



Rithy KHUT <rithy.khut@multco.us>

Fwd: 2016 County Plan Draft Testimony

1 message

Rich FAITH <rich.faith@multco.us>
To: Rithy Khut <rithy.khut@multco.us>

Wed, Aug 24, 2016 at 2:17 PM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Ruth Metz** <ruthmetz@spiretech.com>

Date: Wed, Aug 24, 2016 at 1:30 PM

Subject: 2016 County Plan Draft Testimony

To: Chair <mult.chair@multco.us>

Cc: District 1 <district1@multco.us>, District 2 <district2@multco.us>, district4@multco.us, dans@multco.us

Dear Chair Kafoury:

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the adoption of the Multnomah County Comprehensive Plan, Draft 2016. I am sending this in advance in case I am not able to be present as I hope to be at tomorrow's meeting.

While I appreciate the efforts of the many people that developed the plan, I am extremely concerned about two aspects it. First, I am very concerned that proposed changes in the wording of the plan will weaken the integrity of the plan as it affects subareas. For example, in 1-22, last paragraph - "However with respect to all questions of interpretation of this Plan, the provisions of the Plan control over the provisions of the now repealed SIMC appended to this plan".

The possibility of the diminution of the subarea plans was presaged at the end of the SIMC subarea planning. At that time, citizens insisted before Multnomah County Planning officials and the Planning Commission that sub area plans should not be weakened by a County Plan. My recollection is that citizens, County representatives, and Planning Commissioners were on the same page about this at the time.

The subarea plans which are the result of detailed study and knowledge of the subareas, should inform questions of interpretation and should control decisions.

My second concern has to do with Code Compliance 2.41-1 through 2.41-4. These draft policies put the responsibility of compliance on neighbors who are expected to report suspected code violations. If the County's position on code violations brought to the County's attention continues to be to assuage the non-compliant, to look the other way, to stretch compliance, Sauvie Island will continue to build up with non-compliant structures that fly in the face of the Plan's intentions and goals. Further, the County will discourage the cooperation of residents that experience the effects of violations first hand. The passive treatment of code violations is insincere and provokes citizen resentment of County government. I don't know precisely what must happen for County officials to be able to effectively address code violations—authority, clarity, willingness, know-how, training, coaching—but this is the question I respectfully put before you on this matter.

In conclusion, I share the position raised by others that where a subarea plan like the SIMC plan is either more stringent or in conflict with a countywide plan, the subarea plan language will control. I urge you to deny any changes in the language that diminish or weaken the intentions that led to the SIMC Plan. I encourage you to strengthen the County's responsible follow-through on code enforcement.

Sincerely,

Ruth Metz

17335 NW Lucy Reeder Road

Portland, OR 97231



Rithy KHUT <rithy.khut@multco.us>

Fwd: 2016 County Plan Draft Testimony

1 message

Rich FAITH <rich.faith@multco.us>
To: Rithy Khut <rithy.khut@multco.us>

Wed, Aug 24, 2016 at 2:17 PM

Forwarded message —

From: Ruth Metz <ruthmetz@spiretech.com>
Date: Wed, Aug 24, 2016 at 1:30 PM
Subject: 2016 County Plan Draft Testimony
To: Chair <mult.chair@multco.us>
Cc: District 1 <district1@multco.us>, District 2 <district2@multco.us>, district4@multco.us, dans@multco.us

Dear Chair Kafoury:

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the adoption of the Multnomah County Comprehensive Plan, Draft 2016. I am sending this in advance in case I am not able to be present as I hope to be at tomorrow's meeting.

While I appreciate the efforts of the many people that developed the plan, I am extremely concerned about two aspects it. First, I am very concerned that proposed changes in the wording of the plan will weaken the integrity of the plan as it affects subareas. For example, in 1-22, last paragraph □"However with respect to all questions of interpretation of this Plan, the provisions of the Plan control over the provisions of the now repealed SIMC appended to this plan".

The possibility of the diminution of the subarea plans was presaged at the end of the SIMC subarea planning. At that time, citizens insisted before Multnomah County Planning officials and the Planning Commission that sub area plans should not be weakened by a County Plan. My recollection is that citizens, County representatives, and Planning Commissioners were on the same page about this at the time.

The subarea plans which are the result of detailed study and knowledge of the subareas, should inform questions of interpretation and should control decisions.

My second concern has to do with Code Compliance 2.41-1 through 2.41-4. These draft policies put the responsibility of compliance on neighbors who are expected to report suspected code violations. If the County's position on code violations brought to the County's attention continues to be to assuage the non-compliant, to look the other way, to stretch compliance, Sauvie Island will continue to build up with non-compliant structures that fly in the face of the Plan's intentions and goals. Further, the County will discourage the cooperation of residents that experience the effects of violations first hand. The passive treatment of code violations is insincere and provokes citizen resentment of County government. I don't know precisely what must happen for County officials to be able to effectively address code violations—authority, clarity, willingness, know-how, training, coaching—but this is the question I respectfully put before you on this matter.

In conclusion, I share the position raised by others that where a subarea plan like the SIMC plan is either more stringent or in conflict with a countywide plan, the subarea plan language will control. I urge you to deny any changes in the language that diminish or weaken the intentions that led to the SIMC Plan. I encourage you to strengthen the County's responsible follow-through on code enforcement.

Sincerely,

Ruth Metz

17335 NW Lucy Reeder Road

Portland, OR 97231