TO: Hood River Development Code Update Project Management Team

FROM: Matt Hastie, Carrie Brennecke, and Katie Vickers, MIG

RE: Hood River HPS Interested Parties Interview Summary – Final

DATE: March 24, 2026

Introduction

Matt Hastie, Carrie Brennecke, and Katie Vickers from MIG conducted interviews with a variety of community members involved with the provision of needed housing and other development in Hood River, as well as local residents, public agency representatives and other interested parties. These interviews were conducted by MIG via seven group or individual Zoom meetings. In addition, facilitators from The Next Door, Inc. (TNDI) conducted another online focus group meeting with Spanish speaking community members. That focus group was conducted on February 23 and included 10 participants, with ages varying from 30 to 60 and equally balanced by gender. The list of interviewed groups is below, and a full list of interviewees is attached as Appendix A.

- Housing Developers – including Affordable Housing Developers
- Design Professionals – including architects and engineers
- City Employees, Contractors, and Government Agency Partners
- Real Estate Professionals
- Advocacy Groups and Neighborhood Organizations
- Spanish Speaking Community Members

Key Themes

Below is a summary of recurring themes and comments originating from the interviews. A full list of interview questions has been supplied as Appendix B and more detailed notes from the individual interviews, organized by topic, is found in Appendix C. A detailed summary of the meeting with Spanish speaking residents conducted by TNDI is included as Appendix D.

- **Overarching Issues and Improvements**. Participants note that the code is complex and challenging to use. Improved organization, clear connections between policy intent and code provisions, a recognition of challenging topographic and other conditions in Hood River and being clear about what types of development are desired in specific areas are all recommended.
- **Decision-Making Processes**. Several participants recommend using a Hearings Officer as a decision-maker for many types of development applications. Others say that either a Hearings Officer or the Planning Commission can be effective if processes are implemented in a clear, consistent, and fair manner.

- **Notification Processes**. Most people who commented on this topic say that the City's existing notification processes are adequate or that there should be only modest reductions, if any for the public notice area. They also suggest implementing an online process that allows people to gather information about the status of development application reviews. Spanish speaking residents noted that technology and language barriers impact their ability to get this information. They recommended that a variety of communication methods be used and that information be provided in both English and Spanish.
- **Development Costs**. Several people cite the impact of City fees on the high cost of development in Hood River, particularly system development charges and the cost of required infrastructure.
- **Residential Development and Affordable Housing**. One or more respondents note a variety of issues and suggestions on this topic, including:
    - Housing affordability is a significant issue, particularly for households with lower incomes, many of whom cannot find affordable housing in Hood River.
    - Consider reducing minimum lot sizes in residential zones.
    - Provide tax breaks for affordable housing projects.
    - Simplify and streamline middle housing standards.
    - Balance affordable housing goals with the importance of good design.
    - Increase opportunities for development of accessory dwellings units (ADUs) and "plexes."
- **Parking Requirements**. Participants' opinions on this issue are mixed. Several people say that more parking is needed and cite the impact of limited off-street parking on congestion and related issues. Others recommend reducing minimum parking requirements to help reduce development costs. Some say that even if requirements are reduced, developers are likely to build more parking than is required, given conditions in Hood River.
- **Non-Conforming Uses and Development**. Participants had somewhat different views on this issue. They generally agree that the City should not allow a use to become more non-conforming by expansion. However, some say that a non-conforming use that has been destroyed should be allowed to be rebuilt while others say any new uses, including replacement, should conform to existing City standards.
- **Mixed Use Development**. Most participants, including Spanish speaking focus group participants support allowing for a mix of housing and small businesses within the City, noting a variety of benefits of this approach and that it is a common and familiar feature in other parts of the world.
- **Effective Current Standards**. Participants cite examples of a few things that are working well, including the City's willingness to examine changes to the code, the flexibility of uses allowed in the C-2 zone, the due diligence process, and the City's performance guarantee provisions.

- **Other Code Issues and Potential Barriers**. Participants cite a variety of other issues including, but not limited to the following:
    - Desire for stronger tree preservation standards.
    - Potential need for enhanced design standards for commercial development.
    - Interrelated standards that impact development feasibility (e.g., lot coverage, setbacks, landscaping, and parking requirements).
    - Impacts of outdoor lighting which could be addressed through "dark skies" requirements.
    - Limitations on commercial uses allowed in light industrial zones which adversely impact development and economic feasibility and flexibility.
    - Need for adjustment criteria to allow for minor adjustments to standards.
    - Need for clear and straightforward transit facility standards.
    - Need for clarity about the relationship between development code and public works/engineering standards.
- **Best Practices from Other Communities**. Participants cite a number of other cities' codes as possible models for addressing specific issues, including Ashland (ADUs), Bend (variety of housing allowed), Salem (Historic Preservation), Sisters (dark skies/outdoor lighting), Portland (infill tool kit), and Bellingham, WA (affordable housing). They also cite Bend, Madras, Redmond, Sandy and Sisters as good examples overall and point to middle housing requirements in Sweet Home, Madras and Milwaukie.

Appendix A: Interviewee List

Interviewee	MIG Facilitator	Date/Time
Dan Ball, Chair (2016-2020), City Tree Committee (closed 2020)	Carrie Brennecke	December 3, 2025, 3:00 PM
Bill Irving, Principal Broker, Copper West Real Estate; Hood River Planning Commission member	Matt Hastie	December 4, 2025, 10:00 AM
Mark Zanmiller, Dark Skies Oregon	Carrie Brennecke	December 8, 2025, 11:00 AM
Mike Hendrix, Dark Skies Oregon	Carrie Brennecke	December 8, 2025, 11:00 AM
Peter Cornelison, Board of Directors, Thrive Hood River	Carrie Brennecke	December 8, 2025, 11:00 AM
Chris Robuck, Treasurer, Thrive Hood River	Carrie Brennecke	December 8, 2025, 11:00 AM
Katie Skakel, Consultant, Thrive Hood River	Carrie Brennecke	December 8, 2025, 11:00 AM
Steven Pfeiffer, Attorney, Perkins Coie	Matt Hastie	December 10, 2025, 4:00 PM
Alysha Sherburn, Big River Land Trust	Matt Hastie	December 10, 2025, 4:00 PM
Mike Ketler, Owner, IBC Construction	Matt Hastie	December 10, 2025, 4:00 PM
Amy Schlappi, Executive Director, Columbia Area Transit	Matt Hastie	December 11, 2025, 9:00 AM
Will Norris, Urban Renewal Administrator, City of Hood River	Matt Hastie	December 11, 2025, 9:00 AM
Kathy Fitzpatrick, Mobility Manager, Mid-Columbia Economic Development District	Matt Hastie	December 11, 2025, 9:00 AM
Jessica Metta, Executive Director, Mid-Columbia Economic Development District	Matt Hastie	December 11, 2025, 9:00 AM
Amanda Rose, Property Manager, Port of Hood River	Matt Hastie	December 11, 2025, 9:00 AM
Megan Channell, Waterfront Coordinator, Port of Hood River	Matt Hastie	December 11, 2025, 9:00 AM
Andrey Chernishov, Contract City Engineer, HBH Consulting Engineers	Carrie Brennecke	December 16, 2025, 2:00 PM
Eric Walker, Director, Hood River County Community Development	Carrie Brennecke	December 16, 2025, 2:00 PM
Katie Kadlub, Executive Director, Visit Hood River	Carrie Brennecke	December 16, 2025, 2:00 PM
Annie Robinson, City Engineer, City of Hood River	Carrie Brennecke	December 16, 2025, 2:00 PM
Kuri Gill, Grants and Outreach Coordinator at Oregon Heritage, State Historic Preservation Office	Carrie Brennecke	December 16, 2025, 2:00 PM
Elizabeth Betts, Engineer, Klein Associates, Inc.	Carrie Brennecke	December 19, 2025, 9:00 AM

Interviewee	MIG Facilitator	Date/Time
Mario Anguiano, Intake & Investigations Manager, Fair Housing Council of Oregon	Carrie Brennecke	December 19, 2025, 9:00 AM
Steven Crawford, Legal Director, Fair Housing Council of Oregon	Carrie Brennecke	December 19, 2025, 9:00 AM
Written Responses Received		
See Appendices B and C		

Appendix B: Interview Questions

Interviewers asked some combination of the following questions during the meetings, with different subsets of questions tailored to specific groups.

- How do zoning and land division standards, and a city's development review process, affect feasibility of affordable housing development?
- Which Oregon cities' development codes should be considered examples of best practices in facilitating development of affordable housing, and why?
- What other actions should Hood River consider practicing or avoiding to better facilitate affordable housing development, whether through updates to its development code or other actions (including incentives)?
- What aspects of Hood River's development code affect how you do your job?
- What are examples of things that do work well in Hood River's development code?
- Is there anything in the development code that could be changed to make your job easier, or help achieve the goals of your organization?
- Do you have any other overall or specific suggestions for how the Code can be improved to make it easier to use and/or reduce barriers to development?
- Do you have a preference for presenting development applications to a city planning commission vs. a hearings officer?
- The City is considering options for regulations addressing residential and commercial building design, standards for drive-through and drive-up uses, landscaping and outdoor lighting standards, tree retention and mitigation/replacement, wireless communication facilities, and requirements for off-street parking serving residential and commercial uses. Most of this work is being informed by the State of Oregon's Model Code for Small Cities, but Hood River also is looking at codes in other cities.
    - In your experience, which cities' development codes should be considered examples of best practices for any of the issues highlighted above, and why?
    - Can you provide any examples of how Hood River's existing development code works effectively at addressing any of the issues highlighted above?
    - Are there reasons that Hood River should be cautious about updating/adopting regulations for any of the issues highlighted above? If so, why - what are potential consequences?
- Have you worked with codes that include residential development standards/ requirements for infill development (in existing neighborhoods) that differ from standards/ requirements that apply to larger or peripheral sites? If so, did you find that to be difficult to implement, or effective at reducing conflicts and opposition from neighboring property owners?

- What are examples of best practices for outdoor lighting on public and private property?
- What other Oregon cities' outdoor lighting regulations should Hood River use as models, why, and how do those cities enforce their regulations?
- Do you think an incremental approach to updating lighting standards would be prudent? For example, starting with code revisions that are less controversial but make improvements, followed by advocacy for more restrictive regulations through a separate process.
- What are examples of best practices for tree retention and mitigation/replacement inside Urban Growth Boundaries in Oregon?
- What other Oregon cities' urban forestry regulations should Hood River use as models, why, and how do those cities balance tree retention with wildfire prevention?
- Do you think an incremental approach to updating tree regulations would be prudent? For example, starting with code revisions that are less controversial but are enforceable, followed by advocacy for more restrictive regulations through a separate process?
- What are examples of best practices for landscaping of residential and commercial development sites?
- With its landscaping standards, should Hood River prioritize issues such as aesthetics and stormwater mitigation, or wildfire prevention?
- Is there anything else we should be thinking about as we move forward with the Hood River code update?
- Can you provide any examples of things that don't work well in Hood River's development code, and what changes do you recommend?

Appendix C: Detailed Responses by Discussion Topic

Following is a more detailed compilation of interview responses organized by discussion topic.

Overarching Code Issues or Improvements

- Making code better organized and easier to use/navigate would be useful.
- Code is too segmented.
- Disconnect between policies and intentions of City and what the code allows or supports.
- Industrial zone requires a Conditional Use for a park & ride.
- Code has a lot of overlays, subdistricts, etc.
- Provide support and guidance on what City wants to see built.
- Disconnect between policy and code – a policy statement linked to code could explain what it is trying to achieve.
- Write for clarity not to create hope for something that could happen; focus on clarifying and cleaning up issues that need it.
- Fix past problems/things that are broken or provide structure to allow for creative solutions.
- If objective is to create affordability, density, etc., will write a biased code; code should be agnostic about ability to develop different types of developments.
- The lots left in town are the difficult ones. The land is difficult to develop. Annexation fees are high and the only useable lots are outside of the city limits. Development seems to have been done in a "plug and play" manner without specific consideration and individualized assessment at the local level.
- Topography of sites makes development difficult.
- Current zoning doesn't work for half of the existing properties in Hood River.
- From a public standpoint it's difficult to annex when you're not contiguous. Getting strategic properties into the City would be helpful in encouraging development.
- Identifying preferred development type in a given area to help with incentives would be helpful
- Annexing UGB is important for sewer alignment.
- C1 is a zone for allowing mixed use. Has it been applied appropriately and where else could it be used within HR?

Decision-Making Processes

- Harden code to reduce influence from loudest voices.
- Who makes decision – city, city manager, city engineer, etc. – is interchangeable. Should be consistent.
- Clark County (Washington) has a hearings officer which makes things run smoother – most of the problems have been taken care of before getting to the hearing.
- In Hood River, the Planning Commission takes too broad a view and question things that may or may not be in the Code – more emotional.
- The Planning Commission will often ask for a continuance when it isn't necessary.

- The Planning Commission will ask for changes to be made that are not in the Code and, as a result, the entire project can be derailed.
- Support the use of a Hearings Officer.
- Hearings Officer is a good idea as long as there is a way to appeal. Would help to streamline the process.
- When applied for expansion of a church, required a Conditional Use permit; PC identified conditions of approval (COAs) – lot of conditions need to comply with municipal code and engineering code. COA didn't' line up with code or standards.
- Like opportunity to go to City Council and give them opportunity to make changes or decisions to change.
- Want to have things set up to fit that into process and understand how long it will take; Planning Commission or hearings officer doesn't make a huge difference; both can be problematic.
- Consider using 2-track system – (1) C&O ; or (2) optional discretionary process; PDX example of Community Design process; if possible to do that for affordable housing, would be really helpful.

Development Application Notification Procedures

- There should always be notice for at least 150 feet buffer for sending notice. Notice for type 1 if it is housing related.
- Notice – even if there are no comments allowed – lets people know what is going on around them. Best way to learn about new development. Same as State Law, including emails and Columbia Gorge newspaper.
- Current notice procedure is reasonable
- PC and others to see administrative decisions. Searchable database online.
- Notices should be emailed.

Development Fees and Costs

- Nexus and proportionality: frontage improvements required for a partition are extreme and expensive. You must be allowed to build the house before partition for it to pencil out.
- Upfront fees are difficult to pay – the only people building houses are the people who can afford to pay up front.
- SDCs are high.
- Westside Urban Renewal Area incentives are good but aren't paid until time of occupancy which is too late to be helpful. Incentives are usually on building permits.

Residential Development and Affordable Housing

- Support non-profit developers of accessible housing.
- Increase "plexes" and ADUs.
- Code updates should address affordability: who can and cannot afford to live in Hood River anymore.

- Affordable housing is important. Design regulations are important.
- Don't need 7,000 sq. ft. lots in the R1 zone. Also look at R2 and R3 minimum standards.
- Infrastructure requirements will have biggest impact on cost of housing; be careful about trying to increase throughput; that can be done at state level
- Tax breaks for big developments which require a percentage to be affordable housing.
- Middle housing code is difficult to use.
- Don't site middle housing on the outskirts of town.
- Some of the lots in town that are developable are limited by the number of middle housing units allowed. First you have to divide the lot to get a feasible number of units and then setbacks make design difficult.
- Middle housing code provisions seemed costly and cumbersome and now more likely to use PUD process; streamline process to be able to get through multiple things at once.
- Residential (site) development standards should be addressed, especially minimum lot sizes.

Parking Requirements

- Minimum parking requirements and lot size minimums are a barrier to development.
- There should be parking reductions for tiny lots.
- Increase transit options (especially when reducing parking).
- Parking is a problem "in town" and there should be commercial parking numerical standards.
- Lack of parking in town is not good for pedestrian and bicycle movement.
- Congestion and parking are big problems.
- Current parking requirements for multi-unit development should be aligned with middle housing parking requirements.
- Not sure minimum parking requirements should go away – maybe require space for other type of transportation (bikes)
- Would support alternative parking requirements if there is an option for an alternative analysis from developer.
- Parking is very important downtown.
- When talking about parking fees, in-lieu of fees – consistency with exceptions.
- More parking, seamless process, consistency, with any new development (even refurbishment) brings up parking.
- Intersections that need help.
- Train also causes problems.
- Nowhere to park.
- Have to figure out a better parking situation.
- Developers have to build more than one space per unit, given conditions in Hood River; reducing required parking probably won't move the needle on housing production.
- Driveway and off-street parking standards are problematic.
- Don't implement maximum off-street parking standards.

Requirements Associated with Non-Conforming Uses or Development

- Owners should be required to comply with current regulations and zoning if their property is non-conforming.
- Shouldn't be allowed to expand non-conforming use but maintenance is fine (i.e.. New roof).
- If structure is destroyed, it must meet new standards. Use can continue if it was there historically.
- Currently no ability to expand or enlarge non-conforming uses; should be an opportunity to expand if not making more non-conforming

Other Specific Code Issues that Result in Barriers to Development

- Lot coverage one of the most broken pieces of code – what actually counts as part of building structure, why it counts and how does it impact density always a problem
- Building accessible units (i.e. Universal Design) takes longer to build because of a reliance on grants and support.
- Test-fit approach is important.
- Balance between lot coverage, landscaping and other requirements and/or reduce development potential (ADU tenant requirements example).
- Steps in the front setback aren't allowed.
- Parking lot landscaping standards are not clear.
- Stormwater credits for tree retention.
- Fire Chief does not approve of fire access drawings in Code.
- Infill doesn't look enough at surrounding neighborhood and structures. Architecture and green building should be a consideration in infill developments.
- Code concerns include green infrastructure, sewer connections, equity, affordability. Prohibition of uplighting.
- There is a place for drive throughs, but they can block traffic and take away from walkability.
- Streets without sidewalks should be limited to 20 MPH.
- Tree preservation standards should be applicable to all development. Revisit current standards and Heritage Tree Program.
- More awareness of Urban Forest and value of existing trees.
- Limit and control clear cutting of lots for development. Some have clear cut entire lots before coming in for development.
- Replacement ratios for trees (removed) are too high.
- Need to allow some removal/replacement for development.
- Restart tree committee.
- Encourage people who have preservation programs to make it as easy as possible to do the thing that meets the criteria
- Increase mixed use zoning to avoid food deserts. Allow grocery stores on the ground floor.
- Code wrecks almost every project; hope this project will improve it.

- Adjustment criteria in draft are problematic/cumbersome – use single criterion similar to PDX.
- Light industrial zone has limits on types of commercial uses.
- Provide clarity on what types of associated uses qualify as allowed in the LI/WF zone.
- Look at height standards – reduction in height standards led to flat roofs.

Aspects of the Code that are Working Well

- Impressed with City's willingness to address specific issues in the code – e.g., make it easier to build certain types of housing (some unintended consequences).
- Due diligence is good.
- Performance guarantee section is good.
- Online GIS maps are good. Linking the Zoning Code to the online map would be helpful.
- C-2 zone provides a lot of options for future uses.

Other Code Issues to Address or Consider

- Recent developments downtown could have been more affordable or community-serving (e.g., local food market, housing, etc.), but both projects becoming hotels.
- Seeing a lot of discretionary criteria in code for approval of transit facilities.
- Bus stop applications being denied by Public Works without much explanation.
- Planning for transit facilities, code addressing those would be helpful.
- Hood River County Urban Growth Management Plan – if someone outside the city requires a new sewer hook-up, the property must annex. Has resulted in less development outside the city. The county will also be using the new code.
- Local historic preservation designation needs to be split from national designation process. Hood River does have a fair amount of properties that take advantage of state credits, City has a role to play in Design Review when properties are taking advantage of them.
- Some sections mentions specifically that design exceptions can be approved by the city engineers – helps promote development and flexibility.
- 16.12 incorporates Engineering Standards.
- Explanation of a Design Exemption, how it works and knowing the process.
- Overlaps in code and Engineering Standards. Easier to reference engineering standards. New development code should be consistent with engineering standards.
- Some engineering requests would be better sent to planning.
- PW and Engineering easier to understand and comply with than code.

Examples of Best Practices in Other Communities' Development Codes

- Oregon Model Code sets a good foundation but should be tailored to Hood River's uniqueness.
- University of Arizona has a useful Development Code database.
- Ashland has a good ADU code.

- Sisters has a good code for Dark Skies.
- Bend has a good variety of housing types and supports non-profit builders.
- City of Salem has a good list of Historic Preservation actions that can help to expedite review without having go through design review; if there is interest in demo by neglect or denial – Oregon City.
- Bellingham, WA is helpful for affordable housing development
- Madras, Redmond and Sisters are good examples. Bend and Sandy are OK.
- City of Portland has a good in-fill tool kit and something similar would be useful in Hood River.
- Cities with exemplary middle housing plans: Sweet Home, Madras and Milwaukie.

Summary of Focus Group Responses

Question 1: Should mailed notice still be required?

10 said yes.

Most participants believe mailed notice should be sent even if not legally required.

Reasons:

- Respect for neighbors
- Helps people prepare for noise, construction, electrical cuts, etc.
- Ensures broader access (not everyone uses social media or technology)
- Important for transparency and awareness
- Some felt only large or impactful projects require notice; small improvements deserve privacy

---

Question 2: Best ways to notify residents

Most preferred:

- **Mail to home address (7)**
- **Email (3)**

Overall, participants favor **multiple communication methods** to reach more people.

Additional suggestions:

- Social media (word of mouth is powerful)
- Automated voicemail or Text messages
- Signs on property (bilingual)
- Newspaper
- In-person outreach
- Information in Spanish and easy-to-understand formats

Question 3: Mixed housing and small businesses near residential areas

9 yes, 2 no

Most support mixed-use development.

Reasons for support:

- Common in Latino culture
- Helps small businesses find affordable space
- Encourages community growth
- Provides housing and jobs
- Already works in parts of Hood River (downtown examples)

Concerns:

- Traffic and parking
- Noise and garbage
- Converting too many homes into businesses
- Need for small-scale projects
- Desire for more even investment across neighborhoods

Question 4: Most important design standard priority

Ranked importance:

1. **Reduce costs and barriers to building housing (6 votes)**
2. Sustainable/resilient construction (3 votes)
3. Public safety (1 vote)

Why:

- **Housing affordability is the biggest concern - Many families cannot afford to buy homes. Barriers prevent low-income families from accessing housing**
- Sustainability and fire safety are still important
- Lighting and safety matter but are secondary

Question 5: Reduce parking requirements to 1 space per unit?

Most support reducing parking **only if adequate street parking exists**.

- **Yes: 1**
- **No: 2**
- **Only if street parking is nearby: 8**

Concerns:

- Multiple vehicles per household

- Limited public transportation
- Weather challenges (snow/rain)
- Existing parking shortages

Question 6: Experience with permits

- **Yes: 3**
- **No: 7**

Suggested improvements:

- Simpler rules (they were easier in the past)
- Clear, step-by-step instructions - Instructions available online but easy to follow
- Multilingual materials
- Support for people not comfortable with technology

Common Themes Across All Questions

1. Affordability is the Top Priority

Housing costs and access are the strongest recurring theme.

- Reducing construction barriers is the #1 priority.
- Many feel homeownership is out of reach.
- Small businesses also struggle with high rent.
- Mixed-use development is supported partly because it creates opportunity.

---

2. Communication Must Be Accessible and Inclusive

Residents want:

- Mail notices (most trusted method)
- Multiple formats (mail, text, voicemail, social media)
- Information in Spanish
- Clear, simple explanations
- In-person or human support

There is concern about digital-only systems excluding some residents.

---

3. Growth is Accepted — But Needs Balance

Participants generally support development and change, including:

- Mixed-use neighborhoods
- More housing
- Small businesses

However, they want:

- Small-scale projects
- Attention to traffic and parking
- Even investment across neighborhoods (not only downtown)
- Rules that protect quality of life

---

4. Equity and Cultural Perspective Matter

- Mixed-use is seen as normal in Latino culture.
- There is concern that systems may reflect “Anglo” norms.
- Desire for rules that serve all communities.
- Emphasis on housing for local people, not just downtown or outside investors.

Focus Group Notes
MIG

LOCATION: Zoom
DATE(S)/TIME(S): 2/23/2026
FACILITATOR(S): Lorena S, Liliana L
NOTE TAKER(S): Monica C

Objectives:

1. Gather participant input, opinions, ideas and beliefs about a certain topic
2. Understand participant attitudes, feelings, experiences and reactions about a certain topic
3. Collect data from specific target groups or populations to improve, enhance or change a product, or service
4. Explore a topic in-depth through group discussion through asking open-ended questions

Questions	Answers
Question 1: Digamos que usted solicita un permiso de desarrollo. Y digamos que, según la ley del estado, no se requiere un aviso público de su proyecto, ¿cree que los avisos aún deben enviarse por correo para que sus vecinos estén al tanto de su proyecto?	• 10 said yes
Let's say you ask for a development permit. And let's say that state law does not require public notice of your project. Do you think notices should still be sent by mail so that your neighbors are aware of your project? · *Por que/Why?*	• I think it is good because it is good for the neighbors to be aware out of respect • I think it is good. A lot of us are at different levels of social media/tech use. But mail covers more people • I think it is good for the people to know what is going around their home or business • It is good to register what is going and beneficial for the owner and the neighbors to know • It is good the the neighbor to know who is going to be the new neighbor • Respect and also being able to plan if there is going to be electrical cuts, or noise, or just construction next to them • I think respect for people to prepare. Knowing what the plan is, when will it start • It is good to know how the new development is going to affect the area • I think it is important for people to get in the mail

	• I think that only large and important projects should be reported when a neighbor decides to make improvements needs privacy
Question 2: ¿Cuál sería la mejor manera de avisarle sobre proyectos de desarrollo? (Por favor, marque todo lo que corresponda**)** *What would be the best way to notify you about development projects?* [ ] Por correo electrónico / *email* [] En el periódico (en la sección de avisos públicos en inglés) / *newspaper* [ ] Por correo a su dirección / *direct mail* [ ] Algún otro método / other method (Por favor, diga cual método / *please specify*):	[3] Por correo electrónico [1] En el periódico (en la sección de avisos públicos en inglés) [7] Por correo a su dirección [ ] Algún otro método (Por favor, diga cual método) • Using social media because word of mouth is big. Using all platforms would reach more people • I think an automated voicemail letting people know • A sign on the property that gives info on the development in both English and Spanish • the potions that are best for you and the way you understand it because most of that information is only available in English • An in person effort for people surrounded to be informed. Perhaps a city of HR employee could do this in additon to all the other ways • I think a text message to everyone would be a logic way to get to everyone. Text or voicemail.
Question 3: ¿Debería Hood River permitir proyectos que mezclen viviendas y pequeños usos comerciales en áreas destinadas a apartamentos y ubicadas cerca de vecindarios residenciales? *Should [the City of] Hood River allow projects that mix housing and small commercial use in areas designated for apartments and located near residential neighborhoods?* 9 yes 2 no	• Why would anyone be opposed to this? • This could be a cultural thing. In the latin culture this is normal. But being here with Anglos, the systems might be different. I think it would be good to make changes to meet all needs • Someone might be concerned about the traffic or foot traffic if there is a business next to their home • Downtown HR is doppio and then there are lofts above and same with 10 speed, and houses above. I think we could make it work • What happens with all the homes that are turning into businesses? • It is hard for us to find affordable housing in this area, maybe open up to homes. • "Yes, it can work. But not to continue putting everything in the center and the marina. The Heights already has services.

	What's missing is more attention and more even investment across the city. If these projects are allowed, let them be small and designed to help neighborhoods." • Because I believe in the center because it was small, we had to take advantage of the houses to turn them into businesses to use the areas • Only small businesses for the sake of traffic and noise • It could be a conflict for the families living there, garbage, pets, traffic, noise. I think there weren't a lot of rules before, but now that they are making zones and rules. • More housing or jobs would be good • I think it is a very normal thing when cities are growing. It helps the community grow. • It is hard for small businesses here to find places to rent. It is expensive for someone with a low income.
Question 4: Qué opina que es lo más importante cuando la Ciudad prepara estándares de diseño para nuevos edificios residenciales? (clasifica de más importante a menos importante): *What do you think is most important when the City prepares design standards for new residential buildings?*	___6_____Reducir los costos y barreras para la construcción de nuevas viviendas / *lower cost and barriers to construction* ___0_____Mejorar como nuevas construcciones concuerdan con los edificios y vecindarios que ya existen. / *Improve how construction blends in with existing neighborhoods.* ___3_____Aplicar prácticas de construcción sostenibles y resilientes por ejemplo usar materiales de construcción para prevenir incendios. / *Apply sustainable and resilient construction practices*. ___1_____Aumentar la seguridad pública por ejemplo luzes para iluminar las banquetas. / *Increase public safety*.
Por que / Why?	• I think all the options are very important. But not being able to buy closes all the other doors. Even to rent is not easy. • They are building low income housing, but I don't think they will be as easily acceptable, there are a lot of barriers • There are a lot of barriers for people with a low in come • The most important thing is that the new buildings are for local people, that they are more accessible because living in Hood River is expensive, and that they fit well into neighborhoods, not just for downtown." • We have lost opportunities to buy homes in this area. It is a dream that we may not achieve because our salaries can't afford to buy.

	• I think it is good for me who works in construction for us to have rules for development. I think people are buying cheap stuff that doesn't help with fire safety. • I was a taxi driver for many years, and I think lights is good • Because the climate is changing and we need to contribute to the environment with the construction of houses
Question 5: ¿Debería la ciudad de Hood River reducir el número requerido de plazas para estacionar fuera de la calle a 1 plaza por vivienda?	Si – 1 No – 2 Solo si hay estacionamiento en la calle cerca de la entrada de la vivienda - 8
Should the City of Hood River reduce the required number of spots for off-street parking to one spot per residence? · *Por que / Why?*	• Yes, assuming there is more to park close by • Don't reduce driveway parking, if it is raining or snowing and you can't park next to your house, it is inconvenient and uncomfortable • I think it is hard for HR to chose parking. Some of us have roommates or more than 3 vehicles. We still need public transportation, so a lot of us need more cars. Some housing by may street has limited parking, and it is an issue to find parking. • If we had public transportation, it would make limited parking easier
Question 6: ¿Alguna vez ha usted u otro miembro de su familia obtenido un permiso para construir una casa o un nuevo negocio?	Si – 3 No - 7
Para los quienes respondieron sí, ¿puede recomendar cambios al proceso de permisos o desarrollo que hagan las reglas más claras o que hagan más fácil obtener el permiso? *Have you or another family member ever obtained a permit to build a house or new business? If yes, what would make the rules clearer or make it easier to get a permit?*	• I built my home in the year 2000, and the rules were much more simple before. The development codes were easier. I am not good with technology. Everything is done digitally now a days. Before someone came and did it with a paper, and now it is online, and confusing. • I have seen in various cities where they put instructions online, step by step instructions. A self guided list. That way we can know where we are with the process. But some cities have limited instructions. It would be good if they have step by step easy to read instructions that are in different languages.