

Address	Comment	Email	Name	Comment ID	Date	District	Neighborhood
1817 SE Insley St	I don't think RH is a good fit for 5301-5313 SE 19th Ave. This site currently has 5 apartments on an approx. 10,000 site, which would calculate to an R2 equivalent. It's also about 150 feet from 6 lanes of vehicle exhaust and surrounded on 2 sides by industrial uses. R1 or R2 may be better.	zigsongs@gmail.com	Steve Szigethy	23111	9/15/2017	Southeast	Sellwood-Moreland Improvement League
1817 SE Insley St	I support the RH density, but many of us were really looking forward to the possibility of ground floor commercial to support the hundreds of units that are going in the surrounding blocks. We are in the middle of a retail desert, at least at walking distance. A zone that supports the RH residential density plus retail would be much preferred, such as CM2.	zigsongs@gmail.com	Steve Szigethy	23112	9/15/2017	Southeast	Sellwood-Moreland Improvement League
1817 SE Insley St	I support the RH density, but many of us were really looking forward to the possibility of ground floor commercial to support the hundreds of units that are going in the surrounding blocks. We are in the middle of a retail desert, at least at walking distance. A zone that supports the RH residential density plus retail would be much preferred, such as CM2.	zigsongs@gmail.com	Steve Szigethy	23113	9/15/2017	Southeast	Sellwood-Moreland Improvement League
425 S.E. 32nd Ave., Apt. #10	Laurelhurst Village is a care facility offering varying types and levels of care. Those employed by this facility have shifts which vary around the clock. A large number of these people park their cars on both the North and South sides of Stark Street from 30th Ave to 34th Ave. They also park on the first two blocks of 32nd Ave on both the east and west sides of the street. Often, little parking is available to residents. In this same block of 32nd Ave there exist two 10 unit apartment buildings and two single family homes (one of which is more of a boarding house) that have no off street parking. It is not uncommon for those who live on this street to go to work, go to school, go on daytime errands, or to appointments, only to return home and have to park 2 or 3 blocks away from our homes because of the employees who take up the majority of the available parking. With this proposed change, more employees will be required. Please ensure that this proposed plan includes sufficient employee parking to take these cars off the streets allowing neighborhood residents to park close to where they live.	cricketandchloe@q.com	Kathy Stroh	23114	9/16/2017	Southeast	Sunnyside
10301 N Oregonian AVE	Please keep the current buffer zoning in place. The neighborhood is currently residential. Eliminating a buffer zone will have unwanted impacts on the area. Please contact me to provide more details about this project and potential change. 503-956-6730.	blakeva4@gmail.com	Blake Robertson	23115	9/16/2017	North	St. Johns
8105 SE 86th Avenue	Will the conservation or protection overlays remain in place on the properties adjacent to ours? Will the industrial zoning of those properties remain the same? Will the Crystal Springs Boulevard right-of-way changes status? There are no addresses associated with much of the adjacent property making it difficult to determine their status.	brucebcox@gmail.com	Bruce B Cox	23171	9/18/2017	East	Lents

Hi,

Currently, the property in my backyard has an expiring permit for a 6 story 59 unit apartment complex. I bought my property knowing that this permit was expiring and that the zoning of the property in my backyard (5205 SE 18th Ave) was changing to R2.5. In other words, I bought my property knowing that there was not an active/feasible plan to develop my backyard into a high rise apartment complex. If there was a current feasible plan, then this requested zone change refinement would have been requested.

By unilaterally only keeping my backdoor neighbor as an RH zoned property, I would be at a steep loss on the resale of this property as my neighbor's property will be developed into high rise apartments in the years to come. I request that my property (5216 SE 17th Ave.) be kept within the RH zone as well so that I will not be greatly financially disadvantaged upon resale.

If this is not feasible, I request that the property to the east be kept (as it was stated to be for the last several months) to R2.5. I should not be punished because a developer could not get their stuff together in the time frames that everyone else has to follow.

Again, to reiterate, I think the easiest solution here would be to also keep my property in the RH zoning. I will actively follow this development and plan to call in later this week and to show up at the public hearing on October 24th. I look forward to hearing from you.

Thank you,
Ross Kelley

Parking is non-existent and with the new "Atomic Orchard" project approved to go in across the street with zero parking.
(<http://guerrilladev.co/atomic-orchard-experiment/>) The Pepsi project should be required to install underground parking. This development is not near major public transit and is across from an 86-unit complex.

5216 SE 17th

rosspkelley@gmail.com

Ross Kelley

23172 9/19/2017 Southeast

Sellwood-Moreland
Improvement
League

809 NE 25th AVE

patrick@rmed.com

Patrick Ferguson

24212 9/19/2017 Southeast Kerns

DO NOT REZONE TO CM3

The proposal to change this property into CM3 is wildly inappropriate for this location. It would put a 6-7 story building right up against residentially zoned houses. Not only would it cast an unforgiving shadow on neighbors to the north, but this massive building would jam up two-lane Fremont directly across from an Elementary School. CM2 zoning is not only more appropriate, but already a major density increase from its previous Alternative Density designation. I am a proponent of density, but CM3 in this location is way too aggressive. It is aggressive in expansion and size in such a way that will not benefit the neighborhood or the greater community. It is also aggressive and coy that the announcement of this proposal was merely whispered and presented quite late in the game.

I would like to add, furthermore, that neither the process of notification nor the spirit of transparency were conventionally observed in this proposal. Our neighborhood association was not informed of this change (we had to publicize and circulate this ourselves). It is also rather disappointing that we are getting notice of this only one month before an official meeting about it. This is a big deal--it's a huge change. It would be both conventional and civic to give more time to allow for discourse, education, and appropriate response. Have you listened to the neighbors of this property? Have you had the proper due diligence and vetting of the neighborhood association? I would suggest that you will well serve the community by listening to the community regarding this property and adjacent properties.

3538 n albina ave

kfreeny@gmail.com

kevin freeny

24311 9/25/2017 Northeast Boise

3445 NE 51st Ave

mjdbaldwin@yahoo.com

Michael De Mont

24312 9/26/2017 Northeast Rose City Park

I am the owner of an attractive, well maintained older apartment building at 1510 NE 45th Ave, on the corner of Halsey St. It has 10 apartments and 6 garages. I recently found out of the proposed plan to change the zoning of my property from RH to R1. At the location where I am, Halsey is a busy street with a lot of commercial buildings. Providence Health Center is directly opposite, a house next to hospital is zoned commercial and there are many RH zoned apartments and commercial stores very close by. Up 45th, away from Halsey there is a very large high density residential building and so on. The area is very likely to continue to get busier as the city expands. My apartment building is designed well, and the 10 units are at mostly 1 level. Given the growth of the area, the amount of commercial and RH zonings around the building and the future potential of increasing the size of the apartment complex skillfully and attractively, I would like to request of the commission that you continue to keep the buildings original designation of RH. In my view, given the location it makes little sense to decrease the zoning. Please respond to me on this. Thank you.

4630 SW 39th Drive

stephen@processconsulting.org

Stephen Schuitevoerder

24313 9/28/2017 Northeast Hollywood

DO NOT REZONE TO CM3. I want to echo the comment from 9/25. We discussed this at our 9/25 Boise Land Use & Transportation meeting and you can read the full notes here <http://bnapdx.com/land-use-and-transportation-committee/>. CM3 is not appropriate for this lot. It is on a PBOT-designated local street by a school. Williams and Mississippi are the appropriate places for this type of development. We already discussed the upzoning of this street, and this lot, last year at BNA when PBOT failed to inform us of this controversial change. We heard both sides of the issue and sent a balanced letter explaining both sides to PBOT. We are disappointed that PBOT and BDS failed to communicate anything to the neighborhood association that this decision was being revisited again.

1118 N. Beech
Street

katyewolf@gmail.com

Katy Wolf

24396 10/1/2017 Northeast Boise

comment is no longer in the comments section and so will add it in again.

I am the owner of 1510 NE 45th Avenue and was recently informed of a proposed zoning change from RH to R1 density. I was more than surprised by this proposal for the following reasons:

1. There is a high demand for housing in Portland and with projected increases in population this will only increase.
2. The area is filled with commercial and high-rise properties. My property is diagonally opposite a huge Providence building, the house opposite on Halsey Street is continuing to be RH, all along Halsey Street are high-rise buildings. Even on 45th Ave there are multi level buildings including a very large high-rise building which somehow is continuing to be RH.
3. My building is a 10 plex with 6 garages. With the proposed zoning it would not be in compliance as its not quite 10,000 sq feet. And yet it is a model building, probably the most attractive building in the area. You should check out the visuals of it. Its a courtyard complex with a nice courtyard, good size apartments... 3 of the 10 units are large studios of 450 sq feet and 7 are one bedroom units of 550 sq feet. My standard when I purchased them in 2011 was that I would only buy them if I could live in one comfortably, and I could. They are well designed and beautiful with wooden floors etc. They are mostly one level with the garages and one unit on a lower level underneath some of the units due to the slope of 45th Ave. I could easily build up one or two levels and add another 16 to 18 units and keep them equally attractive and much more so than many of the large buildings around.

Decreasing the zoning density of this property impacts the value and potential future value of the property without any apparent consistency to other properties close by. Further it does not seem consistent to managing city zoning for future growth, or ensuring that what is built fits in well with the environment. I wonder if the design of the building to ensure it fits in well with the environment is the issue here and if so whether this is a design standards issue rather than a limitation on how many units can be built on this particular property.

Thank you for considering my concerns. I am hopeful that you will continue to endorse this property as RH.

4630 SW 39th Drive

stephen@processconsulting.org

Stephen Schuitevoerder

24399 10/2/2017 Northeast Hollywood

Although I understand that Portland needs more housing units, this is not the place to put them for the following reasons:

1. It will impact the livability/character of the immediate neighborhood, characteristics that make Inner SE Portland desirable and unique.
2. A better use of the property would be a pocket park to accommodate the many new residents that fill the apartments/condos being built along Hawthorne and Belmont.
3. Though I'm assuming that the egress issue would be addressed as this is currently at the end of a dead end, traffic is a issue for this area already.
4. In general, the development such as a zoning change would bring about should be kept to thoroughfares such as Hawthorne, Belmont, 20th, 30th, etc.

2402 SE Main

wyckoff@easystreet.net

Laura Wyckoff

24403 10/6/2017 Southeast Buckman

Map Refinement Project Testimony Re: 1511 NE 45th Ave.

We have owned the Halsey Court Apartments at the NW corner of NE 45th Ave and Halsey St. since 1983. The property consists of a 10,291 sq. ft. lot improved with a well-maintained, 1930's era U-shaped apartment building surrounding a landscaped center courtyard. The building contains 3 two-bedroom apartments, 7 one-bedroom apartments, 1 daylight basement studio apartment, and 5 semi-basement garages. There is a paved driveway leading to 3 covered carport stalls and a small garden area along the north boundary.

Our situation is very similar to that of our across-the-street neighbor at 1510 NE 45th Ave. We have one more unit and a somewhat larger lot, but I believe our property also would become a non-conforming use under the proposed R1 classification. The owner of 1510 has already submitted a well-reasoned objection to the proposed refinement classification, so we will incorporate but not repeat his statements here. Instead, we want to emphasize the strategic advantages of this property for potentially higher density development in future years.

The corner at NE 45th and Halsey St is located as follows:

- 2 blocks east along Halsey from a west-bound I80 exit;
- 3 blocks east along Halsey from a major TriMet rail and bus stop
- an easy overpass on NE 39th plus 6 blocks east along Halsey from an exit from and entrance to eastbound I80
- approximately 7 blocks southeast along Sandy Blvd and Halsey from an entrance to west-bound I80

3550 SW Bond Ave
#808

This location obviously has great proximity to the existing transportation and retail hub of the Hollywood District, and close access to the Providence Medical Center. It seems clear to me that any plan refinement should provide for an

milo@ormseth.net

Milo E. Ormseth

24404 10/8/2017 Northeast Hollywood

area develop. A neighboring property is directly affected by the current map refinement project boundaries and I would like to share a few of my observations regarding the current zoning map and the future development of the corridor.

It is my impression that the specific zoning boundaries shown on the 2035 Comprehensive Plan are being driven by historical zoning, and 'conditional use allowances' as much or more than actual planning for the desired future development outcome. For example, looking at the zoning along N. Interstate Ave. between N. Killingsworth and N. Ainsworth Streets, there is discontinuity where a residential zone (RH) is used on both sides of the street (5603-5821 addresses on the west side and 5630-5726 addresses on the east side) whereas commercial or mixed-use zones (now CM) are used nearly continuously from Skidmore St. on the south end all the way up to Lombard St. on the north end.

More specifically, 5835 N. Interstate Ave. is zoned CM purportedly due to its current commercial use. 5835 N. Interstate Ave. is the only property on the entire block zoned CM; a single corner lot of approximately 4000 square feet zoned CM while the rest of the block is zoned RH. I do not believe the envisioned development on such an isolated lot could be expected to move toward the desired goals stated by CM zoning. Any future development project would more likely need a critical mass of at least 3 lots of this size to move forward. The CM zone allows for both commercial and residential. Residential use on the ground floor directly adjacent to the MAX line is less than desirable, and yet this stretch of N. Interstate remains zoned residential within the present proposal. Inversely, several portions of N. Maryland and N. Greenwich side streets are zoned commercial (CM) while exclusively used as residential as is supported by the narrow street infrastructure. Further, within these 2-3 blocks of residential zone along N. Interstate, there exists at least one property (5707 N. Interstate) zoned residential but used commercially—another indication of the primary and intended use along this transit corridor.

5821 N. Interstate
Ave.

I would greatly appreciate if the city would take another look at the reality of the urban environment along this stretch of N. Interstate Avenue between N.

dchemphill@yahoo.com

Dallas Hemphill

10/10/201
24411 7

North

Overlook

the existing approved CM2 zoning are already stretching the boundaries of what the residential properties to the north can bear. The city's own Mixed Use Zones Project document (<https://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/509165>) describes the existing CM2 zoning as "intended to ... complement the scale of surrounding residentially zoned areas." Whereas CM3 zoning is intended to be larger than those allowed in residential zones. As these properties directly adjoin several residential properties, the scale of CM3 is altogether inappropriate for this location.

The Boise-Eliot Neighborhood Association voted unanimously to oppose this rezoning and expressed deep frustration over the lack of process involving their input. They also expressed agreement that the already-approved CM2 brings enough density to this area.

Additionally, 30 residents who live very locally to this proposed rezoning have signed a petition in opposition, which will be presented in person to the Planning and Sustainability Commission.

This property currently houses contains L. Roy Gardens, a diverse low- income community which would almost certainly be displaced by development. This counters the city's own mission to provide inclusive mixed housing to its residents.

Although PBOT has recently declared Fremont St. to be a "collector street" in this area, the massive impact of the multiple developments already in progress in this area have yet to be studied. The close proximity of this property to Boise-Eliot elementary represents a potential significant thread to public safety once the resulting traffic impacts are realized.

The properties at 705 N Fremont and 815 N Fremont share southern property lines with the houses at 3519 & 3521 N Albina Ave., 3509 N Borthwick Ave., and 3548 N Albina Ave. lies directly across a small east-west alley from 3538 N Albina Ave. The

dave@dave-cole.com

David Cole

10/10/201
24414 7 Northeast Boise

the existing approved CM2 zoning are already stretching the boundaries of what the residential properties to the north can bear. The city's own Mixed Use Zones Project document (<https://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/509165>) describes the existing CM2 zoning as "intended to ... complement the scale of surrounding residentially zoned areas." Whereas CM3 zoning is intended to be larger than those allowed in residential zones. As these properties directly adjoin several residential properties, the scale of CM3 is altogether inappropriate for this location.

The Boise-Eliot Neighborhood Association voted unanimously to oppose this rezoning and expressed deep frustration over the lack of process involving their input. They also expressed agreement that the already-approved CM2 brings enough density to this area.

Additionally, 30 residents who live very locally to this proposed rezoning have signed a petition in opposition, which will be presented in person to the Planning and Sustainability Commission.

Although PBOT has recently declared Fremont St. to be a "collector street" in this area, the massive impact of the multiple developments already in progress in this area have yet to be studied. The close proximity of this property to Boise-Eliot elementary represents a potential significant threat to public safety once the resulting traffic impacts are realized.

The properties at 705 N Fremont and 815 N Fremont share southern property lines with the houses at 3519 & 3521 N Albina Ave., 3509 N Borthwick Ave., and lies directly across a small east-west alley from 3538 N Albina Ave. The construction of a building allowed to reach 6 or 7 stories in height immediately to the south of these residences would effectively constitute a de-facto condemnation of these properties, towering over them and blocking out the sun permanently. This construction would be ruinous to the owners and families living in these residences, causing financial and psychological hardship.

3548 N Albina Ave.

dave@dave-cole.com

David Cole

10/10/201
24415 7 Northeast Boise

The properties at 2438 to 2450 SE Main st should not be rezoned to R2. I'm opposed to the rezoning because of the effect it would have on the safety and livability of our neighborhood. This property is on a dead end street so more multiple housing units or apartments would cause too much traffic and congestion and the parking is already maxed out.

Increased density would also cause problems for emergency vehicles if there was a problem. This property should be only used for single family residences. This is a family neighborhood. I believe that increased density needs to be kept on the busy streets like Hawthorne and Belmont to act as a buffer and the neighborhoods between the busy high density corridors should be kept for affordable single family houses.

2443 SE Main st

cori.higgins@gmail.com

Cori Higgins

10/18/201
24428 7 Southeast Buckman