested their money in homes, their life savings, should be given proper protection. I feel there are a number of places already where business can be conducted. The consent you do have isn't in the case of this one. We have a school here which the people in this area have invested their money and raised a family is entitled to some protection. The records show this is the worst divided City in the United States."

Mayor Carson said:
"This is one thing I want just to say. I believe in preserving the integrity of the residential district. Fortin is far ahead of nearly every Western City. You go into a city comparable to this, you don't find nearly as nice a city as Fortin. We have a city comparable to Fortin."

"I understand it Mr. Stahl's property was excepted by the report that was in here before."
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Mr. Reescheid said:

"The zoning resolution favor my property being put in Zone 3."

Mrs. Carson asked:

"Are these business buildings built on it?"

Commissioner Bean replied:

"Yes, it is a vacant lot."

Mrs. Reescheid said:

"Can't have to build a business building; or it wills monopoly is going on until little business can't exist."

"I think we have a prior right to that property as business property because I was one of the first to buy property and there weren't any houses there."

Mr. Black said:

"Somebody in the community bought when we were in Zone 2. If we see a chance to better ourselves we want to take it. That is not business property. There are only four lots on the corner. There is one business house there on one corner, there has been a filling station there. It has been sold and re-sold. No one has made a living there. There is an apartment house on the other corner, it has been vacant all the time."

"It is not business property. I insist it is not business property."

"There are our members of our family not there. We all have nice houses. I was born in this community and have lived there all my life."

Mrs. Louise Balmer asked:

"We live many houses put up a building there. Is there any restriction as to the character of the building? It seems to me these people would have this done. Pledges himself to build a building that wouldn't be an eyesore to the community it might be better."

The Auditor stated that no other restraints had been filed.

Commissioner Bean said:

"When it came up last week the City Attorney was authorized to bring in an ordinance which would not leave four corners in Zone 3, it leaves two non-conforming uses, the other two are one residence and one blank lot wouldn't be in Zone 3."

Mr. Evans Dorsey said:

"The time land before Southwest Mason was used into a main highway and an improved four-lane highway, there was a lot of traffic on present. At this time filling station near by was business up there, the minute they opened up Mason Avenue and put traffic down there, the filling station went to failure from there on. This same way with the apartment building, with the four-stor space up went. Only two out of four are occupied at the present time."

"A short time ago we tried to get a loan to improve our property, F.H.A. They didn't give it to us because it was in Zone 3 and a poor locality."

Commissioner Clyde made a motion which was amended by Commissioner Bean and carried unanimously that the rezoning be overturned and placed on file.

2542 An Ordinance entitled, "An Ordinance amending Section 1-4, amended, To effect Zoning Ordinances by changing the zone of certain properties in Southern Portland and adjacent areas, was passed by order of the Council and read twice.

By unanimous consent said ordinance was passed to the Third Reading.

2550 Report of Commissioner of Public Utilities on petition of Mrs. Gladys N. Nelson and others for re-routing of portion of the North St Johns Water Main. Reurning said petition be considered by the Council as a whole (Set out in its report). Order in this matter. By unanimous consent the time for hearing said matter was fixed at May 27, 1937, at 1:30 P.M. and the auditor instructed to publish notice of hearing.
ENHRIDYD ODINANCES TO BE READ THE THIRD TIME

Ordinance No 66013, entitled, "An Ordinance amending Section 14 of Ordinance No 66013, entitled, "An Ordinance dividing the City of Portland into four districts, prescribing the uses to which property may be put or used, providing a penalty for violation thereof, and repealing all ordinances in conflict therewith", as amended, passed by the Council September 28, 1926, and approved by the legal voters of the City of Portland November 4, 1924, to include regulations for the establishing of building setback lines in any district in the City of Portland, and establishing a procedure therefore was read a first time and declared passed by the following vote; Yeas, Commissioners Mean, Clyde, and Riley, 3.

Ordinance No 66014, entitled, "An Ordinance amending Ordinance No 66020 entitled, "An Ordinance regulating and requiring a permit and payment of a permit fee for the construction and maintenance of service driveways, and providing a penalty for violation thereof" passed by the Council March 20, 1924 by adding thereto a new section to be numbered Section 6 and providing regulations as to service driveways, when painting of the same in certain expedited districts was read a third time and declared passed by the following vote; Yeas, Commissioners Mean, Clyde, and Riley, 3.

Ordinance No 66015, entitled, "An Ordinance amending Section 1.08, entitled, "City Zoning Ordinance by changing from Zone II to Zone III, the west 16.68 feet of Lot 23 and Lots 29, 30, 31 and 32, Block 1, Endicott; Lots 1 and 2, Block 4, Endicott; and the north 55 feet of Lots 1 and 2, Block 4, Eastland, except for the south 5,6 feet of the north 55 feet of the east 8 feet of said Lot 2, Block 4, Eastland, in the City of Portland, Multnomah County, Oregon" was read a third time and declared passed by the following vote; Yeas, Commissioners Mean, Clyde, and Riley, 3.

Ordinance No 66016, entitled, "An Ordinance amending Section 1.08, entitled, "City Zoning Ordinance by changing from Zone I to Zone I-special, Lot 5, Block 50, Ladd's Addition (2103 NE Ladd Avenue), said property being situated on the easterly side of NE Ladd Avenue, 60 feet north of NE Laveda Street, in the City of Portland, Multnomah County, Oregon" was read a third time and declared passed by the following vote; Yeas, Commissioners Mean, Clyde, and Riley, 3.

Ordinance No 66017, entitled, "An Ordinance amending Section 1.08, entitled, "City Zoning Ordinance by changing the zone of certain properties in Southern Portland to adjacent areas in a more suitable and proper manner" was read a third time.

Mr. Anonimous appeared and said:

"Would like to ask Mr. Freeman do you think Zone S on that corner would be objectionable?"

Mr. Harry D. Freeman, Technical Director of the Planning Commission replied:

"Well, Zone S isn't commercial and it isn't residential. It is just a bit in between. You can put in a filling station, a local option or a garage in Zone S. It would have to be done through consent."

Commissioner Clyde said:

"I am going to ask - I don't know if we could ask that - I was going to ask if commercial environment would not reduce the property values for homes and cause a reluctance on the part of the Federal authorities to extend loans."
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Commissioner Bean said:

"In this particular case there are two businesses now on the intersection: a building partly occupied by stores and apartments on one corner, another residence, an intake, a filling station and the fourth corner is just a vacant lot, so that intersection is pretty well determined as far as business is concerned.

This gentleman does have a justification for asking to have it put in Zone 3."

Commissioner Clyde said:

"I am questioning if he has a justification. The workmen have in the greatest good of the greatest number and I feel in many parts of the city where there are many buildings and residences, that it helps to keep up the values of the property in the whole district.

"I don't believe that it would be satisfactory to the people living in that district and if I remember there were one or two withdrawals from the appeal to put the property in Zone 2."

Commissioner Bean said:

"The two haven't been considered."

"We took it out of Zone 3 because of the protest of the neighbors. I don't believe most of them would object to Zone 3."

Mr. Day said:

"I would like to ask a question of Mr. Pearman."

"If this district was not originally planned as Zone 3, that corner?"

Mr. Pearman said:

"I think originally, yes. We received a recommendation and the fact that two corners were in Zone 3 out there, one corner being in apartment house use, it was almost the border line and the Commission gave the property owners the benefit of the doubt in that case. Zone 2 was not discussed in this case."

Commissioner Clyde said:

"I think Zone 3 is in this. We are responsible for every foot that comes before the Council. With all due respect to the Planning Board or any other board, we ultimately have the final disposition of these matters. The Planning Board are just as likely to make a strong mistake as anyone else. When the Planning Board submits anything it is in an advisory capacity.

I firmly believe if they allowed this piece of property to go into Zone 2, it will cause a blight in that neighborhood. It has enough blight now."

"I feel our residential district should be protected. I feel the Council should do something in this matter. As far as I am concerned I shall vote against this being in Zone 3."

Mr. Hancock said:

"Mr. Bean's remarks take a reasonable attitude in Zone 3. I wish to argue about vacant stores. Since I was here last the vacant store has started again on Portland Boulevard and Interstate. The grocer who conducts the business there was obliged to go where there were rooms in back so he could cut down its overhead."

"It is impossible for a business to exist today with the ruthless competition you have here. Men like myself who have business properties are suffering a great deal."

"I think it is really an outrage after we have invested all our money in the land of Oregon, we have never found any petitions in South Portland for improvements, I have always tried to do my best, sometimes haven't cut the grass, it is a terrible situation of business. Every fifty block is a Chinese lottery and people can't do business with the competition existing."

Mr. W. S. Sage said:

"Mr. Bean's remarks take a reasonable attitude in Zone 3. With all due respect to the owner, while he is somewhat financially injured, he probably possessed this lot twenty years. I went in there five years ago and purchased the lot and put a house on it for several thousand dollars. I went in there, invested my money in addition to the lot and didn't wait for an increased valuation in there. Just because he, twenty years ago, bought a lot and hoped it would become business property he is holding out development up."

Commissioner Clyde asked for the roll call.

The roll being called, the passage of said ordinance resulted in favor, Commissioner Bean, Clyde and Hiney, 3, whereupon said ordinance was declared passed.
APPENDIX F

TAX INCREMENT REVENUE GENERATION POTENTIAL OF JOHNS LANDING
AND LA BIEN PROJECTS

Third Analysis - Subject to Revision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax Year</th>
<th>Added Assessed Value</th>
<th>Tax Increment Added in Tax Year</th>
<th>Tax Increment Received In Tax Year</th>
<th>Total Accumulated Tax Increment To Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>$ 0.3^N</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>3.4^N</td>
<td>96,000</td>
<td>104,000</td>
<td>112,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>3.2^N</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>194,000</td>
<td>306,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>5.4^N</td>
<td>151,000</td>
<td>345,000</td>
<td>651,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.0^N</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>401,000</td>
<td>1,057,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Column and Line comparisons may not be exact due to rounding off of numbers.

This analysis is based on the assumption that the planning area is declared an urban renewal area by 15 May 1976.

PDC/Aug., 1975
From: Bureau of Sanitary Engineering
To: Bureau of Planning
Address to: Alan Fox, City Planner
Subject: Comprehensive Plant - Garbett/Terwilliger/Lair Hill Area

This is in response to the request of Dennis Wilde, Chief Planner, Neighborhood and District Planning for a review of Draft II, Sec. III (Goals, Projects and Priorities) relating to the subject area.

A review of the report indicates that the future planning for this area is based on a general premise that the neighborhood will remain residential with a mixture of commercial, apartments and some manufacturing.

The sewers in this general area are quite old, some dating back to the 1930's, and were designed for residential use. To-date these sewers, as a whole, have served adequately with a minimum of maintenance.

Pending detailed plans of specific areas it can be assumed that the existing combination sewer may be utilized for the proposed revitalization of existing residential units along with some new developments. Most of the area is zoned for high density usage. The development of the area to its present zoning will certainly call for increased sewer capacity by the installation of a separated sewer system.

For further information on this subject contact Mr. Ron Sunnarborg at 248-5605 or Mr. Steve Strelowics at 248-4171.

J. P. Niessler
Chief Civil Engineer

SSS:vo

cc: Roy Sims

Maintenance Engineering
January 9, 1975

Bureau of Sanitary Engineering

Bureau of Planning

Ernest R. Doner, Director

Comprehensive Plan-Corbett/Terwilliger/Lait Hill

This is in reply to the memorandum of December 19, 1974 requesting an "educated guess" as to probable future sewer costs involved in establishing a separated sewer system for the subject area.

For purposes of this memo certain assumptions will have to be made. It will be assumed that all existing combination sewers will be duplicated in length with the existing sewers being converted to sanitary use only.

The duplication of trunk sewers will extend to the Willamette River. These trunks are identified as Woods Street, which roughly parallels the Ross Island Bridge, and Thomas Creek which joins the Woods Street sewer at S.W. Moody Avenue under the bridge.

The area under consideration is bounded by S.W. Bancroft Street, S.W. Harbor Blvd., and S.W. First Avenue, S.W. Grover Street and the I-5 Freeway. A rough estimate of the total cost of sewer installation in this area is $1,250,000. This cost would include the extension of storm sewers to the Willamette River. Enclosed is a map indicating the existing sewers. The trunks and sub-trunks are shown in green and yellow and the laterals in yellow.

It is evident from the map that the degree of development will dictate the extent of sewer improvement. Major development in either of the two drainage areas will require a new storm sewer to the river.

A breakdown of costs relating to the area north of S.W. Corry Street is as follows: Trunks and sub-trunks to the river $600,000, laterals $350,000. In the area south of S.W. Corry Street the trunk costs to a point at S.W. Moody and the bridge would be $600,000 with lateral costs at $300,000.

These figures should be used with caution since they are based on a single assumption. An engineering study could make substantial changes in the present concept.

For further information contact S. Strykowicz at 249-4171.

R. C. Strykowicz
Assistant Principal Engineer

Enc.

cc: R. E. Sims
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APPENDIX

CITY BUREAU COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED REZONING

August 7, 1975

Dennis Wilde, Chief Planner
Neighborhood Planning
424 S.W. Main Street
Portland, Oregon 97204

ATTN: Alan Fox

Subject: Proposed Re-Zoning of Corbett/Terwilliger/Lair Hill

Gentlemen:

This is in reply to your letter of July 14, 1975 concerning planning commission staff recommendations for zone changes to be presented at a public hearing on August 26, 1975.

As discussed in an earlier letter addressed to you from this office and dated January 9, 1975, the degree and location of development will dictate the extent of sewer improvement to be required. Review of the existing system indicates that it presently is overloaded even though the area has not yet been developed to the full extent allowed under present zoning.

The proposed change from A0 and C2 zones to A2.5 will decrease the amount of non-permeable area, thereby reducing future storm sewer requirements anticipated for this section of the city. The result would be lower construction and maintenance costs through use of smaller diameter pipes and less footage. Therefore, this office would be in support of the proposed re-zoning.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]
J.P. Niederer
Chief Civil Engineer

ABB: JIG
August 11, 1975

From: Bureau of Traffic Engineering
To: Bureau of Planning
Addressed to: Dennis Wilde
Subject: Zone Change in the Lair Hill/Corbett area

The Bureau of Planning's recommendation of a zone change from A0 and C2 to A2.5, and M3 to M2, in the Lair Hill/Corbett area has been reviewed by this bureau.

Any future traffic generation and its effect on the traffic flow, whether this area remains A0 or is zoned A2.5, is subjective, depending on the number of units and their locations.

From a traffic engineering standpoint we have no objections to this proposed zone change. This request would not reduce the existing traffic flow, but would limit the potential for greater traffic generation from this area.

M. J. Martin
Sr. Traffic Engineer

MB:es
From: Bureau of Street and Structural Engineering
To: Bureau of Planning
Addressed to: Alan Fox
Subject: Review of Proposed Zone Changes in Corbett/Terwilliger/Lair Hill Area

Street needs will not be increased due to the proposed zone changes to A2.8 and R3 since proposed zoning is more restrictive than current zoning.

Signed:
JOHN M. LANG, CHIEF
Bureau of Street and Structural Engineering

Received:
City of Portland
Bureau of Planning
The Bureau of Water Works has reviewed the proposed zone changes with regard to subject plan. The Bureau raises no objections, to the proposed zoning, however, it should be noted that multi-story and commercial development may require larger services than are currently being served. Depending upon the location, a petitioner for a large service may incur considerable costs in upgrading the distribution network in order to satisfy service requirements.

Robert C. Bitten, P.E.
Chief Engineer

MAM: nb
Enc.
cc: P. Norseth
    M. Walker
July 23, 1975

Dennis Wilde
Chief Planner
Neighborhood Planning
424 SW. Main Street
Building #106

Dear Mr. Wilde:

The Central Precinct commanders who will be involved in the Corbett/Terwilliger/Lair Hill Neighborhood Plan were contacted by this division. They responded that they saw no extra ordinary police problems regarding the proposal.

Please advise us when the final decisions are official.
Thank you.

Lt. William Richardson
Planning and Research Division

SMS/d11
8-75-76
July 21, 1975

Mr. Alan Fox
Neighborhood Planning
City of Portland
424 S.W. Main St.
Portland, OR 97204

Dear Mr. Fox:

We are in receipt of Mr. Wilde's letter of July 14, 1975, advising our office of the Planning Commission hearing on August 26, 1975, for the Corbett/Terwilliger/Lair Hill Neighborhood Plan. We do not feel that the plan, as proposed, would have an unmanageable impact on the District's facilities and educational programs.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Gary D. Zimmerman, Manager
Real Property

GD3:dm

cc: Mr. Harold A. Kleiner
    Mr. Clinton E. Thomas
August 14, 1975

Mr. Alan Fox
Bureau of Planning
Portland, Oregon

Dear Mr. Fox:

I am responding to Mr. Dennis Wilde's letter dated July 14, 1975, announcing a public hearing on the Corbett/Erwilliger/ Lair Hill Neighborhood Plan.

From a fire protection standpoint, we urgently recommend some basic requirements:

- Street access into an area from more than one direction and of sufficient width for fire apparatus. Narrow streets plus residents' parking on the street at night is a combination which results in blocking access for fire apparatus.

- Access to buildings for rescue via ladders, application of fire streams from the outside and for interior fire fighting, use of building fire protection systems such as sprinkler connections, fire escape ladders, and firemen's ladders on smoke towers.

- Water supply into the area, sufficient to supply sprinkler systems and the required fire flow for fire streams. Hydrant spacing which meets Insurance Services Office grading schedule standards.

- Adequate regard for fire fighting requirements in the construction of large, frame, multiple-unit, residential occupancies is one of our particular concerns.

We are planning to have a Fire Bureau representative at the meeting on August 26 at 7:30 p.m. in the City Hall Annex, Room 200.

Sincerely,

Gordon A. Monterud
Chief, Bureau of Fire

GA/mjp

cc: Assistant Chief Jones