



Rithy KHUT &lt;rithy.khut@multco.us&gt;

---

**Fwd: Comment re: Multnomah County Comprehensive Plan, Draft 2016**

1 message

---

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

Wed, Aug 24, 2016 at 7:38 AM

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

From: **Cindy Reid** <cinbah@spiritone.com>

Date: Tue, Aug 23, 2016 at 4:07 PM

Subject: Comment re: Multnomah County Comprehensive Plan, Draft 2016

To: Deborah Kafoury &lt;mult.chair@multco.us&gt;, Bailey Jules &lt;district1@multco.us&gt;, Loretta Smith &lt;district2@multco.us&gt;, Judy Shiprack &lt;district3@multco.us&gt;, Diane McKeel &lt;district4@multco.us&gt;

Cc: Adam BARBER &lt;adam.t.barber@multco.us&gt;, Rich FAITH &lt;rich.faith@multco.us&gt;

Dear Chair Kafoury and Commissioners:

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the adoption of the Multnomah County Comprehensive Plan, Draft 2016. Overall, it is a testament to hundreds (maybe thousands) of hours of collective efforts by community members, Community Advisory Committees, Technical Advisory Committees, the County Planning staff, the Planning Commission, and each of you and your staff members. I hope everyone is proud of the work presented here.

There are a few areas of the document that continue to concern me. as a resident of Sauvie Island. I believe most of these concerns have been stated in several venues:

1) See 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to all questions of interpretation of this Plan, the provisions of the Plan control over the provisions of the now repealed SIMC appended to this plan". It seems that all the work that went into the SIMC RAP, which included highly specific language and revisions - should not in fact be repealed - but used in conjunction with the Comprehensive Plan - and that specific SIMC sub area plan language should control the interpretation if there are conflicts, or if the specific sub area language is more stringent.

I cannot speak to the plans of the other sub areas - or had the time to read each of those plans.

2) Finally, the sections re: Code Compliance 2.41-1 through 2.41-4 - The policies suggested for Code Compliance continue to put the onus of reporting Code Compliance violations on neighbors suffering the consequences of unpermitted structures and unpermitted uses. The County proposes to marshal its resources to assist the non-compliant, which can and does result in structures that should have never been built, creatively adapted so that they are compliant. Non-compliant use of those structures remains an on-going issue and these policies do not create incentives to discourage non-compliant buildings or non-compliant uses. They instead create incentives to hope you don't get caught - and create on-going challenging conditions for the adjacent property owners who support and value land use planning, zoning, code and protections to either "bear with" the violations or "report" their neighbors, and endure consequences either way.

I would like the Board of County Commissioners to require that this section be re-conceived and re-written to support the compliant landowners and those who value land use planning, and require County Planning to take a stronger pro-active educational and enforcement role, and pass the costs of actual enforcement onto the non-compliant landowners. The costs to the adjacent landowners of enduring and then reporting these issues go far beyond financial costs - they are time-consuming and have an incalculable emotional toll.

Thank you for all of your good work. I regret missing the Board meeting on Thursday.

Sincerely,  
Cindy Reid  
Sauvie Island Resident

PO Box 83731