

ID	Name	Date	Comment	Feature	Neighborhood
18562	Ken Johnson	5/17/16	Echoing comments from others bemoaning the limits on building height and size. The core is supposed to be tall, and dense, and at this point, what is considered to be the core could do to be expanded around its edges, and along the mixed usage corridors emanating from it. Portland is growing, don't let fearful NIMBYs cut it off at the knees.	Design (d)	South Portland
18561	Ken Johnson	5/17/16	This kind of unique property contributes heavily to the livability of a neighborhood. If anything, the restrictions of ordinance 155609 (setbacks, business type, building size and height, etc.) should be loosened to allow for development that more fully utilizes the parcel in a mixed use manner. Returning the lot to pure residential usage would be a tragedy, and failing to expand the mixed usage would be a massive missed opportunity.	mixed_use-1128-338	Southwest Hills
18560	Marianne Ritchie	5/17/16	Please honor Ordinance No. 155609. The neighborhood needs a grocery store.	mixed_use-1128-338	Southwest Hills
18547	Steve Salas	5/17/16	As an immediate neighbor to the extra-wide expansion of the mixed commercial zone around SE 17th Ave between Harney & Clatsop, I find this proposal to expand commercial uses up to 200' from the main thoroughfare disconcerting. Even on SE Hawthorne I am hard pressed to think of a similar current situation other than around the large grocery stores & maybe the Bagdad Theater. The only reason I can see is that the city is enabling an existing commercial property owner in our SE corner of the Sellwood neighborhood to more easily develop their existing properties into buildings of significant scale right at the edge of an entryway to the city. Commercial has always had a difficult time on this portion of SE 17th given it's predominant status as a route from OR-224 to the Sellwood Bridge. This looks to a transportation bottleneck in the making unless significant measures are taken to shift commuter traffic from 17th to Tacoma & 99E.	mixed_use-1422-6965	Sellwood-Moreland Improvement League
18507	Laurie Weisberg	5/17/16	My preference I would be to see a small cafe, grocery and liquor store, pharmacy, post office with possibly nice townhouses or condos on top. Option 2: A community center with a little cafe or small grocery.	mixed_use-1128-338	Southwest Hills

18506	Valerie King	5/17/16	<p>I live directly across Patton Rd from the former Strohecker's grocery property at 2855 Patton Rd. We bought this house largely because it was a walkable neighborhood with a grocery store (one that incorporated a contract post office, dry cleaner pick up, deli, coffee bar, liquor store and good butcher counter). We feel that our ability to live a walking life has markedly diminished since Strohecker's closure in January 2016. We request that the Commission honor the existing 1984 Ordinance for the Strohecker's site. Any non-grocery store use of the property would decrease the value of our property and would not be helpful to the neighborhood which needs these types of services within walking distance. Since we have moved here Trimet service has gone to weekday business hours only and so having a grocery option on this hill is important to us and our neighbors.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration, Valerie J. King</p>	mixed_use-1128-338	Southwest Hills
18331	Blythe Olson	5/16/16	<p>This property in the heart of our old residential neighborhood is subject to usage restrictions enacted into law in 1984 under Ordinance No. 155609. Any proposed development must comply with this ordinance or be negotiated in detail with adjacent property owners and neighbors to maintain the livability of our neighborhood.</p>	mixed_use-1128-338	Southwest Hills

18102	David Mihm	5/10/16	<p>I learned about the ongoing zoning revisions being proposed at the Richmond Neighborhood Association meeting last night. Doug Klotz of the RNA did an excellent job laying out the impact and implications of the proposed changes.</p> <p>I was surprised and disappointed to see that there are still large swaths of red-colored areas along SE Powell between the Ross Island Bridge and 35th that this plan proposes to leave as "general commercial."</p> <p>SE Powell is one of the widest/largest corridors in the entire inner eastside, soon to be served by a bus rapid transit system. It's one of the most natural places for large-scale residential building projects to happen outside the downtown core. And certainly is a more natural place for these kinds of projects than a number of locations where Mayor Hales' administration has already allowed them to occur (N. Williams is the most glaring example).</p> <p>I had thought that Mayor Hales' embarrassingly-belated declaration of a housing emergency in Portland several months ago was designed to allow for all options to be on the table when it comes to zoning for more housing. Especially for more affordable housing, and especially for more affordable housing close to transit hubs.</p> <p>This section of SE Powell seems like a perfect place for that to happen, and I strongly suggest it be considered more thoroughly to *at least* be zoned as Mixed-Use as part of this process.</p> <p>Sincerely, David Mihm</p>	mixed_use-1073-4109	Creston-Kenilworth
18062	Denise Hare	5/10/16	<p>I support designation of the blocks along Division St. from 35th to 38th Avenues to be preserved as vintage low-rise commercial areas. This is a great response to citizen input, helping to maintain the most attractive and desirable features of the commercial nodes, while still allowing for the development/density needed for future growth. The community appreciates that our voices are heard, and listened to, by the planning bureau. Thank you.</p>	mixed_use-1507-4307	Richmond

17991	Nathan King	5/10/16	Hello, my name is Nathan King. On May 9th I shared testimony expressing my concern for the changes proposed to small-scale zone CM1. Since sharing that testimony, I have had the opportunity to become more familiar with the details of the the Mixed Use Zones Project's proposal. Specifically, I believe I now have a more accurate understanding of the proposed changes to the FAR calculation. I now understand that in the proposal "All uses, including residential, are counted in floor area, which is a change from current practice which excludes residential from the calculation." If my understanding is correct, it is possible that the proposed characteristics of the new small-scale zone, CM1, much more closely reflect the same intent of the existing zones and therefore is much more likely to be viewed as acceptable. My apologies for any confusion my testimony may be causing.	mixed_use-1024-386	Cathedral Park
17983	Jennafer Furniss	5/10/16	This is an ideal triplex, wonderful middle housing for families. This use should be supported with an r2.5 or CS1 designation, It is in hte middle of a residential neighborhood on a narrow street on a narrow lot. It does not support CS2 designation.	mixed_use-1102-165	Sellwood-Moreland Improvement League
17982	Jennafer Furniss	5/10/16	The is a wonderful triplex, great middle housing for families. This should be zoned r2.5 or CS1 to support this excellent use of land. It is in the middle of a residential neighborhood on a narrow street and CS2 is not supported here.	mixed_use-1102-165	Sellwood-Moreland Improvement League
17981	Jennafer Furniss	5/10/16	This is a single family home in the middle of a residential neighborhood on a narrow street. This is does not support CS2 development in the middle of a residential street. At best it should be r2.5 housing to support middle housing, triplex even, but not a four story building in the middle of a neighborhood. Even CS1 would be more acceptable, perhaps a fourplex, but CS2 is not supported here.	mixed_use-1102-165	Sellwood-Moreland Improvement League
17977	Jennafer Furniss	5/10/16	This is a single family residence in the middle of a residential block on a narrow street. At most it should be zoned r2.5 to provide future middle housing. There is not as yet adequate support in transit to support commercial dipping so deep into these narrow residential neighborhoods. CS2 is far to large a building for such a narrow street in the middle of a residential neighborhood.	mixed_use-1102-165	Sellwood-Moreland Improvement League

17976	Jennafer Furniss	5/10/16	This is was originally an R5 lot and developed as such, it is in the middle of a residential neighborhood on a narrow street. This should be zoned R5, but at the very least R2.5 to provide future middle housing, CS2 is clearly inappropriate to be in the middle of a residential block on a narrow street.	mixed_use-1102-165	Sellwood-Moreland Improvement League
17975	Jennafer Furniss	5/10/16	A beautiful mid century Duplex, this is ideal middle housing for this neighborhood. Much needed family housing that houses families, one with a young daughter who is adorable and their family hopes she grows up in this neighborhood. This should be zoned r2.5 realistically but at the very least should be CS1 as it is part of a low rise residential neighborhood and a step down from the commercial district.	mixed_use-1107-491	Sellwood-Moreland Improvement League

17974	Gerald Lindsay	5/9/16	<p>To: The City of Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission</p> <p>We write to ask the commission to consider the CM3 zone for the addresses (please see below) along N Killingsworth between N Borthwick and N Mississippi. As property owners at the intersection of N Albina and N Killingsworth, we have a strong community and personal interest in zoning decisions. In general terms, we believe that the CM3 designation is the most appropriate of those available within the 2035 comprehensive plan. Our perspective is based upon 2 primary considerations. One, such designation best suits the needs of both the neighborhood and the adjacent Portland Community College-Cascade campus, as this intersection and the blocks extending along N Killingsworth serve not only as a Center Main Street for the neighborhood, but also as a sort of campus City Center. Two, the unique transit accessibility of the intersection of N Albina and Killingsworth clearly supports higher density development. Portland Community College-Cascade already exists as a vibrant hub of activity and acts as a major draw of citizens to this Center Main Street. As a home to well over 20,000 students and a campus development plan that has recently seen major additions, the college benefits greatly from local dense commercial opportunities and, we think, would benefit from more, denser housing opportunities. The CM3 zoning would strike the right balance between maximizing the ability of local properties ability to meet the needs of both the neighborhood and the student populations, while retaining the neighborhood center feel. While we think that a similar Center Main street would usually be best served by the CM2 zoning, the dual service as neighborhood and college Main Street, leads us to believe that a small section of higher density would best serve the current and future local development needs.</p> <p>Transit is an important consideration, particularly when considering any increase in density. With regards to the addresses at hand, they are served by two high frequency bus lines and are 5 city blocks from yellow line max stations. In addition, Interstate 5, N Interstate Ave., and Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. are in close proximity. Few intersections on the East side can boast more robust transit connectivity. We think this fact serves to mitigate the potential parking impact of future increased density. Additionally, allowing for greater density proximate to PCC-Cascade dovetails well with that institution's Transit Demand Management Plan. This plan specifically calls for an increase in the number of students walking to campus. Dense mixed-use development placed adjacent to campus properties options could hardly better serve this goal.</p> <p>Other considerations that inform our testimony are as follows. None of the addresses that we propose for CM3 zoning abut current low-density usage or zoning. The Piedmont conservation district will serve to prevent losses of important structures that contribute to the historic character of this vibrant Main Street.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration, Gerald and Anita Lindsay</p>	mixed_use-953-3544	Humboldt
-------	----------------	--------	--	--------------------	----------

			Addresses: 831-839 N Killingsworth, 832-838 N Killingsworth, 820-828 N Killingsworth N Killingsworth, 825 N Killingsworth, 819-823 N Killingsworth, 811-815 N Killingsworth, 805 N Killingsworth, 800 N Killingsworth, 722-740 N Killingsworth, 720-740 N Killingsworth, 710-718 N Killingsworth, and 700-708 N Killingsworth		
7973	Angie Even	5/9/16	This zoning is inconsistent with neighboring commercial property and should be zones CM2 along with the rest of the district.	mixed_use-1193-239	Woodstock

17972	Cameron Brown	5/9/16	<p>PSC,</p> <p>This should not be downzoned to CM1, it should be CM2. There are many reasons for this. First off, it goes against the the Portland to Milwaukie LRT Station Area Best Practices Assessment and Recommendations List from 2009 because it is within 1/2 mile of the Bybee Light Rail Station. It is also inconsistent with the Portland Comprehensive Plan Policies, especially Policy 3.13 and 3.36. If the city is so worried about these neighborhood centers they should institute a design review for these areas and not downzone. Design Review could accomplish all of the goals that this downzoning is trying to accomplish and do it in a much fairer way than essentially taking people's property from them.</p>	mixed_use-1510-4329	Sellwood-Moreland Improvement League
17945	Breah Pike-Salas	5/9/16	<p>I live next door to 1735 SE Clatsop Street, and according to the proposed comp plan changes my next door neighbor's property is changing from R2 to CM2. The current comp plan has the R2 as a buffer to the CS zone along SE 17th. By changing the zoning from R2 to CM2 - the buffer is removed and then my property, which is R2.5, is adjacent to a 4-5 story building. That means the maximum potential height next door to my house could be 60 feet- which will negatively impact privacy and (potentially) sunlight to my property. Please do not bring the CM2 zone so far into the residentially zoned neighborhood - this will destroy the character of our street which is smaller, slower paced, and family friendly. Please keep the CM2 zone along SE 17th Avenue which is currently a CS zone and already designed for mixed used.</p>	mixed_use-1422-6965	Sellwood-Moreland Improvement League
17935	Eugene Dieringer	5/9/16	<p>This property and all properties from 44th thru 47th should all reflect CM2 zoning to be consistent with the surrounding zoning, especially since they are in the core of the business district. CM1 zoning does not give any benefit to a community and business district that wants to grow and does not support the community's vision as shared in a community wide charrette that was given in earlier testimony to the City.</p>	mixed_use-1502-4301	Woodstock
17934	Eugene Dieringer	5/9/16	<p>Properties from 44th thru 47th should all reflect CM2 zoning to be consistent with the surrounding zoning, especially since they are in the core of the business district. CM1 zoning does not give any benefit to a community and business district that wants to grow and does not support the community's vision as shared in a community wide charrette that was given in earlier testimony to the City.</p>	mixed_use-1502-4302	Woodstock

17920	Donald Hanna	5/9/16	I am against the down zoning to CM1. CM2 would be closer to the existing zoning. The character of the street front does not warrant the CM1 designation. This down zoning in the Montavilla business district will diminish our property rights and limit the future opportunities for the businesses and neighborhoods around it.	mixed_use-1500-4298	Montavilla
17917	Nathan King	5/9/16	<p>Nathan King 6901 N Buchanan Ave Portland, OR 97203 nathanfking@msn.com 503.807.4011</p> <p>Hello, my name is Nathan King and this is my testimony to the Mixed Use Zones Project proposed draft from March 2016.</p> <p>The scope of this testimony includes existing zones CN1, CN2, CO1, and proposed zone CM1. These are the zones categorized and referenced in the proposal and in the remainder of this testimony as Small-scale Zones. All other zones, which are categorized and referenced in the proposal as Medium-scale or Large-scale Zones, are not included in the scope of this testimony.</p> <p>The consolidation of existing zones CN1, CN2, and CO1 into the single zone CM1 is viewed as an acceptable proposal. The existing small-scale zones appear to have a high amount of similarity so if the Commission has identified the consolidation of these zones as an improvement, then their proposal should be considered.</p> <p>The proposed characteristics of the new small-scale zone, CM1, are significantly different than the existing small-scale zones. For example, the proposed change in Floor Area Ratio is double the existing value and over three times the existing value when bonus allocations are permitted. Another drastic difference is an up to a 20% increase in building coverage. Due to these drastic differences, the proposed zone does not accurately reflect the intent of the existing zones. For this reason, the proposed characteristics of the new small-scale zone, CM1, are not viewed as acceptable.</p> <p>The characteristics of zone CM1 could be amended to be viewed as acceptable. Below is a list of amendments that should be considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Height – Maximum Base (feet): 30' * FAR – Maximum Base: .75:1 * FAR – Maximum with Bonus: 1.5:1 * Building Coverage: 65% <p>I have been a resident of North Portland for 13 years. As a resident, I have entered into the 30 year process of becoming a home owner.</p>	mixed_use-1024-386	Cathedral Park

			<p>house that my family and I call home shares a boundary with a lot that is currently vacant and zoned Neighborhood Commercial 2 (CN2). When we first considered buying our home we knew there would be certain unknowns about the future of the vacant lot. However, we researched the property, identified how it is zoned, and and educated ourselves. After relying on the existing characteristics of Portland's small-scale zones, we made a confident decision to purchase the home. There are residents like us all over Portland who have made major life and financial decisions based on existing zones and their respective characteristics. It is insulting and eroding to the trust of these residents to drastically change the small-scale zones in such a way that they no longer accurately reflect the intent of the existing zones.</p>		
17916	Angie Even	5/8/16	This property should be CM2 to match the current CS zoning in the district.	mixed_use-1502-4301	Woodstock
17914	Tim Even	5/8/16	This property is needed for further growth. It should have been zoned the same as the other buildings all along. I support CM2.	mixed_use-1199-305	Woodstock
17913	Angie Even	5/8/16	CM2 is the appropriate zoning for this property. The shopping center has the span and room to carry this zoning along with the wide streets. This proposed zone change to CM2 is the correct scale.	mixed_use-1199-305	Woodstock

17912	Doug Klotz	5/6/16	I support the zoning proposed for this site. Restrictions have been added to the proposal to address many issues mentioned here. Deliveries to this store don't seem to be an issue now, and there's no reason to expect them to be in the future. This store provides easy access to foods and beverages for those in the area, and those riding by on their way home.	mixed_use-922-1714	Richmond
17911	Peter McGill	5/6/16	As an owner/manager of commercial property on Woostock I find it wrong to change zoning after the property owners invested time in getting the present zoning in place Provide comments here.	mixed_use-1199-305	Woodstock
17907	Stephen Twelker	5/5/16	As a resident of this neighborhood, we could certainly use a good grocery store such as New Seasons here. I pray that we won't be plagued by a Walmart-ish big box.	mixed_use-1038-1213	Madison South

17905 Ben Bortolazzo

5/5/16

To: The Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission
From: The Woodstock Neighborhood Association
Re: Low-rise Commercial Storefront designation at SE Woodstock Blvd.

mixed_use-
1502-4302

Woodstock

With this letter, the Woodstock Neighborhood Association wishes to speak against the proposed low-rise commercial storefront designation of a portion of the Woodstock Commercial corridor.

The March 2016 Proposed Draft of the Mixed Use Zones Project (MUZ) introduced new mapping and Zoning Code regulations intended to continue the scale and characteristics of older main street areas where low-rise Streetcar Era storefront buildings are predominant. The Proposed Draft identifies some properties along Woodstock Blvd., between SE 44th Ave and SE 47th Ave to be rezoned Commercial Mixed Use 1 (CM1).

The Woodstock Neighborhood Association and its Land Use Committee believe that the CM1 designation does not meet the intent and criteria of the Low-rise Commercial Storefront Areas as the properties included do not have contiguous concentration of low-rise Streetcar Era storefront buildings. In fact, the buildings included in these blocks are utilitarian commercial structures built in the 1940's or later. Interesting to note, the proposed CM1 designation includes a New Season store that opened in late 2015. While we appreciate the city effort to preserve areas of the city with buildings of established historic character, we believe this does not apply to the Woodstock Commercial Core. Furthermore, the 80' width of Woodstock Blvd Right of Way is about 20' wider than most of the other locations within the city where the CM1 designation is being proposed, making the height of buildings to width of right of way ratio less of a concern.

Most of the properties within the proposed CM1 designation are currently zoned CS. Table VI-1 Zone Conversion Table (p.316) in the MUZ Project Proposed Draft indicates that for Mixed Use Neighborhood Comprehensive Plan Designation (such as Woodstock Blvd.), the conversion of the current CS zone would correspond to CM2 in the new MUZ Project. We believe that the CM2 designation is more appropriate for the subject properties, more consistent with the current zoning entitlements as well as with previous drafts of the MUZ Project that have been circulated over the course of the Comp Plan Update process. Representatives of the Woodstock Stakeholders Group (commercial property owners), made their case against the CM1 designation at the WNA general meeting on April 6, 2016. At that meeting, the WNA board voted in support of the Stakeholders Group and gave the mandate to the Land Use Committee co-chairs to draft a letter of support for the Stakeholders Group and against the proposed CM1 designation. At the April 20, 2016 meeting, the Woodstock Land Use committee further discussed the matter and a straw poll vote showed again support for the Stakeholders Group.

The content of the above testimony was reviewed once again by the Woodstock Neighborhood Association board on May 4, 2016.

Respectfully submitted,
Ben Bortolazzo and Terry Griffiths
Co-Chairs, Woodstock Neighborhood Association Land Use Committee

17904	Bryan Scott	<p>5/5/16 Our property was one of many residential properties proposed to change to commercial zoning within the new comprehensive plan. It was also like most residential properties, left with its current zoning designation for now (in our case, R1).</p> <p>I fully understand the reasoning behind leaving these properties residential because each should be considered on a case by case basis with the neighbors and neighborhood in mind, and with a focused eye on whether infrastructure on the street and in the neighborhood can handle the zoning change now, or should wait for a future phase.</p> <p>I'm simply writing to describe why our particular case should be considered for immediate zoning change rather than only being part of a long range plan.</p> <p>Our address is 2624 SE Division St. This probably doesn't mean anything to you, but to everyone in our neighborhood or anyone we give directions to we are "the house that sits in the shadow of Big Rust". We sit 5' away from one of the condo buildings that has built to the full extent of the allowable height and we live in the shadows that this building casts much of our day...certainly not our intent when we bought this tiny home back in 2008. When we live there we spend more time watching people park and listening to the phone calls of those grabbing coffee from the bakery next door than we do chatting with neighbors as they water their lawn (we have no neighbors and they have no lawn). Living here has been difficult to say the least. We have also struggled to rent the house to others because of the "looming giant" and ever-present eyes looking down on the house and back yard from the glass walls above. Privacy (as you'll see in the photos attached) is simply impossible.</p> <p>The neighbors on our opposite side couldn't take it anymore and moved their family to a more family friendly street last year, but they also sold their home to developers who presumably plan to do the same thing. This will leave us literally sitting in the middle of two giants as the "UP house" with balloons hanging from the roof hoping to escape. Their home is also currently scripted as residential, but as developers I'm sure they can afford to push the designation change now, as we cannot. There is no question in terms of surroundings and neighborhood that our home is better suited immediately to commercial storefront than to residential.</p> <p>Outside of our current living environment... I also know and understand that much of the reason for waiting to convert residential zoned lots to commercial zoning was to look case by case at the strength of surrounding infrastructure and whether the zoning change can be handled by existing infrastructure in the neighborhood. In our case, the city (and us its taxpayers) just spent millions of dollars and 2 years ripping up Division Street, disrupting traffic flow and livability (I'm sure you're familiar as you've gotten plenty of calls about that over the last few years) in order to enhance the systems to allow now for the long</p>	Main Street Corridor (m)	Hosford-Abernethy
-------	-------------	--	--------------------------	-------------------

			<p>range plan of the Division corridor.</p> <p>The Division Street Plan (2013-2015) was carried out by the Department of Transportation and Environmental Services with the express intent of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Building curb extensions for bus landing - Adding new crosswalks and streetlights - Improving signalization - Installing public art - Repaving Division from SE 10th to Cesar E Chavez. - Managing stormwater runoff from streets and improve watershed health - Replacing aging sewer lines and manholes to relieve sewer backups and increase sewer system reliability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increasing safety, access, and visibility for pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users - Improving traffic operations through the corridor and provide on-street parking - Stimulating the local economy - Increasing neighborhood attractiveness <p>Our neighborhood's infrastructure (street, sewers, stormwater control, sidewalks, curb extensions, crosswalks, public transportation and even public art) are already years ahead of our case by case zoning designation and it clearly makes the most sense for 2624 SE Division St to change in zoning to commercial now to fit the surrounds and the infrastructure that exist today, and not in a long range plan.</p> <p>Please help us by changing our zoning to match the environment and infrastructure we are already living within so that this lot can be used in a way that is more fitting to its surrounds!</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration. Bryan and Jen Scott</p>		
17861	Doug Klotz	5/5/16	<p>This site, 3945-3975 SE Powell, can accommodate a large development. It and perhaps others around the Powell/Cesar Chavez intersection, should be zoned CM-3 rather than CM-2 to build a Neighborhood Center at this intersection well-served by transit, with a grocery store and other amenities.</p>	mixed_use-1074-1209	Creston-Kenilworth

17860	Doug Klotz	5/5/16	The South Side of Powell from Milwaukie to 17th is ripe for redevelopment, and that redevelopment should be more pedestrian-friendly, and relate to the planned urban neighborhood on the north side of Powell and take advantage of the proximity to the Orange Line Clinton station. There is the gas station, and perhaps it should stay CE, but the rest of the stretch should be CM-2 or even CM-3. Parcels here are large or deep enough to accommodate this.	mixed_use-1073-74	Brooklyn Action Corps
17859	Doug Klotz	5/5/16	The South side of Powell from 11th west, has no drive-throughs and is poorly suited to any. It should be zoned CM-2 to help build a more urban environment here, at the edge of the Brooklyn Neighborhood, with a viable residential area that can benefit from activity on Powell besides car traffic.	mixed_use-1073-75	Brooklyn Action Corps

17858	Mark Leece	<p>5/4/16 This is testimony regarding treatment of small (less than 7500 sq. ft.) isolated Commercial Mixed Use 1 (CM1) zoned parcels contemplated under the Mixed Use Zones Project. City code section 33.130.100 B 2 c, adds a limitation to the CM1 zone for sites less than 7,500 sq. ft. that abut properties that are in a single family zone, and are operating as Retail Sales and Service, limiting hours of operation to 6AM - 11PM. Additional specific limitations for small isolated commercial zoned parcels in primarily residential areas need to be codified to make the Mixed Use Zones Project consistent with the intent of the proposed 2035 Comprehensive Plan update.</p> <p>Section II of the Mixed Use Zones Project Proposed Draft (March 2016) describes the relationship of this project to the comprehensive plan. Specifically, Goal 10.1 (Land Use Designation) part 13 expresses the intent of a CM1 land use designation as follows:</p> <p>13. Mixed Use — Dispersed. This designation allows mixed use, multi-dwelling, or commercial development that is small in scale, has little impact, and provides services for the nearby residential areas. Development will be similar in scale to nearby residential development to promote compatibility with the surrounding area. This designation is intended for areas where urban public services are available or planned. Areas within this designation are generally small nodes rather than large areas or corridors. The corresponding zones are Commercial Mixed Use 1 (CM1) and Commercial Employment (CE).</p> <p>The intent of this element of Goal 10.1 is clear:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • small in scale • has little impact • provides services for the nearby residential areas <p>To address this inconsistency, consideration that code section 33.130.100 B 2 c be expanded to accommodate the following issues consistent with Goal 10.1 part 13.</p> <p>1. Loss of Neighborhood Commercial Resources: With commercial zoning, it would be possible to redevelop these sites for high-density residential use with no commercial elements at all. This is in contrasted to the stated reason for making these isolated non-conforming use sites commercial is to retain commercial use on these sites so they can continue providing services to the surrounding residential areas. The zoning rules need to require that, at a minimum, the ground floor must remain in commercial use should the site be redeveloped. An alternative might be to specify that should these sites be developed as entirely residential, the permitted density would be that of the highest density adjacent residential zone. Without one of these proposals, we fear development pressure might cause the loss of the commercial function that is critical to maintaining a livable community.</p> <p>2. Change of Use: There are currently restrictions on change-of-use that</p>	mixed_use-922-1714	Richmond
-------	------------	--	--------------------	----------

would trigger review if the cumulative impacts of a site increase. This restriction is important to ensure a change in use would remain compatible with a neighborhood setting. This existing review mechanism should be added back to the zoning code. As an example, nearby residents are concerned that the quiet natural food grocery on SE 21st Ave currently in non-conforming use might someday be bought and converted into a bar, which would be possible under the proposed rules. This highlights the significant impact that a single isolated commercial property can have on its neighbors.

3. Applicability of Use: The proposed rules should apply to all commercial uses, not just Retail Sales and Service. The intent here is to limit nighttime noise and activity and to limit other impacts to neighbors from these sites; I believe these rules should apply to all commercial uses.

4. Noise: Existing regulations limit daytime noise emitted from non-conforming residential sites as measured on the property line of the nearest residential receiver to 55dBA (nighttime noise limits are lower) [City of Portland Charter Chapter 18.10.010], however if these properties are granted commercial status, permissible noise levels will increase to 60dBA. Given that a 10dBA increase represents a doubling of perceived volume, 5dBA is a significant increase. The code should specify that isolated commercial sites such as these have the same noise emission limits as residential sites, which is the rule today for non-conforming properties.

Proposed zoning code should be updated to include the additional restrictions that are in place today for non-conforming residential parcels that will be re-zoned to commercial parcels consistent with Goal 10.1 (Land Use Designation) part 13. The unique relationship between residential areas and the isolated commercial parcels embedded within them requires code modification to preserve the fabric of our neighborhoods.

17857	Mark Leece	<p>5/4/16 This is testimony regarding treatment of small (less than 7500 sq. ft.) isolated Commercial Mixed Use 1 (CM1) zoned parcels contemplated under the Mixed Use Zones Project. City code section 33.130.100 B 2 c, adds a limitation to the CM1 zone for sites less than 7,500 sq. ft. that abut properties that are in a single family zone, and are operating as Retail Sales and Service, limiting hours of operation to 6AM - 11PM. Additional specific limitations for small isolated commercial zoned parcels in primarily residential areas need to be codified to make the Mixed Use Zones Project consistent with the intent of the proposed 2035 Comprehensive Plan update.</p> <p>Section II of the Mixed Use Zones Project Proposed Draft (March 2016) describes the relationship of this project to the comprehensive plan. Specifically, Goal 10.1 (Land Use Designation) part 13 expresses the intent of a CM1 land use designation as follows:</p> <p>13. Mixed Use — Dispersed. This designation allows mixed use, multi-dwelling, or commercial development that is small in scale, has little impact, and provides services for the nearby residential areas. Development will be similar in scale to nearby residential development to promote compatibility with the surrounding area. This designation is intended for areas where urban public services are available or planned. Areas within this designation are generally small nodes rather than large areas or corridors. The corresponding zones are Commercial Mixed Use 1 (CM1) and Commercial Employment (CE).</p> <p>The intent of this element of Goal 10.1 is clear:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • small in scale • has little impact • provides services for the nearby residential areas <p>Under current CM1 zoning up to 29 micro housing units could be constructed on a parcel less than 7500 sq. ft. with no consideration of scale, impact or provision of services that I believe are inconsistent with the intent of the goals of the 2035 Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>To address this inconsistency, consideration that code section 33.130.100 B 2 c be expanded to accommodate the following issues consistent with Goal 10.1 part 13.</p> <p>1. Loss of Neighborhood Commercial Resources: With commercial zoning, it would be possible to redevelop these sites for high-density residential use with no commercial elements at all. This is in contrasted to the stated reason for making these isolated non-conforming use sites commercial is to retain commercial use on these sites so they can continue providing services to the surrounding residential areas. The zoning rules need to require that, at a minimum, the ground floor must remain in commercial use should the site be redeveloped. An alternative might be to specify that should these sites be developed as entirely residential, the permitted density would be that of the highest</p>	mixed_use-726-1421	Hosford-Abernethy
-------	------------	---	--------------------	-------------------

density adjacent residential zone. Without one of these proposals, we fear development pressure might cause the loss of the commercial function that is critical to maintaining a livable community.

2. Change of Use: There are currently restrictions on change-of-use that would trigger review if the cumulative impacts of a site increase. This restriction is important to ensure a change in use would remain compatible with a neighborhood setting. This existing review mechanism should be added back to the zoning code. As an example, nearby residents are concerned that the quiet natural food grocery on SE 21st Ave currently in non-conforming use might someday be bought and converted into a bar, which would be possible under the proposed rules. This highlights the significant impact that a single isolated commercial property can have on its neighbors.

3. Applicability of Use: The proposed rules should apply to all commercial uses, not just Retail Sales and Service. The intent here is to limit nighttime noise and activity and to limit other impacts to neighbors from these sites; I believe these rules should apply to all commercial uses.

4. Noise: Existing regulations limit daytime noise emitted from non-conforming residential sites as measured on the property line of the nearest residential receiver to 55dBA (nighttime noise limits are lower) [City of Portland Charter Chapter 18.10.010], however if these properties are granted commercial status, permissible noise levels will increase to 60dBA. Given that a 10dBA increase represents a doubling of perceived volume, 5dBA is a significant increase. The code should specify that isolated commercial sites such as these have the same noise emission limits as residential sites, which is the rule today for non-conforming properties.

17856	Mark Leece	<p>5/4/16 This is testimony regarding treatment of small (less than 7500 sq. ft.) isolated Commercial Mixed Use 1 (CM1) zoned parcels contemplated under the Mixed Use Zones Project. City code section 33.130.100 B 2 c, adds a limitation to the CM1 zone for sites less than 7,500 sq. ft. that abut properties that are in a single family zone, and are operating as Retail Sales and Service, limiting hours of operation to 6AM - 11PM. Additional specific limitations for small isolated commercial zoned parcels in primarily residential areas need to be codified to make the Mixed Use Zones Project consistent with the intent of the proposed 2035 Comprehensive Plan update.</p> <p>Section II of the Mixed Use Zones Project Proposed Draft (March 2016) describes the relationship of this project to the comprehensive plan. Specifically, Goal 10.1 (Land Use Designation) part 13 expresses the intent of a CM1 land use designation as follows:</p> <p>13. Mixed Use — Dispersed. This designation allows mixed use, multi-dwelling, or commercial development that is small in scale, has little impact, and provides services for the nearby residential areas. Development will be similar in scale to nearby residential development to promote compatibility with the surrounding area. This designation is intended for areas where urban public services are available or planned. Areas within this designation are generally small nodes rather than large areas or corridors. The corresponding zones are Commercial Mixed Use 1 (CM1) and Commercial Employment (CE).</p> <p>The intent of this element of Goal 10.1 is clear:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • small in scale • has little impact • provides services for the nearby residential areas <p>Under current CM1 zoning up to 29 micro housing units could be constructed on a parcel less than 7500 sq. ft. with no consideration of scale, impact or provision of services that I believe are inconsistent with the intent of the goals of the 2035 Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>To address this inconsistency, consideration that code section 33.130.100 B 2 c be expanded to accommodate the following issues consistent with Goal 10.1 part 13.</p> <p>1. Loss of Neighborhood Commercial Resources: With commercial zoning, it would be possible to redevelop these sites for high-density residential use with no commercial elements at all. This is in contrasted to the stated reason for making these isolated non-conforming use sites commercial is to retain commercial use on these sites so they can continue providing services to the surrounding residential areas. The zoning rules need to require that, at a minimum, the ground floor must remain in commercial use should the site be redeveloped. An alternative might be to specify that should these sites be developed as entirely residential, the permitted density would be that of the highest</p>	mixed_use-330-2280	Hosford-Abernethy
-------	------------	---	--------------------	-------------------

density adjacent residential zone. Without one of these proposals, we fear development pressure might cause the loss of the commercial function that is critical to maintaining a livable community.

2. Change of Use: There are currently restrictions on change-of-use that would trigger review if the cumulative impacts of a site increase. This restriction is important to ensure a change in use would remain compatible with a neighborhood setting. This existing review mechanism should be added back to the zoning code. As an example, nearby residents are concerned that the quiet natural food grocery on SE 21st Ave currently in non-conforming use might someday be bought and converted into a bar, which would be possible under the proposed rules. This highlights the significant impact that a single isolated commercial property can have on its neighbors.

3. Applicability of Use: The proposed rules should apply to all commercial uses, not just Retail Sales and Service. The intent here is to limit nighttime noise and activity and to limit other impacts to neighbors from these sites; I believe these rules should apply to all commercial uses.

4. Noise: Existing regulations limit daytime noise emitted from non-conforming residential sites as measured on the property line of the nearest residential receiver to 55dBA (nighttime noise limits are lower) [City of Portland Charter Chapter 18.10.010], however if these properties are granted commercial status, permissible noise levels will increase to 60dBA. Given that a 10dBA increase represents a doubling of perceived volume, 5dBA is a significant increase. The code should specify that isolated commercial sites such as these have the same noise emission limits as residential sites, which is the rule today for non-conforming properties.

17855	Mark Leece	<p data-bbox="577 50 1522 381">5/4/16 Our residence is located across SE 21st Ave from Peoples Food Co-op (3029 SE 21st, Portland, OR), an isolated commercial site, which for 45 years has operated a retail grocery on a non-conforming residential parcel which is likely being rezoned as CM1. As a neighbor of this site and under current non-conforming use provisions - we currently are afforded protections against noise, redevelopment, and increased impacts that they stand to lose under the new rules and which are inconsistent with the intent of the planning goal described above. To address this inconsistency, I request consideration that code section 33.130.100 B 2 c be expanded to accommodate the following issues consistent with Goal 10.1 part 13.</p> <p data-bbox="678 479 1522 868">1.Loss of Neighborhood Commercial Resources: With commercial zoning, it would be possible to redevelop these sites for high-density residential use with no commercial elements at all. This is in contrasted to the stated reason for making these isolated non-conforming use sites commercial is to retain commercial use on these sites so they can continue providing services to the surrounding residential areas. The zoning rules need to require that, at a minimum, the ground floor must remain in commercial use should the site be redeveloped. An alternative might be to specify that should these sites be developed as entirely residential, the permitted density would be that of the highest density adjacent residential zone. Without one of these proposals, we fear development pressure might cause the loss of the commercial function that is critical to maintaining a livable community.</p> <p data-bbox="678 998 1522 1299">2.Change of Use: There are currently restrictions on change-of-use that would trigger review if the cumulative impacts of a site increase. This restriction is important to ensure a change in use would remain compatible with a neighborhood setting. This existing review mechanism should be added back to the zoning code. As an example, nearby residents are concerned that the quiet natural food grocery on SE 21st Ave currently in non-conforming use might someday be bought and converted into a bar, which would be possible under the proposed rules. This highlights the significant impact that a single isolated commercial property can have on its neighbors.</p> <p data-bbox="678 1485 1522 1567">3.Applicability of Use: The proposed rules should apply to all commercial uses, not just Retail Sales and Service. The intent here is to limit nighttime noise and activity and to limit other impacts to neighbors from</p>	mixed_use-914-3087	Hosford-Abernethy
-------	------------	--	--------------------	-------------------

these sites; I believe these rules should apply to all commercial uses.

4.Noise: Existing regulations limit daytime noise emitted from non-conforming residential sites as measured on the property line of the nearest residential receiver to 55dBA (nighttime noise limits are lower) [City of Portland Charter Chapter 18.10.010], however if these properties are granted commercial status, permissible noise levels will increase to 60dBA. Given that a 10dBA increase represents a doubling of perceived volume, 5dBA is a significant increase. The code should specify that isolated commercial sites such as these have the same noise emission limits as residential sites, which is the rule today for non-conforming properties.

17757	Don Good	5/4/16	<p>I think, The proposed change 1349 should be moved up to CM2 from CM1. This block of properties have been working together to be developed all together for the last year, which would give more options. The properties that have been working together for the last year as follows R217945, R217942, R217943, R217944. This is Almost 2 acres on Burnside. This Area is next to R217947 that already is CM2.This block of properties is also close to the same size of proposed 103 on SE 148th and Burnside which is proposed CM2. The proposed change 1349 has many advantages to go to CM2. 1. Advantage is that The city would be able to go forward with plans on putting a street through on the south side of properties R217943 and R217945 which will give more flow for the traffic. This would be buy it shelf, a big plus for the area. 2. More units with some commercial use which will be used by Light Rail. This means less traffic when Light Rail is used. another big Plus. 3. The proposed change at 1349 moving to CM2 is also on Burnside and light Rail which is a major corridor. I believe there will be some more jobs in this area if this is moved to CM2 which will help the local area also. Thank you for your consideration Don Good</p>	mixed_use-1349-1762	Glenfair
17698	Steve Szigethy	5/3/16	<p>Honorable PSC members: Please consider expanding this proposed CM1 zone across the street to include the lightly-used parking lot at the northwest corner of SE Milwaukie Ave and Ellis St. The northern part of Westmoreland is in desperate need of retail, especially food & beverage, as the area builds up with more than 100 new apartment units. Sincerely, Steve Szigethy</p>	mixed_use-667-1134	Sellwood-Moreland Improvement League
17695	Steve Szigethy	5/3/16	<p>Honorable PSC members: Please consider expanding mixed-use zoning (either CE or CM2) to include the full block between Holgate, Pardee, Milwaukie and 17th. This would potentially spur some retail development to help activate the 17th/Holgate MAX station area and provide some much needed services and amenities for south Brooklyn and north Westmoreland. Prior to MAX right-of-way acquisition, this corner featured a restaurant, deli, convenience store and other commercial establishments. It would be great to get these uses back - and then some. Sincerely, Steve Szigethy</p>	mixed_use-1071-55	Brooklyn Action Corps

17520	Ted Stonecliffe	4/30/16	I agree that this area of Capitol Hwy could be redeveloped with a mixed-use development as proposed. I would like to see a road diet for Capitol Hwy and 49th Avenue once light rail is built on Barbur Blvd. Wider sidewalks and more marked crosswalks are needed along Capitol and 49th to protect bicycles and pedestrians going to Markham Elementary and PCC.	mixed_use-1145-484	West Portland Park
17457	Nick Christensen	4/28/16	This should be CM2 or CM3.	mixed_use-1510-4329	Sellwood-Moreland Improvement League
17456	Nick Christensen	4/28/16	Shouldn't this be higher intensity?	mixed_use-1107-488	Sellwood-Moreland Improvement League
17455	Nick Christensen	4/28/16	Shouldn't this be higher intensity?	mixed_use-1107-488	Sellwood-Moreland Improvement League
17453	Nick Christensen	4/28/16	Eastport Plaza shouldn't just be commercial. A residential component could help fill space and fill our city's housing needs. Let's allow full mixed-use here.	mixed_use-980-57	Lents
17431	Steve Szigethy	4/28/16	<p>Honorable PSC members:</p> <p>I think downzoning the two major focal points in Sellwood-Moreland (Milwaukie/Bybee and 13th/Tacoma) to CM1 is a bad idea that runs counter to the basic principles of a town center. I believe these locations should feature the neighborhood's most intense, vibrant land uses, including 45'/48' building height maximums. It's especially odd when, under the staff proposal, areas to the north and south would retain 45' heights while the focal points would step down to 35'. While I understand the intent to try and preserve the old streetcar-era buildings by reducing market forces on them, this downzoning would also reduce the possibility of having vibrant development occur on less sacred sites such as the dull US Bank building and its adjacent parking lot. Please apply a CM2 designation at Milwaukie/Bybee and 13th/Tacoma to reinforce these locations' roles as Sellwood-Moreland's main focal points of activity.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Steve Szigethy SMILE Board Member-At-Large</p>	mixed_use-1510-4329	Sellwood-Moreland Improvement League

17410	Doug Klotz	4/28/16	Regarding the Fred Meyer at 3805 SE Hawthorne. This should be zoned CM-2 as proposed. Rather than rezone to an "auto-accommodating" zone, instead, Fred Meyer should follow the direction they chose for the Stadium Store on W. Burnside, and likewise remodel it to a "more urban form". This is the heart of the Belmont/Hawthorne/Division Neighborhood Center, and should develop in a pedestrian-oriented manner. Off-street parking is still allowed, as it is at Stadium, but not new drive-throughs, as has been the case on Hawthorne since 1991 or earlier.	mixed_use-1110-524	Sunnyside
17409	Carla Grant	4/28/16	I heartily agree with the proposal to make this corridor a mixed use zone. I would extend it, however, to include the bus stop at 82nd and Russel. High school students gather there daily. I am appalled at the conditions of traffic coming up that hill from the south and lack of space allowed for pedestrians. There's a derelict building behind and no curb.	mixed_use-1039-103	Madison South
17408	Jaymes Walker	4/27/16	I am concerned that the homes on the east side of NE 81st Ave will be overwhelmed by the proposal of 4 story buildings next to them....thus reducing their value and potential willingness for owners to maintain them in decent order.	mixed_use-1038-1213	Madison South
17407	Michael Botter	4/27/16	null	mixed_use-1038-1213	Madison South
17406	Michael Botter	4/27/16	This neighborhood looks forward to a destination to walk to such as a small grocery store and/or a coffee shop. We are trying to practice Asset Based Community Development (ABCD) and build on our strengths, our neighbors.	mixed_use-1038-1213	Madison South
17405	Michael Botter	4/27/16	This neighborhood is ripe for a destination to walk to such as a small grocery store and/or a coffee shop. We are trying to build on our strengths, our neighbors, to practice Asset Based Community Development (ABCD) to build a place we are proud of and not have businesses we are ashamed to walk by with our kids.	mixed_use-1038-1213	Madison South
17403	Hillary Barbour	4/27/16	I support moving towards a more pedestrian oriented, smaller scale, neighborhood friendly environment. The neighborhoods can/will support these businesses, demographics are changing, and we are eager for businesses that offer family friendly goods and services (a grocery store/retail as opposed to strip clubs, adult video, fast food, and cheap commercial crap).	mixed_use-1039-103	Madison South
17396	Christopher Coiner	4/27/16	I strongly support the proposed change and ask that there be some focus on kind of properties already here. There are many businesses with a nefarious character that do not reflect this community. We've asked the for the city's help with little. The city should include some incentives for businesses that help those living here.	mixed_use-1039-103	Madison South

17394	Christopher Coiner	4/27/16	This neighborhood needs and wants a pedestrian oriented focus that is true to the Portland vision of a walkable city. The zoning for this corridor needs to reflect that change. NE 82nd is very different other places that are car friendly. We would like this neighborhood to reflect the people living in it.	mixed_use-1038-1213	Madison South
17382	Kristen Kibler	4/27/16	The Neighborhood Center - Main Street Overlay is a good idea for this area. This area has been unable to develop at all, as is. Many lots sit vacant or derelict. Neighborhood scaled services that promote positive activity happening along 82nd Ave will help everybody.	mixed_use-1039-103	Madison South
17379	Kimberly Botter	4/26/16	I am quite excited to see this area recently added to be a Neighborhood Center. I support this mixed use CM 2 designation (vs. previous GC) and the Neighborhood Center overlay and I see it as a positive and necessary step to improving this section of Portland. We have a number of buildings (and vacant lots/ land) that have just been a blight to Madison South and Roseway neighborhoods and having mixed use designation along with Neighborhood Center overlay will encourage investment in this area. I would love to see more pedestrian friendly development along this stretch of Madison South, improvements to 82nd Avenue for all modes of transportation, and the type of development that builds a sense of community rather than just a car-centric thoroughfare, with sex shops, prostitution, blight and a negative reputation with no benefit to the community. Getting residents out using the street with places to go to will create positive change and make a more livable, safe and prosperous community.	mixed_use-1039-103	Madison South
17336	Kim Bosley	4/24/16	This is such a wonderful neighborhood, it needs a business front that illustrates the families and pedestrians that represent it! I would love to see a local grocery store in this area...New Seasons, Trader Joes, Green Zebra type stores. A big box type store (Walmart etc) isn't what is needed or wanted in this area. Dharma Rain has put a great deal of effort into making that land beautiful and welcoming...we need business development to be respectful of this and continue to develop this neighborhood in this direction. Thank you.	mixed_use-1038-1213	Madison South
17331	Benjamin Kerensa	4/23/16	Please keep in mind risk for displacement and gentrification in any changes made.	Buffer (b)	Montavilla
17330	Benjamin Kerensa	4/23/16	Please keep in mind risk for displacement and gentrification in any changes made.	mixed_use-1107-700	Montavilla
17329	Benjamin Kerensa	4/23/16	Please keep in mind risk for displacement and gentrification in any changes made.	mixed_use-1072-89	Montavilla

17328	Benjamin Kerensa	4/23/16	Please keep in mind risk for displacement and gentrification in any changes made.	mixed_use-422-998	Montavilla
17310	Elisabeth	4/23/16	I live in a nearby neighborhood (Parkrose) and I am in full support of having a high quality grocer (i.e. New seasons, trader joes, etc) and nice affordable housing in this development. The neighborhoods just east of 82nd are changing fast and one key component that is missing is good local shops and restaurants. Help us make our neighborhood even better!	mixed_use-1038-1213	Madison South
17309	Lauren Schmitt	4/22/16	I support the change to CM2. The GC zoning has been a blight on this area. I also support the Main Street Overlay zone, including minimum floor area requirements.	mixed_use-1039-103	Madison South
17308	Lauren Schmitt	4/22/16	Please change the zoning along the NE 82nd frontage of this lot to one of the CM categories from the IG zoning which was a relic of the site being a landfill. If the IG zoning cannot be changed, continue the Centers Main Street Overlay zone across this land in recognition of the tremendous bus ridership on 82nd Avenue	mixed_use-1038-1213	Madison South
17307	Lauren Schmitt	4/22/16	I support the change from GC to CM1 along Sandy and the Main Street Overlay Zone in the heart of Roseway.	Centers Main Street (m)	Madison South
17306	Joshua Lute	4/22/16	This property should be designated CE, not CM2. We have an existing drive-through coffee location on this site and would be unable to upgrade or improve the site if the zoning were to change to a designation that prohibits drive-thrus, like CM2. Please leave this in CE as this is more characteristic of the surrounding businesses and area.	mixed_use-1074-1206	Mt. Scott-Arleta
17305	Heather Loos	4/22/16	This is such a wonderful up and coming neighborhood. I would love to see a local grocery store in this development, New Seasons, Trader Joes, etc. A large box store isn't what is need or wanted in this area. Something that helps this area become more pedestrian friendly and walkabout would be amazing. Thank you.	mixed_use-1038-1213	Madison South

17302	Carla Grant	4/22/16	<p>NEIGHBORHOOD development is what is needed for this area. There are many pedestrians who brave crossing 82nd without sufficient space. High school students gather at the corners and bus stop several times a day. Children (and mom's with strollers) cross 82nd to play at Glenhaven. (You should come see it for yourself during one of our summer concerts in the park.) For too long now the businesses in this neighborhood do not reflect the residents. Cars with Washington plates park outside the whore houses. Derelict buildings abound. I would like to see development that reflects the people who actually live here. For me, that is small, local businesses that have great pedestrian access. A big box store with a giant parking lot would be a detriment to our neighborhood. Here's some ideas of what I'd like there: a nice cooperative grocery store, cafes with outdoor seating, trees with walking paths, a dog park, an outdoor store to service lumberyard and skate park kids, any small locally owned shop... The thing is this neighborhood is already vibrant with families, pedestrians and cyclists. It would be nice to have the businesses and architecture embrace that. We're counting on you. Let this one be a testament to how sustainable and livable Portland really is.</p>	mixed_use-1038-1213	Madison South
-------	-------------	---------	--	---------------------	---------------

17300	John LaManna	4/22/16	<p>The surrounding neighborhoods here have fast-rising home prices and the flood of recent homebuyers have higher incomes and higher expectations of the retail amenities. We want to see this area develop in a manner similar to N. Williams, Alberta, Division, Hawthorne and other cultural centers. That means attracting unique Portland businesses - restaurants, retail, bakeries, cafes, and service businesses. The best way to anchor a high-quality cultural center is with a high-quality grocery such as New Seasons, Whole Foods or Market of Choice. We currently don't have a high quality grocer nearby and this would serve the demands of residents all around this area. NE 82nd Avenue has great potential to be a bustling cultural center that serves the needs of both high-income and lower-income residents. Currently, there are almost all low-quality and unattractive businesses like convenience stores, dive bars, and uninviting restaurants. Most homeowners in this area drive west to Hollywood or Beaumont to dine out or grocery shop. As a bike commuter, I never venture onto 82nd because there's no safe cycling route and no good businesses to visit anyway. This entire corridor leading to the 82nd Ave Max Station could and deserves to be accessible by bikes and pedestrians. It would increase public transit usage by nearby homeowners and increase the economic output of this corridor.</p>	mixed_use-1038-1213	Madison South
17294	Deb Reitenour	4/21/16	<p>As a nearby homeowner I hope that this space could be an anchor for a pedestrian friendly development. LOCAL small stores and affordable housing would be great. This neighborhood fought off a Walmart about ten years ago and a similar development would still not be welcome here.</p>	mixed_use-1038-1213	Madison South
17255	Doug Circosta	4/21/16	<p>Currently the Macadam Plan District has a 2:1 FAR and a maximum height of 45' with an average height of 35'. The plan district does not seem to permit the owner to take advantage of the potential possibilities of the CM2 zone. Macadam is identified by the City as a significant corridor geared toward higher density. What will be done in relation to the Macadam Plan District limitations to allow higher densities to be achieved.</p>	mixed_use-1146-1245	South Portland

17251	Kelley Fitzpatrick	4/21/16	I recently became aware that a local developer is looking possibilities for developing the old landfill area on 82nd across from Madison HS. It sounds like the first stages are for consideration of a large business with up to 500 parking spaces. I would strongly push for more thoughtful development that will build community in our neighborhood. In the 12 years I've lived in Roseway, I see more people walking and biking. We need more businesses to encourage more of that, not businesses bringing more car traffic to our area. I'd like to see smaller retail with affordable housing above. I want changes that bring people out of their houses and interacting with neighbors---of all ages---on a daily basis! Thank you!	mixed_use-1039-103	Madison South
17250	Heather Jackson	4/21/16	As a resident of Madison South, I'm fearful of the impact a large retail center with a big parking lot will have on this area. Considering it's proximity to the Neighborhood Center between Siskiyou and Beech. However, a smaller scale retail center with grocery, local businesses, etc. that is pedestrian friendly would be perfect for this area. Thank you for considering my comments!	mixed_use-1038-1213	Madison South
17249	Christopher Coiner	4/21/16	I feel that this zoning and use needs to reflect the neighborhood and the potential of the neighborhood corridor to the north. That would include not allowing a big box store with a focus on car commuter to be developed here. What we need is more focus on transit and pedestrian traffic that would match the neighborhood and benefit those living in the neighborhood and students going to school at Madison High School. A focus on ground floor retail with living space above would go a long way toward driving this change.	mixed_use-1038-1213	Madison South
16905	Nancy Cox	4/12/16	This is a lovely, iconic multi-unit residential building. While it is zoned storefront commercial, I suggest bringing the scale down a notch to the same as the buildings east of 50th, in order to minimize redevelopment pressure. The neighborhood needs the mix of old to preserve the original character of Hawthorne.	mixed_use-1110-524	Sunnyside
16843	Hollis Elliott	4/8/16	Height limits for future housing over existing building	mixed_use-1509-22196	Sellwood-Moreland Improvement League

16842	Loren Crawford	4/8/16	<p>The proposed zone CE for my property does not take into account that currently there is a retail/apartment building built next door with 48 units and 2,000 sq ft plus of retail. Also this is an area served by frequent transit (Max, Bus, Spring water corridor).</p> <p>There are many near by apartment buildings on Milwaukie Ave and this is an area that will grow up and connect Brooklyn and Westmoreland.</p> <p>A zone that includes mixed retail and residential would be more appropriate. I suggest CM2.</p> <p>Thank you and I look forward to your reply.</p>	mixed_use-1071-55	Brooklyn Action Corps
16834	Merrilee Spence	4/7/16	<p>Why is this property designated to be CM2? It is currently zoned CN2, which means it should be designated CM1 in the new system. We do not need and cannot handle the increased density CM2 will allow.</p>	mixed_use-1199-305	Woodstock
16833	Merrilee Spence	4/7/16	<p>Why is this property designated to be CM2? It is currently CN2 so it should be designated CM1 in the new scheme. We do not need the additional density since we do not have appropriate infrastructure to support it - I believe we have the highest incidence on unimproved streets in the city.</p>	mixed_use-1199-305	Woodstock
16832	Merrilee Spence	4/7/16	<p>Why is this property designated to be zoned CM2? It is currently CN2, so it's new designation should be CM1. We do not need the increased density here since we do not have the infrastructure to support it and there are no plans to address our high incidence of unimproved streets.</p>	mixed_use-1199-305	Woodstock
16831	Merrilee Spence	4/7/16	<p>Why is this property proposed to be CM2? It is currently CN2, which means it should be CM1. I think some behind the scenes shenanigans have taken place. This is VERY DISAPPOINTING.</p>	mixed_use-1199-305	Woodstock

16809	Ole Ersson	4/6/16	<p>This parcel is close to downtown, the SW Hills, and the Homestead neighborhood of Marquam Hill. All these areas have severe housing shortages due to the paucity of undeveloped buildable land. It is also located on two major thoroughfares (SW Broadway Drive and Sam Jackson Park Road, the gateways to the large residential areas above it). The residential zoning adjacent to the proposed change, and most of the lots between here and downtown, is also higher density, typically R1. For these reasons, it would make more sense that the residential portion of this lot be zoned to higher density, such as R1.</p> <p>Due to the conservation overlay in this area, any structures built here will be adjacent to SW Broadway Drive or SW Sam Jackson Park Road, leaving the interior areas largely undeveloped and retaining the park like feel of this area, regardless of the density of new structures within the developable area.</p>	mixed_use-1113-80	Southwest Hills
16801	Ray Holmgren	4/6/16	The property at 4608 ne 102nd has box outline within the property out line. What is the reason?	mixed_use-333-940	Parkrose
16786	John Koenig	4/6/16	As I see it, your goal in the planning is to Dis-incentive owners of properties in a small section of Alberta from having opportunities that 95% of the rest of the street has at their disposal, without regard to the history, the background, the investment, and the hope that we've built into our businesses. It really limits our opportunity and is an unfair taking of our asset opportunity. If the city would consider that in their proposal as it impact is greater than lines on a map.	mixed_use-1491-4326	Vernon

16782	John Koenig	4/6/16	My wife and I own 2 side by side properties on Alberta where we operate 2 neighborhood stores. We're not developers and are good stewards of the neighborhood and have been since 2000. We're finding our investments and our future opportunity limited by your zoning our small block as CM1, whereas the rest of Alberta is CM2. If the goal is to set aside some history and maintain that history on the street, there are several blocks with the same history and those owners may benefit from their greater opportunities in the future, while we are being singled out. And a note that much of 17th and Alberta has already been developed (the North side). .It's frustrating to build an business, have an asset you hope to pass on to your kid, or preserve, be limited in our use. Its not fair and is a taking of a future opportunity that just cherry picks from a street with shared history and other owners. As someone else asked, why our block? Which really means, why the entire south side of 17-19th which is the segment of the plan that it effects the most? Again, we're small business owners, we've build our business, had the foresight to take a bit and invest in our properties as part of our future retirement, and now finding we can't do what 95% of the rest of the Alberta Street area from MLK to 33rd would be allowed to do with their assets in the future. It's not fair.. We should all be treated in similar fashion and not singled out. I don't believe your plan considers the small business owners with hope to have options with their investments. Please reconsider.	mixed_use-1491-4326	Vernon
16765	William Leigh	4/6/16	Why is the two block area I own property at 18th and Alberta being treated differently?	mixed_use-1491-4326	Vernon
16711	Adam Herstein	4/3/16	I support higher densities in the Foster-Powell-52nd triangle. There is a lot of underutilized space and empty lots, thus much potential to create a vibrant walkable urban center. I live nearby and would love this area to densify and provide amenities to nearby residents.	mixed_use-1074-1247	Foster-Powell

16710	Robin Scholetzky	4/1/16	<p>As a residential property owner in close proximity to this site, I would like to raise the following concerns associated with the site and the mixed use zones project: I understand the City's interest in removing sites from a non confirming situation, so I can agree with changing the comprehensive plan map designation from its current R2.5 to CM1. However, I am opposed to changing the zoning map from its current R2.5 to CM1 for the following reasons: Neighborhood commercial uses in other nearby locations. There are many opportunities along SE Clinton and SE Division for neighborhood serving commercial. SE Division offers ample neighborhood serving commercial opportunities located one block north. It is expected that these opportunities for neighborhood serving commercial will continue to grow as a result of additional map amendments as a result of the Comprehensive Plan process. Additional commercial/office sites are not warranted in the neighborhood. Surrounded on all sides by single family dwellings. The site is not part of a node of commercial uses, but is surrounded on all sides by residential uses, including a residential property which contains frontage on both SE Clinton and SE 34th. There is no mirroring neighborhood commercial across the street in any direction. Small site size. The site is very small (3,150) square feet. Properties at the neighborhood commercial node at 26th and Clinton range in size from 7,000 to 5,000. A larger site size provides ample opportunity for landscaping, building setbacks, screening and other mitigating site features when providing commercial uses. This site, at barely over 3,000 square feet is setting up a situation for future development needing to request modifications or Adjustments as part of future development. Street character, Although this site is along a strong bicycle corridor of SE Clinton, the street widths and dimensions at this corner do not support delivery trucks and other commercial traffic unlike other commercial nodes along SE Clinton. Benefit of further land use review/clarity of zoning code standards. Any future development on the site should have the benefit of a quasi judicial land use review with its associated compatibility criteria. Since the associated CM1 Title 33 language is still in-development, it is unclear if zoning code language will include adequate criteria to ensure that future development on this site will be of a compatible nature. I urge City staff to reconsider the zoning map amendment associated with this site and request that the zoning map be maintained at R2.5 with a Comprehensive Plan map designation at Residential.</p>	mixed_use-922-1714	Richmond
16590	Lily Nguyen	3/31/16	I agree to change the property to all commercial.	mixed_use-821-1508	Brentwood-Darlington
2534	Joseph Elkhali	3/24/16	Thank you for receiving my information and considering this property for the new mixed use civic corridor designation. I will be attending the Thursday April 14, meeting at 6:00 pm to submit my information to you. Please schedule me for a five minute spot. Thank you.	mixed_use-1288-4341	Hazelwood

2496	Michael Geffel	3/23/16	I purchased my property specifically because of the commercial zoning and strongly support the proposed changes. Portland is in the midst of a housing crisis and we need the city to densify. I feel this plan is actually quite conservative giving the demand. I'm glad that Foster Rd has been given more freedom to grow up based on its diagonal orientation and am optimistic about the future of the neighborhood.	mixed_use-1074-1247	Foster-Powell
2464	Bob Kellett	3/23/16	This site has a ton of redevelopment potential. It would be a shame to limit it to CM1 when it could be better served by CM2 like the neighboring properties to the west and south.	mixed_use-1090-4799	Buckman
2454	Bob Kellett	3/23/16	The CM1 zoning is appropriate. Would love to see it extended all the way to 26th on the south side of Stark.	mixed_use-1087-1450	Kerns
2411	Merrilee Spence	3/22/16	The proposed rezoning of properties currently CN2 to either CM1 or CM2 is creating substantially more density than currently exists and will significantly reduce parking availability at the same time. With many unimproved streets in this area, this will create more problems than it will solve. The currently designated areas for CM1 appear random. We really thought we would get more consistency in our zoning patterns but it looks as though things will be less consistent and rational than they are now. I would rather see more consistent zoning of properties with those that currently may be more densely developed being considered "nonconforming" rather than establishing haphazard zoning patterns the reflect current structures. NO INCREASED DENSITY OF ANY KIND - MIXED USE OR RESIDENTIAL - SHOULD BE PROPOSED FOR WOODSTOCK UNTIL A PLAN IS IN PLACE TO ADDRESS (AND REMEDY) OUR HIGH PERCENTAGE OF UNIMPROVED STREETS.	mixed_use-1199-305	Woodstock
1795	Amy Brewer	11/16/15	The intended pending development by Green Light Development maximizes density at the cost of removing south facing sunlight from existing adjacent town homes. The concept does not include any commercial space which is not fit the definition of mixed use. The design is arranged in a courtyard style instead of oriented to the street as other comparable buildings in the neighborhood are. The design needs to be altered to be amenable to, and in the spirit of a mixed retail residential street oriented building with space on the north side of the development for existing homes and for emergency vehicle access.	mixed_use-823-3250	Sunnyside

1793	Kevin Campbell	11/15/15	<p>The CM3 designation for the Palms Motel located at 3801 N Interstate Ave should be changed to CM2 as the neighborhood will not be able to digest the intense infill the city intends for this site. The Overlook triangle already supports a 63 unit apartment building with no (minimal) parking next to the proposed CM3 site and we also have the traffic and congestion generated from Kaiser Permanente which can only be expected to increase when Kaiser decides to expand it's campus. The green way next to the site and Overlook park will also be adversely affected if the city allows the CM3 zoning to stand. You can expect intense pushback from the neighborhood if the city insists on this unsustainable infill and finally the scale and beauty of the Polish meeting house and Catholic church will be diminished if the city allows a towering wall of unrestrained development to occur.</p>	mixed_use-1019-630	Overlook
1791	Amy Higgs	11/15/15	<p>I live near overlook park and feel strongly that switching this area to CM3 would change the character of our neighborhood for the worse. Our neighborhood would be much better suited to CM2. The 63 apartment building that was permitted to be built across the street from The Palms is already putting a strain on the Neighborhood and Overlook Park and will put significant further strain once residents start moving in, considering the insufficiency of parking. Combined with the new homeless camp in our neighborhood, neighbors are really feeling the strain and would love to keep our neighborhood comfortable and livable. Additionally, we do not feel like we were provided adequate notice of this proposed zoning change we just found out yesterday from an informed friend. It seems BPS should invest more in public involvement, to make sure that these major decisions are being informed by the public. Thank you for your hard work for our city!</p>	mixed_use-1019-630	Overlook

1788	Micelis C. Doyle	11/15/15	<p>Similar to the proposed zoning on the West side of Interstate between Shaver and Prescott, I would strongly advocate for a CM2 zoning between N. Overlook Blvd and N. Failing. If the CM2 zoning were to be similar it will provide better transition zoning to our neighborhood. Please note that the area near Overlook Park experiences heavy congestion and use throughout the year. This is due to activities at the park, bike commuters and Max riders who park their vehicles in the neighborhood when riding Max. The similar zoning would also allow for consistent conditions for the single-family residential housing immediately west of Interstate Ave. The intersection of Interstate and Overlook does not have the capacity for a CM3 development. With ongoing construction of a 50+ unit complex dwelling apartment building at Overlook Blvd. and Interstate the extreme congestion is evident at all times of the day. Once this complex is occupied the situation will further deteriorate. Please find a solution that works for the needs of growing Portland, and a working neighborhood that was designed over 100 years ago and cannot support large scale commercial mix-used development. Please zone this area as CM2. Thank you for your consideration.</p>	mixed_use-1019-630	Overlook
1787	Kate Kinder	11/14/15	<p>Similar to the proposed zoning on the West side of Interstate between Shaver and Prescott, I would strongly advocate for a CM2 zoning between N Overlook Blvd and N Failing. This would allow for future development and infill, while also providing better transition zoning to step down to our residential, single-dwelling neighborhood. It would reduce un-intentional incentives to demolish well-preserved historic homes. It also better plans for the traffic, pedestrian, and bike use of the area: now and into the future. The intersection of Interstate and Overlook will not have the capacity for a CM3 development, factoring in the 63 dwelling apartment building going in Overlook Blvd, Kaiser Permanente's large healthcare and research facilities, Overlook Park's robust recreational offerings and sports leagues, a busy bike route along Overlook Blvd, and the consistent commuter congestion from cars and trucks by-passing I-5N. Please find a solution that works for the needs of growing Portland, and a working neighborhood and community that was not designed to and cannot support large scale commercial mix-used development. Please zone this area as CM2.</p>	mixed_use-1019-630	Overlook

1776	Douglas Miller	11/12/15	<p>"I believe the Palms Motel parcel (the equivalent of 6 residential lots each 50' x100') should remain as CM2 zoning rather than CM3. This area cannot sustain the potential of a plus 6 story building so close to the new 6-story, 63-unit apartment currently being built at 3707 and 3717 Overlook Boulevard. This is already a very dense traffic area with inadequate road infrastructure. I would invite the committee to visit the area to actual see the congestion. Overlook Blvd would be turned into an alley way! Complicating this issue is the huge Kaiser Permanente clinic and research offices on the east side of Interstate, as well as additional Kaiser offices on the west side of Interstate that are adjacent to the new apartment complex. Overlook Blvd is a designated bike route through the Overlook Triangle area at the intersection of Overlook Blvd and Interstate Ave. This bike route provides valuable access into the Overlook Neighborhood and on into other North Portland neighborhoods. Changing to a CM3 zoning, with its potential for increased density, would exacerbate an already congested area increasing the potential for accidents. The streets in Overlook Triangle area are already narrow, based upon the traffic patterns of 100 years ago. Further increasing the densification of the area to a CM3 zone would only add additional stress to an already stressed area. In addition, a change to a CM3 zoning has the potential to further increase the building heights to more than the current CM2 65 feet limitation. Please consider these issues in your deliberation. Again a simple visit provides a clear visualization of the impact of a change to the current zoning.</p>	mixed_use-1019-630	Overlook
------	----------------	----------	---	--------------------	----------

1775	Dee Kurilo	11/11/15	<p>Our Overlook neighborhood has had to endure so many changes in recent years. Many of the changes are unwelcome changes. This is yet another. Allowing CM3 zoning only further adds to the many strains already impacting our "neighborhood". People live here. It is a neighborhood. Not a subdivision, not a business park. We bought our 1925 home 15 years ago with a love for the historic feel for the home and the neighborhood. That historic neighborhood feeling is rapidly going away with modern style homes replacing established, historic homes and 6 story apartment buildings towering over our homes. We are highly impacted with increased traffic, less parking for our own guests, and constant construction inconveniences. Please be mindful and respectful of those of us who chose this neighborhood to live in, to raise our families in, when considering allowing CM3 zoning.</p>	mixed_use-1019-630	Overlook
1774	Adrian Baker-Campbell	11/11/15	<p>I would very much like to see the Palms Motel parcel (equivalent of 6 residential lots each 50' x100') as CM2 zoning rather than CM3. This area cannot afford another 6-story building this close to the new 6-story, 63-unit apartment building going in kitty corner to it on Overlook Boulevard. This is already a very dense and complex area with a huge Kaiser Permanente clinic and research offices on the east side of Interstate, as well as additional Kaiser offices on the west side of Interstate. Also there is a major bike route through Overlook Triangle on Overlook Boulevard at this intersection. Having a CM3 zoning allowance would create more congestion on Interstate Avenue and on Overlook Triangle streets, the latter being very narrow as they were originally designed/built 100 years ago. Lastly, my concern over the CM3 zoning is that building heights are not limited to 65 feet from what I've been told, as builders can offer incentives that allows them to build additional stories, increasing the density to the neighborhood.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	mixed_use-1019-630	Overlook

1769	Fred Brewer	11/11/15	Proposed Zoning Change on N Interstate Avenue in Overlook Neighborhood. "Our neighborhood is currently under a lot of strain with the largest apartment complex for residential zoning in the city, sharing the few parking spaces we have with park goers and park and ride transit commuters, and the homeless camp at Hazelnut Grove. It feels like discrimination the amount of strain the city is already putting on this neighborhood community without rezoning for more density that it can handle now. Please take into consideration that there are neighborhoods and communities in North Portland too. We are taking the brunt of many challenges, yet CM3 zoning will kill what livability we have left.	mixed_use-1019-630	Overlook
1754	Kate Kinder	11/10/15	I am concerned about the impact to the Overlook neighborhood with a CM3 zone along Interstate, between N Overlook and N Mason, and would strongly advocate for a CM2 zoning. This would allow for better transition between commercial mixed use and the well-established, historic homes that abut the Interstate zone. This would allow for the much needed ability to develop along transportation corridors, and N. Interstate, while respecting and maintaining a great neighborhood for families, seniors, and young professionals. Neighborhoods like Overlook are what make Portland livable. Please don't destroy this, and further incentivize the demolitions of well-maintained historic homes.	mixed_use-1019-630	Overlook
1713	Martha Johnston	11/9/15	the Comm1 Zone for NE Mariners Loop extends too far south to NE Faloma Rd residential R-10 Please Check and get back to me. I am th Land Use Chair for The East Columbia NA in this area. Thanks	mixed_use-1028-215	East Columbia
1709	Julie Goodrich	11/9/15	Hello, I live in Argay Terrace neighborhood. Given that Portland is encouraging new SFR's in SE, let's keep our great neighborhood of SFR's. We don't want it to be like NE Sandy Blvd. CM1 would be acceptable for the area, from NE Fremont north to NE Prescott, especially given the new schools that have been recently built, and include PARKING!! Slow down traffic on NE 122nd in this area as well.	mixed_use-980-1215	Argay

1702	Tom Amundson	11/4/15	<p>In the Hawthorne, Division, and Belmont neighborhoods, we have seen parking issues with developments that do not require parking. How is it even feasible to build up to 30 units without parking being a requirement? This puts a large stress on the older home/neighborhood that did not have a modern car sized garage or off street parking. Is the city planning on changing this part of the code or will we just continue as is? To me, I feel like this is a HUGE issue that developers are taking advantage of at the cost of the currently presiding homeowner that utilizes the on street parking in front of their property. Density planning works where it makes most sense. In theory, urban housing without parking for cars sounds great for mass transit uses, but that does not factor in the car owner, friends and family that stop by with cars, and commercial traffic. More places for people to live but no place to park just adds a large strain on the neighborhood...please update the code!!!</p>	mixed_use-589-1036	Woodstock
1700	Benjamin Allen	11/4/15	<p>NW 23rd is too densely packed to be safe or practical. The plan should aim to reduce congestion here by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Making the street a pedestrian street, shifting traffic to NW 21st, and encouraging creation of parking structures; 2. Removing parking from NW 23rd and encouraging creation of parking structures; or 3. Making NW 23rd and NW 21st one way streets in opposite directions. <p>While there's a need to provide both auto transit and auto parking in the region, NW 23rd is currently too congested and cramped to be safe. Given its many retail stores and high pedestrian traffic, it makes sense to expand pedestrian use, and shift parking and/or traffic elsewhere (e.g., 21st).</p>	mixed_use-1147-600	Northwest District

1695	Robin McIntosh	11/1/15	<p>Commercial development does not belong on Caruthers. This is a small residential street with no room for the traffic and congestion that comes along with commercial development. Increased density and development on Division has already brought more delivery trucks, moving trucks, garbage trucks, maintenance vehicles and cars to Caruthers and 37th. Delivery vehicles parked on Division decrease visibility for drivers and bikers turning onto Division from 37th, and for pedestrians crossing the street. This dangerous bottleneck will be even worse if Caruthers becomes a street with businesses on it that will need to be serviced by more large, loud vehicles, which will all need to turn on to Division - after parking (or double parking) on Caruthers. Current, grandfathered-in zoning has unfortunately already allowed one large building on Caruthers, and will result in at least one more. Caruthers, Division, and the others streets in the surrounding neighborhood cannot get wider to support the increased traffic and congestion. Caruthers already serves as a buffer between the business district on Division and the surrounding neighborhood, but this function will be lost if commercial development is built on Caruthers too. The narrow, residential streets North of Caruthers cannot support the increased traffic and congestion that would be caused by businesses on Caruthers. Increased residential infill will already ad to the traffic on Caruthers and neighboring streets. Commercial development on Caruthers will create a terrible mess in the whole neighborhood, and will ad to the mess that is already on Division. Commercial development on Caruthers is not a good solution for anything or anyone, and would create many problems - for everyone. Caruthers is the wrong place for commercial zoning.</p>	Buffer (b),Centers Main Street (m)	Richmond
------	----------------	---------	---	--	----------

1694	Robin McIntosh	11/1/15	<p>Commercial development does not belong on Caruthers. This is a small residential street with no room for the traffic and congestion that comes along with commercial development. Increased density and development on Division has already brought more delivery trucks, moving trucks, garbage trucks, maintenance vehicles and cars to Caruthers and 37th. Delivery vehicles parked on Division decrease visibility for drivers and bikers turning onto Division from 37th, and for pedestrians crossing the street. This dangerous bottleneck will be even worse if Caruthers becomes a street with businesses on it that will need to be serviced by more large, loud vehicles, which will all need to turn on to Division - after parking (or double parking) on Caruthers. Current, grandfathered-in zoning has unfortunately already allowed one large building on Caruthers, and will result in at least one more. Caruthers, Division, and the others streets in the surrounding neighborhood cannot get wider to support the increased traffic and congestion. Caruthers already serves as a buffer between the business district on Division and the surrounding neighborhood, but this function will be lost if commercial development is built on Caruthers too. The narrow, residential streets North of Caruthers cannot support the increased traffic and congestion that would be caused by businesses on Caruthers. Increased residential infill will already ad to the traffic on Caruthers and neighboring streets. Commercial development on Caruthers will create a terrible mess in the whole neighborhood, and will ad to the mess that is already on Division. Commercial development on Caruthers is not a good solution for anything or anyone, and would create many problems - for everyone. Caruthers is the wrong place for commercial zoning.</p>	Buffer (b),Centers Main Street (m)	Richmond
1677	Sue Hildreth	10/28/15	<p>Hello, I believe the SE Milwaukie corridor should not require that a re-purposed home be required to have part of the floor area as residential. I understand the zoning is due to the newer structures being built having the housing above the commercial space, but that does not fit the best use for a home that would like to stay true to the look and feel of the neighbor, but provides a service to the neighborhood. Please eliminate the requirement that part of the home be residential. The area has moved well beyond that model. Thank you</p>	mixed_use-256-1042	Sellwood-Moreland Improvement League

1676	Christopher Browne	10/28/15	<p>The city of Portland has embarked on adding more CM zoning on arterial streets and neighborhood centers. The city is also updating the CM zoning to be friendlier to the neighborhoods that surround the CM zones. This is commendable and should be pushed forward.</p> <p>At the same time the city is trying to find a way to encourage affordable housing. At this moment the city does not have a firm plan on what affordable housing is. It seems to look like housing that is set aside for regulated rent price for a specified time frame and rented through a list of people from a city controlled list. This would then be administered by another city bureau adding more expense.</p> <p>The way the city seems to be planning to pay for these affordable housing is by taking back some of the more friendly aspects of the CM zoning for a miniscule addition to affordable housing. This places the burden of adding any affordable housing on the backs of the nearest neighbors and not on the city as a whole. The city as a whole is who wants the affordable housing not the people right next to these large buildings. Keep the buildings a size that is nice for the neighbors and give the owner/developer/builder a break on the permit fees/System Development fees and/or taxes for a few years. The money is made back by the city in raised taxes over time especially since we can only raise taxes 3% on existing houses but new houses are a whole new ballgame. The city will make much more from this new development.</p>	mixed_use-1061-211	Cully
1632	Michelle	10/21/15	<p>Parking is a big concern in this area. There is hardly room for current residents to park as is. Additionally, taller buildings could be a concern.</p>	Buffer (b)	Woodlawn

1600	Joseph Elkhall	10/19/15	To Whom It May Concern, I am requesting that the zoning of my property at 13909-13923 SE Stark St. be changed to Mixed Use- Civic Corridor to maintain and accommodate the current use and only use this building has had since its inception. The office building has six office spaces and was originally built as an office complex by Jim Turel in 1972. It has been used as an office complex since then and has not been used for any other purpose. It was built when Multnomah County had jurisdiction over the property. The permits taken out at that time was a commercial use zoning and through the years was changed to high density residential which is the current zoning. My proposal would re designate the zoning to a more appropriate zoning which would be Mixed Use-Civic Corridor. This would remove this building from the non-conforming use situation that I am in now. It would allow for the creation of new jobs which is beneficial to east county. The building was not built for residential use and was never used as residential space as seen from the floor plan and the 32 parking spaces available. Please consider this request and I am willing to come the the council meeting and testify in person. Thank You , Joseph Elkhall	mixed_use-1110-542	Buckman
1608	David Kingston	10/18/15	Hi, I think this property should be rezoned as mixed-use dispersed. This would allow the construction on small scale residential, for instance on the back of the property, that would serve: 1) as a buffer between the commercial employment zone to the south and the residential neighborhood to the north 2) as a stimulus for the construction of additional housing stock in a close in location with good transit and other infrastructure 3) as a way of aligning with the comprehensive plan designation	Buffer (b)	Creston-Kenilworth
1592	Lisa johnson	10/17/15	The plan for mixed commercial and residential causes additional parking issues. Residents in the neighborhood are dealing with no street parking, increased traffic and an increase in auto/bike accidents.	mixed_use-1429-343	Sunnyside
1587	Vince Huffstutter, Huffco Multnomah LLC	10/14/15	This change in zoning from urban commercial to mixed use neighborhood will harm our business by not allowing enough parking for 4 story apartment houses. Portland needs to take small business seriously when it makes these changes by making sure the business's can provide the necessary parking for customers. They have continually caused problems due to lax parking requirements.	mixed_use-1145-492	Multnomah

1574	Craig Beebe	10/9/15	We support this change on Woodstock. But please pair with safer pedestrian crossings and bike infrastructure, as well as improving nearby unpaved streets.	mixed_use-1107-494	Woodstock
1551	Linda mlynski	10/7/15	I am giving my I put the caruthers between se36-38th streets should be residential like the rest of caruthers st. Is. We do not want businesses on our block!!! Thank you, Linda Mlynski	Buffer (b),Centers Main Street (m)	Richmond
1550	Karyn Munford	10/7/15	Ask any resident of Multnomah Village and they will tell you that they moved here for the historical character of the neighborhood and village. The proposed change to a C2 would not only DESTROY that character but violate the Comprehensive bylaws, specifically Policy 3.99, 4.B, 4.3,4.11, 4.12, 4.28 and 4.29 for starters. All of the neighbors that I spoke with and the neighborhood association are STRONGLY AGAINST this designation of C2 as a city center instead of a neighborhood corridor and I would suspect would fight this proposal to the full extent of the law. Can the city really afford this?? Please comment on this via email as my last comment was never addressed. Karyn Munford	mixed_use-1145-492	Multnomah
1549	Anita MacAuley	10/7/15	I like the idea of more retail going in at the SE Duke & 60th area. It would be great to have a coffee shop or even a bar, something walking distance for people in the immediate neighborhood. There is a lot of foot traffic here already due to Brentwood park and Dairy Queen. Keep the Dairy Queen though, people love it!	mixed_use-1087-236	Brentwood-Darlington
1537	Richard Seaberg	10/7/15	looks good	mixed_use-1064-5104	Beaumont-Wilshire
1572	Paul Del Vecchio	10/5/15	I support the 45 foot height limit on Fremont in the Beaumont Village neighborhood. I own three properties on this corridor and am concerned about the area becoming under developed.	mixed_use-1064-5104	Beaumont-Wilshire
1571	Glen Bolen	10/2/15	I support changing Hillsdale from General Commercial to Mixed Use zoning. This area could easily support 8 to 10 story buildings.	mixed_use-1118-1	Hillsdale