#### MUZ Group A. CM1 Low-Rise area zoning requests

In response to public concerns about the scale of new development, particularly in areas that form the nucleus of community commercial districts, staff proposed application of the CM1 zone in several designated neighborhood centers where existing development included a significant concentration of intact one and two-story commercial buildings. Isolated buildings and areas less than 2 blocks long (approximately 400 feet) were excluded.

PSC received some testimony from neighborhood associations, community organizations and individuals in support of the proposals, but also received a significant amount of testimony from property owners opposing the use of CM1 zoning in most Low-Rise areas. On May 24, 2016 PSC tentatively recommended amending the staff proposal and applying the CM2 zone to a smaller list of areas, excluding areas on larger streets, and areas where there was not local support. The following low-rise commercial areas were initially excluded:

- NE Alberta (NE 17<sup>th</sup> to 19<sup>th</sup>)
- Roseway (NE Sandy from NE 67<sup>th</sup> to 70<sup>th</sup>, and around NE 72<sup>nd</sup>) •
- Parkrose (NE Sandy from NE 105<sup>th</sup> to 108<sup>th</sup>)

- Kerns (NE 28<sup>th</sup> from Burnside to NE Davis)
- SE Belmont (SE 33<sup>rd</sup> to east of 34<sup>th</sup>) •
- SE Hawthorne (SE 35<sup>th</sup> to 38<sup>th</sup>)
- SE Foster (SE 63<sup>rd</sup> to 67<sup>th</sup>)
- SE Woodstock (SE 44<sup>th</sup> to 47<sup>th</sup>)
- Montavilla (SE Stark from SE 78<sup>th</sup> to 81<sup>st</sup>)

The following were tentatively retained in the CM1 zone:

- SE Division (SE 35<sup>th</sup> to 37<sup>th</sup>)
- Sellwood (SE 13<sup>th</sup> from SE Harney to SE Nehalem) except at the Tacoma node
- Moreland (area around SE Milwaukie and Bybee)
- Multnomah Village (core area from east of SW 37<sup>th</sup> to 35<sup>th</sup>)

Since May 24, the PSC has received additional testimony from many people and organizations supporting the CM1 Low-rise proposal on SE Belmont. Also, staff received additional testimony from property interests in the Moreland area (Milwaukie and Bybee) and 1000 Friends of Oregon highlighting that this area is within ½ mile of a MAX station and therefore should be zoned CM2. Given testimony, and the tentative direction from PSC, staff has the following recommendations.

Ref #	Proposal Request	Location State ID	Who testified	Staff Recommendation	Rationale	Implications if the PSC were to make a different decision; Other notes	Consent Item?
1	CM1	Moreland	Property Owners; Owner Representatives; Community Members; Neighborhood Association; Organizations	Apply CM2	<ul> <li>The area at Bybee and Milwaukie is located within ½ mile of a MAX transit station.</li> <li>The area is currently zoned CS, and is developed with a number of low-rise commercial storefronts.</li> <li>Transit service and proximity to MAX make it an opportunity for transit oriented redevelopment.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>If CM1 is applied, new development will better match the scale of existing low-rise development.</li> <li>Development capacity for transit oriented development will be reduced.</li> </ul>	
2	CM1	Sellwood	Community Members; Neighborhood Association; Property Owners	Apply CM2 at Tacoma and north.	<ul> <li>The PSC recommended applying CM2 at the node of SE 13<sup>th</sup> and Tacoma.</li> <li>Applying CM2 to only Tacoma-fronting properties keeps much of the low-rise proposal intact, but does not respond to other zone change requests between Tacoma and Nehalem. It also leaves less than 400 linear feet of low-rise area intact.</li> <li>Staff recommends rezoning to CM2 north of Tacoma in recognition of an existing 4-story building and the lack of low-rise continuity in this area. See related requests Group C, Items 4-8.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>If CM1 is applied, new development will better match the scale of existing low-rise development.</li> <li>There is a 4-story mixed use building north of Tacoma that will be nonconforming in the CM1 zone.</li> </ul>	

Ref #	Proposal	Request	Location	State ID Who testified	Staff Recommendation	Rationale	Implications if the PSC were to make a different decision; Other notes	Consent Item?
3	CM1		Belmont	Community Members (50 Neighborhood Association Property Owners		<ul> <li>The area on Belmont street is characterized by several low-rise commercial buildings.</li> <li>A significant amount of community testimony has been recently received expressing concern about CM2 height allowances, and supporting the application of the CM1 zone.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Applying CM2 will allow larger scale development.</li> </ul>	
4	CM1		Division	Community Members; Organizations	Affirm CM1 – tentative PSC decision	• The PSC tentatively included Division in the group of low-rise storefront areas where the CM1 zone would be applied, pending discussion of Division Design Initiative.	<ul> <li>Applying CM2 will allow larger scale development.</li> <li>Division will potentially be the location of future transit improvements designed to increase capacity. Planned stops include 34<sup>th</sup> and Chavez. A stop at 30<sup>th</sup> has been suggested in outreach discussions.</li> </ul>	
5	CM1		Multnomah	Community Members; Neighborhood Association	Affirm CM1 – tentative PSC decision	• The PSC tentatively recommended applying the CM1 zone.	<ul> <li>Applying CM2 will allow larger scale development.</li> <li>Applying CM1 will limit the scale of new development.</li> </ul>	V

### MUZ Group B. CM2 Zoning requests for groups of properties

The PSC received testimony from individual community members and property owners requesting a change from the proposed CM1 zone to CM2 zone. PSC also received testimony from other stakeholders, some of which opposed requested changes or supported other positions. The locations of these requests are generally at small mixed use nodes, or at the edges of centers, but are not part of the Low-rise Commercial Storefront proposal.

Generally, CM1 was applied to small mixed use nodes that are not in centers or part of continuous mixed use corridors, while CM2 was applied more broadly along many corridors and in many centers. In considering these requests, the commission should refer to the CM2 purpose statement, which mentions availability of frequent transit as a factor in where CM2 is appropriate. In addition, the Comprehensive Plan designation is relevant. For locations with a dispersed comp plan designation, CM2 is not an allowed zone.

Ref #		Request	Location re supported by sta	State ID	Who testified	Staff Recommendation	Rationale	Implications if the PSC were to make a different decision; Other notes	Consent Item?
1	CM1	CM2	N Alberta and Williams	multiple	Property Owners; Representatives; Organizations	Apply CM2	<ul> <li>The area at N Alberta and N Williams is located in an area that has adequate infrastructure, and is well served by transit.</li> <li>The surrounding zoning in this area is generally R1 which allows 45' buildings.</li> <li>Nearby to the south, the Williams corridor is zoned CM3, and has been an area of significant development activity.</li> <li>The characteristics of the CM2 zone suggest it is appropriate for this type of location.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>If CM1 is applied, there is less opportunity for larger-scale development in this area.</li> <li>Applying CM2 will include rezoning of some adjacent properties in the area to CM2.</li> </ul>	V
2	CM1	CM2	NE 30 <sup>th</sup> and Killingsworth	multiple	Property Owners; Representatives; CM1: Community Members; Neighborhood Association	Apply CM2	<ul> <li>The area at NE 30<sup>th</sup> and Killingsworth is a small node of one- and two-story older buildings</li> <li>The area is currently zoned CS.</li> <li>A site at the NE corner is currently planned for a 4-story development.</li> <li>The surrounding zoning is primarily R2.5 (35'), with R2 (40') along Killingsworth to the west.</li> <li>This location is served by transit Line 72.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>If CM1 is applied, there is less opportunity for larger-scale development in this area, and new development has potential to be much larger than existing development.</li> <li>The neighborhood and other community members supported original staff propoosal of CM1, while property owners and some community members requested CM2 at this node.</li> </ul>	
3	CM1	CM2	NE 33 <sup>rd</sup> and Killingsworth	multiple	Community Member; Staff Proposal	Apply CM2	<ul> <li>The area at NE 33<sup>rd</sup> and Killingsworth is a significant node featuring grocery retailer and other community-oriented retail and services.</li> <li>The area is served by two transit lines.</li> <li>This would rezone properties currently proposed as CM1 to CM2.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>This proposal was addressed in oral testimony in the context of testimony on another location. Staff supports more intense zoning at this major intersection.</li> <li>Retaining CM1 allows less development potential than CM1 at this important node.</li> </ul>	

Ref #	Proposal	Request	Location	State ID	Who testified	Staff Recommendation	Rationale	Implications if the PSC were to make a different decision; Other notes	Consent Item?
								• The RTF requested CE on this site, but PSC agreed with staff that CE would not be appropriate.	
CM2	Zoning requ	ests that ar	e not supported by st	taff		1			
4		CM2	NE Fremont and 47 <sup>th</sup> area - several sites on north side street	multiple	Property Owners, Owner Representatives; Community Members; Neighborhood Association	Retain CM1	<ul> <li>The area along Fremont is currently a commercial (CS and CN2) and employment (EG1) zoned area on the north and primarily a residential zoned area on the south.</li> <li>Development is typically one- or two- story commercial buildings, but recent developments in the area include three and four-story mixed use buildings.</li> <li>The area has typical street infrastructure, but lacks frequent transit service.</li> <li>An irregular block pattern and a cemetery on the north may limit on-street parking opportunity.</li> <li>The BWNA expressed concern about larger developments allowed by CM2 due in part to lack of transit on the street.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>closer to NE 42<sup>nd</sup> Avenue where frequent bus service exists.</li> <li>Properties could later seek quasijudicial zone chganges to CM2 – approval may be partially dependent</li> </ul>	
5	CM1	CM2	NE 28th - Everett to Davis	multiple	Community Member	Retain CM1	<ul> <li>This area is currently R1. CM1 allows more intensity than R1, but less height.</li> <li>Quasi-judicial zone change is possible later.</li> </ul>	• CM2 would be upzone from the current R1.	$\checkmark$
6	CM1	CM2	SE Milwaukie Ave. from Center to Holgate	multiple	Community Member	Retain CM1	<ul> <li>This area is currently R1. CM1 allows more intensity than R1, but less height.</li> <li>Was proposed as part of recent Brooklyn station planning in area.</li> <li>Quasi-judicial zone change is possible later.</li> </ul>	• CM2 would be upzone from the current R1.	
7	CM1	CM2	E Holgate from SE 12th to Milwaukie	multiple	Community Member	Retain CM1	<ul> <li>This area is currently R1. CM1 allows more intensity than R1, but less height.</li> <li>Quasi-judicial zone change is possible later.</li> </ul>	• CM2 would be upzone from the current R1.	V
8	CE	CM2	Powell Blvd Ross Is to 35th	multiple	Community Member	Retain CE	• The zoning applied in the context of this area is proposed to be CE.	• Would require a more in-depth look at zoning pattern for surrounding area.	$\checkmark$
9	CE	CM2	Powell Blvd – RI Bridge to SE 17th	multiple	Community Member	Retain CE	• The zoning applied in the context of this area is proposed to be CE.		V
10	CM1	CM2	E Burnside at 157th	multiple	Property Owner	Retain CM1	• The Comprehensive Plan Map designation for these properties is Mixed Use- Dispersed, which does not allow application of the CM2 zone.		

Ref #	Proposal	Request	Location	State ID	Who testified	Staff Recommendation	Rationale	Implications if the PSC were to make a different decision; Other notes	Consent Item?
							<ul> <li>The plan would allow the CE zone, however the site and CE zone characteristics are not well matched.</li> </ul>		
							<ul> <li>E Burnside and 157<sup>th</sup> is located in an area that has significant infrastructure, about five blocks from a MAX station.</li> </ul>		

### MUZ Group C: Other CM2 zoning requests on specific properties

This is a list of miscellaneous CM2 zone change requests from throughout the city.

Location

Ref #

Proposal

Request

The PSC received testimony from individuals, property owners, and others requesting that the CM2 zone be applied to specific properties and broader areas. In addition to these requests, much of the remaining testimony requesting CM2 zoning was in support of the application of CM2 in low-rise commercial storefront areas. These items are not included in this table, as PSC has already considered this topic and suggested a direction, and issues that emerged in Composite Map testimony are covered in Topic 1.

State ID

1N1E09AD 500

Generally, CM2 is applied on corridors and in centers where good transit service exists. In considering these requests, the commission should refer to the CM2 purpose statement, which mentions availability of frequent transit as a factor in where CM2 is appropriate. In addition, the Comprehensive Plan designation is relevant. For locations with a dispersed comp plan designation, CM2 is not an allowed zone.

Where the request is for a change from CM3 to CM2, the commission should consider the CM3 purpose statement. The CM3 zone is intended for sites in high-capacity transit station areas, in town centers, along streetcar alignments, along civic corridors, and in locations close to the Central City. The CM3 zone is not appropriate for sites where adjacent properties have single-dwelling residential zoning.

1	CM1	CM2	SE 12 <sup>th</sup> and Madison; 1221 W/ SE MADISON	1S1E02BD 7800	Community Member	Apply CM2	<ul> <li>Appropriate to rezone to CM2 due to location near central city and adjacent zoning.</li> </ul>
2	CM1	CM2	2626 NE Dekum	1N1E13BC 14400	Property Owner	Apply CM2	<ul> <li>Adjacent to CI zoning - 75' height limit</li> <li>CI steps down to 45' – matches CM2 height</li> <li>CM2 steps down to adjacent R-zones.</li> <li>Served by two transit lines.</li> </ul>
3	CM2	CM2	7953-7961 SE 13TH AVE	1S1E23CA 11800	Owner/Representative	Apply CM2	Proposed to be CM2.
4	CM1	CM2	8112 SE 13TH AVE	1S1E23CD 1900	Owner/Representative	Apply CM2	• Proposed to be CM2 as part of PSC revisions on Sellwood lowrise area: Group A-2.
5	CM1	CM2	8071 SE 13TH AVE	1S1E23CD 13900 1S1E23CD 13800	Owner/Representative	Apply CM2	• Proposed to be CM2 as part of PSC revisions on Sellwood lowrise area: Group A-2.
6	CM1	CM2	8065 SE 13TH AVE	1S1E23CD 14900	Owner/Representative	Apply CM2	<ul> <li>Area is in Sellwood Low-rise area: Group A-2</li> <li>Located north of Tacoma – staff supports CM2 in this area due to existing 4-story building between Spokane and Nahalem.</li> </ul>
7	CM1	CM2	8012 SE 13th Avenue	1S1E23CA 7300	Owner/Representative	Apply CM2	<ul> <li>Area is in Sellwood Low-rise area: Group A-2</li> <li>Located north of Tacoma – staff supports CM2 in this area due to existing 4-story building between Spokane and Nahalem.</li> </ul>
8	CM1	CM2	8002 SE 13TH AVE	1S1E23CA 7200	Owner/Representative	Apply CM2	<ul> <li>Area is in Sellwood Low-rise area: Group A-2</li> <li>Located north of Tacoma – staff supports</li> </ul>

**BPS** staff proposal

Who testified

Staff

Recommendation

Rationale

CM2 in this area due to existing 4-story building between Spokane and Nahalem.

• This is a staff correction

Mixed Use Zones Project - Map Requestrs

9

IG2

CM2

1935 N Argyle

Apply CM2

Implications if the PSC were to make a different decision; Other notes	Consent Item?
<ul> <li>CM1 would offer less development potential.</li> </ul>	$\checkmark$
• CM1 would offer less development potential, but would be more consistent with conversion table.	
	$\checkmark$
• CM1 would offer less development potential, but height limits are more consistent with existing scale.	See A.2
• CM1 would offer less development potential, but height limits are more consistent with existing scale.	See A.2
<ul> <li>Retaining CM1 would maintain more Low-rise designated area in Sellwood.</li> </ul>	See A.2
• Retaining CM1 would maintain more Low-rise designated area in Sellwood.	See A.2
• Retaining CM1 would maintain more Low-rise designated area in Sellwood.	See A.2
	$\checkmark$

Ref #	Proposal	Request	Location	State ID	Who testified	Staff Recommendation	Rationale
10	R1	CM2	2627-2629 N LOMBARD ST	1N1E09CD 19500	BPS staff proposal	Apply CM2	• Existing Commercial use in an R1 zone on a civic corridor.
11	CM3	CM2	NW Alphabet District	multiple	Neighborhood Association; Community Members	Apply CM2	• Apply CM2 in support on NW Plan and in historic district where CM3 presents conflict with district.

## CM2 Zoning requests that are not supported by staff

12	CM1	CM2	60TH & SE BELMONT ST	1S2E06AA 6400	Owner/Representative	Retain CM1	• Staff does not support this request due to traffic issues at the intersection.
13	CE	CM2	4764 SE MILWAUKIE AVE (near Holgate)	1S1E14AB 3200	Property Owner	Retain CE	• The zoning applied in the context of this site is proposed to be CE.
14	CM1	CM2	7409-7411 SW Capitol Hwy	1S1E20AC 18900	Owner/Representative	Retain CM1	• This property is in an area of CM1 zoning just outside of Multnomah Village on Capitol.
15	CM2/R2.5	CM2	7983-7987 SE 13TH AVE	1S1E23CA 9900	Owner/Representative	Retain CM2/R2.5	Cannot rezone entire lot CM2 because of Comprehensive Plan designations.
16	R1	CM2	7401 N Albina	1N1E15BA 15200	Owner	Apply CM1	<ul> <li>CM1 corresponds with adopted Mixed Use- Dispersed designation.</li> <li>CM1 will ensure that building is a conforming use and provides flexibility of existing uses.</li> <li>CM1 allows a FAR of 1.5:1, which provides more generous density allowance than existing R1 zone.</li> </ul>

	plications if the PSC were to make a Ferent decision; Other notes	Consent Item?
•	Retaining R1 would result in a nonconforming use.	
•	Applying CM3 continues issue of conflict between zoning allowances and historic district.	
•	CM2 would allow larger scale development and potentially increase traffic issues at this node.	
•	Applying CM2 would likely require a more in-depth look at zoning pattern for this lot and surrounding properties.	
•	Applying CM2 would be out of zoning context.	
•	Could result in need to consider other zone changes.	
•	CM2 would allow significantly more intensity than R1 at node.	

#### MUZ Group D: CM3 zoning requests

The PSC received testimony from individuals and groups of property owners requesting a change from the proposed CE, CM2 or EG1 zone to the CM3 zone. The locations are typically at key nodes or areas that include several properties, but may also include single-property requests. This table reflects zoning requests from property owners, individuals and organizations. It does not include testimony/requests where the zoning as proposed matches the request.

Generally, CM3 replaces existing EX and CX zones. In considering these requests, the commission should refer to the CM3 zone purpose statement. The CM3 zone is intended for sites in high-capacity transit station areas, in town centers, along streetcar alignments, along civic corridors, and in locations close to the Central City. The CM3 zone is not appropriate for sites where adjacent properties have single-dwelling residential zoning. In addition, the Comprehensive Plan designation is relevant. The CM3 zone is not an allowed zone in Mixed Use-Neighborhood or Mixed Use-Dispersed Comprehensive Plan designations.

Ref #	Proposal	Request	Location	State ID	Who testified	Staff Recommendation	Rationale
СМЗ	Zoning req	uests that	are supported by sta	ıff			
1	CM2	CM3	2401 SW 4TH AVE and other property on block	1S1E04DD 1200; multiple properties	Owner/Representative	Apply CM3	<ul> <li>Staff supports CM3 in this urban location that is well served by transit.</li> <li>Close to Central City.</li> </ul>
2	CM2	CM3	MLK from Wygant to Ainsworth	Multiple Properties	Owner/Representative	Apply CM3 – at the corner node	<ul> <li>Staff supports CM3 in this urban location that is well served by transit.</li> <li>MLK is potential future streetcar line.</li> <li>CM3 is applied nearby and is a contextual zone.</li> </ul>
СМЗ	Zoning req	juests that	are not supported by	y staff			
3	CM2	CM3	1710 SE TACOMA ST; Tacoma and 17th	1S1E23DC 1100	Community Member	Retain CM2	<ul> <li>CM3 not appropriate for this Comp Plan designation (MU-N).</li> </ul>
4	CE	CM3	4534 SE MCLOUGHLIN BLVD	1S1E14BA 1000 and 1100	Owner/Representative	Retain CE	<ul> <li>Site is in area of CE zoning on McLoughlin.</li> <li>CM3 not appropriate for this Comp Plan designation (MU-N).</li> </ul>
5	CE	CM3	3318 SE 92ND AVE	1S2E09AC 1100	Property Owners	Retain CE	<ul> <li>This site is in the context of other CE zoning and near an ODOT interchange.</li> <li>Would require more analysis for more intense zone.</li> </ul>
6	RH	CM3	SE Morrison/14th	1S1E02BA 300	Owner/Representative	Retain RH	• This site has a Residential Comp Plan Designation.
7	CM2	CM3	722-740 N KILLINGSWORTH ST	1N1E22BA 1800	Property Owner	Retain CM2	<ul> <li>The request is to rezone a 2-block area along Killingsworth.</li> <li>Not necessarily appropriate at this time, due to limited analysis of the impacts and implications.</li> <li>Could be an area for future CM3.</li> </ul>

Implications if the PSC were to make a different decision; Other notes	Consent Item?
<ul> <li>If zoned CM2, future rezone may be warranted.</li> <li>Applying CM3 may trigger other changes nearby.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>If CM2 is retained, future rezone may be warranted if streetcar is built.</li> </ul>	
Would be inconsistent with Comp     Plan.	$\checkmark$
<ul> <li>Would be inconsistent with Comp Plan.</li> </ul>	V
<ul> <li>Would need to consult with PBOT and ODOT about transportation issues.</li> </ul>	
Would be inconsistent with Comp     Plan.	$\checkmark$
• CM3 is much more development potential than CM2. Would require broader look at surrounding zoning in this area to see where zoning district should be drawn.	

Ref #	Proposal	Request	Location	State ID	Who testified	Staff Recommendation	Rationale	Implications if the PSC were to make a different decision; Other notesConsent Item?
8	CM2	СМЗ	3835 SE Powell	1S1E12DA 300	Property Owner	Retain CM2	<ul> <li>Not necessarily appropriate at this time, due to limited analysis of the impacts and implications.</li> <li>Could be an area for future CM3.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>CM3 allows much more development potential. Would require broader look at surrounding zoning in this area.</li> </ul>
9	CM2	СМЗ	3945-3975 SE POWELL BLVD	1S1E12AD 7900	Community Member	Retain CM2	<ul> <li>Not necessarily appropriate at this time, due to limited analysis of the impacts and implications.</li> <li>Could be an area for future CM3.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>CM3 allows much more development potential. Would require broader look at surrounding zoning in this area.</li> </ul>
10	CM2	СМЗ	1206 SE Belmont	1S1E02BA 3700	Owner/Representative	Retain CM2	<ul> <li>This site is in the context of other CM2 zoning in this area.</li> <li>This change would require more analysis and possibly a broader look at zoning in the area.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>CM3 would be a spot zone in a CM2 pattern east of SE 12<sup>th</sup>.</li> </ul>

### MUZ Group E: CM1 zoning requests

The PSC received testimony from organizations (NWDA), individuals and groups of property owners requesting a change from the proposed zone (CM2, or Residential) to the CM1 zone. The locations are at a combination of isolated sites and key nodes/areas that include several properties that are not part of the Low-Rise Commercial Storefront proposal. This table reflects zoning requests from property owners, individuals and organizations. It generally does not include testimony/requests where the zoning as proposed matches the request, nor does it include testimony/zoning requests regarding Low-Rise Commercial Storefront areas exclusively.

Generally, CM1 replaces existing CN1, CN2, and CO1 zones. It is applied in dispersed locations, in and around lowerdensity residential areas, and on neighborhood corridors and at the edges of centers. It may be applied in locations where transit service is limited or infrequent. It is also appropriate in locations where a collection of low-rise storefronts is predominant, or as a buffer between higher and lower density areas. In considering these requests, the commission should refer to the CM1 zone purpose statement.

Ref #	Proposal	Request	Location	State ID	Who testified	Staff Recommendation	Rationale	In di
CM1	Zoning re	quests tha	t are supported by	/ staff				
1	CM2	CM1	NW Thurman Corridor	Multiple properties	Neighborhood Association	Apply CM1	<ul> <li>Properties in this area are currently zoned CM, which limits commercial and requires residential uses.</li> <li>Conversion table designated CM2. However, character of most properties is residential. CM1 may be more appropriate C/MU zone.</li> </ul>	•
• C	M2 Zoning	requests	that are not suppo	orted by staff				
2	CM2	CM1 – apply more broadly	Multnomah Village – outside of Low- Rise Commercial areas	multiple	Community Members, Neighborhood Association	Retain CM2	<ul> <li>Multnomah Village is a neighborhood center, which suggests a medium-scale development. It also has transit service and acts as a civic hub for SW Portland.</li> <li>Much of the commercial land in Multnomah is currently zoned CS. The closest equivalent zone to CS in the MUZ proposal is CM2.</li> <li>The area in the core of the village is proposed to be CM1 as part of Low-Rise Storefront proposal. Further reduction in zoning potential is inconsistent with Comp Plan and growth capacity needs.</li> </ul>	•
3	CM2	CM1	2341 NW Quimby Street Unit 28	1N1E28CC 90028	Property Owner	Retain CM2	<ul> <li>Do not apply CM1; the zoning pattern in the area is CM2.</li> <li>The area has good transit and is already developed.</li> </ul>	•
4	CM2	CM1	1644-1648 SE REX ST; 1630 and 1631 SE Flavel; 1636 and 1632 SE Knapp	1S1E23AC 17600	Neighbor/ Community Member	Retain CM2	<ul> <li>The zoning context in this area is proposed as CM2.</li> <li>The area is along/near a neighborhood corridor.</li> </ul>	•

Mixed Use Zones Project - Map Requestrs

plications if the PSC were to make a fferent decision; Other notes	Consent Item?
This represents a reduction in residential development potential for these properties in terms of residential, but a slight increase in commercial.	
Applying CM1 would reduce development capacity in Multnomah/SW. Applying CM1 treats this center differently than most other neighborhood centers.	
CM1 zoning would be somewhat inconsistent with CM2 zoning pattern. CM1 provides less development potential than CM2.	
Change to CM1 would be inconsistent with the zoning context in the area. CM1 provides less development potential than CM2.	

Ref #	Proposal	Request	Location	State ID	Who testified	Staff Recommendation	Rationale Implications if the PSC we different decision; Other	
5	CM2	CM1	4929 SE HAWTHORNE BLVD	1S2E06BD 24300	Community Member	Retain CM2	<ul> <li>This site is adjacent to CM2 zoning.</li> <li>Transit service is good, and the area is within a center.</li> <li>Staff does not agree that a change to CM1 is appropriate in this context.</li> <li>This may create nonco situation.</li> </ul>	nforming
6	CM2	CM1	4439, 4515, 4315, and 4309 SE WOODSTOCK BLVD	Multiple	Community Member	Apply CM2 – per Low-rise storefront	<ul> <li>PSC tentatively supported CM2 in Woodstock as part of tentative decision on Low-Rise Storefront issue.</li> <li>Applying CM1 would re tentative PSC decision area.</li> </ul>	
7	CM2	CM1	Bridgeton	1N1E03BA 80000	Community Member	Retain CM2	<ul> <li>City Council directed a change to CM2 in Bridgeton with its actions on the Comprehensive Plan.</li> <li>Applying CM1 would b City Council direction f Comprehensive Plan p</li> </ul>	rom 🗹
8	CM1	Zone for Public Use	8801 N CHAUTAUQUA BLVD	1N1E08AD 3600	Owner Representative	Apply R7	<ul> <li>The existing use on site is most likely a CU. The proposed zone is R7 and the use would be allowed as a CU.</li> <li>If CM1 was applied, th be a CU.</li> </ul>	e use would still
9	CM1	CM1	3735-3739 SE HAWTHORNE BLVD	1S1E01AD 23900	Community Member	Apply CM2 – per Low-rise storefront	<ul> <li>PSC tentative direction on 5/24/16 to rezone Hawthorne Low-rise area to CM2.</li> <li>Applying CM1 would retentative PSC decision area.</li> </ul>	

#### MUZ Group F: CM1 nonconforming use sites and other special situations

The PSC received testimony from organizations (Irvington NA), individuals and groups of neighbors requesting that properties that are currently zoned Residential, but proposed to become Commercial/Mixed-Use, be limited in hours of operation and their ability to redevelop as multi-dwelling development, should they not include a commercial use.

Staff proposes to develop and apply a new Commercial-Residential zone (CR) to these properties rather than the CM1 zone. The CR zone would allow limited commercial use and limit residential development/density when commercial uses and development are not on-site. The zone would be applied to the sites outside of centers that were identified in testimony below, as well as other isolated commercial sites with Mixed Use – Dispersed Comprehensive Plan designations that are completely surrounded by Residential zoning. Staff recommends that this zone not be used on district collectors or major city traffic streets.

Ref #	Proposal	Request	Location	State ID	Who testified	Staff Recommendation	Rationale	Implications if the PSC were to make a different decision; Other notes	Consent Item?
CM1,	CR Zoning	; requests tl	hat are supported by	v staff					
1	CM1	Limit on hours and housing density	3029 SE 21ST AVE	1S1E11AD 2500	Adjacent Neighbor	Apply CR	• Use a new specialized zone to address issue created by transitioning nonconforming use to allowed use. Limit hours of operation and residential development potential when no Commercial use is provided.	s more development potential.	V
2	CM1	Limit on hours and housing density	SE Clinton at 34th	1S1E12AB 12500	Community Member	Apply CR	<ul> <li>Use a new specialized zone to address issue created by transitioning nonconforming use to allowed use. Limit hours of operation and residential development potential when no Commercial use is provided.</li> </ul>	s more development potential.	
3	CM1	Limit on hours and housing density	NE 15 <sup>th</sup> and Brazee	1N1E26DB 1400	Community Members, Adjacent Neighbors, Neighborhood Association	Apply CR	<ul> <li>Use a new specialized zone to address issue created by transitioning nonconforming use to allowed use. Limit hours of operation and residential development potential when no Commercial use is provided.</li> </ul>	s more development potential.	
4	CM1	n/a	9647 SE HAROLD ST	1S2E16AC 1200	Staff Proposal	Apply CR	Existing Nonconforming commercial use	Applying the CM1 zone would allow more development potential.	V
5	CM1	n/a	10729 SE HAROLD ST, 5435 SE 108TH AVE	1S2E15BD 9501,	Staff Proposal	Apply CR	Current low-intensity Commercial zone on a Neighborhood Collector or Local Street	• Applying the CM1 zone would allow more development potential.	V
6	CM1	n/a	4509 SE 128TH AVE	1S2E15BD 9502	Staff Proposal	Apply CR	Current low-intensity Commercial zone on a Neighborhood Collector or Local Street	• Applying the CM1 zone would allow more development potential.	$\checkmark$
7	CM1	n/a	11811 SE Harold	1S2E15AD 3100	Staff Proposal	Apply CR	Current low-intensity Commercial zone on a Neighborhood Collector or Local Street	• Applying the CM1 zone would allow more development potential.	$\checkmark$
8	CM1	n/a	11825 SE Harold	1S2E15AD 3200	Staff Proposal	Apply CR	Current low-intensity Commercial zone on a Neighborhood Collector or Local Street	Applying the CM1 zone would allow more development potential.	$\checkmark$
9	CM1	n/a	11833 SE Harold	1S2E15AD 3300	Staff Proposal	Apply CR	Existing Nonconforming commercial use	Applying the CM1 zone would allow more development potential.	V
10	CM1	n/a	7640 N JERSEY ST	1N1W12AD 3100	Staff Proposal	Apply CR	• Current low-intensity Commercial zone on a Neighborhood Collector or Local Street	• Applying the CM1 zone would allow more development potential.	V

Ref #	Proposal	Request	Location	State ID	Who testified	Staff Recommendation	Rationale
11	CM1	n/a	7700 N PENINSULAR AVE	1N1E09CD 6200	Staff Proposal	Apply CR	• Current low-intensity Commercial zone on a Neighborhood Collector or Local Street
12	CM1	n/a	3707 NE FREMONT ST	1N1E24DD 17700	Staff Proposal	Apply CR	Existing Nonconforming commercial use
13	CM1	n/a	4048-4060 NE 42ND AVE	1N2E19CB 15400	Staff Proposal	Apply CR	Existing Nonconforming commercial use
14	CM1	n/a	3734-3746 NE 42ND AVE	1N2E19CC 7600	Staff Proposal	Apply CR	Existing Nonconforming commercial use
15	CM1	n/a	5137 NE 60TH AVE	1N2E19CC 7600	Staff Proposal	Apply CR	• Current low-intensity Commercial zone on a Neighborhood Collector or Local Street
16	CM1	n/a	5250 NE HALSEY ST	1N2E31AB 11800	Staff Proposal	Apply CR	Existing Nonconforming commercial use
17	CM1	n/a	1988 SE LADD AVE	1S1E02DC 4900	Staff Proposal	Apply CR	Existing Nonconforming commercial use
18	CM1	n/a	4039 SE CLINTON ST	1S1E12AA 4200	Staff Proposal	Apply CR	Existing Nonconforming commercial use
19	CM1	n/a	2914 SE 52ND AVE	1S2E07AB 7100	Staff Proposal	Apply CR	Existing Nonconforming commercial use
20	CM1	n/a	3616 SE KNAPP ST	1S1E24AC 16900	Staff Proposal	Apply CR	Existing Nonconforming commercial use
21	CM1	n/a	6130 SE DUKE ST	1S2E19AA 400	Staff Proposal	Apply CR	• Current low-intensity Commercial zone on a Neighborhood Collector or Local Street
22	CM1	n/a	304 SE 28TH AVE	1N1E36CC 4100	Staff Proposal	Apply CR	Existing Nonconforming commercial use
23	CM1	n/a	5206 SW CUSTER ST, 5212-5216 SW CUSTER ST	1S1E19AC 10200, 1S1E19AC 10100	Staff Proposal	Apply CR	• Current low-intensity Commercial zone on a Neighborhood Collector or Local Street
24	CM1	n/a	5435 SW TAYLORS FERRY RD	1S1E30AC 20100	Staff Proposal	Apply CR	• Current low-intensity Commercial zone on a Neighborhood Collector or Local Street
25	CM1	n/a	1103 SW TAYLORS FERRY RD	1S1E21DC 10700	Staff Proposal	Apply CR	• Current low-intensity Commercial zone on a Neighborhood Collector or Local Street
26	CM1	n/a	6501 SE 65TH AVE	1S2E20BB 4900	Staff Proposal	Apply CR	Current low-intensity Commercial zone on a Neighborhood Collector or Local Street

# CM1/CR Zoning requests that are not supported by staff

27	CM1	Limit on hours and	1532-1540 SE CLINTON ST	1S1E11AB 8700	Adjacent Neighbor	Retain CM1	•	Adjacent to R1 zoning in the area.
		housing						
		density						

	plications if the PSC were to make a ferent decision; Other notes	Consent Item?
•	Applying the CM1 zone would allow more development potential.	V
•	Applying the CM1 zone would allow more development potential.	$\checkmark$
•	Applying the CM1 zone would allow more development potential.	V
•	Applying the CM1 zone would allow more development potential.	$\checkmark$
•	Applying the CM1 zone would allow more development potential.	$\checkmark$
•	Applying the CM1 zone would allow more development potential.	V
•	Applying the CM1 zone would allow more development potential.	V
•	Applying the CM1 zone would allow more development potential.	V
•	Applying the CM1 zone would allow more development potential.	$\checkmark$
•	Applying the CM1 zone would allow more development potential.	$\checkmark$
•	Applying the CM1 zone would allow more development potential.	$\checkmark$
•	Applying the CM1 zone would allow more development potential.	$\checkmark$
•	Applying the CM1 zone would allow more development potential.	V
•	Applying the CM1 zone would allow more development potential.	V
•	Applying the CM1 zone would allow more development potential.	V
•	Applying the CM1 zone would allow more development potential.	V
•	If CR zone was applied, it would be applied in an area that is zoned for more intense multi-dwelling development.	

Ref #	Proposal	Request	Location	State ID	Who testified	Staff	Rationale
						Recommendation	
28	CM1	CM1 – require retail; Limit on hours and housing density	2855 SW Patton Rd	1S1E08AA 13200	Community Members	Retain CM1	<ul> <li>Size limits of CR not appropriate.</li> <li>Lot size may be larger than appropriate for CR zone application.</li> <li>Existing conditional of approval provide limitations on the site.</li> </ul>

Implications if the PSC were to make a different decision; Other notes	Consent Item?
<ul> <li>The CR zone would over-restrict size of retail uses on this community- serving site.</li> </ul>	

#### **MUZ Group G: CE zoning requests**

The PSC received testimony from businesses (Fred Meyer, Safeway/Albertsons, U-Haul, Starbucks, McDonalds, Space-Age Fuel, others), property owners (Bitar, Angel, others), and organizations (Retail Task Force) requesting the CE zone in order to provide opportunity for large-scale retail uses such as grocery stores, drive-through facilities associated with uses (restaurants, banks, pharmacies, etc.), and Quick Vehicle Servicing uses (gas stations, car washes, lubrication facilities, etc.). PSC also received testimony from other individual property owners requesting the CE zone. This table captures that testimony. It may not reflect multiple pieces of testimony repeating similar themes or requests. At the PSC meeting on July 26, 2016, PSC reviewed thematic maps presented by staff showing areas where CE zoning is generally supported by staff. Staff recommended a limited application for additional CE, primarily outside of inner ring districts and identified centers. Staff generally did not support requests for CE within centers. Staff also recommended against broader conversion of dispersed CM1 and CM2 nodes located on major streets to CE.

The PSC supported the staff recommendation to apply CE zoning to a limited number of sites as shown on Map 6.1.B as shown on 7/26/16, amended to remove the Hollywood West Fred Meyer site and the Cully Albertsons site. It also concurred with the staff recommendation to not apply CE zoning in Centers and to continue to limit application of CE zoning outside of designated centers. The table below recommends zoning outcomes that reflect PSC direction on this issue. Items are marked as consent, based on this prior PSC direction.

Ref #	Proposal	Request	Location	State ID	Who testified	Staff Recommendation	Rationale	Implications if the PSC were to make a different decision; Other notes	Consent Item?
CE Zo	oning requ	ests that a	re supported by staff						
1	CM2	CE	12920 SE STARK ST	1S2E02BA 12400	Property Owner, Owner/Representative	Apply CE	• PSC direction 7/26/16 work session. Site is at edge of a neighborhood center and could be zoned CE. Zoning context is mostly CM2.	<ul> <li>CM2 offers more housing potential than CE and limits some auto- accommodating and other uses.</li> <li>May need to broaden the CE rezone proposal to make a consistent zoning pattern.</li> </ul>	V
2	CM2	CE	NE Glisan and 67 <sup>th</sup>	Multiple lots 1N2E32BC 8000 1N2E32BC 8100 1N2E32BC 8001	Business Operator; Owner/Representative; RTF/ICSC	Apply CE	• PSC direction from 7/26/16 work session	<ul> <li>CM2 offers more housing potential than CE and limits some auto- accommodating and other uses.</li> </ul>	V
3	CM2	CE	N Lombard and Polk	Multiple lots	RTF/ICSC	Apply CE	• PSC direction from 7/26/16 work session. This site is outside a town center.	• CM2 offers more housing potential than CE and limits some auto-accommodating and other uses.	V
4	CM2	CE	12217 SE FOSTER RD	1S2E14CC 4200	Owner/Representative	Apply CE	• This node includes CE zoning and intersection may be appropriate for CE. Zoning context supports CE.	<ul> <li>CM2 offers more housing potential than CE and limits some auto- accommodating and other uses.</li> </ul>	V
5	CM1	CE	SE Chavez and Schiller	1S1E13AA 13200 Multiple lots	RTF/ICSC	Apply CE	<ul> <li>Outside of center. PSC direction from 7/26/16 work session.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>CM1 offers less development potential than CE and limits some auto- accommodating and other uses.</li> </ul>	
6	CM1	CE	SE Division and 136 <sup>th</sup>	Multiple lots 1S2E11AB 200	Owner/Representative; RTF/ICSC	Apply CE	• Outside of center. PSC direction from 7/26/16 work session.	<ul> <li>May need to broaden the rezone proposal to make a consistent zoning pattern.</li> <li>CM1 offers less development potential than CE and limits some auto- accommodating and other uses.</li> </ul>	

Mixed Use Zones Project - Map Requestrs

Ref #	Proposal	Request	Location	State ID	Who testified	Staff Recommendation	Rationale	
7	CM1	CE	2335 SE 162ND AVE	1S2E01DD 12100	Property Owner	Apply CE	<ul> <li>PSC direction from 7/26/16. Zoning context is CE and property was zoned CG.</li> <li>Also change to CE: 2343 SE 162ND AVE</li> </ul>	•
8	CE	CE	16431 SE FOSTER RD	1S3E19BB 500	Property Owner, Owner/Representative	Apply CE	• The proposed zoning is CE.	•
9	CE	CE	3830 SE 82	1S2E09CB 3400	Owner/Representative	Apply CE	• The proposed zoning is CE.	•
10	CE	CE	4442 SE 28TH PL	1S1E12CC 11600	Owner/Representative	Apply CE	• The proposed zoning is CE.	•
11	CE	CE	6850 N LOMBARD ST	1N1E07B 300	Business Operator; Owner/Representative	Apply CE	• The proposed zoning is CE.	•
12	CE	CE	14700 SE Division	1S2E12 101	Business Operator; Owner/Representative	Apply CE	• The proposed zoning is CE.	•
13	CE	CE	12055 N CENTER AVE	2N1E34C 606 2N1E34C 605	Owner/Representative	Apply CE	• The proposed zoning is CE.	•
14	CE	CE	9100 SE POWELL BLVD	1S2E09CA 400	Owner/Representative	Apply CE	• The proposed zoning is CE.	•
15	CE	CE	5482 SW BEAVERTON HILLSDALE HWY	1S1E18AC 2000	Owner/Representative	Apply CE	• The proposed zoning is CE.	•
16	CE	Concern about zoning impacts and allowance	5851 SE FOSTER RD	1S2E07DD 18200	Property Owner	Apply CE	• The proposed zoning is CE.	•
17	CM2	CE	6408 N LOMBARD ST	1N1E07AC 7500	Property Owner, Owner/Representative	Apply CE	<ul> <li>This site was not on the initial Map 6.1.B list PSC considered, but staff supports this request.</li> <li>The site is on an arterial street and outside of a center; adjacent to other CE zoned areas.</li> </ul>	•
18	CE	CE and CM1	1208 SE BOISE ST	1S1E11CD 4900	Property Owner, Owner/Representative	Apply CE and CM1	<ul> <li>This proposal involves zoning revisions to a site currently zoned CG.</li> <li>Provides certainty and scale for neighborhood.</li> </ul>	•

## CE Zoning requests that are not supported by staff

19	CE	CE	3030 NE WEIDLER ST	1N1E36B 100	Business Operator; Owner/Representative	Apply CM2	•	PSC direction on 7/26/16: do not apply CE in designated centers. Inner ring. PSC recommended CM2.
----	----	----	--------------------	-------------	--	-----------	---	---

	plications if the PSC were to make a fferent decision; Other notes	Consent Item?
•	CM1 offers less development potential than CE and limits some auto- accommodating and other uses.	V
•	May interrupt CE zoning pattern.	$\overline{\mathbf{A}}$
•	May interrupt CE zoning pattern.	$\checkmark$
•	May interrupt CE zoning pattern.	$\checkmark$
•	May interrupt CE zoning pattern.	V
•	May interrupt CE zoning pattern.	$\checkmark$
•	May interrupt CE zoning pattern.	$\checkmark$
•	May interrupt CE zoning pattern.	$\checkmark$
•	May interrupt CE zoning pattern.	V
•	May interrupt CE zoning pattern.	
•	CM2 offers more housing potential than CE and limits some auto- accommodating and other uses.	V
•	Possibility of incompatible uses if CE is applied to entire site.	V
•	PSC specifically called for CM zoning on this site. CE would allow new auto- accommodating uses and development.	V

Ref #	Proposal	Request	Location	State ID	Who testified	Staff Recommendation	Rationale	Implications if the PSC were to make a different decision; Other notes	Consent Item?
20	EG2	CE or CM2	2818 NE 82ND AVE	1N2E28BC 400	Community Members; Owner/Representative	Retain EG2	<ul> <li>Comprehensive Plan is Mixed Employment.</li> <li>CE and CM2 are not allowed zones in the designation.</li> </ul>	• Would need to amend Comprehensive Plan to a Mixed Use designation.	V
21	EG2	CE	8011 NE MLK	1N1E10DA 3400	Owner/Representative	Retain EG2	• Comprehensive Plan is Mixed Employment. CE is not an allowed zone.	• Would need to amend Comprehensive Plan to a Mixed Use designation.	$\checkmark$
22	EG1	CE	1612 SE HOLGATE BLVD	1S1E14AB 900	Community Member	Retain EG1	• Comprehensive Plan is Mixed Employment. CE is not an allowed zone.	• Would need to amend Comprehensive Plan to a Mixed Use designation.	$\checkmark$
23	СХ	CE	1831 W BURNSIDE ST	1N1E33DB 6800	Owner/Representative	Retain CX	• This site is in the Central City. CE is not an appropriate zone for this location.	<ul> <li>CE would be a significant downzone, and inconsistent with Central City Plans.</li> </ul>	V
24	СМЗ	CE	7404 N INTERSTATE AVE	1N1E15BB 10600	Business Operator; Owner/Representative	Retain CM3	<ul> <li>PSC direction: do not apply CE in designated centers. In the Kenton-Lombard Neighborhood Center.</li> <li>Adjacent to MAX; Interstate Plan District.</li> <li>Currently zone EXd.</li> </ul>	• CE would allow new auto- accommodating uses and development in a center.	V
25	CM3	CE	5253 SE 82ND AVE	1S2E17AD 600	Business Operator; Owner/Representative	Retain CM3	<ul> <li>PSC direction: do not apply CE in designated centers. Lents Town Center.</li> <li>Currently zone is EXd.</li> </ul>	• CE would allow new auto- accommodating uses and development in a center.	V
26	CM3	CE	5615 SE 82ND AVE	1S2E17DA 1800	Owner/Representative	Retain CM3	• PSC direction: do not apply CE in designated centers. Lents Town Center.	• CE would allow new auto- accommodating uses and development in a center.	V
27	CM3	CE	221 NE 122ND AVE	1N2E34DA 103	Owner/Representative	Retain CM3	<ul> <li>PSC direction: do not apply CE in designated centers. 122<sup>nd</sup>/Hazelwood Center.</li> <li>Near MAX transit station.</li> <li>Current zoning is CXd.</li> </ul>	• CE would allow new auto- accommodating uses and development in a center.	V
28	CM3	CE	8410 SE FOSTER RD	1S2E16CB 8800	Property Owner, Owner/Representative	Retain CM3	<ul> <li>PSC direction: do not apply CE in designated centers. Lents Town Center.</li> <li>Current zoning is EXd.</li> </ul>	• CE would allow new auto- accommodating uses and development in a center.	V
29	CM2	CE	3805 SE HAWTHORNE BLVD	1S1E01AD 22600	Business Operator; Owner/Representative	Retain CM2	• PSC direction: do not apply CE in designated centers. Hawthorne-Belmont-Division neighborhood center.	• CE would allow new auto- accommodating uses and development in a center.	V
30	CM2	CE	7555 SW BARBUR BLVD	1S1E21AC 3100	Business Operator; Owner/Representative	Retain CM2	<ul> <li>PSC direction: do not apply CE in designated centers. Hillsdale town center.</li> <li>Transit station; surrounding area zoning.</li> </ul>	• CE would allow new auto- accommodating uses and development in a center.	V
31	CM2	CE	10050 SW BARBUR BLVD	1S1E29CB 3500	Owner/Representative	Retain CM2	<ul> <li>PSC direction from 7/26/16 work session: do not apply CE in designated centers. West Portland town center.</li> <li>M-overlay; surrounding zoning context; future MAX.</li> </ul>	• CE would allow new auto- accommodating uses and development in a center.	V
32	CM2	CE	5920 NE M L KING BLVD	1N1E14CC 1800	Owner/Representative	Retain CM2	• PSC direction from 7/26/16 work session: do not apply CE in designated centers. Alberta-Killingsworth Neighborhood Center.	• CE would allow new auto- accommodating uses and development in a center.	V

Ref #	Proposal	Request	Location	State ID	Who testified	Staff Recommendation	Rationale	Implications if the PSC were to make a different decision; Other notes	Consent Item?
33	CM2	CE	8336 WI/ N IVANHOE ST	1N1W12AB 4900 1N1W12AB 6200	Owner/Representative	Retain CM2	• PSC direction from 7/26/16 work session: do not apply CE in designated centers. St Johns Town Center.	• CE would allow new auto- accommodating uses and development in a center.	V
34	CM2	CE	5850 NE PRESCOTT ST	1N2E19DA 11500	Owner/Representative	Retain CM2	<ul> <li>PSC direction from 7/26/16 work session: do not apply CE in designated centers. Cully Neighborhood Center.</li> <li>PSC recommended CM2.</li> </ul>	• CE would allow new auto- accommodating uses and development in a center.	V
35	CM2	CE	6901 NE SANDY BLVD	1N2E29BA 202	Owner/Representative	Retain CM2	<ul> <li>PSC direction from 7/26/16 work session: do not apply CE in designated centers. Roseway Neighborhood Center.</li> <li>Transit service; zoning context.</li> </ul>	• CE would allow new auto- accommodating uses and development in a center.	V
36	CM2	CE	3940 WI/ SE POWELL BLVD	1S1E12DA 3400	Owner/Representative	Retain CM2	<ul> <li>PSC direction from 7/26/16 work session: do not apply CE in designated centers. Powell- Creston Neighborhood Center.</li> <li>Zoning context.</li> </ul>	CE would allow new auto- accommodating uses and development in a center.	V
37	CM2	CE	4515 SE WOODSTOCK BLVD	1S2E18CB 14000	Owner/Representative	Retain CM2	<ul> <li>PSC direction from 7/26/16 work session: do not apply CE in designated centers. Woodstock Neighborhood Center.</li> <li>Transit; zoning context.</li> </ul>	• Rezoning to CE would contradict the owner's and neighborhood request to rezone to CM2. Would allow new auto-accommodating uses and development in a center.	Ø
38	CM2	CE	8149 SE STARK ST	1N2E32DD 12100	Owner/Representative	Retain CM2	<ul> <li>PSC direction from 7/26/16 work session: do not apply CE in designated centers. Montavilla Neighborhood Center.</li> <li>Zoning context.</li> </ul>	• CE would allow new auto- accommodating uses and development in a center.	V
39	CM2	CE	10050 SW BARBUR BLVD	1S1E29CB 3500	Owner/Representative	Retain CM2	<ul> <li>PSC direction from 7/26/16 work session: do not apply CE in designated centers. West Portland Town Center.</li> <li>Centers Main Street overlay zone; zoning context; future MAX area.</li> </ul>	• CE would allow new auto- accommodating uses and development in a center.	V
40	CM2	CE	6730-6868 SE FOSTER RD	1S2E17BA 11800	Owner/Representative	Retain CM2	• PSC direction from 7/26/16 work session: do not apply CE in designated centers. Heart of Foster neighborhood center.	• CE would allow new auto- accommodating uses and development in a center.	V
41	CM2	CE	6710 SE Foster	1S2E17BA 11800	Owner/Representative	Retain CM2	<ul> <li>PSC direction from 7/26/16 work session: do not apply CE in designated centers. Heart of Foster neighborhood center.</li> </ul>		V
42	CM2	CE	12109 NE GLISAN ST	1N2E34AD 900	Owner/Representative	Retain CM2	<ul> <li>PSC direction: do not apply CE broadly in response to Policy 4.24.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Applying CE could result in broader rezone proposal.</li> </ul>	V
43	CM2	CE	11080 NW ST HELENS RD	1N1W03AD 3600	Owner/Representative	Retain CM2	<ul> <li>PSC direction: do not apply CE broadly in response to Policy 4.24.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Applying CE could result in broader rezone proposal.</li> </ul>	V
44	CM2	CE	11132 SE DIVISION ST	1S2E10BA 100	Owner/Representative	Retain CM2	• PSC direction: do not apply CE broadly in response to Policy 4.24.	Applying CE could result in broader rezone proposal.	V

Ref #	Proposal	Request	Location	State ID	Who testified	Staff Recommendation	Rationale	Implications if the PSC were to make a different decision; Other notes	Consent Item?
45	CM2	CE	4504 SE 122ND AVE	1S2E14BB 1700	Owner/Representative	Retain CM2	• PSC direction: do not apply CE broadly in response to Policy 4.24.	<ul> <li>Applying CE could result in broader rezone proposal.</li> </ul>	V
46	CM2	CE	5810 N. Lombard	1N1E07DA 5000	Owner/Representative	Retain CM2	• PSC direction: do not apply CE in designated centers. Mid-Lombard Neighborhood Center.	• CE would allow new auto- accommodating uses and development in a center.	V
47	CM2	CE	14425 SE DIVISION ST	1S2E01CC 8900	Property Owner	Retain CM2	• PSC direction: do not apply CE broadly in response to Policy 4.24.	<ul> <li>Could result in broader rezone proposal.</li> </ul>	$\checkmark$
48	CM2	CE	3607-3615 NE 82ND AVE	1N2E20DD 11500	Property Owner	Retain CM2	<ul> <li>PSC direction: do not apply CE in designated centers: Roseway neighborhood center.</li> <li>Zoning context is CM2.</li> </ul>	• CE would allow new auto- accommodating uses and development in a center.	V
49	CM2	CE	3511 NE 82ND AVE	1N2E20DD 11800	Property Owner	Retain CM2	<ul> <li>PSC direction: do not apply CE in designated centers: Roseway neighborhood center.</li> <li>Zoning context is CM2.</li> </ul>	• CE would allow new auto- accommodating uses and development in a center.	V
50	CM2	CE	3435 NE 72ND AVE	1N2E29BA 11700	Property Owner	Retain CM2	<ul> <li>PSC direction: do not apply CE in designated centers: Roseway neighborhood center.</li> <li>Zoning context is CM2.</li> </ul>	• CE would allow new auto- accommodating uses and development in a center.	V
51	CM2	CE	3427 NE 72ND AVE	1N2E29BA 11900	Property Owner	Retain CM2	<ul> <li>PSC direction: do not apply CE in designated centers: Roseway neighborhood center.</li> <li>Zoning context is CM2.</li> </ul>	• CE would allow new auto- accommodating uses and development in a center.	V
52	CM2	CE	3449 NE 72ND AVE	1N2E29BA 11800	Property Owner	Retain CM2	<ul> <li>PSC direction: do not apply CE in designated centers: Roseway neighborhood center.</li> <li>Zoning context is CM2.</li> </ul>	• CE would allow new auto- accommodating uses and development in a center.	V
53	CM2	CE	3449 NE 72ND AVE	1N2E29BA 11800	Property Owner	Retain CM2	<ul> <li>PSC direction: do not apply CE in designated centers: Roseway neighborhood center.</li> <li>Zoning context is CM2.</li> </ul>	• CE would allow new auto- accommodating uses and development in a center.	V
54	CM2	CE	7126 NE SANDY BLVD	1N2E29BA 11600	Property Owner	Retain CM2	<ul> <li>PSC direction: do not apply CE in designated centers: Roseway neighborhood center.</li> <li>Zoning context is CM2.</li> </ul>	• CE would allow new auto- accommodating uses and development in a center.	V
55	CM2	Keep horses on site	5027 SE 70th	1S2E17BA 12600	Property Owner	Retain CM2	• Use would be considered Agriculture - a CU.		V
56	CM3	CE	8816 SE FOSTER RD	1S2E16CA 12800 1S2E16CA 13700	Property Owner, Owner/Representative	Retain CM3	<ul> <li>PSC direction: do not apply CE in designated centers. Lents Town Center.</li> <li>Zoning context is CM2 and CM3.</li> </ul>	• CE would allow new auto- accommodating uses and development in a center.	V
57	CM2	CE	4831 SE POWELL BLVD	1S2E07BD 11000	Property Owner, Owner/Representative	Retain CM2	<ul> <li>PSC direction: do not apply CE in designated centers. Powell-Creston neighborhood center.</li> <li>Zoning context is CM2.</li> </ul>	• CE would allow new auto- accommodating uses and development in a center.	V
58	CM2	CE	7345 NE SANDY BLVD	1N2E20DC 13100	Property Owner, Owner/Representative	Retain CM2	<ul> <li>PSC direction: do not apply CE in designated centers: Roseway neighborhood center.</li> <li>Zoning context is CM2.</li> </ul>	• CE would allow new auto- accommodating uses and development in a center.	V

Ref #	Proposal	Request	Location	State ID	Who testified	Staff Recommendation		Implications if the PSC were to make a different decision; Other notes	Consent Item?
59	CM1	CE	6454 N GREELEY AVE	1N1E16CA 5900	Owner/Representative	Retain CM1	<ul> <li>PSC direction: do not apply CE broadly in response to Policy 4.24. Existing small building; zoning context.</li> </ul>		V
60	CM1	CE	16152 NE Sandy	1N2E24DD 700	Owner/Representative	Retain CM1	<ul> <li>PSC direction: do not apply CE broadly in response to Policy 4.24. Would result in broader rezone proposal.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Applying CE could result in broader rezone proposal.</li> </ul>	V
61	CM1	CE	10354 SE HOLGATE BLVD	1S2E15BB 15500	Owner/Representative	Retain CM1	• PSC direction: do not apply CE broadly in response to Policy 4.24. Zoning context in this area is primarily CM1.	<ul> <li>Applying CE could result in broader rezone proposal.</li> </ul>	V
62	CM1	CE	12225 N JANTZEN DR	2N1E34CA 1400	Owner/Representative	Retain CM1	<ul> <li>PSC direction: do not apply CE in designated centers. Hayden Island.</li> <li>Hayden Is PD allows QVS+DT on this site.</li> <li>Revisit w/ HI Plan update.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>CE would allow new auto- accommodating uses and development in a center.</li> </ul>	V
63	CM1	CE	1824 SE 50TH AVE	1S2E06CA 4100	Property Owner	Retain CM1	• PSC direction: do not apply CE broadly in response to Policy 4.24.	<ul> <li>Incongruous with nearby zoning. Allows larger scale and auto accommodating use.</li> </ul>	V
64	CM1	CE	10750 NE SANDY BLVD	1N2E22BD 5500	Property Owner	Apply CM2 – PSC direction on Low-rise Storefront area	<ul> <li>PSC direction: do not apply CE in designated centers: Parkrose neighborhood center.</li> <li>Zoning pattern.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>CE would allow new auto- accommodating uses and development in a center.</li> </ul>	V
65	CM1	CE	11214 SE POWELL BLVD	1S2E10DB 12600	Property Owner, Owner/Representative	Retain CM1	• PSC direction: do not apply CE broadly in response to Policy 4.24. Area is outside of a center but zoning context is CM1.		V
66	CM1	CE	SW 45th and Multnomah	1S1E20CB 2100	Property Owner; Owner/Representative	Retain CM1	• PSC direction: do not apply CE broadly in response to Policy 4.24.		V
67	СХ	CE	Gateway area	Multiple lots	RTF/ICSC	Retain Proposed Zoning Pattern	• Site is in Gateway. Not part of the MUZ zone change area.		V
68	CM3, CM2	CE	MLK and Ainsworth area	Multiple lots	RTF/ICSC	Retain Proposed Zoning Pattern	• PSC direction: do not apply CE in designated centers: Alberta-MLK Neighborhood Center.	<ul> <li>CE would allow new auto- accommodating uses and development in a center.</li> </ul>	V
69	CM3	CE	SE 82nd and Foster	Multiple lots	RTF/ICSC	Retain Proposed Zoning Pattern	<ul> <li>PSC direction from 7/26/16 work session: do not apply CE in designated centers. Lents Town Center.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>CE would allow new auto- accommodating uses and development in a center.</li> </ul>	V
70	СМЗ	CE	Interstate at Lombard area	Multiple lots	RTF/ICSC	Retain Proposed Zoning Pattern	<ul> <li>PSC direction: do not apply CE in designated centers. Kenton-Interstate Neighborhood Center.</li> </ul>	• CE would allow new auto- accommodating uses and development in a center.	V
71	CM2/CE	CE	NE Chavez and Broadway	Multiple lots	RTF/ICSC	Retain Proposed Zoning Pattern	• Do not apply CE broadly in response to Policy 4.24. PSC direction 7/26/16.	<ul> <li>Applying CE could result in broader rezone proposal.</li> </ul>	V
72	CM2	CE	55th and Burnside	Multiple lots	RTF/ICSC	Retain Proposed Zoning Pattern	• Do not apply CE broadly in response to Policy 4.24. PSC direction 7/26/16.	Applying CE could result in broader     rezone proposal.	V

Ref #	Proposal	Request	Location	State ID	Who testified	Staff Recommendation	Rationale	Implications if the PSC were to make a different decision; Other notes	Consent Item?
73	CM2	CE	Barbur – West Portland Town Center area	Multiple lots	RTF/ICSC	Retain Proposed Zoning Pattern	<ul> <li>Do not apply CE broadly in response to Policy 4.24. PSC direction 7/26/16.</li> <li>Future MAX line.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Applying CE could result in broader rezone proposal.</li> </ul>	V
74	CM2	CE	SE Powell and Chavez	Multiple lots	RTF/ICSC	Retain Proposed Zoning Pattern	• PSC direction from 7/26/16 work session: do not apply CE in designated centers. Powell-Creston Neighborhood Center.	• CE would allow new auto- accommodating uses and development in a center.	V
75	CM2	CE	SE 82 and Powell	Multiple lots	RTF/ICSC	Retain Proposed Zoning Pattern	<ul> <li>PSC direction from 7/26/16 work session: do not apply CE in designated centers. Jade District Neighborhood Center.</li> </ul>	• CE would allow new auto- accommodating uses and development in a center.	V
76	CM2	CE	SE Foster 67 <sup>th</sup> -70 <sup>th</sup>	Multiple lots	RTF/ICSC	Retain Proposed Zoning Pattern	• PSC direction from 7/26/16 work session: do not apply CE in designated centers. Heart of Foster Neighborhood Center.	• CE would allow new auto- accommodating uses and development in a center.	V
77	CM2	CE	SE Woodstock and 42 <sup>nd</sup>	Multiple lots	RTF/ICSC	Retain Proposed Zoning Pattern	<ul> <li>PSC direction from 7/26/16 work session: do not apply CE in designated centers.</li> <li>Woodstock Neighborhood Center.</li> </ul>	• CE would allow new auto- accommodating uses and development in a center.	V
78	CM3	CE	122nd/Glisan to Stark	Multiple lots	RTF/ICSC	Retain Proposed Zoning Pattern	<ul> <li>PSC direction: do not apply CE in designated centers. 122<sup>nd</sup>/Hazelwood Neighborhood Center.</li> </ul>	• CE would allow new auto- accommodating uses and development in a center.	V
79	CM2	CE	42nd and Killingsworth	Multiple lots	RTF/ICSC	Retain Proposed Zoning Pattern	<ul> <li>PSC direction: do not apply CE in designated centers. 42<sup>nd</sup> and Killingsworth Neighborhood Center.</li> </ul>	• CE would allow new auto- accommodating uses and development in a center.	V
80	CM2	CE	Hawthorne and Chavez	Multiple lots	RTF/ICSC	Retain Proposed Zoning Pattern	<ul> <li>PSC direction: do not apply CE in designated centers. Belmont-Hawthorne-Division Neighborhood Center.</li> </ul>	• CE would allow new auto- accommodating uses and development in a center.	V
81	CM2	CE	Cully and Prescott	Multiple lots	RTF/ICSC	Retain Proposed Zoning Pattern	• PSC direction: do not apply CE in designated centers. Cully Neighborhood Center.	<ul> <li>CE would allow new auto- accommodating uses and development in a center.</li> </ul>	V
82	CM2	CE	SE Division and 122	Multiple lots	RTF/ICSC	Retain Proposed Zoning Pattern	• PSC direction: do not apply CE in designated centers. Division-Midway Neighborhood Center.	• CE would allow new auto- accommodating uses and development in a center.	V
83	CM2	CE	SE 82nd and Stark	Multiple lots	RTF/ICSC	Retain Proposed Zoning Pattern	• PSC direction: do not apply CE in designated centers. Montavilla Neighborhood Center.	• CE would allow new auto- accommodating uses and development in a center.	V
84	CM2	CE	82nd and Burnside	Multiple lots	RTF/ICSC	Retain Proposed Zoning Pattern	• PSC direction: do not apply CE in designated centers. Montavilla Neighborhood Center.	• CE would allow new auto- accommodating uses and development in a center.	V
85	CM2	CE	NE Sandy and 72 <sup>nd</sup>	Multiple lots	RTF/ICSC	Retain Proposed Zoning Pattern	• PSC direction: do not apply CE in designated centers. Roseway Neighborhood Center.	• CE would allow new auto- accommodating uses and development in a center.	V
86	CM2	CE	Stark and 148 <sup>th</sup>	Multiple lots	RTF/ICSC	Retain Proposed Zoning Pattern	• PSC direction: do not apply CE in designated centers. Rosewood-Glenfair Neighborhood Center.	• CE would allow new auto- accommodating uses and development in a center.	V

Ref #	Proposal	Request	Location	State ID	Who testified	Staff Recommendation	Rationale	Implications if the PSC were to make a different decision; Other notes	Consent Item?
87	CM2	CE	Stark and 162 <sup>nd</sup>	Multiple lots	RTF/ICSC	Retain Proposed Zoning Pattern	• PSC direction: do not apply CE in designated centers. Rosewood-Glenfair Neighborhood Center.	<ul> <li>CE would allow new auto- accommodating uses and development in a center.</li> </ul>	V
88	CM2	CE	Barbur and Multnomah	Multiple lots	RTF/ICSC	Retain Proposed Zoning Pattern	• PSC direction: do not apply CE in designated centers. Rosewood-Glenfair Neighborhood Center.	<ul> <li>CE would allow new auto- accommodating uses and development in a center.</li> </ul>	V
89	CM1	CE	33rd and Killingsworth	Multiple lots	RTF/ICSC	Apply CM2 – see Group B.3	<ul> <li>Do not apply CE broadly in response to Policy 4.24. PSC direction 7/26/16.</li> <li>Staff proposes to apply the CM2 zone in this area – see B.3.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Applying CE could result in broader rezone proposal.</li> </ul>	V
90	CM3, CM2	CE	NE Glisan and NE 122nd Avenue	1N2E34DA 101 1N2E34DA 102 1N2E34DA 105 1N2E34DA 106	Owner/Representative	Retain Proposed Zoning Pattern	<ul> <li>PSC direction: do not apply CE in designated centers. 122<sup>nd</sup>/Hazelwood Neighborhood Center.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>CE would allow new auto- accommodating uses and development in a center.</li> </ul>	V