

ID	Name	Date	Comment	Feature	Neighborhood
18328	John Colligan	5/15/16	Keep this neighborhood R7 as it was intended and actually preserve a great Portland neighborhood. I pay very high property taxes to live here and myself and my neighbors enjoy the quieter, more relaxed feel as opposed many other areas of SE PDX. Thank you.	residential_os-58-839	Reed
18151	Claire Carder	5/10/16	I am in favor of the R7 to R1 re-zoning. While this is a significant increase in density, this is the best location for increased density in this area of SW Portland. The development project by St. Luke's Church has provided an increase in infrastructure capacity that can serve a higher density development better than at any other location in the Hayhurst/Maplewood areas, and the proximity to the SW Community Center, the OHSU clinic and Gabriel Park are amenities that will reduce rental turn-over while while providing much needed multi-family housing. While the number of units allowed on the R1 zoned parcel is a significant increase, I think the potential traffic effects can be managed with careful site planning, especially since there are several egress/ingress possibilities at this site, future increases in Tri-Met service on SW Vermont is expected, and changing driving habits and increased transportation alternatives will reduce dependence on cars and the need for each individual to have a vehicle - which is so much better for the planet!	residential_os-795-2360	Maplewood

17862	Francis X. Rosica	5/5/16	<p>Good Morning Bureau of Planning Services,</p> <p>I am writing to make comment on the proposed zoning changes to SW California St/St. Luke's the new housing structure would represent a significant change to a small neighborhood (see location details below).</p> <p>Our services are already overburdened with many needed improvements. We have insufficient or no sidewalks for walkers and alternative transportation, needed road improvements, inadequate parking, problems with local water quality due to exposure of water sheds in the area (Fanno & other creek drainages), and many more issues which would be compounded by this huge increase in population density and traffic.</p> <p>I would suggest revising the proposal to a smaller version and then offering that to the Public and Council for comment and voting. I would also suggest services improvements to the area before proposing significant population increases.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>F.X.Rosica 6167 SW Miles Court Portland, OR 97219</p>	residential_os-795-2360	Maplewood
17646	Karen "Micki" Carrier	5/2/16	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Green spaces, rain gardens and swales, retaining as many trees as possible. 2. DESIRE LOW PROFILE (43 units is too many for our quiet neighborhood and would create TOO much density, traffic and over-crowding at the SWCC rec center. 3. NEED TWO parking spaces plus guest parking are necessary in this area of town! Please do not force residents onto the street like Park Village at 45th & Vermont-what a mess. 4. Please build sustainably and GREEN, preferably LEED certified. 5. SOUND PROOF the floors & walls. 6. Low-income units <p>I'll be the first one to apply if you meet these standards. Please don't turn our lovely area into an urban jungle. Micki Carrier</p>	residential_os-795-2360	Maplewood

17600	Kathryn & Fred Stewart	5/2/16	Multi-family units in this neighborhood need to be carefully integrated into planning for expansion of Portland Public Schools' properties. There are many overcrowding issues occurring in NW Portland (see, issues at Chapman School), that are starting to be felt in SW Portland. No new multi-family construction should be permitted without a concurrent planning discussion with Portland Public Schools as to where students are going to be able to attend school, and to ensure that the neighborhood school has capacity for further enrollment. Developers are not being asked to contribute to schools' construction or expansion with all of these apartments going in all over the City of Portland, and they perhaps should be assessed a school construction fee, similar to what is paid for parks.	residential_os-795-2360	Maplewood
17587	Ed Hurtley	5/2/16	I wholeheartedly support this rezoning, contingent on the developer committing to making these units affordable.	residential_os-795-2360	Maplewood
17398	Christopher Coiner	4/27/16	I support this change because there is a user trail here to access rocky butte without needing to walk the road. It would be great if the city would fully endorse this and add it to their list of maintained trails.	residential_os-510-1076	Madison South
17397	Christopher Coiner	4/27/16	Not sure what this is going to accomplish as this area is part of Madison High School and the golf course. It looks like a mistake was made somewhere. But if it's a real proposed change then I would oppose turning part of the high school and golf course into residential because the community needs high schools and golf courses are pretty.	residential_os-1272-1522	Madison South
17344	Marilyn Scott	4/25/16	As a senior citizen and frequent user of facilities at the SW Community Center, my input is that there is very limited parking available at that center, and practically no on-street parking within walking distance. It seems that the size and scale of this proposed building will add to congestion and make it more difficult to use facilities at the SW Center.	residential_os-795-2360	Maplewood

17236	Charles Barrows	4/20/16	<p>We may have missed the time limit for commenting on the proposed change the property at 6825 SW 45th to R1 and build a multistory apartment house but hopefully you give our concerns some consideration as my wife and I are both in our seventies and have lived in Maplewood for 48 years.</p> <p>1. Currently there is a traffic congestion and parking problem in this section of SW 45th and adding a 65 unit apartment will only make this worse. Claims that younger people will not use cars is not realistic in this area because of the lack of stores within walking distance. Many of the people in Maplewood work in Washington county and the only practical commute for the foreseeable future requires a car.</p> <p>2. If an apartment complex is needed to meet increased population density objectives it would be safer to limit the structure to two stories similar to facilities that have been in Maplewood for years. Going above two stories will significantly increase the risk from earthquakes. The clay sub soil in the Maplewood area is susceptible to liquefaction when saturated rain water and subjected to forces such as earthquakes. The recent earthquakes in Ecuador and Japan are evidence of the danger earthquakes pose to multistory buildings. I do not think there have been any studies of the particular clay subsoil in SW Portland to determine safe building practices for multistory structures.</p> <p>3. Maplewood school is currently over capacity. Adding a 65 unit apartment house with out a plan to increase the school's capacity is not fair to the young families that live here now.</p> <p>4. We would like to see this project scaled back or at least delayed until the majority of Maplewood residents can make an input.</p>	residential_os-795-2360	Maplewood
17227	Gretchen Holden	4/20/16	<p>The oppose the shift from R7 to R1. It is extreme. R7 is NOT appropriate for this area where there are NO services. I go regularly to the SouthWest Community Center which is directly across the street from the proposed development. I can attest to the fact that there is already heavy congestion in this area, competing already with pedestrians and bikes. Adding so many units would create real hazards. I am not opposed to increasing density but how about something more appropriate such as duplexes?</p>	residential_os-795-2360	Maplewood
17214	Kristy Lakin	4/20/16	<p>I strongly support the proposed zoning changes along SE Franklin St. In order to stop growing out, we need to grow up. I support higher densities throughout Portland.</p>	residential_os-1339-2546	Richmond

17034	Damian Miller	4/14/16	<p>I currently rent in Brentwood and am shocked that the city would consider downzoning my neighborhood in the middle of a housing crisis. I would like to think I might someday have a chance of buying in some proximity to family and my stepdaughter's school in this neighborhood. If the city permits nothing but large unattached houses in this area, it will become one more neighborhood in the city that is designed to push out its middle-income and poor residents.</p> <p>We have good transit service on the #19 and a lovely amenity in Brentwood park. Please, allow my neighborhood to do its part in meeting the desperate need for housing that I see all around me!</p>	residential_os-365-1332	Brentwood-Darlington
17032	Jill Gaddis	4/14/16	<p>This site is congested, there is no adequate services as transportation, grocery stores, library, etc. The zone change should not be for such high density. R1 is not appropriate for this area. Duplexes or cottages would be more fitting with this property.</p>	residential_os-795-2360	Maplewood
17030	Ronald Slichter	4/13/16	<p>We recently purchased this property less than a year ago due to the fact partly that the current zone is at a R5. We had set plans for dividing of the lot so we could have more than one lot put in the back of our property. This is not what we were anticipating happening nor part of our long-term future plan. We are proposing that the property stay at R5 and not be changed to an R7 residential zone, This was to be a part of our future retirement & if changed will affect our long term future. Thank you for your time and for listening.</p> <p>Sincerely, Ronnie & Angie Slichter</p>	residential_os-714-1399	Brentwood-Darlington

16909	Tanya Haddad	4/13/16	<p>Dear commissioners,</p> <p>I am submitting this testimony to formally request that my current R2 zoning be left in place, rather than be changed to the proposed R5. My reasoning for this request relates to the current status of the parcel immediately adjacent to the east (8705 SE 13th Street), which is in the process of developing into a 5 story apartment building.</p> <p>This change, and the proposal of R1 on the neighboring 2 blocks of 13th street, causes me to think it is not unreasonable for my parcel to develop at R2 density within the time frame of the proposed comprehensive plan, and I would like to preserve this option. I also believe this request is compatible with desires for overall increases in density within the UGB over time.</p> <p>Many thanks for your time,</p> <p>Tanya Haddad 1216 SE Marion Street, Portland, OR 97202 503-475-7833</p>	residential_os-888-2985	Sellwood-Moreland Improvement League
16908	Alice West	4/12/16	This area should be protected from further tear downs and not be rezoned. Developers are exploiting areas that exist due to racist redlining in the past. In addition this area is full of beautiful victorian era homes. Protect Portland's history and character.	residential_os-140-1123	Eliot
16907	Alice West	4/12/16	This area should absolutely not be rezoned. There is already a very dangerous traffic situation with school and the one way street coming out on to belmont. Please protect the safety of elementary school children and their families.	residential_os-946-2114	Mt. Tabor

16906	Alice West	4/12/16	<p>As a second generation Portland native raising a third generation, I strongly oppose the rezoning from R5 to R2.5 here and in other historic neighborhoods that are off of main thoroughfares through out inner se, particularly off of hawthorne, belmont, and stark, and division. We must protect existing close in neighborhoods and stop tearing down the homes that make portland liveable. Sewickly's addition and it's craftman's should be protected. We have an affordable housing crisis thanks in large part to developers out bidding first time home owners and replacing them with homes 2x-4x their original value block light, removing green space and polluting the air and destroying the reasons people want to live in portland to begin with. There are many areas in portland that are grossly underserved that could use added density. This area is not one of them. The reason Portland became famous for it's artists, food culture, makers, writers, musicians, and progressive ideals like sustainability was it was affordable and there was space for ideas. It was a beautiful city with charm. Preserve what is left, for everyone's children. Before any zoning is changed the zoning code also needs to be updated immediately. Please stop the demolitions of historic homes and neighborhoods. There are many ways to build density while preserving history.</p> <p>Thank you sincerely.</p>	residential_os-1336-2603	Mt. Tabor
-------	------------	---------	--	--------------------------	-----------

16902	Allan Rudwick	4/12/16	<p>www.eliotneighborhood.org ? info@eliotneighborhood.org April 12, 2016 Planning and Sustainability Commission 1900 SW 4th Avenue, Suite 7100 Portland, OR 97201-5380</p> <p>Dear Commissioners,</p> <p>On behalf of the Eliot Neighborhood Association (ENA), I am writing to reaffirm that our proposal to down-zone properties in residential Eliot from R2 to R2.5 is based on the assurances that we have received about the properties not being wholly reassessed as a part of this process. It is our understanding that properties that are being down-zoned from R2 to R2.5 will be taxed as if no change has occurred. If this is not the case, The ENA is opposed to the rezoning and this effort should revert to the existing conditions for these affected properties.</p> <p>If the Multnomah County cannot guarantee that the zone change from R2 to R2.5 to properties in the Eliot Neighborhood will not trigger reassessments of properties then the ENA Land Use Committee withdraws its support of the change in zoning and wishes that all of these properties would remain in the R2 zone. The ENA is strongly opposed to wholesale reassessment and are concerned that this would cause displacement of existing residents.</p> <p>Sincerely, Allan Rudwick Land Use Chair, Eliot Neighborhood Association 228 NE Morris St Portland, OR 97212</p>	residential_os-140-1125	Eliot
16901	Darvel Lloyd	4/12/16	<p>I am concerned about the increase of traffic on narrow SE 74th if the proposed zone change at 74th-76th and Thorbein is adopted. Doubling the residential density from R5 to R2.5 will greatly increase traffic on those already dangerous intersections, especially left turns from Thorbein to 74th. Also, SE 74th can't handle any more traffic because of it's narrowness and lack of off-street parking, Also, I worry about increased congestion at SE 75th and Stark, where one must cross Stark to make a left turn on Washington heading east.</p>	residential_os-1334-1653	Mt. Tabor
16899	Steven and Laurie Simpson	4/11/16	<p>Laurie (my wife) and I request to retain our property as it's current R2 zoning. Thank you. 4/11/2016 We do not agree with the proposed zoning change to R2.5. Steven Simpson</p>	residential_os-140-1123	Eliot
16896	Paul Janssen	4/11/16	<p>I OPPOSE this upzoning change to this degree, from R7 to R1. This is to extreme of a change, does not fit the rest of the surrounding streets or neighborhood. Traffic is a high concern in the specific location as is bike and pedestrian safety.</p>	residential_os-795-2360	Maplewood
16885	Doug Klotz	4/11/16	<p>I support this change as consistent with existing development.</p>	residential_os-934-3831	Sunnyside

16884	Doug Klotz	4/11/16	I support this change, as more consistent with existing development.	residential_os-934-2755	Sunnyside
16883	Doug Klotz	4/11/16	I support this change, as it is more consistent with the existing development, and appropriate near the Chavez/Belmont node.	residential_os-935-3709	Sunnyside
16882	Doug Klotz	4/11/16	I support this change, to provide more consistent zoning for these lots, and higher density at an important node.	residential_os-1206-1686	Sunnyside
16881	Doug Klotz	4/11/16	I support this change, to provide consistent zoning along Chavez.	residential_os-1206-2455	Sunnyside
16880	Doug Klotz	4/11/16	I support this change, to provide more consistent zoning along Chavez.	residential_os-936-4031	Sunnyside
16879	Doug Klotz	4/11/16	I support this change, to provide more consistent zoning along Chavez.	residential_os-936-3107	Sunnyside
16878	Doug Klotz	4/11/16	I support this change.	residential_os-1205-1986	Mt. Tabor
16877	Doug Klotz	4/11/16	I support this change, and would support a change to R-1 as well, which would seem to be more in line with the density that already exists here.	residential_os-1205-2725	Mt. Tabor
16876	Doug Klotz	4/11/16	I support this change, to add to housing capacity in this area.	residential_os-1334-1845	Mt. Tabor
16875	Doug Klotz	4/11/16	I support this change, which acknowledges the prevailing pattern, and allows for more Missing Middle housing within the neighborhood.	residential_os-1335-4282	Sunnyside
16874	Doug Klotz	4/11/16	I support this modest change to increase the housing possibilities near the Clinton Max station.	residential_os-1338-2395	Hosford-Abernethy
16873	Doug Klotz	4/11/16	I support this upzoning, acknowledging the pattern in the neighborhood.	residential_os-269-1322	Brooklyn Action Corps
16872	Doug Klotz	4/11/16	I support the upzoning here, to provide more housing units in a close-in neighborhood.	residential_os-269-1323	Brooklyn Action Corps
16870	Doug Klotz	4/11/16	I support the change proposed here, which acknowledges the development that is here already and will allow the Missing Middle infill that this neighborhood could accommodate.	residential_os-930-6593	Sunnyside
16869	Doug Klotz	4/11/16	I support changing the zoning from R-5 to R-2.5 in this segment, east of 50th. This area is near services and transit on Powell, and close to the growing node of business at 50th and Division, in addition to being on the Clinton Greenway.	residential_os-1339-1754	Richmond

16865	Danielle Dumont	4/10/16	<p>I would like to provide feedback on the proposed zoning change from R5 to R2.5 for a two-block area in the Piedmont neighborhood. This area encompasses N Borthwick and N Kerby between N Rosa Parks and N Dekum. These two blocks are lovely residential houses bookended by Peninsula Park and the historic building of Rosemont Court. It seems an arbitrary designation to convert these well-maintained single family dwellings into attached residential housing of 2 to 8 units without parking.</p> <p>My neighborhood representative who met with city staff to discuss the potential rezoning has been informed that the change from R5 to R2.5 also means that the neighbors would not be allowed to provide feedback and input to developers and new development in this zone. This is unacceptable when such large changes are possible that could affect the streetscape and quality of life on these quiet and pleasant residential blocks.</p> <p>I suppose the city saw that the blocks immediately north of this area are already zoned R2.5 and simply drew a larger rectangle around the spot on the map to increase density. This again seems arbitrary. The blocks of N Borthwick and N Kerby surrounding Rosemont Court, immediately north of Dekum, were a special case for planned redevelopment of the St. Rose Industrial School and its 10 acres of orchards into senior apartments and affordable townhouses. This land did not already contain historic neighborhood homes. The logic that applied to the Rosemont development should not simply bleed over into an already established neighborhood now.</p> <p>I am not against smartly planned zoning to address the issue of density in Portland. It makes sense that the zones on N Rosa Parks and N Albina, busier thoroughfares a block or two away, are zoned or rezoned for higher density. Additionally, the current R5 zoning on the N Borthwick and N Kerby blocks in question already allows for greater density than what is currently built. However, to begin to designate these interior neighborhood blocks for R2.5 higher density begins to destroy the balance of harmonious residential living.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider the zoning change from R5 to R2.5 for the two blocks of N Borthwick and N Kerby between N Rosa Parks and N Dekum.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	residential_os-1356-8590	Piedmont
16864	Doug Klotz	4/9/16	This change is justified by the apartments already on the site.	residential_os-579-1033	Richmond
16863	Doug Klotz	4/9/16	I support upzoning this area to acknowledge the apartment buildings that are existing on it.	residential_os-933-2087	Richmond
16862	Doug Klotz	4/9/16	I support this change, which acknowledges the development that is already in place, and will support future Missing Middle housing types which fit in with the neighborhood.	residential_os-348-6200	Buckman
16861	Doug Klotz	4/9/16	I oppose this change. This area should remain R-2.	residential_os-140-1125	Eliot
16860	Doug Klotz	4/9/16	I oppose this change. The area should remain R-2.	residential_os-140-1123	Eliot
16859	Doug Klotz	4/9/16	I oppose this change. This area should be R-2.	residential_os-140-1124	Eliot

16858	Doug Klotz	4/9/16	I support the change from R-5 to R-2.5 in compliance with the Comp Plan designation. This area is seeing increased commercial uses and has good transit service, so is a logical candidate for this proposal.	residential_os-1339-3271	Richmond
16857	Doug Klotz	4/9/16	I support this change, which is in line with the development now on the ground.	residential_os-932-3489	Richmond
16856	Doug Klotz	4/9/16	I support the R-2.5 zoning proposed, to increase the availability of housing near the transit service on Powell, as well as near shopping.	residential_os-1339-2546	Richmond
16855	Doug Klotz	4/9/16	I agree that the lots along Chavez should be upzoned, at least to R-1. This is a major transit corridor. With each new project the sidewalk will be widened and buffered by trees from the traffic lanes. This will be helpful when the Multifamily zones rewrite occurs in the future.	residential_os-1340-2400	Richmond
16854	Doug Klotz	4/9/16	I support the zone changes here. This area is near two bus lines and a growing shopping area at 50th and Division. This change will enable more people to live within walking distance of these feature, and could facilitate Missing Middle housing in the future.	residential_os-1339-4278	Richmond
16853	Doug Klotz	4/9/16	I support the rezoning from R-5 to R-2.5 in this area, along the north side of Hawthorne. It will enable more people to live near shopping and transit and create a buffer between commercial buildings and single-family areas. It can also facilitate Missing Middle housing in the future.	residential_os-1336-2603	Mt. Tabor
16852	Doug Klotz	4/9/16	I support changing the zoning from R-5 to R-2.5 in compliance with the 1981 Comp Plan. This will help create a transition from the commercial and higher intensity transit streets and corridors. This will help enable more people to live within walking distance of stores and transit.	residential_os-1339-3984	Richmond
16851	Doug Klotz	4/9/16	I support changing zoning in this outlined area from R-5 to R-2.5 in conformance with the 1981 Comp Plan. This will help create a transition from the commercial zoning to the single-family zoning. It will provide the zoning that can support more Missing Middle housing in the future, and enable more people to live within walking distance of shopping and transit.	residential_os-1339-4277	Richmond

16844	Rebecca Mode	4/8/16	<p>I am writing once again to request my property at 506 N.E. Thompson street be opted out of the Eliot Neighborhoods selective down zoning. I request for my property to retain it's current R2 zoning.</p> <p>The reasons are as follows:</p> <p>With R 2 zoning I can build "Middle Housing" next to my existing duplex on the empty front half of my 9,375 s.f. lot. I can do this leaving my existing duplex intact and still retain a large backyard. With R2.5 zoning I will be required to do a lot division which averages between \$15,000 to \$35,000 dollars. My lot division will trigger tax reassessment which will raise my taxes \$8,000 or more a year without building anything. These additional fees associated with R2.5 zoning will put the financial reality of building out of reach for my family. Even if we were able to absorb these additional costs we could only build a single family home. Since I have an existing duplex(that my family has lived in the past 16 years) I must split off 5,000 S.F. in R2.5 zoning. This would leave 4,375 s.f. where only a single family home can be built.</p> <p>There are several "Middle Housing" properties already on our block. These properties fit in nicely with the existing homes. These properties will be non conforming with R2.5 zoning. They are as follows:</p> <p>532-536 N.E. Thompson (1 triplex and 1 side unit on 6,250 s.f.)</p> <p>544 N.E. Thompson (1 triplex on 4,125 s.f.)</p> <p>431-437 N.E. Thompson (2 homes and 1 duplex on 8,334 s.f.)</p> <p>These stated properties are not currently correctly documented on Portland Maps. These properties fit in nicely with our neighborhood. Leaving my zoning R2 will allow me to add more great "Middle Housing" without harming anyone. Down zoning to R2.5 will result in this land staying empty and underutilized as long as I own it.</p> <p>I have contacted a measure 49 specialist and attorney whom both agree down zoning my property at 506 N.E. will allow me compensation under ORS 195.300</p> <p>Please do the right thing and leave my property with current R2 zoning.</p> <p>Thank you, Rebecca Mode and David Stone owners of 506/508 N.E. Thompson st. Portland,Oregon 97212</p>	residential_os-140-1125	Eliot
-------	--------------	--------	---	-------------------------	-------

16830	Clint Lundmark	4/7/16	<p>Eliot Neighborhood has taken many hits over the last 100 years in the name of "Urban Renewal." Expansion of Emanuel Hospital and building the I-5 freeway in the name of public good eliminated over 1000 homes in the area. Some of that land is develop-able but remains vacant 40 years later. The historic housing stock is continually at risk of being demolished. Once it's gone it is gone forever. This zoning change is still higher density than what actually exists on most of the single family home lots. The proposed change does a lot to encourage retaining the homes instead of replacing, but still allows for increased density. Don't let a short term housing crisis dictate the best long term plan for this neighborhood. Eliot Neighborhood already is contributing more than most neighborhoods with nearly 500 housing units online within the last year or scheduled to be finished in 2016. Several hundred more units are proposed within the next 2 years. The neighborhood population could easily double within a 5 year time period. The Eliot Neighborhood proposal is trading a very slight decrease in density where our single family homes exist in exchange for increased density and more appropriate zoning along our corridors – MLK, Williams, and Vancouver. From a planning perspective the R2.5 zone is still a density increase from what currently exists, but it also encourages protecting historic resources. It is a great change that will protect what is left of Eliot Neighborhood. Further, it better aligns with the R5 zoning across 7th ave. Please do not let individual's greed or a short term problem dictate the long term future of the neighborhood.</p>	residential_os-140-1125	Eliot
-------	----------------	--------	---	-------------------------	-------

16829	Clint Lundmark	4/7/16	<p>Eliot Neighborhood has taken many hits over the last 100 years in the name of "Urban Renewal." Expansion of Emanuel Hospital and building the I-5 freeway in the name of public good eliminated over 1000 homes in the area. Some of that land is develop-able but remains vacant 40 years later. The historic housing stock is continually at risk of being demolished. Once it's gone it is gone forever. This zoning change is still higher density than what actually exists on most of the single family home lots. The proposed change does a lot to encourage retaining the homes instead or replacing, but still allows for increased density. Don't let a short term housing crisis dictate the best long term plan for this neighborhood. Eliot Neighborhood already is contributing more than most neighborhoods with nearly 500 housing units online within the last year or scheduled to be finished in 2016. Several hundred more units are proposed within the next 2 years. The neighborhood population could easily double within a 5 year time period. The Eliot Neighborhood proposal is trading a very slight decrease in density where our single family homes exist in exchange for increased density and more appropriate zoning along our corridors – MLK, Williams, and Vancouver. From a planning perspective the R2.5 zone is still a density increase from what currently exists, but it also encourages protecting historic resources. It is a great change that will protect what is left of Eliot Neighborhood. Please do not let individual's greed or a short term problem dictate the long term future of the neighborhood.</p>	residential_os-140-1124	Eliot
16808	Ole Ersson	4/6/16	<p>This change reflects existing and historic conditions as this parcel is a 32 unit multifamily apartment building constructed legally in 1959. Not sure why it was ever zoned R2.5 which is a single family zoning.</p>	residential_os-57-715	Creston-Kenilworth

16764	James Gillen	4/6/16	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>We are very concerned about the proposal to change our land use designation and zoning from R20 to R10. We have counted on the ability to develop the back of our lot in the near future for our retirement funding and the proposed change would present an economic hardship and effective taking of our property rights.</p> <p>Additionally, there have been land divisions (flagged lots) on identical 30000 square foot lots immediately to the north and south of ours, including a recent land division and construction on the property directly south (this lot is included in your map to be changed to R20, too, but it's already been split into several R10 lots).</p> <p>The lot to the north, which has more problematic topography and drainage issues, was divided into a flag lot and both it and the lot to the south have been able to access sewer and other city services without difficulty, so again we don't understand why our lot would be singled out for restrictions.</p> <p>We appreciate a quick response to our request so we can avoid retaining an attorney to defend our rights.</p> <p>Sincerely, James & Lynea Gillen</p>	residential_os-176-1321	Marshall Park
-------	--------------	--------	--	-------------------------	---------------

16762	Scott Patterson	4/6/16	<p>We are the property owners to the adjoining parcel. I don't see that this piece of land is separate from the adjoining OS designation other than for the encursion to the centerline of the existing ROW. I do not see where the outlined section is any sort of separate parcel that the indicated boundary represents. The parcel we own is challenging enough to develop and although preliminary plans don't indicate extending beyond the centerline of the ROW due to the nature of the existing slopes, but we are concerned that abandoning half the ROW (which from what I can tell is the limits of this proposal) would create additional hardships for accessing our property as grading in the ROW would be very different than offsite grading on an OS designated parcel. We request that the ROW be maintained as dedicated. Once completed, we would not object to abandoning any remaining ROW. The current parcel boundary for City of Portland owned R324033 somehow has both the OS and R7 designation. We do not object to removing reference to the R7 zoning for the existing boundaries of this parcel.</p> <p>We request that no changes be made to the existing ROW as doing so serves no purpose other than limiting development (access) on our parcel. There is no separate parcel as indicated on the plan map with any potential for development assuming the city were even to sell or subdivide the actual parcel R324033</p>	residential_os-461-1250	Forest Park
16759	Casey Cotton	4/6/16	I am opposed to the proposed zoning change from R5 - R2.5. The inclusion of this stretch of 40th Ave seems arbitrary and has the potential to disrupt the unique architecture and traffic/parking situation in this one of a kind portland neighborhood,	residential_os-1339-3984	Richmond

16713	James Gillen	4/4/16	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>We are very concerned about the proposal to change our land use designation and zoning from R20 to R10. We have counted on the ability to develop the back of our lot in the near future for our retirement funding and the proposed change would present an economic hardship and effective taking of our property rights.</p> <p>Additionally, there have been land divisions (flagged lots) on identical 30000 square foot lots immediately to the north and south of ours, including a recent land division and construction on the property directly south (this lot is included in your map to be changed to R20, too, but it's already been split into several R10 lots).</p> <p>The lot to the north, which has more problematic topography and drainage issues, was divided into a flag lot and both it and the lot to the south have been able to access sewer and other city services without difficulty, so again we don't understand why our lot would be singled out for restrictions.</p> <p>We appreciate a quick response to our request so we can avoid retaining an attorney to defend our rights.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>James & Lynea Gillen</p>	residential_os-176-1321	Marshall Park
16708	Gene Dieringer / Dieringer's Propertie, Inc.	4/1/16	<p>Dieringer's Properties, Inc. owns this tax lot and the two tax lots immediately to the east. 12500-12506 NE Glisan has existing and identical development as the two tax lots immediately to the east. Each tax lot is currently constructed with identical 4-plexes. The zoning for 12508-12514 NE Glisan, immediately adjacent to this lot, has NOT been proposed to change, yet 451-457 NE 126th is proposed with a zone change. We believe that these proposed changes are in error and inconsistent for the stated reasons and the fact that downzoning is not proposed across all 3 tax lots. Downzoning should not be recommended for any of these narrow and very deep lots. Downzoning would make our property non-conforming and would also diminish our existing property rights which would be damaging to us as the property owners. Additionally, These properties face Glisan St, a heavily used main transit corridor, a location ideal for higher density and not R-5.</p>	residential_os-1220-13020	Hazelwood

16707	Gene Dieringer / Dieringer's Properties, Inc.	4/1/16	451-457 NE 126th has existing and identical development as the two tax lots immediately to the west. Each tax lot is currently constructed with identical 4-plexes. The zoning for 12508-12514 NE Glisan, immediately adjacent to this lot has NOT been proposed to change, yet 12500-12514 NE Glisan is proposed with a zone change. We believe that these proposed changes are in error and inconsistent for the stated reasons and the fact that downzoning is not proposed across all 3 tax lots. Down-zoning should not be recommended for any of these narrow and very deep lots. Downzoning would make our property non-conforming and would also diminish our existing property rights which would be damaging to us as the property owners. Additionally, These properties face Glisan, a main transit corridor, a location ideal for higher density and not R-5.	residential_os-1220-13023	Hazelwood
16595	Tammy Stephens	3/31/16	I feeling going from a R5 to a R1 zone is too drastic of a change. The current houses will be dwarfed by 4 story multi-unit dwellings. A R2.5 change is more acceptable.	residential_os-1332-3412	North Tabor
16589	Keri O'Connell Bennett	3/30/16	I testify that I do not agree with, or approve of this rezoning, I do not want my house and land rezoned.	residential_os-1356-8590	Piedmont
16495	Rebecca Mode	3/27/16	<p>Leaving my property zoned R2 will help create more "middle housing". Please opt out my property at 506 N.E. Thompson from the selective down zoning in the Eliot Conservation District. With my current zoning of R2 I will be able to create "middle housing" on the large empty side of my property. I can do this keeping my existing duplex and also a large backyard.</p> <p>With the proposed R2.5 I will not be able to afford to build anything and this land will stay empty.</p> <p>My block consists of several "middle housing" properties that will be non conforming with proposed R2.5 zoning.</p> <p>They are not documented correctly on Portland Maps currently. They are as follows: 532-536 N.E. Thompson st.(1 triplex and one side unit on 6,250 s.f. 544 N.E. Thompson (1 triplex on 4,125 s.f. 431-437 N.E. Thompson (2 homes and 1 duplex on 8,334 s.f.</p> <p>These properties as well as mine at 506 N.E. Thompson should remain zoned R2. These properties do fit nicely in our neighborhood and leaving my property R2 would allow me to add housing that will also fit nicely into our neighborhood.</p> <p>If my property is down zoned to R2.5 it will qualify for compensation under Measure 49 ORS 195.300</p> <p>Please save time and money of mine and the tax payers and let the property at 506 N.E. Thompson keep its R2 zoning.</p> <p>This is the right thing to do if "middle housing" is truly wanted as I keep reading it is.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.Rebecca Mode</p>	residential_os-140-1125	Eliot

2612	Tim Clark	3/26/16	I support this change to R2.5. My wife and I would like to continue living here after we retire, and the only practical way to afford that is to build a smaller home on our lot and rent out or sell our current home.	residential_os-1339-4277	Richmond
2598	Anina Bennett	3/25/16	I agree with the comment that this area, and in particular the area east of 49th/50th, does not warrant a change to R2.5. In addition to the reconfigured intersection at Hawthorne and 50th, which requires a left turn to reach this area, the larger neighborhood is already facing a heavy increase in traffic due to new and planned high-density developments on Hawthorne, 50th, and Division. Increasing density in this area would add to congestion and change the character of an historic single-family home neighborhood.	residential_os-1336-2603	Mt. Tabor
2491	Gabriele Hayden	3/23/16	This is a great place for R1. Yes!	residential_os-1332-3412	North Tabor
2490	Gabriele Hayden	3/23/16	R1 seems excellent for this area right near Hollywood.	residential_os-1377-7060	Rose City Park
2489	Gabriele Hayden	3/23/16	R2 or R1 would be much better than R2.5 for all the area around this corridor, because it would allow for more missing middle housing. Please consider it!	residential_os-1342-3334	Woodstock
2487	Gabriele Hayden	3/23/16	What possible justification is there for downzoning here? Please don't cave to nimbyism. I went to Reed and have walked and bicycled through this neighborhood for years. There is absolutely no reason to zone this area R7.	residential_os-58-839	Reed
2486	Gabriele Hayden	3/23/16	Yes! perfect spot for R1	residential_os-573-1031	Creston-Kenilworth
2485	Gabriele Hayden	3/23/16	Please consider R1 instead of R2.5 for this whole area. Given the central location, R1 missing middle housing would be highly desirable here, and you'd get pretty upscale buildings.	residential_os-1339-2546	Richmond
2484	Gabriele Hayden	3/23/16	This is a great place to increase density, but why only R1? Cesar Chavez is a major street. Please consider zoning this RH instead. This is the perfect location for RH that would increase livability, affordability, and city tax revenue all at once, without adding too much strain to city services. This is the perfect place to put microhousing or small apartments for young car-free 20-somethings.	residential_os-1340-2400	Richmond
2482	Gabriele Hayden	3/23/16	Yes! This is a great place to increase density. I own a single family home in Overlook, but would seriously consider buying a rowhouse in this area instead because it's so wonderfully central. So please consider zoning this R1 instead to allow missing middle housing. This is the perfect location for R1 that would increase livability, affordability, and city tax revenue all at once, without adding too much strain to city services.	residential_os-1334-1845	Mt. Tabor
2477	Gabriele Hayden	3/23/16	Yes! This is a great place to increase density. I live in Overlook in an R5 single family home, but would seriously consider buying a rowhouse in this area instead because it's so wonderfully central. So please consider zoning this R1 instead to allow missing middle housing. This is the perfect location for R1 missing middle housing.	residential_os-348-6200	Buckman

2475	Gabriele Hayden	3/23/16	Yes! This is a great place to increase density. I live in Overlook and this is an area that will soon get more retail, has great transit, etc. Please consider R1 instead of R2.5	residential_os-1366-4279	Concordia
2468	Gabriele Hayden	3/23/16	Yes! This is a great place to increase density. Please consider R2 instead of R2.5	residential_os-1355-3252	Overlook
2466	Gabriele Hayden	3/23/16	R2 would allow for an appropriate amount of density in this very central and highly desirable location near transit, along a bike route, and near many high rises. This is the exact area where missing middle would be appropriate and desirable, allowing for duplexes rather than ugly skinny houses. We need affordable housing in our city. Why are we down-zoning in this very central location? The job of the city is to accommodate growth. If there is any moral justification at all for allowing a bunch of white people to get richer off the continual displacement of African Americans who because of systemic racism were not allowed to build equity for generations, it must be that we are allowing the kind of density that will keep it at least somewhat affordable. Please leave it as R2!	residential_os-140-1123	Eliot
2462	Gabriele Hayden	3/23/16	RX would allow for an appropriate amount of density in this very central and highly desirable location near transit, along a bike route, and near many high rises. This is the exact area where high rise rather than R1 would be appropriate. We need affordable housing in our city. Why are we down-zoning in this very central location? Why are we caving to NIMBYism? Please leave it as RX!	residential_os-128-857	Eliot
2460	Gabriele Hayden	3/23/16	RH would allow for an appropriate amount of density in this very central and highly desirable location near transit, along a bike route, and near many high rises. This is the exact area where high rise rather than R1 would be appropriate. We need affordable housing in our city. Why are we down-zoning in this very central location? Is a rich person who lives here friends with a commissioner? This seems very inappropriate. Please leave it as RH!	residential_os-142-851	Eliot
2459	Gabriele Hayden	3/23/16	R1 would allow for an appropriate amount of density in this very central and highly desirable location near transit, along a bike route, and near many high rises. This is the exact area where the kind of missing middle housing allowed by R1 rather than R2 would be appropriate. We need affordable housing in our city. Why are we down-zoning in this very central location? Please leave it as R1!	residential_os-147-854	Eliot
2457	Gabriele Hayden	3/23/16	R2 would allow for an appropriate amount of density in this very central and highly desirable location near transit, along a bike route, and near many high rises. This is the exact area where the kind of missing middle housing allowed by R2 rather than R2.5 would be appropriate. We need affordable housing in our city. Please leave it as R2!	residential_os-140-1125	Eliot
2453	Bob Kellett	3/23/16	The site currently functions like it is R1 but I'd hate to limit it in the future. The proximity to the Lone Fire open space and to amenities on 28th as well as Belmont makes me think it could be zoned for a higher capacity. This is true of the entire stretch between 26th and 30th on SE Stark.	residential_os-930-6954	Sunnyside

2452	Bob Kellett	3/23/16	This is a good location for R1 and matches the existing use on the site.	residential_os-929-2657	Buckman
2451	Bob Kellett	3/23/16	The house that currently exists at 1535 SE Alder is beautiful. It also happens to be 5,000 square feet with 7 bedrooms. It has been subdivided over the years so that it is 2 or 3 rental units. I generally support increased potential for density, but in this case I fear that R2.5 zoning could incentivize the demolition of the existing house and lead to a couple of new houses that end up decreasing the density on the site.	residential_os-348-7572	Buckman
2450	Bob Kellett	3/23/16	The existing apartments on the site fit into the neighborhood well. R1 is a good zone for this location.	residential_os-928-2307	Buckman
2449	Bob Kellett	3/23/16	R1 is the appropriate zoning for this site. I live nearby and I approve.	residential_os-929-3919	Buckman
2448	Bob Kellett	3/23/16	Piccolo Park is a great example of a small scale park that serves a neighborhood well. It should be zoned OS.	residential_os-501-752	Hosford-Abernethy
2447	Bob Kellett	3/23/16	This is a great example of the "missing middle" type of courtyard housing that Portland needs. Happy to be a neighbor supporting a change to R1 zoning.	residential_os-929-2924	Buckman
2404	Andrew Augustin	3/21/16	We specifically bought in this area due to it's feeling and vibe of an established neighborhood. I'm hoping this new zoning is NOT approved. It will significantly change the feel of our nice quiet neighborhood.	residential_os-1365-7284	Rose City Park
2395	Scott Smith	3/20/16	Thank you for your consideration on this. This particular area, which is partly east of 50th Avenue, does not warrant a change to R2.5. The plan originally made sense when Hawthorne was straight at the intersection of 50th. But now that it jogs, and we've got minimal commercial beyond the jog in the road and that sign, it doesn't make sense to build a denser neighborhood east of 49th north of Hawthorne or east of 50th south of Hawthorne. Thank you.	residential_os-1336-2603	Mt. Tabor
2389	Adam Herstein	3/17/16	I support higher density on 50th Avenue.	residential_os-1202-4159	Richmond
2378	Jennifer Scott	3/16/16	To rezone portions of this block as R1 completely disrupts the existing character of this neighborhood. We already have parking issues due to our proximity to Richmond Elementary School and the fact that the houses on this block were built without driveways. The switch from R5 to R2.5 off 39th is already going to have huge impacts to this area, please don't cram an additional and more intense change just a few houses away. How can you consider decreasing density in East Moreland but radically alter Richmond?	residential_os-1339-3984	Richmond
2374	Larry Holmes	3/12/16	Our family has been in this neighborhood for more than 65 years. It still retains the charm of old Portland that is disappearing all to quickly. It is our hope that this tiny area may remain with it's original R5 residential zone designation.	residential_os-1365-7284	Rose City Park

2373	Christina Gradt	3/9/16	I have lived at this address for 23 years. Our street used to be a great place to raise children, not any more! All of us neighbors would get together monthly in the Summer time for bbq's and block parties. We have lost the feel of a neighbor. With all the foot and car traffic and parked cars, who wants to be in their front yards. I'm enjoying them! You once told us the development "43 division" patrons would all ride bikes. Guess what they mostly own two cars that sit for weeks at a time in front of my house. All night long I hear car doors slamming, which causes my dog to bark. YEAH!! Re-zoning such a huge area does nothing for our neighborhood, except bring more traffic and noise. I am very much against re-zoning my property, and I didn't move here to live next door to multiple houses next door to me. The city has done enough in our area to ruin livability. It needs to stop!!!! Why isn't Laurelhurst considered for re-zoning?????	residential_os-1339-3271	Richmond
2372	Jacob Carroll	3/9/16	I do not understand why the west side of 38th Avenue is being considered for R5 to a R2.5. This is a residential neighborhood that you are trying to double the size of, which could destroy the integrity of our block. Why are you putting homes more than a block away from Cesar Chavez into this category? I ask that you seriously reconsider this zoning change and the impact it will have on our families and neighborhood. To be clear, I am against this zoning change.	residential_os-1339-4277	Richmond
2371	Heather Patterson	3/7/16	I am concerned that this re-zoning will only open the door for contractors to tear down the historical homes in the neighborhood and put up more "skinny homes." Every couple of weeks I get a letter in the mail from "interested buyers" willing to buy my house as-is for cash. I can only guess that this interest is related to this potential zone change and the money to be made by tear downs and squeezing in new homes 2-3 per lot. As a home-owner with a child, I'm leery of the environmental ramifications of teardowns of historical homes in the area (e.g., lead, asbestos, etc). I'm also concerned what this will do to my property value since R5 homes are more sought after than the higher density residential zones.	residential_os-1339-1754	Richmond
2370	Gary Sorrels & Joseph Zipagang	3/7/16	We support the zoning change from RH to R1 as was supported in our 2014 public process. Thank you, Gary Sorrels and Joseph Zipagang-Homeowners.	residential_os-260-942	Sellwood-Moreland Improvement League
1959	Terry Dublinski-Milton	12/21/15	This property is butting up to a mixed use zone. As such, should be zoned R1. The two owners, and the two renters living here all agree R1 is the appropriate designation.	Zoning Review Area	North Tabor
1941	Anita Bigelow	12/12/15	The city spent quite a bit of money in the early '80s to demolish houses and apartment buildings along N. Going St. as part of a noise mitigation project. Is noise and past expense no longer a consideration? Is it worth trading density for open space now? We need all the open space we can get, and why not get it next to Going Street which is not sonically attractive?	residential_os-320-951	Overlook

1937	Rebecca Mode	12/11/15	<p>My name is Rebecca Mode and I own and live in a duplex at 506 NE Thompson St. Portland OR 97212. I have lived here and raised my family here for the last 16 years.</p> <p>I oppose my 9,375 square foot lot in Eliot being down zoned from R2 to R2.5. This will prevent me from building a duplex on the large empty side of my lot for which my current R2 zoning allows. The only reason nothing has been built here as of yet is I have not sold it to a developer and am not yet able to finance the construction. This proposed zoning change will devalue my property.</p> <p>My block consists of a combination of duplexes, triplexes, apartments and single family homes which fit nicely together.</p> <p>This proposed zone change is inequitable to my property. It will make my property, which is the only lot with large open space on my block, unable to build to R2 density which much of my block is already built to currently.</p> <p>9 out of the 19 Thompson residential addresses on my block currently have or are in the process of having multifamily units.</p> <p>Current multifamily units: 435 NE Thompson St 545 NE Thompson St 605 NE Thompson St 506 NE Thompson St 522 NE Thompson St 534 NE Thompson St 544 NE Thompson St</p> <p>Multi units currently being built: 623 NE Thompson 633 NE Thompson</p> <p>Inequitable as well is the fact that properties at 623 NE Thompson, 633 NE Thompson, 545 NE Thompson and 605 NE Thompson are not proposed to be down zoned to R2.5 as mine is.</p> <p>I was informed my property was included in the proposed zone change because I am in the Eliot Conservation District. Only these properties have proposed zone change. The rest of the Eliot is not proposed to be changed even though their home are equally historic.</p> <p>Some properties in Eliot conservation district requested to be an were excluded from rezoning and I wish to be as well. If I had been aware of that option I would have requested it as well.</p> <p>Excluded Eliot Conservation Properties: 32, 40 and 52 NE Fremont 23, 27 and 33 NE Ivy 2020 NE Rodney 109 NE San Rafael (This property is in the middle of the properties proposed to be</p>	residential_os-140-1125	Eliot
------	--------------	----------	--	-------------------------	-------

rezoned)
104, 112, 120, 206, San Rafael
103, 109, 121, 207, 213-215, 231 and 241 NE Hancock.

This simply is inequitable for my property and it makes no sense to down zone it in the area it is in and what's around it.

I would be satisfied with only my lot keeping R2 zoning if that can happen. If it cannot because it would be considered pocket zoning I encourage you to keep the current R2 zoning for all NE Thompson residential properties between NE MLK and NE 7th Ave.

Many properties on my block are already built to higher density than R2.5:

534 NE Thompson (1 triplex plus one home 6, 2510 SF)
544 NE Thompson (1 triplex on 4,125 SF)
435 NE Thompson (2 homes plus 1 duplex on 8,334 SF)
545 NE Thompson (4 units on 6,250 SF)
605 NE Thompson (4 units on 6,250 SF)

One goal listed in the residential and open space planning is to rectify inconsistent land use patterns and non conforming density. I believe keeping R2 zoning on my block would be more in the line with that goal.

I cannot see how retaining R2 zoning would be harmful or change anything for the Thompson residential properties between NE MLK and NE 7th Ave in Eliot.

Thank you for your consideration,

Rebecca Mode and David Stone
owners of 506 and 508 NE Thompson.

1936	Stephen Keller	12/10/15	<p>As the owner of the above mentioned property located on the south side of SE Belmont (at SE 51st), I support the planned map designation change from R5 to the proposed R2 designation. I also support the actual change in base zone respectively from R5 to R2.</p> <p>As a longtime resident of this property, I welcome the zone and map update for several reasons and would not oppose taking the zone one step further to an R1 designation. I suggest this, because higher density properties specifically along transit routes such as this one on Belmont relieve traffic congestion thru greater public transportation use. More specifically the proposed R2 (or higher density) zone change will provide a catalyst to greater feasibility when considering converting the existing primary residence to multiunit.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this matter.</p>	residential_os-946-2114	Mt. Tabor
1887	Adam Herstein	12/1/15	Upzine all R5 to R2.5 to allow for infill and skinny houses.	Zoning Review Area	Richmond

1873	Brian Richardson	11/29/15	<p>Our neighborhood bordered by Stark/Belmont and 26th/30th has been singled out as a site for high-density residential development. The proposal is to change from R5/R2.5 to R2/R1. Our neighborhood already provides ample opportunities for development and increased density without changes to the existing zoning laws (i.e. development along Belmont and Stark, and development using the existing R5/R2.5 zoning parameters within this pocket neighborhood).</p> <p>The proposed change will alter the character of our neighborhood, which is currently made up mostly of single-family homes, duplexes, and small apartment buildings. There are many historic and well-maintained single-family homes and duplexes that deserve the protection of R5 and R2.5 status.</p> <p>If the commission wishes to acknowledge non-conforming buildings, that should be done on a case-by-case basis rather than a blanket change to our neighborhood. Please don't punish law-abiding property owners for those who disregarded the zoning laws!</p> <p>It is particularly odd that this small section of SE Portland is facing this proposal while the vast majority of other nearby streets with a similar housing composition do not have the same changes proposed. It is very clear from looking at a map of SE Portland that our neighborhood is being targeted in an unfair manner.</p> <p>I ask that the R1/R2 designation for the Stark/Belmont-26th/30th quadrant is removed from the proposed changes to the comprehensive plan, as these types of buildings belong on commercial corridors and not within an established pocket neighborhood.</p>	residential_os-930-7949	Buckman
1871	Steven Szigethy	11/25/15	<p>I support the establishment of an R2.5a district here. I feel that it strikes a good balance between keeping high-density residential zoning and downzoning all the way to R5 - neither of which were good options in my opinion. I also support the inclusion of the 'a' overlay to provide additional options for me and others who have invested in this part of the neighborhood.</p>	residential_os-261-944	Sellwood-Moreland Improvement League
1835	Jennifer Scott	11/19/15	<p>The majority of homes on Grant Ct do not have parking, so everyone parks on the street. We are down the street from Richmond Elementary School, a magnet school. The majority of Parents drive their kids to school and at 8am and 3pm, the street is clogged with traffic and parking is a nightmare. Please keep this in mind when you're thinking about zoning changes and parking requirements.</p>	Zoning Review Area	Richmond
1834	Nancy Mitchell	11/19/15	<p>I do not think it is appropriate to rezone the north half of SE Clinton St between 41st and 43rd as R2.5 from R5 at this time, potentially changing half the street to 3 story row houses packed in small lots across the street from mostly 2 story homes on lots that are going to remain R5.</p>	residential_os-592-1357	Richmond

1823	Garlynn Woodsong	11/18/15	<p>There is a hole in the current zoning code: Portland does not currently have a zone for residential of 3-5 stories above ground-floor retail. The mixed-use zones allow for either residential or office/employment, but do not specify that upper stories must be residential. This is a vast oversight, which is resulting in the under-production of ground-floor retail, and resulting in dead zones along our commercial corridors.</p> <p>There are two potential solutions that could be made easily at this point in time:</p> <p>1) Create an overlay zone for within 250' of the centerline of streets with transit service, centers, and corridors, allowing up to 1.0 FAR of ground-floor retail in R2, R1, RH, RX, and IR zones within that overlay.</p> <p>2) Allow up to 1.0 FAR of ground-floor retail in R2, R1, RH, RX, and IR zones citywide.</p> <p>There are instances in this city where neighbors want to make sure that housing is provided, but also want the benefits of ground-floor retail along main streets. Either of these proposed changes would allow for this outcome, which is otherwise prevented by the current zoning code for R zones.</p>	residential_os-127-1118	Eliot
1820	Frederick Liebhardt	11/17/15	We welcome the change in density on our street, however the damage has basically already been done to our neighborhood. What good is it to downgrade the residential zoning when some properties have already been developed to maximum RH zoning specs?	residential_os-366-982	Sellwood-Moreland Improvement League
1819	Frederick Liebhardt	11/17/15	We welcome the change in density on our street, however the damage has basically already been done to our neighborhood. What good is it to downgrade the residential zoning when some properties have already been developed to maximum RH zoning specs?	residential_os-366-982	Sellwood-Moreland Improvement League
1742	Garlynn Woodsong	11/9/15	r2.5 is inappropriate for a commercial center. All of Alberta Street from 33rd to Vancouver should be either CM1, CM2, or CM3.	residential_os-361-8289	Vernon
1703	Brett Horner	11/5/15	We prefer this property remain as IH.	residential_os-551-790	Northwest Industrial

1699	James Gillen	11/3/15	<p>We are very concerned about the proposal to change our land use designation and zoning from R20 to R10. We have counted on the ability to develop the back of our lot in the near future for our retirement funding and the proposed change would present an economic hardship and effective taking of our property rights.</p> <p>Additionally, there have been land divisions (flagged lots) on identical 30000 square foot lots immediately to the north and south of ours, including a recent land division and construction on the property directly south (this lot is included in your map to be changed to R20, too, but it's already been split into several R10 lots).</p> <p>The lot to the north, which has more problematic topography and drainage issues, was divided into a flag lot and both it and the lot to the south have been able to access sewer and other city services without difficulty, so again we don't understand why our lot would be singled out for restrictions.</p> <p>We appreciate a quick response to our request so we can avoid retaining an attorney to defend our rights.</p> <p>Sincerely, James & Lynea Gillen</p>	residential_os-176-1321	Marshall Park
1696	Joe Recker	11/2/15	I strongly support rezoning the NE 60th MAX station community to the R1 comp plan density to allow for infill development. The R-5 zoning has already led to wasted land that could've supported 3-5 units each that would be much more affordable than the monstrous excessively large single-family homes that sell for \$450k. Given that most homes are 1-2 stories, can height be limited to 3 stories on new development?	Zoning Review Area	North Tabor
1682	Tobin Bottman	10/31/15	Hello, I notice a proposed zoning change for the school grounds across from my house. Can I please get further information on this proposal? Is this hypothetical, or did the school sell half of their remaining lands? Does the R2.5 zoning allow for duplexes and multiplexes?	residential_os-1207-3696	Reed

1680	Eva Miller	10/28/15	<p>How do I find out specifically what this means for my property? It doesn't tell me anything about proposed changes, just that there may be some.</p> <p>"This property is within a Zoning Review Area.</p> <p>Properties in these areas have pre-existing Comprehensive Plan designations that are different from the current zoning. Generally, these pre-existing designations (most from 1980, but some more recent) were applied with the assumption that deficient / incomplete infrastructure (streets, sidewalks, etc.) would eventually be upgraded to support increased residential density. During this Discussion Draft review period, these areas are being re-evaluated. Some areas may be recommended for zone changes in the next phase of the update (the Proposed Draft). Others may retain the status quo."</p>	Zoning Review Area	Creston-Kenilworth
1679	Daniel Peterson	10/28/15	<p>I'm concerned about the height of new development in the area. If redevelopment is planned for this area, can there be restrictions on the height of buildings, so that 1.5 story houses aren't loomed over by new 3-story row houses? Or increase the side setback requirements for houses over 20 feet?</p>	Zoning Review Area	Creston-Kenilworth
1678	Eva Miller	10/28/15	<p>Please tell me what zoning changes are being considered and where. My house is in this area, and want to know what is under discussion.</p>	Zoning Review Area	Creston-Kenilworth