

ID	Name	Date	Comment	Feature	Neighborhood
20153	Nancy Cox	7/19/16	The proposal for CM1 on this two block section of Hawthorne where the most historically significant buildings are located is very appropriate these buildings have everything to do with success of this business district and should be given every possible option for preservation the owners should be given the right to sell the air rights as well thanks for doing the right thing!	mixed_use-1497-4292	Richmond
20078	Don Drake	7/18/16	received notice that the property was being rezoned from Exd to CM3. I attended several meetings to understand the implications of the new zoning and was satisfied that the CM3 zoning was consistent with existing and most likely future potential uses of the property which is commercial retail currently but has potential to be office and otherwise mixed use in the future. The property has enjoyed long term tenancy for its existing commercial uses and the intention is for those uses to remain into the future until such time is becomes desirous and economically feasible to redevelop. In June 2016 we received notice that the zoning was to now be changed to EG1. The only reason I was able to find out from planning staff that this was being done was to attempt to satisfy NWNAs desire to maintain EG1 uses in the neighborhood. The ownership of the property objects to having the property reclassified to EG1 and respectfully requests that the property be reclassified to the new CM3 zoning for the following reasons. 1)The CM3 zoning is consistent with the current mixed use nature of the neighborhood and the comprehensive plan. 2)EG1 zoning would be more appropriately placed in the Guilds Lake area of NW Portland where there are larger sites, better parking and traffic circulation better suited to EG1 uses. This has been the case for the last 100+ years and should satisfy NWNAs desire to keep employment uses in the nearby vicinity. 3)The EG1 zoning if implemented would make the past and existing uses of the property allowed under EXD non-conforming and is an underutilization of the site's potential. 4)The EG1 zoning would prohibit future mixed use development and density that is currently allowed where the CM3 zoning would allow future development and uses consistent with the comprehensive plan and the existing growth patterns associated with the neighborhood and need for closer in density.	employment-1515-4394	Northwest District
20075	Stanford T Warnock	7/17/16	I am very much in support of this proposed zoning map change	residential_os-1532-4492	Madison South
20074	Stanford T Warnock	7/17/16	I am very much in support of this proposed zoning map change.	residential_os-1532-3682	Madison South
20001	Mark Whitlow - Perkins Coie for Starbucks	7/12/16	please continue CE zoning with no CMSO overlay	mixed_use-1038-102	Rose City Park
20000	Ryan Woodward	7/12/16	It appears that all proposed zoning changes for my property have been removed. This leaves my single family residential property next to a 3-5 story mixed use building. It also retains the design overlay for my property but not for the commercial mixed use building that would likely be built next door. I thought the plan to step down the zoning on the properties adjacent to the new mixed use zoning made the most sense. This allows those of us that own property adjacent to these larger buildings to retain property value through expanding our properties to multi unit. It is unclear to me at this time what my options will be if any once this change occurs. I think the "drop in" sessions that were made available were extremely helpful. However now the plan has changed and the information obtained at that is no longer valid. If additional drop in sessions could be made available that would be very helpful.	mixed_use-1107-488	Sellwood-Moreland Improvement League
19987	Thomas Karwaki	7/12/16	The University Park Neighborhood Association Board strongly supports the proposed change from commercial to residential for safety (stormwater, erosion and traffic/pedestrian) reasons.	residential_os-1319-4357	University Park

19986	Thomas Karwaki	7/12/16	he University Park Neighborhood Association Board strongly supports the proposed change from commercial to residential for safety (stormwater, erosion and traffic/pedestrian) reasons.	residential_os-1319-4357	University Park
19985	Thomas Karwaki	7/12/16	The University Park Neighborhood Association Board strongly supports the proposed change from commercial to residential for safety (stormwater, erosion and traffic/pedestrian) reasons.	residential_os-1319-4357	University Park
19967	Joanne Manson	7/11/16	null	mixed_use-1024-387	Portsmouth
19966	Joanne Manson	7/11/16	Previous Comments were deleted by map app - Please note that the site at 8801 Chautauqua is a publicly owned property - previously in federal ownership and public use for the past 50 years - Now a state-owned public facility for the next 20 years at least. Accordingly - zoning for this site should be updated with this Comp Plan Update to allow Public - state armory use.	mixed_use-1024-387	Portsmouth
19965	Joanne Manson	7/11/16	State owned property adjacent to proposed Mixed Commercial Use - with Park (O/S) behind. OMD - State Militia looks to have its property(ies) throughout state in compliance with local land use. The Dept anticipates and plans for this site to remain in support of state militia training facility for the next 20 years. The facilities in the Portland area are deficit space and are scattered. Agency is working toward replacement site and facility(ies) that would accommodate all of its space requirements in the Portland Metro area. However - current projected replacement if funding comes through is past 2032. As such agency must maintain and improve site and facility in its current state. Toward this end - this Adjacent Property should be zoned for Public use accordingly recognizing the armory that has been sited here for the past 50 years that will continue in that capacity (for the state militia) for the next 20 years.	mixed_use-1024-387	Portsmouth
19957	Lisa Marshall	7/10/16	Commissioners, I live in close proximity to the areas on NE Fremont that are currently being developed. While I support some apartment development like the one at 4323 NE Fremont, I am truly concerned about further high-density development on NE Fremont. My neighbors and I are concerned that NE Fremont would be asked to support urban densities without the provision of urban services and infrastructure. You do not currently required developers to provide parking for the apartment residents. Our narrow residential streets cannot support these people using them for their parking needs. You do not require parking because you state that there is transit available. Well, the bus service on Fremont has steadily declined over the past several years. And there is no weekend bus service. Will you increase this bus service to support this increased density? Will you look at neighborhood parking and protect existing residential parking? Please consider the people who bought in this neighborhood first because it WAS a neighborhood and not an urban area. I believe that the CM-1 zoning on Fremont east of NE 44th street and CM-2 zoning within 500 ft of frequent-service transit is a good compromise to developers. When developers complain about the urban growth boundary, remind them that there is plenty of land available for them to build on along those boundaries that they have not yet used. Get developers to contribute to the mass transit system extensions and to more frequent service to the NE Fremont area if they want to build high density in our area. They have responsibilities too. They don't get to just take the money and run. Please take the whole area of development into your consideration and its ramifications to our neighborhood. Renters don't have the same stakes in our neighborhood that we have spent the last 20 years investing in. Thank you for your consideration. Lisa Marshall	mixed_use-1489-554	Beaumont-Wilshire

		<p>Please help us by making our property commercially zoned. We live next to a large mixed used build (live in its shadow) and the property on the opposite side was recently purchased by a developer as well.</p> <p>We would very much like this property to be mixed use/commercial so that we could eventually do a complex of small but well designed housing units (i'm a small space designer) with a gallery for local makers/designers on the main floor (we would like to open the gallery asap to help raise/save money for the larger development project).</p> <p>We sadly cannot afford the cost to pay for a zoning change but are hoping as part of the study/plan you will go ahead and change this property to mixed use/commercial now to match our immediate neighbors, neighborhood and the infrastructure that already exists/just got completed on SE Division St.</p> <p>Thank You!! bryan scott brydanger@gmail.com 503.679.7949</p>		
19956	bryan scott	7/9/16	Main Street Corridor (m)	Hosford-Abernethy
19955	Phillip Lee	7/8/16	mixed_use-222-921	Kerns
19954	Brent Heeb	7/8/16	mixed_use-1510-4329	Sellwood-Moreland Improvement League

19953	Tom Brown	<p>I am the Trustee of the Harry H.H. Brown & Co. Profit Sharing Plan, the owner of</p> <p>the property located at 1625 SE Rural Street Milwaukie and 16 th Avenue in Westmoreland (the</p> <p>"Property"). The Rural Street Property is proposed for downzoning from CS to CM1 (the</p> <p>"Proposal"). This letter requests that the City of Portland abandon its current Proposal and, rather</p> <p>than apply a punitive downzone, treat the Rural Street Property the same as all other properties</p> <p>currently in the CS zone in the vicinity of Milwaukie in Westmoreland and apply the proposed</p> <p>CM2 zone.</p> <p>commercial district and is surrounded primarily by other commercial development. The</p> <p>Property currently has a __ unit apartment complex, providing housing in the heart of the</p> <p>commercial district adjacent to three high-frequency bus lines and within one-half mile of the</p> <p>Bybee light rail station. This area is very well suited for additional commercial and residential</p>	mixed_use-1510-4329	Sellwood-Moreland Improvement League
-------	-----------	---	---------------------	--------------------------------------

19952	Tom Brown	<p>I am the manager of City View Park LLC, the owner of the property located on 16 th Avenue between Bybee and Rural in Westmoreland (the "Property"). The Property is proposed for significant and economically damaging downzoning from CS to CM1 (the "Proposal"). This letter requests that the City of Portland abandon the Proposal and treat the Property the same as all other properties currently in the CS zone on Milwaukie in Westmoreland and apply the proposed CM2 zone.</p> <p>surrounded by other commercial development. The Proposal to downzone the core of the commercial district, but to leave the rest of the corridor that abuts directly against existing single family neighborhoods at a higher density, runs counter to the City's traditional zoning policy of stepping zoning down in order to buffer residential neighborhoods. The current Proposal inverts the City's normal zoning approach by allowing dense redevelopment adjacent to single family neighborhoods and reducing development potential in the commercial core,</p>	mixed_use-1510-4329	Sellwood-Moreland Improvement League
-------	-----------	--	---------------------	--------------------------------------

			<p>I am an officer of Harry H.H. Brown & Co., the general partner of Brown Properties Limited Partnership, the owner of three properties located at 1616-1622 SE Bybee Blvd. and 7001 to 7019 and 7027 SE Milwaukie (the "Brown Partnership Properties" or the "Property"). The Brown Partnership Properties are proposed for significant and economically damaging downzoning from CS to CM1 (the "Proposal"). I understand that the policy objective behind the downzoning proposal is to preserve neighborhood character. This letter requests that the City of Portland abandon its current Proposal and treat the Brown Partnership Properties the same as all other properties currently in the CS zone in the vicinity of Milwaukie in Westmoreland and apply the proposed CM2 zone.</p> <p>The properties proposed for downzoning are in the heart of the Westmoreland commercial district and are surrounded primarily by other commercial development. The</p>		
19951	Cameron Brown	7/8/16	Proposal to downzone the core of the commercial district, but to leave the rest of	mixed_use-1510-4329	Sellwood-Moreland Improvement League
19950	Susan Milholland	7/6/16	These are all single family homes, why is the zoning changed? Who plans to build apartments? Who is selling to developer? No one I know of.	Design (d),Alternative Design Density (a)	Sellwood-Moreland Improvement League
19947	PETER WALTER	7/6/16	Will the Centers Main Street overlay require ground floor commercial use? It would be shortsighted to allow outright multi-story multi-family buildings without having a commercial use requirement on the ground floor, and concurrent reasonable off-street parking minimums and maximums.	mixed_use-1072-89	Montavilla
19946	Micki Carrier	7/3/16	TOO DENSE and NOT ENOUGH PARKING!!! Most apts will be too expensive for one person to inhabit. Thus, need one car space per BEDROOM, not per unit. The developer came to our meeting and "promised" one parking space PER BEDROOM, not per unit. What happened? Where are guests supposed to park? What about couples, each owning a car, of course? We are not a mass-transit friendly area, but even if we were, most people want to own a car, even if they bike some places, some of the time.	residential_os-795-2360	Maplewood
19915	Heather Coleman	6/22/16	While it would create a lot of noise for me if they remodeled/rebuilt this Fred Meyer, I would definitely support this. This store is old, dirty, and attracts a lot of crime/transients. The customers speed through the area routinely so you have to be very careful crossing the street even though there are lots of children in the neighborhood. If they could remodel to have multiple floors like some of the other Fred Meyers I could really see it making a difference for the future of Foster, and I'm really excited to see how things change over the years.	mixed_use-987-613	Lents

19914	Jesse Harter	6/21/16	<p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>I just recently purchased the property adjacent to us at 5434 SE Malden Dr with the intention of either subdividing and/or building an ADU for my elderly mother. With the proposed zoning changes for my area, I fear that we will not be able to move my mother close to her grandchildren or take care of her as needed.</p> <p>Can you please provide a timeline in which the new zoning changes will take effect?</p> <p>Please advise or provide reassurance as this will put financial and emotional hardship on my family.</p>	residential_os-714-1399	Brentwood-Darlington
19909	Tom Karwaki	6/21/16	<p>The University Park Neighborhood Association Board and Land Use Committee OPPOSE the proposed Institutional Zoning for this part of the University of Portland. The UPNA Board has consistently commented during the Institutional PEG, PSC and City Council testimony that the Residential Base Zone was appropriate for this property given the University's approved Conditional Use Master Plan. The R2 zoning and CUMP would provide the University with greater freedom to operate the land as needs change over the next twenty years. There are more uses allowed by right under R2 zoning than Institutional and this flexibility might be good to have if economic or institutional needs change without requiring a rezoning.</p> <p>The UPNA strongly OPPOSES the entire Institutional Zone as it is laid out in the Comprehensive Plan: Institutional Project and proposed code because it does not provide adequate protections for the neighborhoods or require the institutions to engage the neighborhoods in a meaningful way. The current (CUMP) process has historically well served the University of Portland and University Park Neighborhood.</p>	institutional-35-1307	University Park
19908	Tom Karwaki	6/21/16	<p>The University Park Neighborhood Association Board and Land Use Committee SUPPORTS removing the River Industrial (IR) overlay. UPNA's Board OPPOSES the proposed Institutional Zoning for this part of the University of Portland. The UPNA Board has consistently commented during the Institutional PEG, PSC and City Council testimony that the General Employment Base Zone was appropriate for this property given the University's approved Conditional Use Master Plan. The EG2 zoning would provide the University with greater freedom to operate the land as needs change over the next twenty years. There are more uses allowed by right under EG2 zoning than Institutional and this flexibility might be good to have if economic or institutional needs change without requiring a rezoning.</p> <p>The UPNA strongly OPPOSES the entire Institutional Zone as it is laid out in the Comprehensive Plan: Institutional Project and proposed code because it does not provide adequate protections for the neighborhoods or require the institutions to engage the neighborhoods in a meaningful way. The current CUMP process has historically well served the University of Portland and University Park Neighborhood. The Institutional zone process should be at the discretion of the Institution at the end of a CUMP.</p>	institutional-35-1467	University Park

19907	Tom Karwaki	6/21/16	<p>the EPA Superfund program in 1994. The University Park Neighborhood Association's (UPNA) Board and Land Use Committee SUPPORTS the University of Portland's 2013 Conditional Use Master Plan (CUMP) approved by the City Council and the Planning & Sustainability Commission. The CUMP page 7 notes that "The re-use analysis for McCormick & Baxter includes a recommendation for open space and recreational pursuits." As a result the University's CUMP has an FAR of 0.15 because the site can't hold heavy buildings. The CUMP approved use was athletic and open fields.</p> <p>General Employment zoning would permit an FAR of 3.00 with no height limits. This is TWENTY TIMES the APPROVED FAR for the property and is in total opposition to the approved EPA and DEQ reuse plan. The EG2 zone in Table 140-1 notes that vehicle repair and servicing is an allowed use, as is manufacturing, self storage, warehouse, wholesaling, and industrial services. Retail up to 20,000 sf is also allowed, although access to the M&B property is difficult and goes through residential neighborhoods in the Cathedral Park Neighborhood. Group homes, households and correctional institutions are also a conditional use (residences are prohibited under EPA and DEQ remediation conditions).</p> <p>The UPNA Board and Land Use Committee therefore OPPOSES the proposed General Employment Zoning of the Baxter & McCormick property, although it notes that Educational and Recreational uses are permitted in General Employment zoning. The UPNA is concerned that General Employment is too broad and provides too many uses by right as a zoning classification for this property given the approved uses in the CUMP and reuse conditions imposed by the EPA/DEQ.</p> <p>The UPNA Board has consistently and repeatedly requested in commnts on the MapApp, testimony to the PSC and the City Council that the land be zoned OPEN SPACE since that is the only zoning category that fits the approved reuse plan and CUMP. The UPNA OPPOSES continued Industrial Heavy Zoning for the</p>	employment-1218-1465	University Park
18907	Tom Karwaki	6/21/16	<p>The Baxter and McCormick property is a 45 acre DEQ Brownfield that became an EPA Superfund site in 1994.</p> <p>The University Park Neighborhood Association Board and Land Use Committee support the 2013 University of Portland Conditional Use Master Plan. The CUMP noted that the "re-use analysis for M&B includes a recommendation for open space and recreational pursuits." This led to an FAR of 0.15 which was ADOPTED by the City Council and PSC.</p> <p>The UPNA has testified to the PSC and City Council to OPPOSE General Employment Zoning positing that the only zoning that is consistent with the EPA/DEQ reuse plan is OPEN SPACE</p>	employment-1218-1465	University Park

18906	Robert Foglio	6/18/16	<p>6/15/16 Portland City Council Attn: Comprehensive Plan Testimony. RE: 2626 NE DEKUM</p> <p>My property is adjacent to Concordia University. Understanding the desire to stream line development for our Institutions, I am not opposed to re-zoning efforts however it should not de value and impact negatively the development plans of smaller private investors. I hired Christopher Koback to represent me early to ensure I did not wind up with a near useless parcel in the Campus Institutional zone. The subject property has been re-assigned to CM1 and while it is an improvement it has been brought to my attention that FAR will be a requirement and it negatively effects my buildable square footage by 20%. I request removal or you grant exemptions to the FAR requirement for Residential uses on these small sites. FAR increase for affordable housing for this new zone clearly shows it is available and reasonable.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter. Bob Foglio 13705 SE THURMONT, Clackamas OR 97086</p>	institutional-23-1186	Concordia
18905	Joe Recker	6/17/16	<p>Thank you for rezoning this area to the long-range planning designation. This will reduce confusion with new and existing homeowners regarding what they can expect to happen with new infill. The R1 zoning is both appropriate near the light-rail station with extremely frequent service and long overdue given that several infill homes have occurred in the last few years alone that were unable to take advantage of the zone change. The adjacent grocery stores and commercial storefronts on Glisan will also help to reduce car dependency of future residents, furthering City goals toward greenhouse gas reductions.</p>	residential_os-1332-3412	North Tabor
18904	David Remington	6/16/16	<p>I also support the zoning change in along the 52nd corridor. It will provide more opportunity for families to be apart of our great neighborhood. There is high demand for family homes and land to build is scarce. I think it is a better alternative then apartment buildings to support our growing neighborhood.</p>	residential_os-1339-1754	Richmond
18903	David Remington	6/16/16	<p>I also support the zoning change in along the 52nd corridor. It will provide more opportunity for families to be apart of our great neighborhood. There is high demand for family homes and land to build is scarce. I think it is a better alternative then apartment buildings to support our growing neighborhood.</p>	residential_os-1339-1754	Richmond
18902	Christopher Stenken	6/16/16	<p>As a home owner directly affected by this proposal, I fully support the idea. This is an ideal location for higher desity (near grocery, 2 bus lines, 3 max lines) and much of the neighborhood is already filling in. I think it will create a more vibrant neighborhood</p>	residential_os-1332-3412	North Tabor
18901	Jeff Cole	6/16/16	<p>This section should also be downzoned to CM1</p>	mixed_use-1110-534	Sunnyside
18900	Jeff Cole	6/16/16	<p>This should be zoned OS. It is publicly held land and the area is officially park deficient by 2020 Standards.</p>	residential_os-1335-4282	Sunnyside
18896	Kerry Rowand	6/14/16	<p>Please include ample underground parking - and bike racks in all new developments on Foster! Ideally the new constructions would be set back a bit so their entrances do not crowd the sidewalks.</p>	mixed_use-1074-1247	Foster-Powell
18895	Kerry Rowand	6/14/16	<p>All new buildings should have bike racks and ample underground parking. Preferably the buildings would be set back a bit so as not to crowd the sidewalk. Hopefully this building will not take away all of the Mercado's overflow parking without replacing it?</p>	mixed_use-1074-1206	Mt. Scott-Arleta

18890	Piedmont Neighborhood Association	6/10/16	<p>On behalf of the Piedmont Neighborhood Association, we object to the Comp Plan rezoning proposal 1356. The rezoning concept is expressed in a draft of the Comprehensive Plan 2035, in which property defined by streets N Borthwick/N Kerby, between N Dekum and N Rosa Parks, would be rezoned from R5 to R2.5.</p> <p>Here is the link to original report: http://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/568819 pg. B-24 for Piedmont specifically.</p> <p>Rezoning this area would be inappropriate for numerous reasons, as enumerated below:</p> <p>Effects of zoning change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -On existing community -On future growth -Unintended consequences <p>On existing community:</p> <p>An analysis of the history of this part of our neighborhood is important. The main feature of this area was a convent and a school for troubled girls, founded by the Sisters of the Good Shepard in 1902, and moved to new buildings in Piedmont in 1917. The main building, also known as Villa St. Rose, is now on the National Registry of Historic Places, and is used for affordable senior housing.</p> <p>The Rosemont facility and property were purchased by the City of Portland in 1995, and plans for development went to bid under the parameters that there would be a mixture of housing options for a range of income levels. The city fast-tracked the planning and infrastructure before construction-streets, sewer, permitting. Walsh Constuction Co. won the bid, because their proposal addressed the desired and stated goals of providing different housing types for a diverse demographic-some rentals, some affordable homes built by Habitat for Humanity, some market-rate homes. Northwest Housing Alternatives now owns the Rosemont Commons, 100 apartments for affordable senior living in Rosemont Court, and 18 affordable-rent apartments in</p>	residential_os-1356-8590	Piedmont
18889	Teri Loporchio	6/9/16	<p>The zoning change needs to consider local traffic patterns. There are times that those of us that live in this area can't get home when traffic is backed up on I-5 Northbound. Higher density homes, commercial use would only make the issue worse. Also, DEQ has been working on an issue to determine where related to horrible air quality in the area due to commercial refineries on North Marine Drive. Something needs to be done there before exposing more residents and employees at commercial businesses to horrible toxic fumes.</p>	mixed_use-1542-1218	Bridgeton

18824	Lara Mendicino	5/30/16	<p>I oppose the zoning change for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The current zoning rules allow residents of these two streets to have very minimal but important input on new construction. Changing the zoning would remove what little input we have on projects that affect the affordability and livability of this neighborhood. Why do developers who don't live here get to make decisions without our input? 2. Affordability: To date, the few infill and remodeling projects done by developers on the street have resulted in 0 affordable housing. In fact, these projects have resulted in less affordable housing as previous section 8 tenants who'd been long time residents on the street were forced to move as a result of such development. In our experience, developers have built unenvironmentally friendly, expensive properties that result in less diversity in our neighborhood. 3. ADUs: The current zoning already allows ADUs and several of us have already built them. In fact, the only eco friendly affordable housing that's been built on this street in the 16 years I've lived here has been done by current residents in the form of ADUs. 4. Lack of Infill Opportunity: This block is full of well built, maintained homes--there is nowhere to fill in. Allowing developers to buy one of these homes, tear it down, and build cheap housing that is not affordable just so they can make a lot of money is not what I thought Portland was about. 5. No resident of Kerby Ave. supports this zoning change. So will the city listen to us or not? Is our opposition heard or is this just a formality that you have to go through? Have you already decided that developers will get their pay day at the expense of the people who actually live here? 	residential_os-1356-8590	Piedmont
-------	----------------	---------	---	--------------------------	----------

			<p>mistake that requires extra consideration before proceeding. These two blocks should be allowed to develop as the rest of the neighborhood and surrounding neighborhoods develop. Changing the zoning allows for growth in the immediate term that could actually harm the neighborhood.</p> <p>The current zoning allows for plenty of increased density as the mostly small houses have much space on each lot for additions and ADUs. New structures are also being built that accommodate more people than previous structures. As the current structures rarely approach the limits of the existing zoning, it makes little sense to apply rules that are meant to increase density with different restrictions when the limits of the old zoning are only now being approached by current owners who are just starting to understand the possibilities for investment in their own lots.</p> <p>Changing the zoning encourages profit-driven developers who specialize in multi-unit properties to demolish existing homes that have the potential for increased density without large-scale demolition. Please let this community of neighbors increase density as they will naturally through rules of supply and demand. Changing the zoning robs current owners of modest homes the opportunity to take advantage of increasing population and greater demand by encouraging professional developers to change the neighborhood at an unnatural pace.</p> <p>To demonstrate how the proposed zoning change is forcing unnatural growth, you only have to look at the map of the area. There are areas right next to I-5 with R5 zoning yet the proposed change is for two blocks within a much quieter neighborhood.</p> <p>https://www.evernote.com//AepLVP_1AYdPWb4FtbICiLVUMHuqWKp7lasB/image.png</p>		
18823	Joel Michael	5/28/16	I can only assume the zoning change is meant to bring the two blocks into some perceived alignment with the Rosemont development zoning immediately to its	residential_os-1356-8590	Piedmont
18822	James Bennett	5/28/16	We are opposed to the rezoning of this area. I have seen what has happened to other streets and neighborhoods in the area when the residents do not get to have input on the types and sizes of houses/dwellings that are built. We want to have input on what is allowed to be built on our streets. We do not have the infrastructure to handle more density at this time. I don't trust the city or the builders to have the best interest of the residents in mind. The goal should not be to cram as many people into a space as possible, we need to be ready for more residents, and we are not.	residential_os-1356-8590	Piedmont
18821	Kim Graham	5/27/16	I am currently zone ex and do not agree to the zone proposal	residential_os-872-2506	Eliot

18730	Spencer Parsons	5/24/16	<p>These comments are submitted specifically concerning the intersection of NE 30th Avenue and NE Killingsworth. However, to the extent that the observations are applicable to similar intersections under consideration for either CM-1 or CM-2 designation, the observations may have broader applicability.</p> <p>NE 30th Avenue at NE Killingsworth:</p> <p>I live near the intersection of NE 30th and NE Killingsworth, and own a mixed-use unit in a CS-zoned condominium building on NE 30th just south its intersection with Killingsworth. I walk, bicycle and/or drive through that node almost every day, often multiple times in a single day. As you are likely aware, Concordia University's developer Brian Spencer is developing the lot on the northeast corner of the intersection into a 30-unit, 32,058 square foot residential building. The work will be undertaken by Rick Porter's company, Union Corner Construction. Of that 32,000+ square feet, less than 750 square feet of it will be put to any use except residential.</p> <p>Those numbers are not misprints; less than 2% of the square footage on that corner lot will be used for any other use. Not much mix in that "mixed-use". There will be one disproportionately small retail unit at the corner of the building, and the remainder of the ground floor will be residential units opening not onto the street but into an interior corridor/hallway, ostensibly as student housing-type units catering to Concordia University.</p> <p>As a resident of the neighborhood, I rely on this CS-node to provide me with goods and services close to where I live. As proposed, Brian Spencer's development will deprive neighborhood residents like me of the opportunity to access potential goods/services in my neighborhood that the City forecasted would be in demand when it designated the node CS.</p> <p>As a property owner with a business located at the node, I rely on the commercial pull of the other businesses at the intersection for exposure. The customers visiting the businesses around me see mine; the proximity of the businesses help cross-pollinate one another.</p> <p>Businesses on the ground floor would have been a wonderful opportunity for such cross-pollination, and as a neighborhood resident I would have looked forward to the commercial offerings. Now I get to look forward to ground-floor drawn privacy</p>	mixed_use-1491-4326	Vernon
-------	-----------------	---------	---	---------------------	--------