



50 SW Bond St., Ste. 4 | Bend, OR 97702  
Phone: (541) 647-2930  
[www.centraloregonlandwatch.org](http://www.centraloregonlandwatch.org)

July 17, 2017

Bend Collaborative Housing Workgroup  
c/o Erin Foote Morgan  
Bend 2030  
Bend, OR

**Re: Housing Workgroup Policy Report**

Dear Workgroup:

Thank you for sending out again for comments on your list of 12 recommendations for spurring middle income housing development in Bend. I won't repeat all the support we expressed for some of the recommendations that we addressed in our letter of May 24, but I just want to reiterate our concerns about the other recommendations and the particular concern that advocating for them could undermine support from the public for the others. We support what actually helps to implement the UGB Plan, but do not support those elements which would actually change it.

We assume that the lack of response to our May 24 letter means that the workgroup does not understand or disagrees with our concerns, so we would like to try to explain them again. As a matter of public process and as I explained in the May 24 letter, the altering of the compromise positions unanimously adopted by the City Council and County Commission on the UGB Plan just eight or so months ago is a problem. The public participation in that process was extensive and that broader public has not been engaged here where it has been mostly led by COBA and CORA representatives. It will also be expensive and difficult to replicate that UGB public process.

Given the rate of change that is already occurring in Bend and the changes that will be felt when UGB Plan policies are implemented, we don't believe it is appropriate without extensive public understanding/support to change density rules beyond what has already been agreed upon. It would be good to first see what can be accomplished under the adopted UGB Plan before amending it.

As for changing all of the existing zones in the City to conform to Plan designations, the UGB Plan did that only for places like Korpine and the Central Area Plan and left to the traditional zone change process, which involves significant public participation, the conversion of other areas. Those two places had the zone changes done upfront in large part because of the relatively low neighborhood impact of the changes. A guiding objective of the UGB Plan was not just to provide more density, but also to direct most of the near-term density and its impacts to certain Opportunity Areas. While neighborhoods may become more dense over time, we wanted that to occur as gradually as possible so the changes would not be so disruptive to the neighborhoods.



Much of the historical reason for a zone change process separate from the Plan designation is to provide the public with the opportunity to comment on the timing and conditions for the conversion of particular property and to ensure needed infrastructure, like transportation, is available. One of the approval criteria under BCC 4.6.300(C)(2) for quasi-judicial zone changes for a particular property provides:

“The property and affected area is presently provided with adequate public facilities, services and transportation networks to support the use, or such facilities, services and transportation networks are planned to be provided concurrently with the development of the property.”

Your proposed automatic alignment of the City’s zoning map with the Comprehensive Plan is going to primarily impact east side neighborhoods, such as the Rungay and NE 8<sup>th</sup> area from RS to RM, the neighborhood north of Rosemary off of 27<sup>th</sup> from RS to RM, the neighborhood from Vail and NE 8<sup>th</sup> from RS to RM, the neighborhood around 5<sup>th</sup> Street and Neff from RH with RM buffer to all RM, the neighborhood from Powers up to almost Reed Market from RS to RM, the neighborhood off of Reed Market (Gleneden, Glengarry, Glencoe and west to 3<sup>rd</sup>) from RS to RM, the neighborhood off of NE Irving and 5<sup>th</sup> from RS with some RM and RH to all RH, etc. Though the rezoning will eventually occur, the public has the right to comment on how and when.

In your chart on page 9, you depict a level of “community support” as the apparently highest level of “3.” If by community support you mean COBA and CORA, then 3 might be appropriate, but it is doubtful that Bend neighborhoods would give that kind of broad support. The stated objective of reducing costs to developers to do zone changes does not trump the public’s right to participate in the zone change process.

Under Resource Considerations, you show the need for staff/consultant time and give a recommended timeline of six months. These are serious understatements. The effort to amend the Comprehensive Plan to do the sweeping zone changes would create a long-term controversy and divert needed staff time from implementation of the UGB Plan.

We also continue to be concerned about the allowance of fourplexes in the standard residential zone and the proposed change in calculation of density. Though these tools may eventually be necessary, they are not part of the UGB Plan. Finally, we do not think that reducing open space for multi-family developments just because they are within ¼ mile of a park or trail is appropriate.

Again, we support most of what is being proposed because it appears to be implementing the adopted UGB Plan. Our concerns are about proposals that would, in effect, change what has been adopted.

Very truly yours,

Paul Dewey, Executive Director



