

CNAME	CADDRESS	CCITY	CSTATE	CCOMMENT
Gina Morvay	2044 se 12th avenue	portland	OR	This is a horrible proposal to include parts of historic Ladds Addition (east of SE 12th) into an endless construction corridor so real estate developers can fill their pockets. What this proposal means is more housing, destroy available parking in our neighborhood, build unattractive and stylistically incongruous structures which completely shut off the light and views from their neighbors. It will subject us to many years of construction noise and disruption. As a homeowner in the proposed area which will be changed, I am completely against it and will fight it whatever way I can. I believe that the neighborhoods I understand Portland's neighborhoods are not for sale.
Opher Nadler	2326 NW Hoyt St	Portland	OR	Opposed to current changes as they dont take into account the historic nature of the neighborhood and the need to preserve that feature; how a higher density with possible excessive parking, a front door and the ignoring the fact that there is already shortage of parking and allowing more development that does not incorporate parking into the design will exacerbate that problem.
Alan Carpenter	9136 SE 82 Ave	Clackamas	OR	You should include 1500-1520 SE 162 into the R2/R3 zone, RM1 zone. It is currently R7 but the owners would be amenable to including it in a multi zone . It is a fourplex in a SFR zone. I support the proposed zone change.
Peter Martin	7304 N. Concord Ave.	Portland	OR	I strongly DISAGREE to the proposed merger of current zoning R2 and R3 into the so-called RM1 zoning status. This proposal shows complete disregard for the quality of life to the neighborhood. Such a proposal is means to the destruction of neighborhoods property values and takes advantage of those who can ill afford to lose their homes. It is a gross display of greed and self-interest.
Mary Clare Metscher	4914 N. Williams Ave.	Portland	OR	I do not think that these zoning changes should happen in this stretch of N. Williams. We have already seen a lot of development that has affecting our parking, our yard maintenance, and our neighborhood and allowing for more expansion is going to change that and change North Portland even further. I don't want to see that happen.
Ryan Woodward	1728 SE Harney St.	Portland	OR	I just want to say that I am extremely happy to see the buffer zones addressed next to areas where large structure would have otherwise decreased the value of our investments.
David Landrum	430 NE Morgan Street	Portland	OR	These questions remain unanswered: Why just my side (west side) of Grand Ave.? Why not on the east side of Grand? Why not the north side of Morgan? Why not the east side of MLK in the same block? Who profits from this change?
Cole Poland	5295 NE 52nd Ave	Portland	OR	My wife and I are all for the planned zoning changes. This seems like it will limit confusion around how people can develop their land.

Adam Zielinski 6488 SW Capitol Hwy Portland OR

Dear Planning & Sustainability Commission,

Over the past two decades, Portland has fallen way behind in building the amount of residential housing required to accommodate the population growth the city and region have resulted in rapidly rising prices as well as the gentrification of formerly affordable neighborhoods and the displacement of many households in those communities.

The reason for this is obvious: Too many people are chasing too few housing units, driving up prices and pricing people out of the city. The residential zoning code is too restrictive sizes that used to be perfectly legal. This has locked in a status quo that may have been appropriate for the 70s and 80s but has no chance to accommodate the growth of the city while maintaining affordability, quality of life, and economic and environmental sustainability.

Unfortunately the Residential Infill Project Proposed Draft is woefully inadequate to address this crisis of affordability, only scratching the surface of changes that should be made.

The question planners and economists should be asking is, "What would Portland's residential zoning code need to look like in order to accommodate all the new households as well as the new households that are projected to come here or be formed here in the next few decades, while maintaining housing affordability, and economic and environmental sustainability and the parks, greenspaces, and forest and farmland outside the Urban Growth Boundary?"

I think if you really analyzed and researched this question, it would quickly become apparent that Portland's existing zoning code is woefully inadequate and not up to the task.

When people walk around older sections of Portland, such as close in neighborhoods in Northwest, Northeast and Southeast Portland, there are a lot of old residential housing built before they wonder why no one builds homes and apartments like these anymore. It's because they are illegal under Portland's zoning code; usually for no good reason. What we're missing is the missing middle residential housing types such as duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, even six, seven and eightplexes, etc, as well as small apartment buildings.

These should be allowed in all residential areas of the city, not just some areas as currently proposed. Homeowners and landowners in all parts of the city should have the same options based on geography. Limiting new housing options to only some areas of the city will only create negative unintended consequences over time.

The focus on drastically limiting housing square footages is misguided in my opinion, and will only create a windfall for all existing homeowners with homes larger than the proposed limits.

Padraic Conway 1113 NE 59th Ave Portland OR

I'm protesting this rezoning proposal. This is a quiet street with single family homes. Parking is already a major challenge. Rezoning to multi family homes will only add to the parking problem directly outside my house and it is a challenge to get in and out of my driveway

Stephanie Crowell 1350 SE 80th Ave portland OR

We have lived in Portland since 1991. We own the home at 1350 SE 80th Ave. We bought this home and moved here because we LOVED this neighborhood. It feels entirely unfair to intentionally change the entire nature of this neighborhood for the sake of infill and density. I would never have bought this home or moved here had I known the city's plan was destroying the very things we have loved about living here.

Melissa Berube 852 NE Emerson St. Portland OR

I do not support the building of any apartment building on NE Emerson St, east of MLK, and west of 14th. The street is VERY narrow, and would not be up to the task of supporting parking and multiple tenants.

Stephen Effros	1426 NE 58th Ave.	Portland	OR	As a family with young children, our support of the overall increase in future housing density in our neighborhood as well the development of additional mixed use developments planned pedestrian and bike access/safety improvements to NE 60th Ave in the vicinity of the 60th Ave MAX Station. NE 60th Ave between the station and NE Halsey has severely bike riding; it is not safe for the current number of residents and commuters that use the 60th Ave MAX station, much less the planned additional residents that will come with the must be made at the same time that additional housing is planned for this transit zone in order for it to be successful in the future. NOTE: I have attached a 2016 PBOT document showing proposed infrastructure improvements in the 60th Ave MAX station area.
Jason Gottgetreu	4323 SE Division St	portland	OR	Hello, I support the proposed Comp Plan & Zone Change. Thank you. Jason Gottgetreu
Ruth Haag	4657ne 97th ave	Portland	OR	There are no other 3 story buildings in this neighborhood and parking is terrible. Some of the plans I have seen for increased density do not have sufficient parking. There are no c difficult to mow. All of the houses in this area are single family dwellings.
Jeremy Henderson	3866 SE Taylor St	Portland	OR	I'm for it. Density is a good thing, and people deserve to live in good neighborhoods like this without owning a large house.
Toby Welborn	614 NE 61st Ave	Portland	OR	I am torn about this proposal. While densification would help with several of the area's growing pains, I do not believe that the plan as written provides a successful blueprint. Liv resident parking and a max station, our neighborhood has parking issues, waste/discarded trash, petty crime, and high speed traffic. As it stands, the proposal would intensify the that the proposed housing will be affordable and/or what defines affordable. There is no proposed open space with higher density, no proposed transportation infrastructure, no improved to deal with increased loads (and would this cost fall on the local neighborhood residents?). The street offsets and the construction code updates are a good step but w best use for our roads a parking area for vehicles or should they be a "complete street" where the community gathers, neighbors interact, and kids safely play games. If we increa parking or neighborhood garage areas and neighborhood roads closed to non-delivery or service traffic? Can we propose green space offsets for the number of proposed resident densification is good) but it sucks when there is no place to sit or stand and moving around is difficult without bumping into and impacting others.
Eric Schoenbrunn	1335 NE 77th Avenue	Portland	OR	I wish to see no change to the zoning of my property or that of my neighbors. Do not destroy Portland character, homes, or homeowner property values for the sake of developers wellbeing of Montavilla.

Kristie Williams

6103 NE Davis Street

Portland OR

I am STRONGLY asking that you please require ample parking for all the up zoning that is taking place in our neighborhoods... the recent zoning definition has now made it even ea with no accountability for the "lack of parking" mess they leave behind.

In addition, the city isn't thinking around other areas they could be smarter... for instance as I am converting my garage to an ADU I am required to "curb" my driveway. No good e "thru" the front of the garage therefore at a time when parking is a shortage they are making it even more difficult for people to have parking. I could "appeal" it for a few thousand my money back. Also, as developers are coming in with all these units, the requirements for permitting my ADU are so stringent I can't afford it. Portland is more in support of dev embrace and incorporate the growth at a grass roots level. I plan to vocal on these issues. I am a Realtor that believes in ETHICAL and PRACTICAL growth. I am also a small business storefront (located in Montavilla) less and less due to not being able to park. You aren't encouraging small businesses by limited the variety of customers that are able to access the

Nikolai Ursin

1605 N Sumner St

Portland OR

I support the proposed changes to the comprehensive plan pertaining to R2 zones. The new RM1 zone will allow greater flexibility for developing more housing units, which will ho

Matthew Christen

3614 NE Garfield Ave

Portland OR

Dear Chair Schultz and Members of the Commission,

I am a property owner whose property (3614 NE Garfield Ave) will be subject to the proposed Comprehensive Plan Map and base and overlay zone changes. I fully support the pro the Comprehensive Plan Map and from R1ad to RM2d in the base and overlay zone designations.

There are several reasons why the changes to my property are fully consistent with the intent of the adopted goals and policies of the 2035 Comprehensive Plan.

Chapter 5's intent, in part, is to "ensure adequate access to housing for a socially-and economically- diverse population" and "concentrate new housing in and around centers and housing/transportation cost burden."

Policy 5.4 "encourage[s] new and innovative housing types that meet the evolving needs of Portland households, and expand housing choices in all neighborhoods."

Policy 5.5 requires the City to "Apply zoning in and around centers that allows for and supports a diversity of housing that can accommodate a broad range of households, includin

Policy 5.6 requires the city to "enable and encourage development of middle housing. This includes multi-unit or clustered residential buildings that provide relatively smaller, less between the core of the mixed use center and surrounding single family areas. Where appropriate, apply zoning that would allow this within a quarter mile of designated centers,

Before this proposed change to my property, I had been conducting my own due diligence to determine how to go about getting a zoning change to allow more density on my pro affordable multi-dwelling building (up to 36 studio/micro apartments) on my property. With this proposed change, this type of middle housing development on my property beco to those who have been priced out of a lot of the housing opportunities in the area. Further, my intended use of the property will concentrate new housing within 1/4 mile to "fre Fremont and within 0.3 mile to similar corridors on N Vancouver and N Williams. In sum, this zoning change will have the effect of directly meeting Chapter 5 goals and policies.

This proposed change will also be consistent with the Design and Development Chapter policies. Policy 4.16 provides: "Encourage design and development that complements the e of neighborhoods. Consider building forms, scale, street frontage relationships, setbacks, open space patterns, and landscaping...." The proposed zoning changes to my property w vicinity. There are two very large multi-dwelling structures across the street from my property, one that is 32 units (Beech Street Apartments) and the other contains 64 units (All market rate) project down the street from my property at 3525 NE Garfield. The City is also reviewing a multi-unit proposal on 3536 NE Garfield, two properties south of my prop care facility that houses several adults and staff. And, to the east of my property is NE MLK with multiple commercial businesses and a multi-story Planned Parenthood structure.

Courtney Aronson	7114 N Mohawk Ave	Portland OR	I feel that the zoning of R1 is sufficient for the side of the street my house is on. My back yard shares a fence with R5 neighborhood and most of the buildings on my side of the street are allowed to build four story housing it would cause the standard of living to decline for those of us that live in our houses and for those who own R5 and share the property line. This is a bad cause. Plus developers are buying perfectly good houses and demolishing them to build on Mohawk between Lombard & Willamette to replace them larger apartments. Please keep the zoning as is from Willamette to N Lombard.
Gilbert Lissy	1905 NE 47th Ave	Portland OR	People do not move to Portland to be in a New York or San Francisco. While they may bike or use mass transit for work, on the weekends they enjoy the outdoors and need a car. Further reduction in off street parking requirements will fill the streets, reducing the neighborhood feel that Portlanders now enjoy. This is a bad idea as well as for bikes and autos trying to cross at intersections.
AJ Hutchens	8804 SE Alder St	Portland OR	ABSOLUTELY OPPOSED! I have lived in my homeowner residential neighborhood for 30+ years. The neighborhood will be destroyed with an infiltration of skinny squeeze box houses and car traffic flow worse than it already is. Don't want the noise. Don't want more litter. Let this type of housing stay on the commercial main streets, city centers, but do not put them on residential streets out of desperation. We pay outrageous taxes to Multnomah Co to have what we have now. Homeowners have worked and paid darn hard to live where they chose to live in a nice neighborhood of the neighborhood. Don't want to see less green and more cement and smaller space. Don't want our property value to go down. I just learned of this proposal when I read the news. The city has already made their decision and this is just a formality for us but I hope not. Please do not make these changes. We already have enough anger and hate floating around Portland. Don't want to be known for you know it used to be called the most livable city in America; reason why many migrated here. I have heard it referred to now as "sewage".

Steven Szigethy	1817 SE Insley St	Portland OR	<p>Honorable Commissioners:</p> <p>I oppose the elimination of housing unit density maximums in the R1 and R2 zones, both citywide and in north Westmoreland.</p> <p>North Westmoreland just went through a protracted rezoning process as part of the Comp Plan and Map Refinement processes. Downzoning from RH to R2.5 was originally proposed as a result of the cancellation of the Harold Street MAX station and the presence of a combination of single-family homes, small duplexes and apartment courts. Later, through the Map Refinement process, it was determined that R2.5 was not appropriate, so as to not create a handful of non-conforming apartment buildings. While concerning at first for some of us who thought R2.5 was the best compromise, most of us moved on to R1 and R2.5 was not put into effect on 5/24/18.</p> <p>Then came Better Housing by Design (BHBD). This proposal essentially brings north Westmoreland back to RH density, negating years of planning and outreach work and potential benefits for an area that has seen degraded transit service, zero supportive retail development, and continued harmful particulate emissions from the Union Pacific Brooklyn Yard and Oregon High School.</p> <p>Another negative is that the proposal increases the front setback line. This decreases options for existing homeowners wishing to expand their homes or build covered front porches closer to the rear setback line, where most backyard privacy issues are experienced.</p> <p>Finally, I believe BHBD answers a question nobody is asking. On the design topic, most existing development I'm seeing in the R1 and R2 zones is well-designed and does not warrant a change. On the density side, there remains plenty of underutilized land in RH, RX, CM and CS zones where high-density residential development can occur to meet our city's demand for housing and transit. The R1 and R2 zones, as currently regulated, are less intense zones that provide opportunities for thoughtful, small and medium scale multifamily development, including the "missing middle" housing types.</p> <p>Please leave the R1 and R2 zones alone and direct staff to start over on this project, or to scrap it altogether.</p> <p>Respectfully,</p> <p>Steven Szigethy</p>
David Kelso	21400 SW 65th Ave	Tualatin OR	<p>Please provide any details regarding any proposed changes with regard to waiving SDCâ€™s for development on this parcel as it is currently within an exempt zone given its close proximity to the city limits. Does this re-zoning classification affect this in any way?</p>
Aaron Schalon	2033 NE Couch Street	Portland OR	<p>Traffic control and traffic calming need to be addressed along this corridor. Cars are now frequently driving at high speeds down Couch St. in order to try to evade the traffic congestion. This is a very dangerous situation for pedestrians and cyclists. The intersection at E. Burnside and 20th needs improved signals, particularly it needs the addition of a left turn arrow on 20th. Currently, heavy traffic along 20th, those trying to make a left turn onto Burnside (from either direction) have to wait until the signal turns red and then run it to make the left turn, usually several seconds. This is a dangerous situation for cyclists and pedestrians as well as further congests Burnside as those vehicles cannot start on their green light until the vehicles running the red light on 20th clear the intersection. The 20 mph residential speed limits are totally ignored. Infrastructure needs to be put in place to resolve these issues. Street parking is almost completely utilized all the time. If higher density residential street parking permit zones should be created just like the congested areas on the west side of the city. It is time to treat both sides of the river with parity. Thank you for your consideration.</p>
Tex Rankin	111 SW Columbia	Portland C OR	<p>I am against this purposed change. This will not be beneficial for the neighborhood.</p>
Carl Allen	123 Main St	Portland OR	<p>Bad for the neighborhood! I urge you not to pass these purposed changes! THANK YOU</p>

Roger Kruse	2704 SE 52nd Ave	Portland	OR	Bad News! The last thing that we need is a zoning change! Waste of time and tax dollars.
Dorothy Hester	3421 SE Main St	Portland	OR	It sounds like your proposed draft will limit development for smaller lots and would only help the owners of large lots. Not in favor
Doug Klotz	1908 SE 35th Pl	Portland	OR	New comments on Proposed Draft, see PDF
Doug Klotz	1908 SE 35th Pl	Portland	OR	Chair Schultz and Commissioners: I want to add that I appreciate a change from the Discussion Draft, that allows a zero front setback when the building has a significant front corner style of multifamily building.
Ruth Kastner	701 NE 28th Ave. #35	Portland	OR	The address of this parcel is 701 NE 28th Ave and the State ID is 1N1E36BC 80033, according to the document sent to me. I oppose any increase in development density in this area, especially any increase in commercial development. I oppose new residential construction that does not provide its own parking here, and need for parking will only increase with higher density development. Parking demands have increased astronomically in recent years. Please reverse this trend rather than increase it. comment.
Lesa Dixon-Gray	4307 SE Stark Street	Portland	OR	Our 1910 duplex sits on a very busy corner (Hawthorne and 23rd). It's on a tiny lot (2475 sq ft) and currently has a driveway that can fit two cars. I've often hoped (and once inquired about) the possibility of a second bottom floor, with an apartment upstairs. For this particular property, that possibility is intriguing to me. I worry, though, that because the lot is so small, some of the opportunities that would be bestowed on my property wouldn't be bestowed on my property. And as a caregiver, who has had to retrofit my own home, I welcome the requirement for wheelchair and disability access. The concern is that if the bottom floor is to be ADA accessible in any new construction, then you should require disability parking (people in wheelchairs don't usually ride bikes). I do think that one or two off-street parking spaces are needed. Currently in that neighborhood, even street parking isn't available. I cautiously support, but feel I need more conversation to fully understand the effects on my property.
Sellwood Moreland Impro	8210 SE 13th AVENUE	Portland	OR	The Sellwood-Moreland Improvement League (SMILE) is pleased to offer the attached comments on the Better Housing by Design Project (BHD) Proposed Draft Report.
Brandy Ascough	4345 NE 84th Ave	Portland	OR	It is with firm opposition that we reject this proposal to change the zoning of this property and region. This zoning change is in an encroachment on a defined area of stability. An unwarranted. The area houses many stable families whom have established their property and continue to maintain and increase their unit values. It is important to note that the zoning change in question infringes on the rights of the property owners and should not be allowed.
Yvonne Rice	4622 NE 91st Ave	Portland	OR	As I have led to understand, property along I-205 is owned by ODOT and would not be developed in case they wanted to expand the freeway. Now I see that this has re-zoned for residential use. I don't want to have a park and this is the closed piece of land we have and now you want to take that away for future development that the City of Portland will never need. Portland is becoming more and more car dependent.

Evan Burton	8957 NE Wygant St.	Portland	OR	Very concerned about rezoning the SAN Lot --NE 92 between Sandy Blvd. and Killingsworth Ave. This is the ONLY green space our neighborhood has. We have no parks or access to green space. Evan Burton Sumner neighborhood resident
Jennifer Schmidt	4929 NE 92nd Ave.	Portland	OR	I live across from what is know as the SAN LOT. I enjoy the quiet and and green space that is provides not only local neighbors to walk dogs, fly kites and just generally enjoy a little green space from my home.
Gregory Kullberg	2046 SE 12th	Portland	OR	Hi: I am the owner of a two story townhouse at 2046 SE 12th avenue at the western edge of Laddâ€™s Addition. SE 12th Ave where my property is has mostly a low profile single family homes. Encouraging the development of additional and even more high density change would do - could downgrade the existing character of this Laddâ€™s neighborhood and negatively affect the future value of my property. I oppose this proposed zoning change.
Peter Mohling	4831 NE 91st Ave	Portland	OR	Please stop building things on every available open lot. The San Lot is very important to our neighborhood and a large reason why we bough a house in this neighborhood. Developing this into apartments would already a nightmare during peak hours and many people use 91st avenue as a 40 mph road. Developing this into apartments would only exacerbate the problem. Taking little street space away from us brings everyone here joy. We must preserve green spaces like this to prevent Portland from becoming a garbage city.
Christine Andersen	3806 N Borthwick Ave	Portland	OR	My primary and critical concern with any zoning code and plan map designation is parking. We have good public transit and bike access but this does not alleviate the need for additional parking in the neighborhood. Exempting off street parking for new units is a serious safety and livability problem for the neighborhood. Currently there is an ongoing problem of crosswalks and sidewalks being blocked by carsâ€™ mostly because there is such an existing lack of parking. Even people who bike and bus when possible own vehicles and storing them on the street. Adding units in an already crowded area to neighborhood livability and safety. In addition, while I support the commercial businesses along Mississippi Street, the parking problem in neighborhoods is exacerbated by parking in front of businesses. This problemâ€™ donâ€™t make it even worse.
George Crawford	2234 ne 38th ave	Portland	OR	This makes sense to create more flexible affordable housing options. I think it makes most sense where parking needs are less and distance is walkable to main transit or central business district. Zoning being based on # of units results in trying to optimize sale price or value for each specific unit which translates to higher costs of living.
Amy Marks	1824-1826 SW Main St.	Portland	OR	This house backs up to the Legends Condominium and fronts on the MAC parking garage. I have attached pictures of the views front and rear of this house. I think this was mistakenly placed half block from the new front entrance to the new Lincoln high school and is a block from a MAX station.
Amy Marks	1824-1826 SW Main St.	Portland	OR	This property will be directly across the street from the New entrance to Lincoln high school. It is one block from a MAX stop and fronts on the MAX line. It backs/sides to the Legends Condominium and should be zoned at RM4d

Cathy Stermer	1121 NE 84th Av	Portland	OR	Please reconsider relaxing required parking space regulations on new building in this area. The streets here are extremely narrow, even by Portland standards, and if cars are parked down the road simultaneously. Additional units without parking, will significantly increase problems with traffic flow in this area. Therefore, again, Please reconsider parking space
Cathy Stermer	1121 NE 84th Av	Portland	OR	Please reconsider relaxing required parking space regulations on new building in this area. The streets here are extremely narrow, even by Portland standards, and if cars are parked down the road simultaneously. Additional units without parking, will significantly increase problems with traffic flow in this area. Therefore, again, Please reconsider parking space
Cathy Stermer	1121 NE 84th Av	Portland	OR	Please reconsider relaxing required parking space regulations on new building in this area. The streets here are extremely narrow, even by Portland standards, and if cars are parked down the road simultaneously. Additional units without parking, will significantly increase problems with traffic flow in this area. Therefore, again, Please reconsider parking space
richard omohundro	3247 se 120th ave	portland	OR	My only real issue with your new better housing by design is you are some times filling in areas such as this one with no thought on unimproved roadways. this example is going to so it will become impassable by the time construction is done. the power poles are located in the street seven feet in so unimproved road is 23 feet wide. put cars on both sides of endangering the whole street for more infill. Also 120th and powell is one of portlands worst intersections for accidents and you are adding more issues not less. I have been up k if you realize this is just a dead end dirt road with no turnaround.

Terry Parker

1527 NE 65th Avenue

Portland OR

One of the things that makes Portland an enticing livable city is the preservation of older and established single family home neighborhoods that green yards and big mature trees life taints this through the lens image of our popular city.

The proposed setbacks and maximum building coverage limits in the Better Housing by Design Draft are pleasing and welcomed as are required outdoor green spaces. Transfers of massive monolith structures that do not fit in context with their surroundings. The transfer of development rights that can create larger out of scale buildings needs to be reconsidered.

FAR bonuses also need to be significantly reduced. One size does not fit all neighborhoods. The FAR bonuses for affordable housing are too large and will create oversized building neighborhood structures in adjacent lower density zoning. The length of time units must remain affordable is multi-generational, far and way too long, and in reality, may outlive the zoning that border R5 zoning, FAR bonuses need to be eliminated. The properties on the North side of NE Halsey Street from 61st to 65th Avenues should remain R2.5 and not be rezoned. In areas acceptable in downtown and the central city, but even with step down architecture, the large scale buildings will create negative quality of life impacts for residents nearby in adjacent areas.

One of the negative quality of life impacts in the Better Housing by Design Draft is the absence of, or insufficient, off-street parking. This includes the non-requirement for off-street parking where lower density zoning exists. Is this plan to not require adequate parking throughout the city also a plan to create the same type of on-street parking mayhem and crisis that we have with electric cars have to run extension cords across the sidewalks or down the block for overnight and home charging? At some point, drivers of electric cars will need to start paying for parking instead of expecting utility ratepayers to continue footing the bill at free charging stations.

Moreover, is the absence of adequate on-site parking an attempt to "dictate" to renters they should not have a car? 59% of low income people drive to their place of employment. This is a type and neighborhood choice, but what about choice in transportation? Is the elimination of parking with affordable housing a form of discrimination? This testifier thinks so!

The city's own studies suggest that 72% of households in new large multi-unit buildings without parking have one or more cars. Filling up parking places on the streets with stored cars and inadequate off-street parking is already a hot button issue for the property tax paying residents of adjacent neighborhoods.

Parking demand management must require adequate off-street car storage parking - with overnight charging connectivity for electric vehicles - for all new residential developments in zones RM2, RM3 and RM4, this parking needs to have no less than three parking spaces for every four units. Smaller developments such as in zone RM1 need a one to one ratio. A parking requirement must apply to new residential development on frequent transit corridors and within light rail station areas. People that use an alternative means of transport to commute also have a right. Bicyclists as skewed logic for not paying their own way with user fees to fund the "privilege" of having specialized bicycle infrastructure. Continuing an expectation to make use of public space for private cars is not a good idea.

Juliana Cartwright

5920 SW Riveridge Ln

Portland OR

I am very concerned that any plan must address the lack of street parking available on streets in 'Johns Landing' and the too-fast, dense traffic on Macadam and Corbett. If new building size expansions are allowed, there must be required off street parking for all units. Also please note that Macadam is a major commuter route and the cars travel with high density in this community will only add to the traffic and noise and congestion. I oppose more dense apartment housing because of the increased commuter traffic on Macadam and the insufficient off-street parking for owners, renters, and guests.

SHAWN BLYTH

337 NE Morris St

Portland OR

I am the homeowner on the lot with the proposed changes. While I do not necessarily believe the current proposed changes to Property ID# R673376 will have a dramatic effect, we are already a fairly high density area (11 units located on the one lot). Additionally, there are concerns among residents regarding the 2 lots next to ours at 3007 NE MLK Blvd being rezoned and large 4+ story buildings being placed which would adversely effect our residents living situation. We understand that at present, it shows the the Map App website showing "residential property" we have heard that there is a push to change this. We hope that the surrounding neighborhood will be considered before adding more large apartment buildings, condos, and townhomes blocks along MLK, and this only further puts strain on traffic, parking, and general nuisances.

Bruce Johnson

2323 NW Johnson Street

Portland OR

Letter attached.

Dennis Harper

221 NW 18th Avenue

Portland OR

Letter attached.

Annie Mengis	9034 NE Wygant	Portland	OR	I live a block away from the SAN Lot that is set to be rezoned to multi-dwelling units. This is the only park-like area in the neighborhood as the other space is the Helensview school. It should be required that a substantial portion stayed available as a neighborhood public space for dogs, people and the like and be designed in such a way as to benefit the neighborhood.
Adam Meyer	2184 NW Kearney St.	Portland	OR	Greater density is practical between 21st and 23rd ave. But DOES NOT work for the middle of neighborhoods like near 25th and Lovejoy. This area should be left for single family and preserve the personality and feel of the neighborhood/Portland. Thank you.
Christopher Browne	5905 NE Failing st	Portland	OR	The RM1 code seems to allow all R1, R2 and R3 to become R1 with a building size limit. If this is so then there is not step up to the residential areas. Please go back to R1, R2 and R3.
Mark Hewitt	4816 N. Albina	Portland	OR	I have lived at 4816 N. Albina for nearly 20 years. It was once a relatively quiet street, but now we have a restaurant/bar across the street that is open until 2:30 in the morning with a proposed 5 story building going up 2 lots to the south my property at 4732 N. Albina. This is no longer a residential neighborhood. I would ask the city of portland to consider changing the zoning for retail or office space.
michelle sprague	2534 SE 13th	Portland	OR	Notice of Proposed Zoning Change 2534 SE 13th Portland OR 97202 Better Housing by Design My Zoning just changed from base zone R2 to base zone R1, now the May 11, 2018 proposal is to change current base and overlay zone R1 to proposed base and overlay zone RM1. The MapApp "testify" shows lot sizes of 5000 square feet: My house pre-dates building records, City Maps list it as Year Built 1900. The sidewalks and utilities (water, sewer, electricity, etc.) were all created after the house was built. The 20th century into what was referred to as a "mother in law" house, the 2 houses had shared sewer line. My lot should be 50 feet width by 60 feet depth facing 13th and the depth facing Ivon. There are many houses within the designated RM2 Zone change which have undersized lots. In my area, the most common house style being a foursquare, with an above ground parking garage. The houses are very tall and are very close to the public sidewalk. The Development Standards do not address: Need for Sewer and other utility easements through private property. Converting existing houses on under 5000 square foot lots: "basement apartment with visitable accessible to people using wheel chairs." "Attic conversions into living space." "Grandfathered Set Back Allowance." "Grandfathered open space/outdoor area."

Mark Humpal	5104 SE Cesar E Chavez Blvd	Portland	OR	We live in a 2000 square foot home built in 1915. The block we live on years ago was comprised of double lots stretching back to 40th Avenue. Over past 15 years, the last double lot was subdivided into 6 duplexes. Between the short stretch of Cesar E Chavez Blvd and Steele, we already have 6 duplexes. These units blend in well with the neighborhood. The proposed zoning change would displace the duplexes and be subject to the change. We've achieved housing density on our street and don't need 3 story monstrosities popping up around here. Since the proposal was announced, we've seen a lot of people purchase our home. These zoning changes benefit no one except real estate developers.
Michael J Kane Martha Richards	1234 NW 25th Ave 7516 NE Halsey	Portland Portland	OR OR	Letter attached. I am concerned about the proposed changes to the neighborhood b/w Halsey and I-84. There is very limited parking now, and the proposed changes seem to make parking even more difficult for residents, in their own homes, in this area with the proposed zoning change.
Lee Sim Suey	5031 SE Cesar E. Chavez Blvd	Portland	OR	The rezoning to any new zones for business or multi dwelling plans is unwanted here. This is a neighborhood of Reed, and always will be. This is a family oriented neighborhood. We don't want the neighborhood gentrified. This is our property, and no trespassing on our property by stepping on it. Random lady walks up on to my property to look at my backyard. Seriously!!! This is Reed Neighborhood Eastmoreland. We don't want the same, greedy, money hungry, ugly monstrosities constructed identically like all the others in peaceful neighborhoods. DO NOT CHANGE MY ZONING RIGHTS stay presided above any other decisions, courts, government, state, city, and county. The family has all rights to build what we want on it, and how we build on our property.
Kathy Shepstone	7409 SE 82nd Ave	Portland	OR	So we just turn our homes over to you with a pat on the head and say ok, have you looked at what you have done to this city. I work at Joanns on 82nd everyday I chase people that pay 100 dollars a year walk out the door because of your housing. They cant afford your housing projects and I cant afford it with my job that I have been at 14years at \$12.00 AN HOUR. We are just going to make a few more homeless How do you people sleep at Night. You just keep digging a bigger hole why not through us all in and turn on the gas like the Germans did in the Holocaust. I don't know what you are doing these people they have know where to go .You have sentenced the few that are trying to death, what else is there. you don't care ,, What do your kids think of Portland God will deal with you in time I feel sorry for your familys
Lucas Gray	5229 NE MLK Blvd.	Portland	OR	Regarding Better Housing By Design: Increasing setbacks is a terrible idea. It is against everything that makes safe active streets. We don't need more lawns and dead space, we need active street edges that engage pedestrians. If you want more space for wider sidewalks, plantings, street trees, etc. you should make roads and lanes narrower. Take public owned land to make our city more green, which will reduce traffic speed, putting trees in places they will shade sidewalks and asphalt, plantings that will separate pedestrians from cars, plantings that can address stormwater runoff from the roads, and plantings of new buildings to preserve usable open space, existing trees, add additional housing units, and add other amenities on the private land.

Doug Klotz
Connie Levine

1908 SE 35th Pl
PO Box 529

Portland OR
Eugene OR

See attached PDF of Comments & photos
G Group, LLC manages the property located at 2330 NW Flanders St., Portland, Oregon. The property is being operated as a medical building.

The 2/3 west side of this property is proposed to be modified from an RH Zone; CM2m to a RM3d; CM2m. We understand that the RM3d zoning will disallow future commercial uses. We encourage you to continue to allow a mix of residential and commercial at this property.

Thank you.

Connie Levine

Glenn Esler

9124 SE Alder Street

Portland OR

Greetings,

I am all for increased density outside the central city core. However, I would submit for consideration, that apartments be limited to the main arterial roads (e..g., in my area; SE 8th and only townhouses and condos be allowed on residential streets.

I think apartments in neighborhood streets might alter the character of the community on these streets too much. Apartment renters aren't as well invested in a community as a homeowner. The high turnover of apartment dwellers. I think this would destabilize a residential street.

In addition, I fear if one apartment complex goes in on a residential street then other home owners may consider moving out. I myself would give it serious thought.

If it was a condo complex or several townhouses, I would welcome that more on my street than apartments.

Thank you for allowing my opinion.

L Tom

5608 ne davis

portland OR

Will my comments have any impact? Have you already decided and are just going through the motions. Why would you listen now? You want to make changes in the name of "affordable housing" but you want the least amount of space.

What about the people who have lived here for decades. Paying taxes, building Portland into a place people want to be. Developers have been allowed to call the shots. Destroying neighborhoods without regard to the impact they leave behind. They cram as many units as they can on a lot with no regard for the people who live there. Here is an example. Recently a developer bought a 3 bdrm house for a little over \$300,000. He left a small bit of the old house so it could be "remodeled." This way he didn't have to demolish the house. He built a McMansion that is going to sell for close to 1 Million. It dwarfs the houses on both sides which impacts the homes that had vegetable gardens. and the privacy they used to have.

My point here is the continued destruction for no benefit expect the developer. In this case it is still 1 house in the place of 1 house. The city needs to recognize their part in the housing crisis.

This brings me to the zoning change. What exactly is the purpose? It seems to me this will only encourage more overbuilding. Single homes won't stand a chance. I don't want to encourage more parking. Is this to make it easier for developers? It isn't for the homeowners. Neighborhoods are being squeezed and you aren't listening. You are taking away the livability factor everyday.

You need to fix the zoning so more parking is required for new buildings. There is an 84 unit apartment going up on Sandy. There will be 21 parking spaces. That means at least 5 parking spaces per unit.

I find it hypocritical that you don't like parking spaces because it takes away "green." What about all the trees that are being removed daily by developers. Wake up, people have a right to live in a city that is livable. "new" people to live but you aren't doing anything about the crowded roads.

It feels like you are just rubber stamping what developers want. It would be great to see the city say no once in awhile.

Because of the lack of cohesive planning, the city feels like chaos. One day you will discover you (city of Portland) had a part in making us the new San Francisco. An elite city no one wants to live in. Everyone trying to leave the nightmare you created.

Louise Pender

1514 NE 76th Avenue

Portland OR

Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission
Better Housing Testimony
1900 SW 4th Avenue, Suite 7100
Portland, Oregon 97201

June 7, 2018

From: Owner of Property at 1514 NE 76th Avenue, Portland 97213

Dear Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Your zoning proposal is not possible for my neighborhood. The area north of Halsey Street, south of freeway 84 and between 72nd to 77th Avenues is 100% surrounded by concrete barriers. There is no room for additional cars.

I am a member of an increasingly organized neighborhood group brought together by our severe concern about the proposed property zoning change. Our neighborhood is entirely surrounded by concrete barriers to the north, west, and east and by Halsey Street to our south. It is an area north of Halsey between NE 72nd Avenue and NE 77th. Most, or almost all, of us are house owners living in our neighborhood. We have worked together for decades to improve it and to maintain harmony and cooperation among ourselves. Aren't we exactly the kind of neighborhood that the City of Portland values?

We are confused and dismayed that notices, or some of them, regarding a zoning change that would severely impact the quality of life in our neighborhood were not received until the hearing. Why was the notice not sent months before the hearing? Some of us seriously wonder whether the decision to delay notifying citizens raises worrisome credibility issues about the Commission's process.

We are extremely concerned about your inadvisable proposal to rezone our area from R2 to MD-N, a multi-dwelling, higher living density zone. The crime rate in our area has rapidly increased since the rezoning. A change to multi-dwelling, higher density units predicts more crime. However, the reason unique to our neighborhood that makes such a change an impossibility is that our parking spaces are limited. Our streets dead end into 84 (no parking) or dead end into Halsey (no parking). Our area was developed long ago and our narrow, one-car driveways already force most of us to off-street parking. Most of our households already require more than one car. There has already been an increase in car break-ins due to our lack of parking close to our houses where we can help ourselves. The proposed change will 100% predictably severely aggravate the problem. Do you really want to force us to walk a mile or more away across 84 to an area with its own restrained parking or very dangerous off-street parking while carrying heavy groceries and other items to our homes? Again, our area literally has concrete barriers. There is zero option for additional parking. There is already substantial evidence that the proposed change will increase crime in our area.

Louise Pender

1514 NE 76th Avenue

Portland OR

Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission
Better Housing Testimony
1900 SW 4th Avenue, Suite 7100
Portland, Oregon 97201

June 7, 2018

From: Owner of Property at 1514 NE 76th Avenue, Portland 97213

Dear Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Your zoning proposal is not possible for my neighborhood. The area north of Halsey Street, south of freeway 84 and between 72nd to 77th Avenues is 100% surrounded by concrete barriers. There is no room for additional cars.

I am a member of an increasingly organized neighborhood group brought together by our severe concern about the proposed property zoning change. Our neighborhood is entirely surrounded by concrete barriers to the north, west, and east and by Halsey Street to our south. It is an area north of Halsey between NE 72nd Avenue and NE 77th. Most, or almost all, of us are house owners living in our neighborhood. We have worked together for decades to improve it and to maintain harmony and cooperation among ourselves. Aren't we exactly the kind of neighborhood that the City of Portland values?

We are confused and dismayed that notices, or some of them, regarding a zoning change that would severely impact the quality of life in our neighborhood were not received until the hearing. Why was the notice not sent months before the hearing? Some of us seriously wonder whether the decision to delay notifying citizens raises worrisome credibility issues about the Commission's process.

We are extremely concerned about your inadvisable proposal to rezone our area from R2 to MD-N, a multi-dwelling, higher living density zone. The crime rate in our area has rapidly increased since the rezoning. A change to multi-dwelling, higher density units predicts more crime. However, the reason unique to our neighborhood that makes such a change an impossibility is that our parking spaces are limited. Our streets dead end into 84 (no parking) or dead end into Halsey (no parking). Our area was developed long ago and our narrow, one-car driveways already force most of us to off-street parking. Most of our households already require more than one car. There has already been an increase in car break-ins due to our lack of parking close to our houses where we can help ourselves. The proposed change will 100% predictably severely aggravate the problem. Do you really want to force us to walk a mile or more away across 84 to an area with its own restrained parking or very dangerous off-street parking while carrying heavy groceries and other items to our homes? Again, our area literally has concrete barriers. There is zero option for additional parking. There is already substantial off-street parking in the area.

Louise Pender 1514 NE 76th Avenue Portland OR

Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission
Better Housing Testimony
1900 SW 4th Avenue, Suite 7100
Portland, Oregon 97201

June 7, 2018

From: Owner of Property at 1514 NE 76th Avenue, Portland 97213

Dear Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Your zoning proposal is not possible for my neighborhood. The area north of Halsey Street, south of freeway 84 and between 72nd to 77th Avenues is 100% surrounded by concrete and has no room for additional cars.

I am a member of an increasingly organized neighborhood group brought together by our severe concern about the proposed property zoning change. Our neighborhood is entirely surrounded by concrete to the north, west, and east and by Halsey Street to our south. It is an area north of Halsey between NE 72nd Avenue and NE 77th. Most, or almost all, of us are house owners living in our neighborhood and we have worked together for decades to improve it and to maintain harmony and cooperation among ourselves. Aren't we exactly the kind of neighborhood that the City of Portland values?

We are confused and dismayed that notices, or some of them, regarding a zoning change that would severely impact the quality of life in our neighborhood were not received until the hearing. Why was the notice not sent months before the hearing? Some of us seriously wonder whether the decision to delay notifying citizens raises worrisome credibility issues about the process.

We are extremely concerned about your inadvisable proposal to rezone our area from R2 to MD-N, a multi-dwelling, higher living density zone. The crime rate in our area has rapidly increased since the rezoning. A change to multi-dwelling, higher density units predicts more crime. However, the reason unique to our neighborhood that makes such a change an impossibility is that our parking spaces are limited. Our streets dead end into 84 (no parking) or dead end into Halsey (no parking). Our area was developed long ago and our narrow, one-car driveways already force most of us to off-street parking. Most of our households already require more than one car. There has already been an increase in car break-ins due to our lack of parking close to our houses where we can help ourselves. A 100% predictably severely aggravate the problem. Do you really want to force us to walk a mile or more away across 84 to an area with its own restrained parking or very dangerous streets to park while carrying heavy groceries and other items to our homes? Again, our area literally has concrete barriers. There is zero option for additional parking. There is already substantial evidence that the rezoning will increase crime and reduce the quality of life in our neighborhood.

Leon Porter 1822 NE Wasco St. Portland OR

Dear Planning and Sustainability Commission,

My testimony on the Better Housing by Design, Proposed Draft is attached. I also generally support the additional recommendations made by Portland for Everyone.

Best wishes,
Leon Porter

Angela Abadjian 12606-12620 E. Burnside Portland OR

Dear Planning and Sustainability commission. The changes are fine except for one point that it does not take into consideration the individual property owner who is not a developer. The present changes does not work for the common home owner who might in time just want to add a unit or two and can not afford to build a new building. Please create a exception for the small home owner who has the dream of expanding their property but not at the scale that would be the minimum allowed by the new zoning. The common property owner who is not rich and has the desire and dream off adding few more units to their property. Please don't just help the big companies and developers but help the common property owner who has worked hard and has the desire to be better. Thank you in advance for your consideration. Its all great for the updated zoning but please don't live out the common hard guideline for the minimum number of units. Sincerely, Angela Abadjian

Mary Carr

6184 SW Capitol Hwy

Portland OR

I'm writing concerning the proposed zoning changes adjacent to my property. I'm very concerned about increasing the density in this area. Burlingame ave. Is adjacent to a traffic. There is already extremely limited off street parking , increased density would only make that worse. Hills dale business area routinely has vacancies for commercial proper there is not space for adequate parking to support additional commercial property. Traffic congestion on Capitol hwy has also increased in the last few years and since there are li to get out of the driveway. Additionally I'm concerned that changes be proportionate to additional structures with adequate space between structures and respect for privacy have seen examples of such development in other neighborhoods and hope that is not what is planned for Hillsdale.
Thank you for your consideration.
Respectfully,
Mary Carr

Dennis M. Harper
Dawn Peterson

221 NW 18th Ave
5121 SE 79th Ave

Portland OR
Portland OR

Letter attached.
I agree that it's a good idea to provide more housing for people near transportation. But I think that Portlanders and those who are new arrivals will need continuing education on yourself in everyday life. This applies to renters and homeowners alike.

Richard U'Ren

1735 NW Irving Street

Portland OR

June 11, 2018

Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission
Better Housing by Design Testimony
1900 SW 4th, Suite 7100
Portland, Oregon 97201

RE: Better Housing by Design Proposed Changes to RH Zone in Northwest Portland Historic Alphabet District

Dear Commissioners:

We received the May 11, 2018

NOTICE OF PROPOSED ZONING CODE, ZONING MAP AND COMPREHENSIVE PLAN MAP CHANGES THAT MAY AFFECT THE PERMISSIBLE USES OF YOUR PROPERTY AND OTHER PRO

Our State ID#: 1N1E33AC 4900

Current Comprehensive Plan Map designation: RH

Proposed Comprehensive Plan Map designation: MD-U

Current Based and overlay zone: RH

Proposed base and overlay zone: RM4d

According to the mailing, our property at 1735 NW Irving Street may be affected by the proposed changes.

We consulted www.portlandmaps.com/bps/mapapp and found no mention of the Historic Alphabet District (HAD). This Portland zoning designation (as noted on official street sig

National Register of Historic Places and as such is subject to provisions to which Northwest Portland properties outside the Alphabet Historic District are not.

We have lived at the above residence since 1993 and supported the area's designation as an historic district in 2000 with the full understanding of the attendant restrictions. W

HAD we accepted the responsibility of maintaining our Couch Family Investment House, which was built in 1884, with the expectation that future development would follow guide

The proposed zoning changes, as best as we can tell, fail to take into consideration the Northwest District Plan and the associated Historic Resource Protection Overlay.

Even now, cases of spot zoning which ignored the impact of 4:1 FAR on swaths of less than 2:1 historic residences have caused all kinds of problems. It has led developers to propo

historic residences only to be frustrated by neighborhood opposition and wasted time and money by everyone involved, including the city.

If RM4d zoning becomes the overriding zoning structure, then the Historic Alphabet District designation will be superseded and will be abandoned, thereby freeing all property ow

the new parameters. We view this as a very unfortunate development if a historic district is to be maintained-especially considering that less than three percent of the entire city f

William & Nicki Meyers 33045 SE Dodge Park Blvd Gresham OR

To the Planning and Sustainability Commission:

This letter is our response to the City's notice of a proposed zone change affecting property we own in the Montavilla neighborhood.

My wife, Nicki Fischer-Meyers and I are the owners of 1036 NE 80th Ave. we recommend that the commission not approve the proposed zone change as written because it is not in homes, trees and green areas for children and adults and safer streets. It will have severe effects on the continuance of North Montavilla as an affordable neighborhood of family and it will flood the neighborhood with untold number of cars whose owners have only street parking provided with their high rise apartments/condos. It will provide buildings full price as the home originally sited there. We see no mention of safety plans for 82nd Ave, which is a major issue if you are placing hundreds more people along it.

Our two bedroom, one bath house has been home to four generations of the Fischer and Meyers family, Nicki's parents, brother, us and now our son and his family. Nicki's Montavilla. We mention this only to illustrate how important a stable neighborhood of single family homes is to the continued health of our city. As you know, the city's housing maintaining housing for a diverse population and maintaining a supply of affordable housing for vulnerable populations. Right now, We suggest that our son, a PPS teacher with 1 home is a vulnerable population. Families like his find it increasingly difficult to purchase a home within Portland.

Because the house is listed as owned by our family trust, we receive two or more solicitations each week from developers who want to buy the house, usually for cash. Should the apartment buildings come to pass, I expect increased pressure on owners to sell. The effect on property values if a 40 foot high building is next to or just down the street from your neighborhood go through normal transitions, the WWII generation passed on, several of the homes became rentals for a while, then families moved in at started purchasing the home. The entire north portion of Montavilla will be destroyed as a single family neighborhood and many people will be searching for new homes. Example, a beautiful home about four hours old many years and grew gorgeous roses, was recently purchased, torn down and now sits vacant waiting, we suspect, for the approval of this proposal. This neighborhood is exactly what we want. Homes with yards for gardens and children, trees in the yards for all the good things trees do for a city, driveways and garages to help keep the street less congested and porches and patios. We see this happening in other neighborhoods. Acquaintances of ours in Lents, artists whose work is in several of Portland's finer homes and businesses, recently lost the lease on their condos have recently been built. The only thing affordable to them is outside of Portland. These are the folks a city needs to keep, not chase away.

This overall plan, and we've spent hours on line reading staff reports, zoning codes and all related info (never did find an official definition of MD-C, only in citizen forums) and the west side or the Central neighborhoods. We see the word "discourage" a lot in the proposals, which suggests good sounding ideas will happen only if the developer thinks something is hazy on what exactly proposed, what loopholes are available for developers to get breaks from the zoning codes and what benefits there are for the current residents.

Brittney Hall 8827 N Edison St. Portland OR

Formatted testimony voicing support and listing three main areas of concern is included in the file attached to this submittal. The three areas of concern discussed in our testimony are zoning, and transportation needs. Please see the attachment for our complete testimony.

Dennis B Smith 827 NW 25th Ave Portland OR
Steve Connolly 1917 NW Hoyt Portland OR
Laurie Hall 10259 NW Edgewood Drive Portland OR

Letter attached.
Letter attached.
I bought my property in June 2001 with the understanding that the green belt below my lot was protected by a grandfather clause. I paid \$10,000 more for my dwelling due to its location. If changes are made in the land use I expect to be compensated for the loss. The property below my house is very steep and is bordered by a creek that feeds a pond...I feel this is an enforcement that endangers the wildlife and water table established in the

Carolee Paugh 6140 SE 128th Ave Portland OR
Kristine Quintana 10721 E Burnside Portland OR

Letter attached.
10703 E Burnside slopes down drastically to the north. A townhouse or apartment block style building built as mandated to the proposed MD-N height would dwarf the surrounding building spread more evenly over the lot would be preferred. In addition this home is at the edge of the Gateway plan district and has previously been designated as subject to buy

Kristine Quintana	10721 E Burnside	Portland	OR	10721 E Burnside is a large garden lot and would be appropriate for a cottage pod/adu etc rather than a large MD-N block-style development. A tall building would dwarf the surrounding buildings, block out valuable southern light, and be harmful to indoor and outdoor privacy of the surrounding buildings.
Kristine Quintana	10721 E Burnside	Portland	OR	109 NE 108th is at the lowest point of a valley and surrounded to the north and south by one story homes. The proposed MD-N with or without a FAR bonus would be wrong for the location. The density is not so much the issue as the height. It would be more appropriate for a cottage pod style of development, or even a duplex. A taller apartment block would be: not compatible with the neighborhood character and would be harmful to other residents by way of: overlooking (harmful to indoor and outdoor privacy) (harmful to potential solar energy array and gardening as well as natural light in homes.)
Kristine Quintana	10721 E Burnside	Portland	OR	121 NE 108th is at the lowest point of a valley and surrounded to the north and south by one story homes. The proposed MD-N with or without a FAR bonus would be wrong for the location. The density is not so much the issue as the height. It would be more appropriate for a cottage pod style of development, or even a duplex. A taller apartment block would be: not compatible with the neighborhood character and would be harmful to other residents by way of: overlooking (harmful to indoor and outdoor privacy) (harmful to potential solar energy array and gardening as well as natural light in homes.)
Bob Johnson	1545 SW Terwilliger Blvd.	Portland	OR	Letter attached.
John J. and Bernadette M.	1524 NE 76th Ave	Portland	OR	Letter attached.

Greg Theisen	2257 NW Raleigh St	Portland	OR	<p>The NWDA and our neighbors support the objectives of the Better Housing By Design proposal, and many of the elements in the Proposed Draft. For over a century NW Portland housing explored in BHBD, enabling our neighborhood to serve an economically diverse mix of housing needs. Our current zoning patterns include considerable RH, R1 and R2 zoning for housing units. Yet this pattern of zoning and development is fragile: in particular the threat of higher land values associated with BHBD may affect the long-term presence of older housing units. This impact playing out in RH and R1 areas of the neighborhood, with higher priced units replacing more affordable units.</p> <p>Broadly, we support most of the major changes proposed in BHBD, but we have concerns about how the changes will be implemented.</p> <p>In particular, we support these major changes summarized on pages 4 and 5 of the Proposed Draft.</p> <p>“Provide a revised set of zones that relate to different types of places.”</p> <p>During work that led to the Portland Plan and the update Comprehensive Plan, the concept of “many Portlands” was discussed: There are different characteristics in different neighborhoods and to those differences rather than applying a broad brush approach. Clearly, the special regulations for East Portland come from that concept, but it should be applied more broadly to other areas and uses and mixed housing types, including many multi-dwelling buildings and many single-dwelling houses (some of which have been converted to multi-dwelling). This is particularly true in areas to the north and west. Applying the RM-4 zone everywhere the current zoning is RH does nothing to continue the existing character of our neighborhood or the historic district.</p> <p>Within the RH zone, some portions have an FAR of 2:1 and some have an FAR of 4:1. The 4:1 FAR was applied to many parts of Northwest in 1980, in large part reflecting development potential was assessed by considering the existing floor area on a site as a ratio to the area of the site. When the Alphabet Historic District was created in 2000, no evaluation of the conflict with several other neighborhoods, have called for “right-zoning” in historic districts. Base zones which allow much more height and mass than would be approved through Historic Preservation, conflict between neighbors and developers and require the Landmarks Commission and City Council to repeatedly make decisions about balancing historic preservation (which are not the “truth in zoning,” this conflict and repeated decision-making continue, and all parties are damaged. The neighborhood repeatedly expends energy fighting development that they pay too much for land because they expect a higher development potential, and then incur the costs and frustrations of a battle with neighbors; and staff, the Landmarks Commission, are addressing the same issues repeatedly.</p> <p>In fact, the new RM-4 zone exacerbates the conflict between the base zone and the Historic Protection Overlay Zone in two ways. First, it allows an FAR of 4:1 on all sites now zoned RH. Second, it allows even more FAR through bonuses and transfers than is allowed under current regulations. This further threatens the Goal 5 resources inventoried and protected in the Comprehensive Plan.</p>
J Hopkins	4101 NE Killingsworth St	Portland	OR	This is not a step forward for our neighborhood. This proposal will not benefit the neighborhood or our properties in a positive way.
J Hopkins	4102 SE Belmont St	Portland	OR	This is not a step forward for our neighborhood. This proposal will not benefit the neighborhood or our properties in a positive way. Think of the long term ramifications.
J Hopkins	5226 SE Clinton Street	Portland	OR	This is not a step forward for our neighborhood. This proposal will not benefit the neighborhood or our properties in a positive way. Think of the long term ramifications.
J Hopkins	4073 SE Holgate blvd	Portland	OR	This is not a step forward for our neighborhood. This proposal will not benefit the neighborhood or our properties in a positive way. Think of the long term ramifications.
Erika Hanson	3035 SW Vermont Street	Portland	OR	I do NOT want the zoning to change on my house! I bought a single family house in this area years ago and do not want it to change to a MD-4. It would most likely reduce the value of my house and I would not want to maintain all the time I have lived here. I'd not want to live next to multi units that would likely loom over my house, have increased density, more people, more noise, more trash, and more traffic. I would like to see the city with this plan would never change the zoning of their own home or property in this way! And I do not want it either. And neither do several of my neighbors.

Mark Hanson

3035 Sw Vermont Street

Portland OR

I am TOTALLY opposed to the zoning change. We DO NOT want our property to lose value by the proposed zoning change. We work very hard to keep our home and land in great condition. If zoning changes, it will be more difficult to sell our home to a potential single family home buyer because of the potential negative development next door of a towering multiplex. How can we expect a city council person vote to make this new zoning on their home property with the detriment of losing considerable value of their homes? Obviously not and we don't want this zoning change.

JASON TAND

2128 SE 12th Avenue

Portland OR

I am Jason Tand, property owner at 2128 SE 12th Avenue in Ladd's Addition. I received a notice of zoning changes that will directly affect my property and the surrounding area. As a resident of Ladd's Addition between Division and Hawthorne. As a resident of a nationally recognized historic district I am concerned that the proposed revisions make no attempt to protect the historic nature of the district. As other property owners and concerned members within the district, I request these proposed revisions be either further revised to allow for consideration of the historic nature of the district or eliminated from within and surrounding Ladd's Addition in their entirety.

Proposed increased density negatively impacts the fabric of a neighborhood that is intended to be preserved, not changed over time. By attempting to make dense development in Ladd's Addition is not only being compromised, it is being dismissed. This can also be said for the transitional zone between 11th and 12th avenues on the west side of 12th. This district is an Eastside Industrial District and residences to the east. This zone should be treated sensitively and respectfully for any added volume of residents. Already we are beginning to see a loss of open space for added apartment residents. Because there is no room to grow west into the industrial district, overflow is already being experienced within Ladd's Addition.

We must work together to protect our City's precious historic resources and these elements that make Portland a desirable home. If revisions must occur, propose opportunities with open space to promote livability. Limit density in these areas. Do not offer increases. It is all of our duties to promote zoning changes that dissuade development density of a nationally recognized historic district.

Kristin Tand

2128 SE 12th Avenue

Portland OR

Hello, my name is Kristin Tand and I am a property owner at 2128 SE 12th Ave. which is part of the Ladd's Addition neighborhood and also one of the properties that would be included in the rezoning.

One of my main concerns about the rezoning of this area is how densification will negatively impact a historic district which already addresses the goals that the Better Housing bylaw can be seen in Ladd's already established multi-family housing properties, community green spaces, how traffic patterns alleviate congestion throughout the district, and overall livability in Portland. It encompasses open spaces, a walkable neighborhood, and green elements such as tree canopy and rose gardens. All of this contributes to the overall wellbeing of the district and that if rezoning in and around Ladd's moves forward, many of these built-in components will be destroyed.

Additionally, the traffic on SE 12th has become extremely congested since the Light-rail/Train crossing modifications, causing much heavier traffic through and around Ladd's which further exacerbate the situation, creating grid-lock and pedestrian/bicycle safety issues in the area.

I would like to see how these issues would be addressed by the city before rezoning changes are put forward. Creating more density without thinking through the livability of the district through the process and think through long-term ramifications of how these changes will impact our district.

David Kube

4013 SE Cora St

Portland OR

Our home was built in 2013 as an infill project. It occupies the bulk of the lot with minimal wasted space, but still with green areas. The lot is graded so that there is minimal runoff and meets earthquake standards and is certified energy efficient. I presume all of these are what is desired by PSC for any new construction. The house was built in the Old PDX style to fit in with the neighborhood in this neighborhood are in zones that still include single home dwellings. There would be no good reason to rezone this property for a multiple home dwelling or apartment complex. Our lot is adjacent to a lower density zone on the west side of our property that will allow single family dwellings. I think that we more than meet qualifications to be included in the rezoning consideration in this matter.

Linda Engels

636 NE 61st Avenue

Portland OR

I would like to preface my comments by saying that I am a LEED Green Associate and I do understand the need for more housing and its importance to mass transportation.

Having said that, our block on 61st Ave. between Hoyt and Oregon and some of the surrounding streets are not a viable location for increased density. It is one thing to look at a map and say we need more density, but it is another to actually live there.

Because of our proximity to the MAX station at 60th Ave. we have people who go away for the weekend or on vacation and use our street for free parking. Also, the apartments on the block and those inhabitants park here as well. We never have our streets cleaned as there are always cars parked both sides of the street. The street is narrow, and if cars are badly parked, it causes traffic and recycling.

We have one car that we park in our garage, and use public transport. We would love to host a party, except only one car can fit in our driveway and there is never any street parking in our driveway.

Keeping the integrity of the neighborhood is also important and seems to be overlooked for the sake of density. The buildings at 1739 NE 45th are totally unsuited to the neighborhood. People who can or are willing to take public transportation is foolhardy.

It is my hope that you take into consideration some of these comments. I look forward to your response.

Susan Haywood

2146 NW Everett St

Portland OR

I see that these changes include new development standards, including REDUCED requirements for off-street parking. That you are allowing large buildings to be built without parking spaces where I live is mainly residential, we now need to pay for parking on the street, and my understanding is that not all tenants in these older buildings will be guaranteed a parking space. If a building, they expect to be able to park near their home. With the new buildings being built, the population density has increased so that there just isn't any parking. All new buildings should have parking so that the rest of us can find a parking space.

Although more green space is mentioned, so is the development standard of changes to building setbacks. What does this mean? Sidewalk up against the front entry? I would also like to see so the Alphabet District does not lose its charm. I object to 7-story buildings that will dwarf the historic buildings of this neighborhood. Although my building is a triplex, it is actually an old house. There is a building behind it that is at least 7 stories high; if that building were to be built, there would be no light left for my house. I think there should be a limit of how many tall buildings can be built when they impact the buildings already there. Only one side should lose its character to a gray climate.

David Beck

636 NE 61st Avenue

Portland OR

Although I see the need for increased density as a means of providing more housing, I don't trust that it will be done well.

A case in point is the development at 1739 NE 45th Ave, in which two SFRs have been replaced by two multi-family condo(?) units. The new buildings are totally out of character and the city planning department look at what was being proposed? And also went to the site to see the surroundings?

Buildings such as these make sense lining a major street, but to plop one down in the midst of a mature neighborhood is a disaster. What were they thinking? It's the antithesis of

What are you doing to ensure this is an unfortunate exception and not the norm?

Richard Shoemaker

211 Boas Rd

Duxbury MA

I object to the proposals for reduced parking as outlined in items 10 and 11. Despite Portland's public transportation options, most people still own cars, sometimes more than one. Increasing density clogs our already crowded streets and denigrates our neighborhoods. Streets like Tenino are only 3 lanes wide curb to curb, with parking on both sides due to our commercially zoned streets you have already created dangerous conditions for children, pedestrians and bicycles. It is also annoying to have to park two blocks away from your residence. The city must recognize this as a fact and require parking for new development

E. Delafield Spurgeon

1520 SW Montgomery St

Portland OR

I support the proposal on reducing the parking requirement in the new MD-C zone.

The proposed changes would allow me greater development flexibility and maximize the site's potential.