

NAME	DATE	SOURCE	ARTICLE	TOPIC	COMMENT	RESPONSE
Cheryl Leeman	08/11/2023	Email	1. Introductory Provisions	1.8.1 Meaning of words and terms	Section referencing to "undefined" terms (1.8 Rules of interpretation, Section 1.8.1 Meaning of word and terms if not stated are interpreted by common dictionary meaning or customary usage... To insure correct interpretation, terms to be defined should include definition of urban, urban compact development, on or near peninsula (on-peninsula south of I295 and on-peninsula north of I295), classification of streets (arterial, collector or local), Dwellings (Conservation and Cottage Court),	Not all terms are defined in the code. Many of these are generally used in the code, and their common definition can suffice.
Portland Foreside (c/o Mary McCrann)	10/13/2023	Email	10. Waterfront	General	Ensure that the City's waterfront zones continue to function effectively. To acknowledge and support prioritizing the mix of marine and non-marine uses in the EWVZ, while prioritizing the health and operational needs of the working waterfront, consider zoning text modifications that allow for the general public to more fully experience the area (see our proposed Zoning Text Amendment on page 1 [regarding rooftop uses]).	See proposed change in Article 7 to exempt decks and other surfaces (such as pedestal pavers) up to 18" in height from height limits.
Barbara Vestal	07/13/2023	Email	13. Site Plan	Design standards	The "first wave" is said to only address definitions, zones, uses and dimensional standards. The design standards appear in later sections -- particularly in the site plan and historic preservation sections. It is hard to tell from this first wave release where you are going with design review issues. Is it your intent to also remove the concepts of preserving neighborhood character and consistency with the neighborhood context from the design standards? If so, what do you envision the standards will be based on? Or is it the intent to remove design considerations entirely? I would be interested in your thoughts.	See Article 13, which continues to require compliance with the Design Manual, which will contain all of the city's design standards.
Portland Foreside (c/o Mary McCrann)	10/13/2023	Email	13. Site Plan	Landscape preservation & planting standards	Landscape requirements should address all aspects of site development, from preservation to screening and buffering -- Landscaping standards should be modified to include consideration of current landscaping on adjacent properties and consistency within an area of the City or neighborhood. Consideration should also be given to incentivizing techniques that can be used to support resiliency and flood mitigation.	See Article 13, noting that additional landscape standards have always and will continue to be held within the city's Technical Manual.
Avery Kamila	10/12/2023	Phone	13. Site Plan	Landscape preservation & planting standards	Tree preservation should be prioritized on redevelopment sites.	See Article 13, where tree preservation is proposed to be handled along with other significant natural resources as defined in Article 3. These site plan standards will be accompanied by a 'low-impact development' section of the Technical Manual, which will take a more holistic approach to natural resource protection.
Elizabeth Parsons	07/07/2023	Email	13. Site Plan	Landscape preservation & planting standards	Greetings from the West End and thank you for sending around the information on proposed changes to our land use code. Herewith a few observations and wonderings: Avery Yale Kamila's comments (email dated 1 July 2023) were spot on and I offer a hearty "second" to everything said there, especially her point that the current times call for us to do things differently. For example, if planning proceeds under the assumption that our power grid will hold steady over the next several decades, this is a very risky proposition. Around the country we are already seeing power grid failures during periods of extreme heat and grids being targeted by violent political extremists. Add to that the complexity of mass conversion to renewables and we arrive back at the importance of tree canopy coverage. Trees have an ancient track record of providing cooling and calm. Our One Climate Future plan implicitly acknowledges this in multiple places: TLU 1.7; CR 2.2; CFR 2.5; CR 4; and CR 5. So it is of great concern to see that the ReCode revisions do not seem to take this into account when allowing new construction in the most densely populated and lowest income sections of the peninsula. While there has been a lot of talk about the disaster that Victor Gruen's urban renewal effort created by destroying neighborhoods, there seems to be less talk about avoiding the other part of urban renewal's mistakes: constructing massive buildings without giving sufficient attention to physical and socio-economic contexts. How long will the anticipated new, dense developments be expected to last—20 years? 50 years? During the hottest week ever recorded around the world, it's hard for me to imagine that conditions in urban heat islands even 10 years from now will be consistently stable. The irony here is that many residents of the peninsula's most densely-treed sections already have options that poorer people lack for fleeing the heat. Now is the time to emphasize tree planting where trees are most lacking. Of course there are all sorts of regulations and tax/financing issues to consider when deciding what can and can't be done in particular areas. But there are also developers doing good, thoughtful work in Portland whom I suspect would be open to brainstorming creative ways of incorporating more open/green space and trees in areas slated for dense construction. I wonder if they've been asked about this. Finally, a wondering about the revisions' effects across the entire city: while the impetus to eliminate single-family zoning is laudable, we should anticipate that constructing multi-family dwellings and ADUs in areas where such were previously not possible will bring with it more tree felling on private properties. How will we be prepared to deal with this added stressor to an already stressed tree canopy? Assembling this document has undoubtedly been a monumental task perhaps made more onerous by soliciting citizen reactions. Nonetheless, I thank you for considering these comments.	See new climate resilience zoning elements in Articles 8 and 13, including standards related to high heat and stormwater.
GPL Advocacy Committee	12/14/23	Email	16. Historic Preservation		In addition to locally designated historic districts and buildings, the Maine Historic Preservation Commission has designated neighborhoods and some individual buildings as eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. We feel strongly that design standards are important for these areas as well to ensure adjacent new construction will enhance the setting of those historic places. MHP's database, CARMA, is available on their website. We are also curious to learn if MHP's GIS layer could be added to the city's GIS system, to flag any eligible buildings when a demolition or building permit application is made?	See Article 16, where some revisions have been made to language around work on National Register-eligible properties to provide additional clarity around process.
Connect Portland	07/19/2023	Email	17. Housing	Table 18-C Dimensional Bonuses for Affordable Housing	What affect does "housing bonuses" potentially have on proposed 65 height in the B-2 and B2b zones?	As drafted, height bonuses would apply as they do under the current ordinance.

NAME	DATE	SOURCE	ARTICLE	TOPIC	COMMENT	RESPONSE
Acorn Engineering (c/o Will Savage)	10/13/2023	Email	17. Housing	Table 18-C Dimensional Bonuses for Affordable Housing	Strongly encourage Table 18-C be revised to include height and setback bonuses for residential districts such as RN-5 so that affordable housing projects can have the tools they need to get enough floor area to support the density that's currently being promoted by the City and the State's new legislation under LD 2003, effective January 1, 2024.	No change is proposed to the basic structure of the height bonus language, which provides for height bonuses for affordable housing in mixed use zones, where greater height can be more seamlessly integrated, but generally not in residential zones.
Damon Yakovleff	08/04/2023	Email	17. Housing	Table 18-C Dimensional Bonuses for Affordable Housing	Related to this, please add clarifying information regarding the 2.5 times density bonus required by LD2003 to the recode website. It appears that this would apply in all areas except for the RN1 zone, since all these locations are served by public water and sewer and allow multifamily dwellings. The RN2 zone is a bit odd, in that it does not permit the 3 and 4 unit development required in growth zones but does allow for multifamily development. This ambiguity should be clarified.	See Council-adopted LD2003 amendments from December 2023.
Urbanist Coalition Portland (c/o Todd Morse)	10/11/2023	Email	18. Off-Street Parking & Loading	Bicycle parking requirements	Require as much bicycle parking as we do car parking.	See revisions to Article 18, where off-street parking maximums are proposed.
Urbanist Coalition Portland (c/o Todd Morse)	10/11/2023	Email	18. Off-Street Parking & Loading	Parking maximums	In peninsula zones the city should set parking maximums to the current parking minimums, with a few exceptions where the minimums are low like lodging houses and congregate care facilities.	See revisions to Article 18, where off-street parking maximums are proposed.
Christian Milneil	10/12/2023	Email	18. Off-Street Parking & Loading	Parking maximums	In a similar vein, I'd like the city to consider maximum off-street parking limits, especially in the new TOD zones and in the R6, R7, B1, B2, B3, and B7 zones – the zones where Metro provides bus service and mixed-use development is encouraged. Similar to how we've seen large single-family homes monopolize valuable land in transit-accessible neighborhoods, we've also seen, in recent years, high-end development projects with exorbitant off-street parking ratios in buildings that otherwise could have accommodated more productive uses (see, for instance, the latest iteration of the Portland Foreside development). Off-street parking is allowed, subsidized, and mandated everywhere else in Maine. But to meet our climate goals, Portland needs to build more neighborhoods where driving and car ownership are optional. Off-street parking takes up too much space and costs too much money in the service of undermining those goals. The City of Boston recently adopted maximum parking ratios for new development that are calculated as a function of access to transit, jobs, and services like grocery stores. While Boston does have a better transit system in general, the city's rules still apply in more suburban neighborhoods like West Roxbury and Hyde Park, where land uses and transit service are similar to Portland's (in those neighborhoods, developers can build, at most, 1 new off-street parking space per apartment). I encourage the City of Portland to consider a similar approach to help ensure that car-free households can still afford to live in our most transit-accessible neighborhoods.	See revisions to Article 18, where off-street parking maximums are proposed.
Cary Tyson	10/13/2023	Email	18. Off-Street Parking & Loading	Parking maximums	I'm reaching out in support of eliminating parking minimums as a part of ReCode.	See revisions to Article 18, where off-street parking maximums are proposed.
Portland Foreside (c/o Mary McCrann)	10/13/2023	Email	18. Off-Street Parking & Loading	TDM requirements	Consider enhancing the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan requirements to incorporate recommendations within One Climate Future – There is also a need to update the TDM requirements so that consideration is given to the bigger picture of projects and activities within the City and not just the project requiring the TDM. There should be more consideration and collaboration given to what is going on with TDM as a whole.	See broader discussions about transportation demand in the city.
Urbanist Coalition Portland (c/o Todd Morse)	10/11/2023	Email	18. Off-Street Parking & Loading	Transit-proximate exemption	No longer require a Transportation Demand Management plan to benefit from the transit proximity exception to parking minimums. Plans will still be required for very large developments as before, this just removes it as a condition for that exception.	See revisions to Article 18, where off-street parking maximums are proposed.
Cindy Park	07/15/2023	Email	19. Signs		3. Please tighten the restrictions on business signage. Two examples: a. the signage for the business called 'Continental' (Brighton and St John, new and not yet open for business) has lettering that is really too large for the neighborhood setting b. internally lighted signage like the lighted numbers '449' for 449 Forest Avenue, while grandfathered, can be effective without being so bright - the light is too bright for the neighborhood setting	Some changes are proposed to sign regulations in Article 19.
Betsey Remage-Healey	10/12/2023	Email	2. Administration		Re Sec.2.3,11.E.6, it currently deprives ONLY islanders of the right to appeal lot sizes. Not fair!	Revised drafts eliminate this language.
Portland Foreside (c/o Mary McCrann)	10/13/2023	Email	3. Definitions	"Agriculture"	Consider revising the definition of "agriculture" to include modern agricultural activities - Adding to the definition of agriculture some urban agriculture concepts could include elements like rooftop gardens and amenities.	Agriculture definition has been revised to cover modern, urban ag concepts. Rooftop gardens and amenities would be accessory uses.
Will Savage	10/13/2023	Konveio	3. Definitions	"Approval"	an approval date with conditions.	Date is implied.
Heather Sanborn	06/30/2023	Konveio	3. Definitions	"Bar"	As written, this definition of "bar" is broad enough to encompass the definition of "tasting room." It should be narrowed to avoid confusion.	These are two separate uses, addressed and defined separately. One is only allowed as accessory (the tasting room).
Will Savage	10/13/2023	Konveio	3. Definitions	"Construction and engineering services"	Should this read General Office use so that it ties to the definition and land use table?	Revised drafts add the word 'general' to 'office' in this definition.
Jay	07/01/2023	Konveio	3. Definitions	"Drive-through features"	you should add language to differentiate between a drive thru where you have order boards and a pick up window. With mobile ordering and pick up windows, you can have another type of food operator that doesn't necessarily need a typical drive thru and can operate in other zones.	There is no need to differentiate between these uses, as they have the same fundamental operational issues, regardless of the presence of a menu-board.
Todd Morse	10/12/2023	Konveio	3. Definitions	"Dwelling unit"	In the past, this has been interpreted to mean that a dwelling unit can only have one kitchen facility. This interpretation seems overly restrictive and it is not made clear in the definition. I feel this definition should be updated to explicitly allow that. I think the distinction between dwelling units is really the degree of separation from other dwelling units (i.e. separate lockable entrances).	This is a matter of interpretation.
Amy Oberlin	10/11/2023	Konveio	3. Definitions	"Dwelling, townhouse"	Many typical implementations of a townhouse have multiple units stacked vertically, including townhouses proposed by the PHA. This definition requiring "each dwelling unit is located on a separate lot" would not allow the most common form of townhouses.	This definition is intended to distinguish the most typical townhouse form, which is one way of building housing.

NAME	DATE	SOURCE	ARTICLE	TOPIC	COMMENT	RESPONSE
Karen Snyder	08/12/2023	Konveio	3. Definitions	"Fill"	Why isn't it required that developers put fill that is of good quality rather than junk fill?	Quality of fill is handled through other regulations.
Wesley	10/11/2023	Konveio	3. Definitions	"Fill"	That is usually covered in statewide regulations/ best practice, specifically 2021 IBC CODE 1610.1. (however Maine currently uses 2015 IBC). But, why not change the wording?	The land use code refers to state regulations in many areas, rather than duplicating state requirements.
Heather Sanborn	06/30/2023	Konveio	3. Definitions	"Industrial, low-impact"	Given that alcohol production is specifically excluded from "specialty food" definition, it would make sense to specifically include it in "light industrial" if that is the intent (as I think it is).	Proposed low-impact industrial definition does not include specific uses, instead allowing some flexibility around interpretation. Alcohol production has always been a permitted sub-category of low-impact industrial per the city's land use code.
Brent Adler	07/17/2023	Form submission	3. Definitions	"Lodging house"	Another comment that I had was to clearly define the difference between a boarding house, halfway house, and sober house. As the code is defined now somebody can open a boarding house in R6 and run it as a halfway house or homeless shelter. We require certain kinds of social services and onsite professional management under a shelter and somebody could use the boarding house as a loop hole. This kind of management can lead to unsafe conditions in a R6 zone.	Lodging house is distinct from group home and shelter.
Liv Chase	07/26/2023	Email	3. Definitions	"Lodging house"	Under R-6 allowable uses: lodging houses should be excluded from this section or the definition of lodging house needs to be amended. Currently, the city is allowing housing of homeless residents and the operation of homeless shelters under this vague language in the land use code. The original intent of this section I believe was to accommodate b and b style housing. If the definition creates a decrease in value of the homes around it then it would make sense not to include this use under any residential zone. Drug trafficking, trespassing, and vandalism are all an outcome of this loophole that has impacted my property on the West end.	Lodging house is distinct from group home and shelter.
Liz Trice	10/11/2023	Konveio	3. Definitions	"Lodging house"	This needs to be clarified; I believe it's legal to rent out as many rooms in your home as desired without it being considered a lodging house.	Revised draft increases the number of rooming units within a lodging house to differentiate this use.
Wesley	10/11/2023	Konveio	3. Definitions	"Lodging house"	[Response to Liz Trice] Good callout here	Revised draft increases the number of rooming units within a lodging house to differentiate this use.
Twells	10/11/2023	Konveio	3. Definitions	"Lodging house"	[Response to Liz Trice] How would this impact co-living spaces? Many of which may have 8 bedrooms or so and which fit into neighborhoods very nicely. They are not the same as a lodging house.	Revised draft increases the number of rooming units within a lodging house to differentiate this use.
Wesley	10/11/2023	Konveio	3. Definitions	"Non-native invasive species of vegetation"	Is there a distinction between invasive plants that harm the overall ecosystem vs ones that outcompete a specific niche and leave the rest of the ecosystem relatively unchanged. from my limited understanding of this, it seems like it may be useful down the line for resource allocation.	No distinction in current ordinance.
Portland Foreside (c/o Mary McCrann)	10/13/2023	Email	3. Definitions	"Pedestal paver system"	Add a new definition to Section 3 - Pedestal paver roof deck system: Flooring system consisting of pavers which are laid over a pedestal support (fixed or adjustable height) which raises the tiles or pavers off the existing surface to create a level, elevated deck.	See Article 7, where some changes have been made to the interpretation of height.
Todd Morse	10/11/2023	Konveio	3. Definitions	"Place of assembly"	Reducing this from 15 to 8 is needlessly restrictive. What is the motivation behind this change?	This reduction aligns with the adjustment to the definition of "family" from Phase I, which reduced the number of unrelated individuals in a "family" from 15 to 8.
Liz Trice	10/11/2023	Konveio	3. Definitions	"Place of assembly"	[Response to Todd Morse] 8 people seems extremely restrictive, even discriminatory; anyone can have a 50 people in their house for party; a small group of 8 would cause no trouble, and likely is a minority group.	This reduction aligns with the adjustment to the definition of "family" from Phase I, which reduced the number of unrelated individuals in a "family" from 15 to 8.
Ashley Keenan	10/11/2023	Konveio	3. Definitions	"Place of assembly"	This is a highly restrictive new intrusion on places of assembly, lowering the minimum number of congregants and restricting use standards to collector roads is a substantial burden on these places of worship and other assembly. I'm proud to attend a historic parish church which would not be allowed under this provision. I'm further worried that this would conflict with constitutional rights, and am concerned about the history of this provision in conjunction with the treatment of synagogues in Portland.	This reduction aligns with the adjustment to the definition of "family" from Phase I, which reduced the number of unrelated individuals in a "family" from 15 to 8.
Kevin Parker	10/13/2023	Konveio	3. Definitions	"Roadway"	This roadway definition overlaps with the definition of "street" (which is written more broadly to include all users), and should either be updated to specifically include both motorized and non-motorized users (cyclists) under the umbrella of "vehicular", or removed. Currently between the roadway and sidewalk definitions, cyclists have no clearly defined place within a public right-of-way.	Revised draft adds "or bicycle traffic" to this definition.
Kevin Parker	10/13/2023	Konveio	3. Definitions	"Sign copy"	"Copy" is specific to text in the context of signage. Definition name should be "Sign Content" based on the descriptive text.	The term 'copy' is generally preferred.

NAME	DATE	SOURCE	ARTICLE	TOPIC	COMMENT	RESPONSE
Kevin Parker	10/13/2023	Konveio	3. Definitions	"Sign, blade"	What defines "pedestrian scale" in this case? This duplicates the projecting sign definition, unless that is intended for vehicular traffic (in which case more specifics are needed for intended sign audiences)	The concept of 'pedestrian-scale' is reinforced in the area limits and illumination standards for blade signs.
Kevin Parker	10/13/2023	Konveio	3. Definitions	"Sign, cabinet"	This should be made less specific to transparent-faced panels. Cabinet signs are often no longer made with transparent acrylic front faces as described—so a broader definition would also include push-through text and solid sign faces, for example.	The definition uses the term 'translucent.' Revisions have been made to Table 19-E to ensure that illumination standards speak to 'halo' signs, and halo signs have been defined.
Kevin Parker	10/13/2023	Konveio	3. Definitions	"Sign, canopy"	Canopy and awning sign definitions overlap (the awning definition already includes "canopy"), and should be condensed into one category.	The revised draft removes the term 'canopy' from the awning sign definition.
Kevin Parker	10/13/2023	Konveio	3. Definitions	"Sign, single-color or two-color LED"	Why is this capped at two LED colors? For example, commonly-used faux-neon LED "OPEN" signs with a different color per letter would be non-compliant. This level of specificity is not needed, when illumination can be better regulated via the internal and external illumination definitions..	Allowing more than two colors begins to start to create gray area with an electronic message sign.
Kevin Parker	10/13/2023	Konveio	3. Definitions	"Sign, window"	How far within a space would a sign or graphic need to be for it to fall under the definition of a window sign, if this covers anything exposed to public view through a window? Would a mural graphic on the rear wall of a restaurant be considered a window sign? This should be clarified to mean a sign intended primarily for viewing from outside the window, along with a maximum distance from the interior surface of the window (something in the 5 foot range seems reasonable).	A mural (artwork) is not a sign. It would have to contain sign copy for it to be considered a sign. Currently the definition of 'sign, window' states that the sign must be placed in or on a window, and Table 20-Q narrows what is considered a window sign exempt from area or number standards.
Kevin Parker	10/13/2023	Konveio	3. Definitions	"Sign"	This definition should be modified to exclude murals on building exteriors/windows, where the intent is entirely the art itself as an enhancement to the public space, and not as a sign in any way — or a separate definition should be added for public art/murals, to remove the ambiguity about which definition/regulations would be applicable.	The code does not regulate murals, but does regulate sign copy. For example, if a mural contains text or a logo fitting the definition of sign copy that area would be reviewed as a sign. The rest of the mural would not be reviewed.
Will Savage	10/13/2023	Konveio	3. Definitions	"Stormwater detention area"	Define Storm. 0.5" of rainfall or greater within a 24-hour period. Then go on to clarify that Stormwater Detention does not contain water 48 hours after the end of a Storm.	See <i>Technical Manual</i> for these types of technical details.
Will Savage	10/13/2023	Konveio	3. Definitions	"Structure"	Does not include retaining walls.	Drafts exempt retaining walls from setbacks in Article 7, but they are considered structures under state law, etc.
Cheryl Leeman	08/11/2023	Email	3. Definitions	Street types	NO classification of streets that identify arterials, connectors and local roads by recognized traffic standards.	These functional classifications are defined by the state and federal government.
Connect Portland	07/19/2023	Email	3. Definitions	Various	Definitions includes definition of "on-peninsula and off-peninsula, where is the definition for "on or near peninsula"? No definitions for "arterials" vs corridors or other accepted street type designations? No definition for "urban neighborhoods"?	These terms are either defined elsewhere or used broadly in purpose statements and can be interpreted to carry their common meaning.
Tim Wells	10/12/2023	Konveio	5. Zones	5.2.2 Zone boundaries when uncertain	It might be helpful to add a definition of adjacent. I can see how this could be exploited in a legal case and the courts saying that there is not enough definition around "adjacent" and kick a decision back to the City. Someone will sue and say that a zone across a street is adjacent even though that is not what the City intends.	These terms appear in numerous places throughout the code - differentiating through definitions may unintentionally cause issues rather than resolving them. Language has been updated in various places to ensure that there is clarity around this reference, however.
Kevin Parker	10/13/2023	Konveio	5. Zones	6.6.2(C)3 Drive-throughs	[Response to Nathan Miller] Seconding this. Drive-thrus are fine in the suburbs where there's land to spare, but they have no place in a city, where land should be used for housing and pedestrian-focused commercial space. Plenty of people in cities around the world walk/bike/take transit to Dunkin and Starbucks, without wasting the space on drive-thru lanes.	The first wave changes limit drive-throughs considerably.
Connect Portland	07/19/2023	Email	5. Zones	Table 5-A: Zones	Zone Table 5A does not include Roux Institute at Northeastern University in the Overlay Zones.	Table 5-A does not include either of the two institution-specific IOZs, the MMC IOZ or Roux. The text of both of these is incorporated under the general language of the Institutional Overlay Zone.
Karen Snyder	08/12/2023	Konveio	5. Zones	Table 5-A: Zones	Why aren't these zones on page 24 directly linked to the actual purpose statements which are on page 27? This is very clunky and inefficient for the public to follow.	Tables exist in separate places in the code, as not all material can be consolidated into one place.
Winston Lumpkins	7/18/2023	Konveio	5. Zones	Table 5-B: Residential Zones	Single family homes are very expensive for the city (more street, sidewalk, water, sewer etc) while typically generating less tax revenue than multi unit buildings do, while being financially out of reach for many. They also tend to encourage a level of density that can't support public transportation, encouraging car use, which is bad for wildlife, children, people who can't drive, the environment and infrastructure: walking, e-bikes, bikes, scooters etc don't wear out the road and cause fatal crashes. Cars & their effect on infrastructure is super expensive for the taxpayer. Single family homes are expensive for everyone, inequitable, and should not be encouraged. This is a city; there is a lot of Maine that is not a city, but, this is a city.	The revised drafts continue to support a variety of housing types, particularly around transit.
Kevin Parker	10/13/2023	Konveio	5. Zones	Table 5-B: Residential Zones	[Response to Winston Lumpkins] This is so spot on. We need to stop zoning the majority of the city as a 1960's-era suburb—and all the associated harms that come along with that.	The revised drafts continue to support a variety of housing types, particularly around transit.

NAME	DATE	SOURCE	ARTICLE	TOPIC	COMMENT	RESPONSE
Liz Trice	10/11/2023	Konveio	5. Zones	Table 5-B: Residential Zones	It would be lovely to have more small businesses spread throughout neighborhoods like r3; I think neighborhood businesses should be allowed throughout.	Generally, the approach to create more opportunity for small scale, neighborhood commercial is through the addition of the neighborhood nonresidential reuse use category and through map changes.
Liz Trice	10/11/2023	Konveio	5. Zones	Table 5-B: Residential Zones	It would be nice to allow neighborhood businesses like small cafes, shops and restaurants with strict noise restrictions in R3 and other R zones.	Generally, the approach to create more opportunity for small scale, neighborhood commercial is through the addition of the neighborhood nonresidential reuse use category and through map changes.
Tim Wells	10/12/2023	Konveio	5. Zones	Table 5-B: Residential Zones	[Response to Liz Trice] Portland needs to loosen up restrictions on businesses. Saratoga Springs has done a very nice job of allowing neighborhood businesses. It doesn't harm the character of the neighborhood. It greatly enhances the character and livability. We are over-reacting to fear of possible, initial pushback. It is the right thing to do and will strengthen and improve the City.	Generally, the approach to create more opportunity for small scale, neighborhood commercial is through the addition of the neighborhood nonresidential reuse use category and through map changes.
Barbara Vestal	07/13/2023	Email	5. Zones	Table 5-B: Residential Zones	Asking just for myself, I can't help but notice that you have taken out the language in the purpose statement which (admittedly imperfectly) referred to conserving the existing housing stock, preserving the existing neighborhood character, and making new development consistent with the typical compact lot development found on the peninsula. Of course those are things that people living in the R-6 zone have typically valued. It would seem better to improve how they are referenced in the purpose statement rather than deleting them entirely. What was your thinking in making this change?	Many of the purpose statements have been revised with the idea that they should be parallel in structure. In revised drafts, language has been added to purpose statements to ensure that this intent is retained.
Emma Rubin	07/16/2023	Konveio	5. Zones	Table 5-B: Residential Zones	A few zones say they allow for "select nonresidential uses". Not sure exactly what this means but this code should go further to encourage mixed-use walkable neighborhoods.	Purpose statements have been revised to ensure that this language aligns with permitted uses.
Kellan	07/16/2023	Konveio	5. Zones	Table 5-B: Residential Zones	I can't see any purpose for either RN-1 or RN-2 to still exist. These are archaic zoning definitions that arbitrarily prohibit any sort of density, walkability, bike access, safety, or transit. Keeping these in existence will continue to raise housing costs and result in sprawl outside of Portland limits. The zoning definitions overall can be greatly simplified and modernized by eliminating RN-1 and RN-2 zoning.	R-1 and R-2 have been consolidated in drafts, but otherwise no residential consolidation is proposed.
Emma Rubin	07/16/2023	Konveio	5. Zones	Table 5-B: Residential Zones	It seems like these zones could be condensed/simplified. Why are 7 different residential zones needed for a small city?	R-1 and R-2 have been consolidated in drafts, but otherwise no residential consolidation is proposed.
Emma Rubin	07/16/2023	Konveio	5. Zones	Table 5-B: Residential Zones	Eliminate RN1 to allow for smaller lots and more housing density. Roll into RN2?	R-1 and R-2 have been consolidated in drafts, but otherwise no residential consolidation is proposed.
Kevin Parker	10/13/2023	Konveio	5. Zones	Table 5-B: Residential Zones	All of these should be condensed into two zones, with the only difference being maximum building heights. Making zones contingent on proximity to existing transportation routes (which by definition would change if/when we get to a higher density that can support more robust public transit), differentiated between on-peninsula vs. off-peninsula, or at all concerned with 'compatibility' and 'context' will just perpetuate the status quo, which is obviously not working.	R-1 and R-2 have been consolidated in drafts, but otherwise no residential consolidation is proposed.
Jill Roland	08/06/2023	Email	5. Zones	Table 5-B: Residential Zones	Why not add the R1 and R2 zones - both higher income areas - to the process?	R-1 and R-2 have been consolidated in drafts, meaning both have been modified.
Cameron Thompson	07/19/2023	Konveio	5. Zones	Table 5-B: Residential Zones	In the zone purpose section there is no mention of climate resilience. Following the recommendations of One Climate Future zoning should consider climate risks when designating zones. In areas where there is a low risk of flooding the city should encourage higher density through zoning. Low density zoning should only be allowed in areas where the risk of flooding is high.	See proposed CFROZ in Article 8.
Nathan Miller	10/13/2023	Konveio	5. Zones	Table 5-B: Residential Zones	As I understand it the current R-3 zoning (here reclassified as RN-2) is the largest (by area) zoning designation in our city, making up almost 1/4 of the square footage of Portland. If we do not make more significant allowances to this zoning type than what is in this draft document this effort will have a muted impact. This zone type deserves significant scrutiny additional loosening of the restrictions.	The changes to use permissions adopted under LD 2003 significantly expand use permissions within this zone.

NAME	DATE	SOURCE	ARTICLE	TOPIC	COMMENT	RESPONSE
Nathan Miller	10/12/2023	Konveio	5. Zones	Table 5-B: Residential Zones	[Response to Emma Rubin] Agree, I don't see any reason we'd want to require lots this large for any portion of our city.	The drafts rely on a combination of zone consolidation, changes in use permissions, and additional flexibility within dimensional standards to create opportunities for more housing within residential zones.
Liz Trice	10/11/2023	Konveio	5. Zones	Table 5-B: Residential Zones	[Response to Kellan] Seems like we should just roll in R1 and R2 into R3	The existing R-3 pattern is generally distinct from the R-1 and R-2.
Urbanist Coalition Portland (c/o Todd Morse)	10/11/2023	Email	5. Zones	Table 5-B: Residential Zones	Eliminate the R-4 zone and zone all land currently zoned R-4 as R-6.	The R-4 pattern is generally distinct from the R-6 pattern in terms of lot size, setbacks, etc. For this reason, it has been retained as a distinct zone. However, uses in the R-4 have been revised to more closely resemble the R-6.
Urbanist Coalition Portland (c/o Todd Morse)	10/11/2023	Email	5. Zones	Table 5-B: Residential Zones	Eliminate the R-5 zone and zone all land currently zoned R-5 as R-6.	The R-5 pattern is generally distinct from the R-6 pattern in terms of lot size, setbacks, and uses. However, uses in the R-5 have been revised to more closely resemble the R-6.
Dela Murphy	08/19/2023	Konveio	5. Zones	Table 5-B: Residential Zones	The RN-1 and RN-2 zones are restrictive enough to still be considered exclusionary zoning. They should be eliminated. Perhaps RN-3 should be generalized to remove language about the Western Prom and instead be the starting point from a density perspective.	The RN-3 pattern is generally distinct from the RN-1 and RN-2, as it was written to apply to a particular on-peninsula neighborhood.
C.M.	07/03/2023	Konveio	5. Zones	Table 5-B: Residential Zones	are the "compatibility and context sensitivity" explained anywhere? many properties have vacant spaces and cannot be properly converted to multi-units, because many cannot conform to current building code or would be too cost prohibitive for small landlords. A few examples that come to mind are stair treads dimensions and requirement of fire sprinklers. Existing multi-unit properties however don't have to conform to such code but are allowed to operate simply by being "grand-fathered-in". Such dichotomy shows a lack of commitment to either safety or compatibility. Are there any plans to address this issue?	This comment pertains to building code/fire code.
Urbanist Coalition Portland (c/o Todd Morse)	10/11/2023	Email	5. Zones	Table 5-B: Residential Zones	Eliminate the R-1 zone and zone all land currently zoned as R-1 as R-2.	Working drafts reflect this change.
Karen Snyder	08/12/2023	Konveio	5. Zones	Table 5-B: Residential Zones/RN-5	Planning Dept has removed the language in R6 now RN5 of "conserve the existing housing stock and residential character of neighborhoods...and controlling the scale of external impacts of professional offices of non-residential use" What will happen? 1) As many houses as possible will continue to be demolished which is extremely environmentally detrimental and large non-descript buildings with luxury condo or subsidized housing will be created with no ties to the neighborhood and not really be used for long term residential need. 2) Existing housing stock should be conserved and have an easier time to create more multi units without cost prohibitive improvements. For example, going from a 2 unit to a 3 unit should not require sprinkler systems when an existing 3 unit does not have to have a sprinkler system. 3) The R6 now RN5 zoning statement will also allow more commercial and/or non-residential businesses to easier be built in residential neighborhoods which instead should be focused on creating long term residential housing and not running non-residential businesses such as commercial businesses or professional office, sober houses or group homes. This takes away from long term residential housing units by allowing more commercial businesses within residential zones. Theoretically, a strip joint could be allowed to be located in a residential neighborhood with this type of vague language. 4) There is a mention of a minimum lot size of 2,000 sq ft without stating a maximum lot size which theoretically an entire block could be one parcel instead of multiple existing housing.	Many of the purpose statements have been revised with the idea that they should be parallel in structure. In revised drafts, language has been added to purpose statements to ensure that this intent is retained.

NAME	DATE	SOURCE	ARTICLE	TOPIC	COMMENT	RESPONSE
Karen Snyder	08/14/2023	Email	5. Zones	Table 5-B: Residential Zones/RN-5	<p>How does the Planning Department think that Relaxing the Residential Neighborhood Zoning Language Will Ensure Long Term Residential Housing is Created? City of Portland Planning Department has loosened most of the residential zoning language specifically targeting yet again on-peninsula neighborhoods (RN-5 formerly R6). Specific examples of this are shown below.</p> <p>Example #1: The Gutting of RN-5 (formerly R6) Residential Neighborhood Purpose Statement.</p> <p>In Table 5-B: Residential Neighborhood Purpose Statement (page 27), of the following document link, First Wave Changes - Comments — ReCode Portland, the City of Portland Planning Department has specifically removed from the RN-5 (formerly R6) Residential Neighborhood Zone Purpose statement the following verbiage "conserve the existing housing stock and residential character of neighborhoods....and controlling the scale of external impacts of professional offices of non-residential use"</p> <p>What will happen? Large non-descript buildings with luxury condo or subsidized housing will be created with no ties to the neighborhood and not really be used for long term residential need. The lack of importance now in conserving or incentivizing existing housing stock by having an easier time to create more multi units without cost prohibitive improvements. For example, going from a 2-unit to a 3-unit should not require sprinkler systems when an existing 3-unit does not have to have a sprinkler system. The proposed RN-5 (formerly R6) residential neighborhood zoning statement will allow more commercial and/or non-residential use businesses such as Bed & Breakfast/Hostels/Lodging homes which are all temporary transient housing businesses an easier time to be built in residential neighborhoods instead of focusing on long term residential housing to be built or created. There is a no mention of a maximum lot size but only a minimum lot size of 2,000 sq ft. Theoretically, an entire block could be combined into one parcel instead of multiple existing housing rather than people crammed in large and sterile, solid housing blocks like rats in a lab cage. Didn't the City learn during COVID that large buildings where people lived in close quarters are not livable in which people fled these cities where there was too much density and came to smaller cities such as Portland which are less dense?</p>	Many of the purpose statements have been revised with the idea that they should be parallel in structure. In revised drafts, language has been added to purpose statements to ensure that this intent is retained.
MHNO (c/o Barbara Vestal)	10/11/2023	Email	5. Zones	Table 5-B: Residential Zones/RN-5	<p>2. THE PURPOSE STATEMENT FOR THE NEW RN-5 ZONE OMITTS IMPORTANT CONCEPTS. In the purpose statement for the R-6/ New RN-5 zone, the proposed draft has deleted concepts that appear in the current purpose statement that refer to conserving the existing housing stock, preserving the existing neighborhood character, and making new development consistent with the typical compact lot development found on the peninsula. While perhaps imperfectly expressed in the current code, they identify concepts that are typically valued by residents. It would be better to improve the way they are referenced rather than removing them entirely.</p> <p>Staff has said that similar concepts now appear in proposed Table 5-B, with the introductory paragraph emphasizing "context sensitivity." However, while statements about "standards encouraging compatibility and context sensitivity" do appear in the RN-2, RN-3 and RN-4 zones in the context of conversion of existing structures to higher density uses, that phrase does not appear anywhere in the RN-5 zone. Standards requiring compatibility and context sensitivity should be an integral part of the RN-5 purpose statement, and should apply to all new development as well as to the conversion of existing structures. Similarly rewritten design standards, long put on hold, need to be completed and adopted so that they are a meaningful part of the development review process. Design standards are an integral part of assessing compatibility and context sensitivity.</p>	Many of the purpose statements have been revised with the idea that they should be parallel in structure. In revised drafts, language has been added to purpose statements to ensure that this intent is retained.
Winston	10/13/2023	Konveio	5. Zones	Table 5-B: Residential Zones/RN-5	<p>[Response to Karen Snyder] I want to boost Point 2 & 4: Adding a unit to a 2 unit is a nearly-in-surmountable issue, when almost all the Portland's naturally occurring affordable 2-5 unit housing was subdivided larger single family homes, with weird non-standard stairs and odd additions. None of it has sprinkler systems, isn't ADA accessible etc. I've NEVER seen a 3 unit building with a sprinkler. It's a perfectly safe, perfectly accessible unit, or *the street* I'm not sure how much we can actually get around that, but it's an issue to be acknowledged: 60 people die on the street in Portland every year... I doubt we have that many people falling down weird stairs.</p>	This comment pertains to building code/fire code.
Cheryl Leeman	08/11/2023	Email	5. Zones	Table 5-D: Mixed-Use Zones	<p>B-2 and B2-b consolidated yet are different in their purpose. The ReCode II recommendation states that the B2-b appears to be working well... the "gradients" in use B-2 zones appear to primarily address levels of commercial intensity and transitions to adjoining neighborhoods. As such, there is likely a need to maintain them.</p>	B-2 and B-2b were not consolidated in the draft.
Connect Portland	07/11/2023	Email	5. Zones	Table 5-D: Mixed-Use Zones	<p>Did the B2 and B2b get consolidated? If so, it appears the height has increased significantly in the Dimensional Standards?</p>	B-2 and B-2b were not consolidated, although many of the use permissions and dimensional standards for these two zones are the same, both in the existing code and in the draft under
Cheryl Leeman	08/11/2023	Email	5. Zones	Table 5-D: Mixed-Use Zones	<p>Every Business Zone includes "residential" to encourage housing is in conflict with it stated purpose of providing for a mixture of commercial as their primary use.</p>	Most mixed-use zones currently permit housing, with the exception of the B-4, and generally the policy goal within these zones has been to support a mix of uses, including residential, for quite some time.
Connect Portland	07/19/2023	Email	5. Zones	Table 5-D: Mixed-Use Zones	<p>Zone Purpose Statements where residential or mixture of residential in RN, Islands and B zones are reference does not clarify what type of permitted residential which are clearly spelled out in the RN1 to RN4 zones. The B-1 provides for residential uses but not in the language, page 5-7.</p>	Purpose statements have been revised to ensure that this language aligns with permitted uses.

NAME	DATE	SOURCE	ARTICLE	TOPIC	COMMENT	RESPONSE
Portland Foreside (c/o Mary McCrann)	10/13/2023	Email	5. Zones	Table 5-D: Mixed-Use Zones	Evaluate and refine the City's mixed-use zones to ensure they support the city's thriving mixed-use areas, and continue to enable modern, sustainable, walkable development in line with the City's vision for the future – To further encourage mixed-use redevelopment, support new development and redevelopment in areas of the City that can occur and is already happening. Incentives and support can be tax, economic, financial, or regulatory. We support simplifying the regulations in the B6 Zone. We encourage the City to require that the majority of a street fronting ground floor in any of the urban mixed-use zones be open to the public (hotel lobby, retail, etc.) to support active pedestrian/public uses.	These types of PAD principles have been integrated into many of the mixed use zones.
Kevin Parker	10/13/2023	Konveio	5. Zones	Table 5-D: Mixed-Use Zones	B1, B2, B2b, and B3 need to be combined into a single zone, broadly following the language in B1, but without being restricted to 'limited areas' or 'small scale'. A truly complete neighborhood with walking access to daily shopping/service needs means allowing for smaller dispersed groceries/markets throughout the city, along with a mixture of other goods/services, both integrated into residential neighborhoods—without being developed into "shopping centers", which are inherently car-oriented and a bad use of land in a city environment.	These zones vary widely in purpose and form.
Tim Wells	10/12/2023	Konveio	5. Zones	Table 5-E: TOD Zones	What is low, moderate and high density? How about: Low Density = or <12 DU per acre Moderate = or <44 DU per acre or requiring no more than 500 sf/du High = > 40 DU per acre with no sf requirement per du	Generally, these terms are not defined in ordinance in terms of specific ranges like these.
Portland Foreside (c/o Mary McCrann)	10/13/2023	Email	5. Zones	Table 5-E: TOD Zones	Explore opportunities to encourage transit oriented development within appropriate areas of the city, in coordination with regional transit planning - Consider the idea of adopting a TOD ordinance that creates incentives (density, height bonuses, tax incentives) or requires certain types of development to meet specific criteria that is focused on TOD.	See TOD zones and associated map changes.
Connect Portland	07/11/2023	Email	5. Zones	Table 5-E: TOD Zones	Where will the Transit Oriented Development (TOD) be located? Define "urban neighborhood" and "on or near peninsula"? TOD heights with a maximum of 80 ft and 125ft in or near residential seems excessive. Doesn't the B2b transit nodes sufficiently address TOD in a more compatible way in highly residential areas in or near peninsula?	There is some overlap between the TOD zones and several of the mixed use zones, including the B-2b, which encourages a dense, urban form. The
Kevin Parker	10/13/2023	Konveio	5. Zones	Table 5-E: TOD Zones	All development in the city should be transit-oriented development. The language in these zones should be incorporated into the residential and mixed-used zones, and it's the city's responsibility to create a robust transit system (and non-motorized vehicular transportation) to encourages the resulting development.	Transit-supportive principles are generally integrated into many of the city's zones that are located proximate to transit.
Cameron Thompson	07/19/2023	Konveio	5. Zones	Table 5-H: Open Space Zones	OS-P purpose should include the acknowledgement of maintaining an open space for climate resilience, i.e. high risk flood areas.	Revised drafts reflect this concept.
Cheryl Leeman	08/11/2023	Email	5. Zones	Various	All Zone Purpose statements should be clearly defined as to what is or what is not permitted in the zone as opposed to open ended terms such as "on or near peninsula, select areas off-peninsula and along arterials. -RN-5 (R-6) includes new inserted text that states and "in select off-peninsula locations." -Inconsistencies in Zone Purpose Statements regarding type of "residential" or "mixture of residential" which are not clearly spelled out in every zone. -Transit Oriented Development (TOD) -1 is off-peninsula and -2 is on or near peninsula with no indication as to where and new zone is similar to the B2-b.	Purpose statements are not meant as a proxy for the use tables, where use permissions are described, but as more broad statements about each zone's intent.
Brent Adler	07/17/2023	Form submission	6. Use Standards	6.4.1	Hello. Thanks for all the work on this recode.. its been a long time! I had a couple things to comment on. What has been done for building on established city streets that are paved that are less than 25' wide. This was a section in the old code under chapter 14-403. This was updated a couple years ago but im concerned that the exception that is allowed to build is up to somebody's opinion. Can we not agree that these narrow streets in Portland are safe and should be allowed to have new buildings built on them. this will help with housing and density. Please remove the restriction on narrow streets to allow development.	See revisions to Section 6.4.1 to provide more flexibility in these situations while ensuring that there is adequate oversight related to life safety and access for basic services.
Liv Chase	07/26/2023	Email	6. Use Standards	6.4.1	Section 6.4.1- width of a street is no less than 35'. Amendment should contain the language that this requirement does not apply to accepted city streets. The original intent of this section was to make sure that existing paper streets were designed in a manner that was up to current fire code requirements. Preventing residential construction on accepted city streets that are already built on is not in line with the overall city goal of creating more affordable housing in areas that can accommodate development.	See revisions to Section 6.4.1 to provide more flexibility in these situations while ensuring that there is adequate oversight related to life safety and access for basic services.
Bob Rodney	9/12/2023	Email	6. Use Standards	6.4.1	Hello,my wife christine and I own two house lots at the dead end of Florida ave in portland.these house lots start where the hot top ends.there is one house after our lots built in the 1980s..and two homes directly Accross the dirt street from our lots.these home owners receive city services,such as trash pick up, snow plowing,mail, etc..christine and I know we need to upgrade the road before we build.my question is.on the recode for rezoning coming up, will our lots become buildable without upgrading?	See revisions to Section 6.4.1 to provide more flexibility in these situations while ensuring that there is adequate oversight related to life safety and access for basic services.

NAME	DATE	SOURCE	ARTICLE	TOPIC	COMMENT	RESPONSE
					<p>The proposed language for width of streets has an implied assumption that the street is the same width along its length. Or at least for the segment of street upon which the subject lot fronts the street. This assumption appears to not always be true. Small pavement width variation exists. This does not pose a problem when pavement width is far wider than the proposed language guidelines. It does introduce ambiguity when the street has small pavement width variations that vary around the target width guidelines. This is the case for Bond Street, based on my measurements. The section to which I refer is 6.4.1 (A.1.a).</p> <p>Bond Street is over 20' in width (20' 2" of pavement width, from inside of curb to inside of opposite curb). But not uniformly along its length. Sometimes it is 19' 10", and so forth. Some variation.</p> <p>Should the language clarify that one rounds up to the nearest whole foot? Or conversely take the minimum width measured?</p> <p>The lot is at the corner of Bond and Orange. Clearly, as I get very close to the corner (directly in front of the lot) the streets are preparing to intersect and the pavement width increases further to perhaps 21' or 22'. But numerous feet back away from the intersection on Bond, and still in front of the lot in question, the pavement width measures over 20'. But a few feet further on and it measures 19' 10".</p> <p>Practically speaking, there is no safety or access difference between 20' 2" and 19' 10". So it is not a public safety issue. But the language leaves this ambiguity on where to measure and if to round to the nearest whole foot (up or down), or to use the minimum width found in front of the lot. Or simply round to the nearest whole foot for the minimum width found in front of the lot. Do you have any thoughts on this?</p> <p>Alternatively, this could be such a rare case that it is better to discuss it with the Fire Chief and/or the head of the DPW. I realize this falls squarely into the '90-10' rule of potentially an edge case! But I do want to be thoughtful and engage for clarity and balance the production of housing in Portland with safety. Thank you for thinking about this. In this case, if my measurements are correct, the street is over 20' wide in front of the lot. But not for all of the frontage. It is just a slight variation. But it does dip below 20'.</p> <p>For your consideration, since streets tend to be reasonably stable in width (although imperfectly so as in this case), I would think if the street is 20' or more wide as measured somewhere in front of the lot, that would meet the minimum width requirement.</p> <p>This is because, even if it dipped below, it is always just inches of difference and thus not a safety or access issue. This would allow the production of housing per the language and be in keeping with the intent to promote fire safety and unrestricted DPW access.</p>	
Andrew Schiller	07/21/2023	Email	6. Use Standards	6.4.1		This is a matter of interpretation.
Peaks Councilors & Housing + Zoning Subcommittee	10/10/2023	Email	6. Use Standards	6.4.1	Paper Roads - Though not addressed in the draft, the H&Z Committee is wondering if ReCode is planning to interface with the paper road determination process in any way.	This is a separate process.
Liz Trice	10/11/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.4.1(A)1	[Response to Jaime Parker] If 16' is the minimum needed by fire trucks, 16' should be our minimum street width.	No additional reduction in minimum width suggested, as draft adds significant flexibility to these provisions.
Jaime Parker	10/11/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.4.1(A)1	These width requirements seem excessively rigid. Will we be considering "skinny streets", Shared-streets, or other. more flexible street designs? IF 16' is an acceptable width on the islands, why wouldn't we consider it for neighborhoods with low-speed, low-volume conditions around the city?	See revisions to Section 6.4.1 to provide more flexibility in these situations while ensuring that there is adequate oversight related to life safety and access for basic services.
WB	10/11/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.4.1(B)	If you have a detached garage can you tear it down and add additional living units? Based on the principle structure code, it reads, you can not. This will not help get units built.	The changes to use permissions adopted under LD 2003 significantly expand use permissions within this zone.
Todd Morse	10/12/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.4.1(B)	This seems like it may be a violation of LD2003. The additional units lots are entitled to are not secondary, they are units that must have the same dimensional standards applied.	This language does not comply with LD 2003, so has been struck.
Emma Rubin	07/16/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.4.1(B) Number of structures on a lot	What counts as a principal structure? Can you have the main 1-,2-,3-,4- family dwelling and then also have an ADU? You should be able to.	Yes, ADUs are permitted as accessory structures within Article 6.
Cameron Thompson	07/16/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.4.12(A) Multi-family conversion standards	This seems overly strict to the point that multifamily dwellings are not practically allowed in these zones. How many existing buildings are there in these zones that could potentially be converted?	Restrictions in the RN-2 & RN-4 are from the existing code, and I-B currently limits MF to 4 units. 3-family and 4-family are new uses within these zones.

NAME	DATE	SOURCE	ARTICLE	TOPIC	COMMENT	RESPONSE
Connect Portland	07/11/2023	Email	6. Use Standards	6.4.12(A) Multi-family conversion standards	How will the real possibility of demolition of single-family homes to build multi-family structures be addressed in ReCode?	The proposed drafts acknowledge the potential for standards that may incentivize tear-downs. If uses are permitted, tear-downs may occur. Generally speaking, the approach reflected in the draft changes is to allow for conversion from single-family to two-, three-, four-, or multi-family where the higher-density use is permitted within the zone, but to try to ensure that these conversions are achieved in a way that reflects the existing built context (i.e. the pattern of setbacks, heights, and design choices characteristic of the surrounding neighborhood). This is why the draft changes don't include drastic changes to residential dimensional standards.
Connect Portland	07/19/2023	Email	6. Use Standards	6.4.12(A) Multi-family conversion standards	Conversions 6.4.12, additions to "existing structures" in all RN zones. What does "existing structures" mean? All residential and nonresidential structures? Should "Conversions" with sub categories for additions, residential and non-residential be added to the Use Standards Table?	This language has been struck as a result of use changes under LD 2003.
Peter Brandon	10/11/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.4.12(A)1 Multi-family use limitations	Why limit the opportunity for conversion to only non-residential buildings? Portland contains many large historic homes that already contribute to and match the character of neighborhoods that could easily hold 2-4 units with little to no exterior modification or neighborhood impact.	This language reflects existing policy, and would only apply to "multi-family," meaning buildings with 5+ units. Under recently adopted LD 2003 changes, up to four units would be allowed in the RN-2 and RN-4 as new construction or conversion of any type of building.
Ashley Keenan	10/11/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.4.12(A)1 Multi-family use limitations	It's an unreasonable restriction on property rights, as well as a legacy of exclusionary and racist local regulations, to prevent the construction of multi-family homes in these zones - especially in a housing shortage.	Under recently adopted LD 2003 changes, up to four units would be allowed in all mainland residential zones, plus two ADUs.
Emma Rubin	07/16/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.4.12(B) Multi-family conversion standards	Why limit to 25% of existing? Seems strange that if you already have a big house you can expand way more than you could if you happened to have a tiny existing house on the same sized lot.	The 25% expansion limitation has been eliminated from the conversion standards.
Liz Trice	10/11/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.4.12(B) Multi-family conversion standards	[Response to Emma Rubin] agreed. Any expansion should allow whatever lot coverage is already legal. Otherwise you're just putting more restrictions on any attempts to build new housing.	The 25% expansion limitation has been eliminated from the conversion standards.
Kevin Parker	10/13/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.4.12(B) Multi-family conversion standards	This is an arbitrary restriction that serves no purpose other than to restrict the construction of denser housing in existing neighborhoods. As others have said, as long as the size would otherwise be allowable within other parts of the code, there's no reason for this additional layer of restriction.	The 25% expansion limitation has been eliminated from the conversion standards.
WB	10/11/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.4.12(B)3 Multi-family conversion standards	Why have this wording? If housing cannot be built because of parking code specific locations, the city will not have the new units they need. Let the parking spots be placed where they fit best on the site plan. Not specified prior to the site and design plans.	It is the city's long-held policy direction to encourage parking to the side or rear of buildings. Parking is currently not required in many locations throughout city.
Liz Trice	10/11/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.4.12(B)3 Multi-family conversion standards	[Response to WB] agreed. Parking should never dictate whether housing can be built.	It is the city's long-held policy direction to encourage parking to the side or rear of buildings. Parking is currently not required in many locations throughout city.
Ashley Keenan	10/13/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.4.12(B)4 Multi-family conversion standards	The intent here is clear and sympathetic. But I've lived in studio apartments well below 500 feet, and if I hadn't had that option, I would've been homeless. It was cozy! I don't believe that Portland is at risk of tenement housing slumification, rather the opposite if anything - enforced luxury. If a unit is safe, who cares if it's small? That's our choice to live there, and sometimes its the difference between a warm bed and the street.	Language has been edited to eliminate unit sizes in conversion standards, but retain minimum size of structure for conversion.
Peter Brandon	10/11/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.4.12(B)5 Multi-family conversion standards	Why? Point 4 above would suggest you could have three studio apartments, or two 1 bedroom apartments in a 1,500 square foot envelope. Fail to see the point of this limitation.	Language has been edited to eliminate unit sizes in conversion standards, but retain minimum size of structure for conversion.
Ashley Keenan	10/12/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.4.12(B)5 Multi-family conversion standards	This is a redundant measure cluttering up the document. It should be removed.	Language has been edited to eliminate unit sizes in conversion standards, but retain minimum size of structure for conversion.
Kevin Parker	10/13/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.4.13 Dwellings, townhouse	Why is there a restriction on minimum spacing between townhouses? We already have examples of contiguous townhouses in Portland (on Park Street and Danforth), and they're a more efficient use of land than most residential within the city.	The draft does not require 15 ft. between townhouses.

NAME	DATE	SOURCE	ARTICLE	TOPIC	COMMENT	RESPONSE
Cheryl Leeman	08/11/2023	Email	6. Use Standards	6.4.17 Group homes	Group home restriction that they can not be located within 500ft of another has been eliminated.	There is currently a lodging house separation requirement in the R-5 zone.
Will Savage	10/13/2023	Konveio	6. Use standards	6.4.21 Lodging houses	At almost 3x the room size the common area appears excessive. Are there national examples of best practices for the ratio between room and common area?	This language has been retained as a way to censure common space in buildings with very small living unit sizes
Cindy Park	07/15/2023	Email	6. Use Standards	6.4.23 Marijuana-related uses.	Please include some restrictions on density of cannabis businesses (as in, per square mile).	6.4.23 includes dispersal requirements as they exist today.
Acorn Engineering (c/o Will Savage)	10/13/2023	Email	6. Use Standards	6.4.26 Neighborhood Nonresidential Reuse	Under 6.4.26.A, does an "existing structure that is nonresidential in its current use" include a building that has a principal use of housing, but a subordinate use of commercial?	Clarified that this clause is related to principal uses.
Acorn Engineering (c/o Will Savage)	10/13/2023	Email	6. Use Standards	6.4.26 Neighborhood Nonresidential Reuse	When would the effective date be for locking in an existing neighborhood nonresidential reuse? Does this make it an "existing structure" under this section?	Effective date would be the date of ReCode Phase II adoption. Any nonresidential structure existing as of that date would be eligible for nonresidential reuse.
Rachel Conly	10/13/2023	Email	6. Use Standards	6.4.26 Neighborhood Nonresidential Reuse	I think this is a great idea, but the reality is there are few, if any, buildings on Peaks that would benefit from this change.	Revised drafts maintain neighborhood nonresidential reuse within island zones.
Lucas Ankhartz	09/11/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.4.26 Neighborhood nonresidential reuse	Why don't we include all first floor retail and non- nuisance (thinking WFH folks, art studios, barbers, etc) business as part of the zone?	Many of these uses are covered under Section 6.6.2(E) as home occupations.
Nathan	07/25/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.4.26 Neighborhood nonresidential reuse	[Response to Amy Oberlin & Winston Lumpkins re neighborhood nonresidential reuse.] Agree with the sentiments above. The summary of Recode II progress made it sound like it would be significantly easier to introduce small scale commercial into our purely residential neighborhoods, but this language is far too restrictive. We don't just want to allow buildings originally built to be non-residential to open a business in them, we want to encourage NEW neighborhood amenity business to pop up. I like the allowance for no parking spots however.	New neighborhood businesses are not currently allowed within residential areas. The neighborhood nonresidential reuse category will help to address some need for neighborhood businesses. Other neighborhood business needs are addressed within the B-1, B-2 or other zones located nearby to residential zones. See B-1 mapping.
Amy Oberlin	06/30/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.4.26 Neighborhood nonresidential reuse	Despite touting the "new use" of neighborhood nonresidential reuse, this section appears to rule out all new neighborhood businesses. Was this the intent?	New neighborhood businesses are not currently allowed within residential areas. The neighborhood nonresidential reuse provides flexibility that allows new businesses in residential zones in certain circumstances.
Winston Lumpkins	7/18/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.4.26 Neighborhood nonresidential reuse	[Response to Amy Oberlin re neighborhood nonresidential reuse] This seems really problematic. It seemed like more might be allowed above.	New neighborhood businesses are not currently allowed within residential areas. The neighborhood nonresidential reuse provides flexibility that allows new businesses in residential zones in certain circumstances.
Karen Snyder	08/14/2023	Email	6. Use Standards	6.4.26 Neighborhood nonresidential reuse	Example #3: Inconsistent and Unclear All the Different Non-Residential Use Businesses Allowed in the Residential Zones This is strange and not clear. In Section 6.4.26 -Neighborhood Non-residential Reuse (page 52), in the following document link First Wave Changes - Comments — ReCode Portland, it lists additional non-residential use commercial businesses such as: general offices < 5,000 sqft, general services < 5,000 sq ft, restaurants, retail < 5,000 sq ft, specialty foods, studios for arts that can be opened up within residential neighborhoods without listing these commercial/non-residential reuse businesses on page 36 of Table 6-A: Permitted and Conditional Uses in Residential Neighborhood Zones. What will happen? It needs to be clear in Table 6-A (page 36) all the differing types of commercial and non-residential use businesses that are allowed in residential neighborhoods and how far apart these non-residential use businesses can be located between each other. All these different business types can potentially overwhelm residential neighborhoods with commercial and non-residential use businesses rather than long term residents.	Structure of the tables makes integrating of these uses challenging. Instead, they have been consolidated as 'neighborhood non-residential reuse,' with use standards to govern the way that these uses are allowed to occur.

NAME	DATE	SOURCE	ARTICLE	TOPIC	COMMENT	RESPONSE
Karen Snyder	08/12/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.4.26 Neighborhood nonresidential reuse	This is strange and not clear. In Table 6-A: Permitted and Conditional Uses in Residential Neighborhood Zones it shows what non-residential uses are allowed in the different residential zones but NONE of the general offices, service, restaurants, retail listed in this 6.4.26 section (page 52) are included in Table 6-A which is on page 36 of this document. Therefore, it needs to be clear in Table 6-A which residential zones allow these nonresidential uses.... of General offices, services, restaurants, retail, etc.. It also needs to be clear how many of these non-residential uses are the allowed in residential neighborhoods and how far apart they are from each other. What will happen? Again, it is really NOT considered a complete neighborhood when non-residential uses could remove long term residential housing units and overwhelm residential neighborhoods.	The neighborhood nonresidential reuse category is meant to allow the use of nonresidential structures for nonresidential uses within residential zones. It does not allow nonresidential uses writ large.
Todd Morse	10/11/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.4.26(A) Neighborhood nonresidential reuse	Specific calendar dates should never be in a land use code. People should not have to do historical research to know what they are allowed to build on a given piece of land. I am pretty familiar with available city data sources and reasonably well informed about land use but I could not find a single unified data source to figure out which lots this would apply to. This just creates nonconforming lots by another name, but it is ambiguous if the rules of nonconforming lots apply.	Dates have generally been removed from the code where possible.
Ashley Keenan	10/11/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.4.26(A) Neighborhood nonresidential reuse	An outrageous false name for a nothingburger of a use.	Neighborhood nonresidential use will allow some flexibility for non-conforming uses in locations that currently have none.
Tom Bander	10/11/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.4.26(A) Neighborhood nonresidential reuse	[Response to Amy Oberlin, Winston Lumpkins, & Nathan re neighborhood nonresidential reuse.] Completely agree. Neighborhood nonresidential reuse is a huge benefit to this project and should be allowed much more broadly, not restricted to those that currently exist. Look no further than the amazing amenities on Congress St on Munjoy Hill. These businesses make neighborhoods more walkable and pleasant to live in!	New neighborhood businesses are not currently allowed within residential areas. The neighborhood nonresidential reuse category will help to address some need for neighborhood businesses. Other neighborhood business needs are addressed within the B-1, B-2 or other zones located nearby to residential zones. See B-1 mapping.
Tom Bander	10/11/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.4.26(B) Neighborhood nonresidential reuse	Completely agree, we should allow small scale businesses in every residential zone (cafes, small shops, coffee shops).	New neighborhood businesses are not currently allowed within residential areas. The neighborhood nonresidential reuse category will help to address some need for neighborhood businesses. Other neighborhood business needs are addressed within the B-1, B-2 or other zones located nearby to residential zones. See B-1 mapping.
Todd Morse	10/11/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.4.26(B) Neighborhood nonresidential reuse	From what I have been able to observe this will apply to a tiny number of lots and it will be difficult for people to even know which lots this will apply to so they know where to open a neighborhood business. Their placement is also determined by what made sense decades ago, before zoning was in place preventing them from being built. They may not be the best places for businesses to be today. I would be very surprised if this is ever used, which is a shame because the top-level summary of these changes advertises "create opportunities for neighborhood scale business". This is one of only four "Big Takeaways" listed on the site when really it is an extremely minor change. We should allow small scale neighborhood businesses everywhere people live. We can add limits so they are on the first floor, and are small, to control impact.	New neighborhood businesses are not currently allowed within residential areas. The neighborhood nonresidential reuse category will help to address some need for neighborhood businesses. Other neighborhood business needs are addressed within the B-1, B-2 or other zones located nearby to residential zones. See B-1 mapping.
Kevin Parker	10/13/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.4.26(B) Neighborhood nonresidential reuse	It's not clear if either general 'retail' or specialty food services', specifically includes grocers. Having walkable access to small scale grocers/food markets would be one of the main benefits of a zoning change like this—to allow daily necessities to be available in each neighborhood, without everyone in the city traveling to/from large, suburban-style grocery stores. Only utilizing the tiny handful of existing non-residential buildings around the city for an overly-restrictive set of uses makes this a change in name only.	Retail would include grocers.
Todd Morse	10/13/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.4.30(A) Places of assembly	This is unnecessarily restrictive. Places of assembly have traditionally always been integrated into the residential neighborhood of the people assembling. The majority of our current religious buildings are in residential areas and this pattern makes sense. This requirement will dramatically reduce the number of possible parcels that can accommodate this use. This also feels designed to address the recent controversy around the Chabad house on Pomeroy Street. If that is the case, we should have a public conversation about the motivation behind this change and it's knock on effects. Though the situation was controversial, what they did was ultimately allowed. Neighbors are often frustrated by nearby development and the idea behind having zoning rules is to arbitrate those disputes. If you do something that was allowed, and by doing it, trigger a subtle change of the rules, it brings the reliability of those rules into question.	Collector and arterial roads are currently often the locations of places of assembly within residential neighborhoods.
Todd Morse	10/11/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.4.30(A) Places of assembly	Specific calendar dates should never be in a land use code. People should not have to do historical research to know what they are allowed to build on a given piece of land. This just creates nonconforming lots by another name, but it is ambiguous if the rules of nonconforming lots apply.	Dates have generally been removed from the code where possible.
Alan Thibeault	12/1/23	Email	6. Use Standards	6.4.31(B)	In regards to revisions noted in section 6.4.31.B Post-Secondary Schools, that now states in "In any residential zone, a new post-secondary school or an expansion on an existing post-secondary school shall not cause displacement or conversion of existing residential uses". This is in contrast with the deleted version on page 6-39, which stated "The proposed use shall not cause significant displacement or conversion of residential uses as of June 1, 1983, or July 15 in the IR1 and IR2 zones, or thereafter." This revision is too restrictive and the word "significant" should be reinserted in the proposed text. I can see a situation where we might acquire a residential property and need to convert it to another institutional use, which would be prohibited under the new text. We actually surround three residential properties that could never be repurposed should we ever acquire them. If this is considered in the greater context and we have added a residential facility to accommodate 100 students, this would be overly restrictive and not allow for any growth.	Policy direction has been to move toward IO2s for institutions, which can speak directly to this type of situation, taking into account the long-term growth plans of an institution.
Will Savage	10/13/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.4.8 Campgrounds	Not allowing recreational vehicles seems outdated. How about a limit on length instead, such as 24 ft and under.	This is language from the existing code.
Cheryl Leeman	08/11/2023	Email	6. Use Standards	6.5.5 Limitations on conditional use approvals	Changed Limitations on Conditional Use from 6 months to 5 years	This language was changed to three years, as six months is a short time to establish a new use, especially if paired with a site plan review.

NAME	DATE	SOURCE	ARTICLE	TOPIC	COMMENT	RESPONSE
Alan Thiabeault	12/1/23	Email	6. Use Standards	6.5.6(F)8	A second concern is related to section 6.5.6.F.8 Institutional Uses, which currently reads:8. In the case of a post-secondary school within the R-5 zone and not including the USM Overlay Zone, such school may build principal structures to a height of 55 feet if the following standards can be met: a. Minimum lot size: 10 acres which may include adjacent land owned by the institution on both sides of a public street. b. Minimum setback between buildings on-site: 20 feet. c. Minimum setback from external property boundary: 30 feet, except that parking garages over 35 feet in height must be located 50 feet from external property boundaries when adjacent to an adjoining residential use. d. The area between the structure and adjoining residential uses must be adequately screened with appropriate landscaping or other features to buffer the building and effects thereof (i.e. noise, light, etc.) from abutting properties. UNE lobbied to have this exemption inserted into the code and feel we would be extremely limited in our ability to construct institutional style buildings without it. Our Pharmacy, Oral Health Center and new Medical School buildings were only able to be constructed because of this clause.	Policy direction has been to move toward IOZs for institutions, which can speak directly to this type of situation, taking into account the long-term growth plans of an institution.
Urbanist Coalition Portland (c/o Todd Morse)	10/11/2023	Email	6. Use Standards	6.6.2	Remove the ban on renting out a room in your house if you've added a new bathroom or kitchen in the last two years.	This language was removed in the first wave.
Urbanist Coalition Portland (c/o Todd Morse)	10/11/2023	Email	6. Use Standards	6.6.2	Allow renting up to four rooms per dwelling unit instead of two.	This language was removed in the first wave.
Sherida Perrin	10/6/2023	Email	6. Use Standards	6.6.2(A) ADUs	My partner and I live in a 484 sq. ft. house, we also have a 160 sq. ft. utility shed (old garage). Our lot size is 5634 sq. ft. We have been thinking & dreaming about possibly building an ADU on our property, where our shed is now, or having an ADU built somewhere else on our property. We would like to eventually have a year-round rental unit to help provide local affordable housing in Portland, and also to help with paying off our current mortgage. I have read through the RECODE materials, and I'm unsure if we would even be able to have an ADU built based on the Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards Lot Area minimum for RN-3 of 6000 sq. ft.? If you know of anyone that could answer my question, and possibly walk us through the process, it would be greatly appreciated.	ADU standards are located within Article 6.
Ken Madore	10/06/2023	Form Submission	6. Use Standards	6.6.2(A) ADUs	Reaching out as I am not able to find zoning and/or regulations for accessory dwelling units in the new RN-4 zone. I own a property that includes 2 garages and additional square footage above the minimum lot requirement for this zone of 5,000sf (lot is approximately 8,000sf with 2 driveways so looking at creative options for possible ADU and/or increased building envelope Re: 12 Kenilworth St	ADU standards are located within Article 6.
Cindy Park	07/15/2023	Email	6. Use Standards	6.6.2(A) ADUs	Please consider allowing ADUs that meet square footage requirements to use grandfathered setbacks (ie. replacing an existing structure like an old garage) *without* needing to fit within the current structure's footprint - or alternatively, at least only ONE of the grandfathered setbacks (side or rear).	Revised draft includes changes to setbacks for ADUs to allow additional flexibility.
Lucas Ankhartz	09/11/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.6.2(A) ADUs	These rules are subjective thus giving abutters and other busy bodies room to slow down the approval process in creating sorely needed new housing.	This language is meant to acknowledge that ADUs may be close to property lines in nonconforming structures, with some height.
WB	10/11/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.6.2(A) ADUs	Section 6.4.12 [mult-family standards] is limiting two zones to push them into ADU's. Then, you restrict ADU's. If you don't allow home owners scale when building, the changes you're making will not be financially feasible for non multiplex developers and fewer units will be built. What is the number of new units the city is hoping to build after these changes?	This seems to be referring to the multi-family limitations in RN-2 and RN-4, which are carried over from the current code. ADUs are broadly allowed.
Lucas Ankhartz	09/11/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.6.2(A)10 ADUs	Similar comment as 6 [see reference to comment re full remodel] - this makes multi-stage building much more difficult to legally do and will add large financial burdens on small owners looking to upgrade the complete property.	Revised draft modifies language to allow more flexibility around construction of ADUs.
Smith	9/27/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.6.2(A)10 ADUs	What if you have a one story house that wants to add an ADU over a garage? That may be a very likely scenario that would prevent a otherwise efficient use of space that reduces impermeable surfaces. I consider this a design standard that may not fit into every every neighborhood. Please reconsider.	Revised draft modifies language to allow more flexibility around construction of ADUs.
Winston Lumpkins	7/18/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.6.2(A)4 ADUs	Does this mean that you couldn't immediately being renting out a new ADU as a longterm rental unit?	The revised draft eliminates this provision.
Lucas Ankhartz	09/11/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.6.2(A)4 ADUs	Why are we making it harder to create more rental units?	The revised draft eliminates this provision.
Smith	9/27/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.6.2(A)4 ADUs	I think this is okay, but the other commentator has a point about this provision being another barrier to rental housing production. I can see how this rule would fit well in a suburban community, but that's not the Portland I like to think of in the future. (I live in a single-family zone and would love to have greater density).	The revised draft eliminates this provision.
Kevin Parker	10/13/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.6.2(A)4 ADUs	This would prevent the landlord of a single family home from building ADUs as additional rental units on the property. Presumably this is the city trying to curb the construction of dedicated Airbnb units, but that regulation can be accomplished elsewhere, without creating this unnecessary barrier on adding much-needed housing units.	The revised draft eliminates this provision.
Lucas Ankhartz	09/11/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.6.2(A)6 ADUs	How will this be enforced? What happens if the owners are planning to do a full remodel of the property and need a place to store everything before they build a bigger primary home?	The revised draft eliminates this provision, but adds dimensional standards that are meant to allow flexibility while reinforcing the accessory nature of ADUs.

NAME	DATE	SOURCE	ARTICLE	TOPIC	COMMENT	RESPONSE
Nathan Miller	10/12/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.6.2(A)6 ADUs	[Response to Lucas Ankhartz] "significantly visible" is doing a lot of work in this item. I assume it's not defined (don't feel like paging back to the definitions), but seems to arbitrary. Let's not add ambiguous, easy to argue over language.	The revised draft eliminates this provision, but adds dimensional standards that are meant to allow flexibility while reinforcing the accessory nature of ADUs.
Lucas Ankhartz	09/11/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.6.2(A)7 ADUs	This will force many families in creating LLC's and other financial/legal instruments to maintain compliance which will make ownership even harder to track.	The revised draft eliminates this provision.
Smith	9/27/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.6.2(A)7 ADUs	What is the deed restriction supposed to accomplish? What other cities have this rule? This rule will increase the costs of developing an ADU as now the homeowner will need legal assistance to understand the implications, draft and record the deed restriction. In addition, many homeowners will be reluctant to to basically create a stain in their deed record. What if in the future the city allows multifamily and neighbors are able to develop and sell condos? We need to think 50 years ahead and the deed is forever. Please strike this out. Let's make developing ADUs easier.	The revised draft eliminates this provision.
Smith	9/27/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.6.2(C) Drive-throughs	Let's move away from the 80's and get rid of the drive throughs and not allow them anywhere. Do you want to live in a neighborhood with a drive-through? I don't. The B-2 and B-4 zones are right next to residential zones. There is no transition, so let's make the city more conducive to walking. After all, does Portland's climate action plan support cars idling in line?	First wave changes limit drive-throughs.
Kevin Parker	10/13/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.6.2(C) Drive-throughs	[Response to Smith] Seconding this. Drive-thrus are fine in the suburbs, but have no place in the busiest, densest city in the state.	First wave changes limit drive-throughs.
Tom Bander	10/11/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.6.2(C)2 Drive-throughs	Dates should not be used, needlessly confusing	The inclusion of a date here is a way to allow a limited number of existing drive-throughs to remain.
Todd Morse	10/11/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.6.2(C)2 Drive-throughs	Specific calendar dates should never be in a land use code. People should not have to do historical research to know what they are allowed to build on a given piece of land. This just creates nonconforming lots by another name, but it is ambiguous if the rules of nonconforming lots apply. Why not just remove drive throughs entirely? The existing drive throughs will still be able to operate as non conforming structures.	The inclusion of a date here is a way to allow a limited number of existing drive-throughs to remain.
Ashley Keenan	10/11/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.6.2(C)2 Drive-throughs	Drive-throughs should be heavily restricted in the city, but a carve-out should be make for walk-up windows.	Walk-up windows are not addressed in the code and likely don't need to be. Could occur as an accessory use where associated with a permitted principal use.
Winston Lumpkins	7/18/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.6.2(C)3 Drive-throughs	Drive throughs are dangerous for Pedestrians, and encourage anti social habits, like driving instead of walking for short errands that could be better done on foot. Pickup windows should of course be allowed, as they're safe and accessible for all modes of transport.	First wave changes limit drive-throughs.
Nathan Miller	10/12/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.6.2(C)3 Drive-throughs	[Response to Jay] I'm in favor of limiting drive throughs because they inherently favor vehicular traffic (duh) and pedestrian access is often no more than an afterthought, plus pedestrians frequently have to cross both a busy entrance and exit for these businesses, they are set back from the curb, etc. Just sets us up for sprawl and not density and line ups of idling vehicles.	First wave changes limit drive-throughs.
Jay	07/01/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.6.2(C)3 Drive-throughs	This is a general comment for the all the B districts that don't allow drive thru for food/coffee. One reason this was changed(and still allowed for a pharmacy or bank) was the thought that the higher retail rents could potentially help with more housing above. If I can get the same rent from a food operator why not allow it? If the drive thru works let them do it. Only allowing drive thrus in certain zones is shortsighted and actually increases traffic since people will travel further to go through those drive thrus. Covid taught us that drive thrus are essential. We all want our Dunkin or Starbucks in the morning and will drive to get it.	The first wave drafts reflect a new policy direction to limit drive-throughs, which are typically suburban in form and can create challenges for vehicles, bikes, and pedestrians. The limited allowances for drive throughs are tailored to the nature and form of the city's zones.
Heather Sanborn	06/30/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.6.2(G) Tasting rooms	I honestly don't know what this means any more. I would think that the intent is to continue to allow the kind of foods that our breweries (and/or their food truck partners) are currently offering? "Full course meal" isn't a definition that I really understand at this point.	Revised language to refer to 'full meal,' which aligns with language from the state.
Smith	9/27/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.6.2(I) Wind energy generation	Honestly, I would love to have a neighbor install one in their front yard to show commitment to renewable energy. Pavement and parked cars are less visually appealing. Let's think about making making it easier to implement out climate action goals.	The front yard prohibition reflects concerns about pedestrian experience in the right-of-way and to some extent, safety.
Smith	9/27/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.6.2(I)3 Wind energy generation	Is 25 feet not high enough if one needs to harness wind power? Perhaps ask the sustainability office to look into this...	25 feet is a common standard for accessory systems in a residential or low intensity mixed-use setting.
Portland Foreside (c/o Mary McGrann)	10/13/2023	Email	6. Use Standards	6.7 Temporary Uses	A comprehensive set of temporary uses should be addressed in the Code - Temporary events should not only be modified but also more inclusive. The Temporary Event language in the Eastern Waterfront Port Zone is something that could be modified to focus on the whole Zoning District along with the City owned Ocean Gateway.	The first wave drafts added broad language re temporary uses.

NAME	DATE	SOURCE	ARTICLE	TOPIC	COMMENT	RESPONSE
Kevin Parker	10/13/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.8.6 Historic resources	[Response to Kellan] Agree with Kellan on this. I can personally attest that Historic Preservation prevented the conversion of our building's condo units from gas boilers to heat pumps. This should be added to the code as an exception from Historic Preservation's oversight ability. There's no sense keeping perfectly-preserved buildings in a world destroyed by climate disaster.	Draft changes to Article 17 provide additional clarity on the review of these types of installations.
Karen Snyder	08/12/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.8.6 Historic resources	[Response to Kellan] Unhinged Historical Commission? Firstly, it is called the Historic Preservation Board and this unsubstantiated claim that the HPB demands single pane windows and ban installing air heat pumps is unsubstantiated. There are plenty of solar panels and heat pumps installed in the HDs. There are also plenty of single pane windows outside HD so maybe focus on that rather than these hysterical claims about HPB.	Revised drafts include some changes to the historic preservation ordinance in Article 16.
Kellan	07/16/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.8.6 Historic resources	Suggest expressly prohibiting the historical commission from making rules that substantially hinder improving building energy efficiency. The historical commission has become unhinged in its demands that all windows remain as single pane and its forbidding of the installation of air source heat pumps.	This reference has been eliminated from Article 6.
Tim Wells	10/12/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.8.7 Landscaping and screening	[Response to Karen Snyder] There are screening requirements. The City is inconsistent in requiring them across zones. But maybe it should be more conditional. Some projects should not be required to install as no one can see the mechanicals on the roofs. But in other places they can be seen by everyone. Like all the developments on Commercial or Fore that the neighborhoods and offices and people on the street can see. It doesn't make sense. A SF home can install a heatpump on the side of the house and it doesn't need to be screened. This is much uglier than rooftop mechanicals which most people cannot see. Why? This can add unnecessary costs but it is wildly inconsistent and doesn't really achieve much for the City.	See changes to landscaping standards under Article 13.
Karen Snyder	08/12/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.8.7 Landscaping and screening	There does NOT seem to be any landscaping or screen requirements for residential zones RN1 to RN7. Apparently, Planning Dept wants hot, urban and sterile microclimates within residential neighborhoods with no trees or vegetation while allowing large air handling units being installed on the flat roofs with no screening requirements on these modern clunky condo buildings being built.	The performance standards related to landscaping and screening have not been modified. Related standards under site plan review have been changed. See Article 13.
Cheryl Leeman	08/11/2023	Email	6. Use Standards	6.8.7 Landscaping and screening	Landscape and screening changes do not address residential or the recommendations in ReCode II for a stated need to evaluate and revise for consistency and clarity.	The performance standards related to landscaping and screening have not been modified. Related standards under site plan review will be revised in that article.
ksimp1	07/07/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	6.8.8 Noise	"Maintenance Activities" don't seem to be defined elsewhere in the document. Any commercial company not providing one-time construction services (E.G. landscapers) should be subject to the same noise standards as any other activity. Exempting lawn care from noise restrictions and allowing unlimited noise pollution creates significant externalities on the city as a whole. Exempting these activities that also generate enormous levels of air pollution is a direct contradiction of the cities one-climate future pledge.	Exempting these types of activities is typical in most noise/nuisance codes.
Avery Kamila	10/12/2023	Phone	6. Use Standards	6.8.8 Noise	How would noise impacts to residential properties be measured? Are the standards equitable? Are residential properties within a mixed-use zones subject to higher noise thresholds than residential uses in residential zones? This is an equity issue. All residential uses should be afforded the same noise limits as a basic matter of public health.	Noise standards have been revised such that all noise from uses in B zones is measured at the lot line, not at the boundary of the nearest residential zone.
Jonas Eule	07/03/2023	Form submission	6. Use Standards	6.8.8 Noise	Hello. I am wondering if there is anything in these phases pertaining to noise pollution emitting from in particular Maine Craft Distilling on Washington ave. I also have some questions about sound ordinances and decibel levels.	Some minor changes to noise standards are proposed.
Tim Wells	10/11/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	In general	[Response to Jaime Parker] Agree that connectivity has to be considered. Not sure it should be required except in large developments which brings up the questions of how it is defined. But an important point.	Site plan and subdivision standards currently speak to this.
Markos Miller	10/7/23	Email	6. Use Standards	In general	I'm really happy to see the ReCode work is re-emerging for public input. I miss the committee format of pre-pandemic, but appreciate the recent effort to reconnect with the public. this is important work. I just wanted to offer a few comments. On the recent 9/27 virtual public forum one staff member commented that a fair amount of the public response was that the recommendations had gone to far, while another significant amount of the responses were that the recommendations had not gone far enough, and thus the recommendations must be about right. I think that is a good way to think about political efforts- especially when all parties are at the table and able to see that they are getting some wins, and the other parties are some wins, but these wins are balanced, and come with some losses. However, ReCode is not merely a political exercise- it is setting policy to reach Comp Plan goals that have already been established through a comprehensive public engagement process and a political process. The question now should not be what kind of city (zoning-wise) we want to be, but how do we best become the city envisioned in the approved and adopted Comp Plan. Setting a goal, but creating a path/policy that only gets us half way there, is not successful policy. My first comment is that there has been very little reference back to the Comp Plan, and this weakens the position of the recode process. The Comp Plan is visionary, solid, and based in a transparent, broadly supported process. It is foundational to all the ReCode work; ReCode should always be presented in the context of the Comp Plan- the WHY has already been decided, we just need to be reminded. The discussion is HOW we achieve these goals. 2nd comment- I applaud the general move towards more density. This is necessary for more housing, for walkable communities, transit, everything people say they want. However, the high end of the recommendations satisfies only the bare minimum needed to support better transit, neighborhood businesses, and thus, walkable neighborhoods. This means we will never reach those goals- because only in the maximum build out scenario can it be achieved, and we will never have maximum build out. The recommendations must present a plausible path to reaching our goals. I don't know if it's 30%, 50%, build out, or what, but it's not 100%. So, please, be more ambitious with policy that encourages more housing.	The draft changes to the code increase opportunities for housing and mixed use in significant ways in both residential and mixed-use zones.
Portland Foreside (c/o Mary McCrann)	10/13/2023	Email	6. Use Standards	In general	The Code should address additional creative uses not currently listed - We offer support for the idea of "creative uses" not currently listed including but not limited to roof top gardens, roof decks, food and beverage offerings at marinas, etc.	These are generally accessory uses.
Todd Morse	10/09/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	Table 6-A: Uses in Residential Zones	Adding new categories for three and four family dwellings adds complexity to the code and limits housing potential. We have dimensional standards in place that will control the impact of buildings and naturally constrain the number of units in certain zones. We should not be constraining numbers of units in entire zones.	3- and 4-family are mid-scale housing types that have historically had a place in the city. Including these uses explicitly will help create broader opportunities for them.

NAME	DATE	SOURCE	ARTICLE	TOPIC	COMMENT	RESPONSE
Ashley Keenan	10/11/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	Table 6-A: Uses in Residential Zones	The introduction of 3- and 4-unit uses is plainly a construction to comply with LD2003 while changing as little as possible otherwise. There is no meaningful distinction between a 4-unit and 5-unit use, it's an overly burdensome and unjustified restriction to apply.	3- and 4-family are mid-scale housing types that have historically had a place in the city. Including these uses explicitly will help create broader opportunities for them.
Portland Foreside (c/o Mary McCrann)	10/13/2023	Email	6. Use Standards	Table 6-A: Uses in Residential Zones	Identify barriers, and explore options and implications related to allowing for a greater diversity of housing types within the City's residential zones – Consider a diversity of housing types for all Zones, but when doing so, also think about transportation options that serve each zone and a variety of transportation choices that are and can be offered.	The ReCode drafts include changes designed to support a variety of housing types.
Cameron Thompson	08/15/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	Table 6-A: Uses in Residential Zones	[Response to Karen Snyder] The definition for lodging home is on page 9 and matches that of the current code. The current code allows lodging homes in R5, so the recode is more strict and I agree less equitable. They should at least be allowed in RN-4. Lodging homes and SROs are an affordable option for individuals who are struggling with finding housing. They are not necessarily sober homes though they can be. Your comments imply that individuals struggling with housing are also individuals struggling with substance abuse, and they imply that neither demographic deserve housing in our communities. I and I believe many others disagree with your sentiment. We are in the middle of a housing crisis effecting all demographics and in this recode we need to expand and encourage affordable housing options.	Lodging houses are currently permitted as a conditional use in the R-5 only as conversions and with significant restrictions. Added similar language to apply to the RN-5.
Phyllis Guevin	07/18/2023	Email	6. Use Standards	Table 6-A: Uses in Residential Zones	No outside gardens should be allowed. We all know they attract critters and rats. They should only be permitted within a structure. Enough said.	Many gardens exist as a customary and incidental accessory use to residential. Supporting gardens and the food economy is reflected in the comprehensive plan.
Emma Rubin	07/16/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	Table 6-A: Uses in Residential Zones	Light business use that would benefit residents like small grocers, bakeries, coffee shops, food service etc. should be allowed in residential neighborhoods. Let's make it easier to walk to things!	New neighborhood businesses are not currently allowed within residential areas. The neighborhood nonresidential reuse category will help to address some need for neighborhood businesses. Other neighborhood business needs are addressed within the B-1, B-2 or other zones located nearby to residential zones. See B-1 mapping.
Urbanist Coalition Portland (c/o Todd Morse)	10/11/2023	Email	6. Use Standards	Table 6-A: Uses in Residential Zones	Allow small, low-impact, first-floor commercial uses in all residential zones as well as low- and medium-impact industrial zones. Some examples of uses that will be allowed, on the ground floor: restaurants, small retail, and clinics. Some examples of what will not be allowed: bed and breakfasts, marijuana retail stores, bars, adult business establishments, and auto service stations.	New neighborhood businesses are not currently allowed within residential areas. The neighborhood nonresidential reuse category will help to address some need for neighborhood businesses. Other neighborhood business needs are addressed within the B-1, B-2 or other zones located nearby to residential zones. See B-1 mapping.
Acorn Engineering (c/o Will Savage)	10/13/2023	Email	6. Use Standards	Table 6-A: Uses in Residential Zones	Encourage allowing additional uses within the RN-5 such as office and small retail uses on the ground floor that have a similar (or less) impact than allowable uses in the B-1 zone with similar performance standards such as hours of operation. This provision does not compete with housing, but rather it encourages complete neighborhoods where certain goods and services can be accessed by foot or bike, while promoting mixed-use smart growth development.	New neighborhood businesses are not currently allowed within residential areas. The neighborhood nonresidential reuse category will help to address some need for neighborhood businesses. Other neighborhood business needs are addressed within the B-1, B-2 or other zones located nearby to residential zones. See B-1 mapping.
Will Savage	10/13/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	Table 6-A: Uses in Residential Zones	Include General Office as an allowable use.	Offices are currently allowed in a limited capacity as a home occupation.
Will Savage	10/13/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	Table 6-A: Uses in Residential Zones	Include" Office Use"	Offices are currently allowed in a limited capacity as a home occupation.
Jim Wolf	07/18/2023	Email	6. Use Standards	Table 6-A: Uses in Residential Zones	While the old R3 zone seems to be allowing more development at a lesser density, the R2 lots remain significantly larger. Is there an explanation for this. I own land at the end of Tucker Avenue where the upper part of Tucker is R3 while the lower is R2. Is there an explanation as to why the old 2 zone is not being made the same as the upper part of Tucker	R-1 and R-2 were consolidated as part of the first wave changes. R-2 lot size has not been modified.
Urbanist Coalition Portland (c/o Todd Morse)	10/11/2023	Email	6. Use Standards	Table 6-A: Uses in Residential Zones	Create a new use called "coliving buildings" that is similar to lodging houses with the crucial difference of allowing separated common spaces. Ensure that the total amount of space available to each resident with the new configuration conforms to the standards for lodging houses.	Revised draft to eliminate requirement that lodging house kitchens be available to 'all residents.'
Cameron Thompson	07/20/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	Table 6-A: Uses in Residential Zones	According to definitions section the accessory level are those roof top versions less than 1000 sqft. Minor are those 1000-10000 sq ft Make it clear that accessory solar is also allowed	See 6.6.2(H). This is where solar as accessory is discussed.
Gabe Zappia	07/25/2023	Email	6. Use Standards	Table 6-A: Uses in Residential Zones	I watched your video and I understand how you are consolidating the zones. No mention was made about how the allowed uses are changing. Are there any allowed use changes expected for the RN-2 (formerly R3) zones?	See additional changes as described in companion materials.
Sam Lebel	11/6/2023	Email	6. Use Standards	Table 6-A: Uses in Residential Zones	The current R-3 zone allows for ground-up construction of multifamily under the PRUD when you hit the min lot size of 3 acres. Because the PRUD is being eliminated under ReCode, an R-3 lot that is currently 3+ acres today and is eligible for multifamily development via the PRUD will no longer be able to build new multifamily projects. I do appreciate the 1,200SF density for CU multifamily in R-3 (renovation of existing nonresidential building); however, I think these conversions will be relatively rare and as such, would advocate for perhaps a less dense option with ground-up new multifamily being permitted by-right land use in the R-3, otherwise, in a sense this zoning district is going backwards in the pursuit of housing for the larger lots.	See alternative development scenarios under Article 7.
Jim Wolf	07/17/2023	Email	6. Use Standards	Table 6-A: Uses in Residential Zones	I also would be curious to know if the zoning map is being altered. In the case of my land on Tucker/Newell it is currently in the R-2 zone, however, via Tucker half the road is R-3. Shouldn't the area have a consistent zone?	See map changes.

NAME	DATE	SOURCE	ARTICLE	TOPIC	COMMENT	RESPONSE
Cheryl Leeman	08/11/2023	Email	6. Use Standards	Table 6-A: Uses in Residential Zones	Removed Planned Residential Unit Development, (PRUDs) and Small Lot Development which have worked well to increase density more in keeping with historical pattern of neighborhoods,	Small lot development standards in the R-5 have been rolled into base standards for the RN-4. Removed PRUDs, and replaced with new alternative development scenarios, as PRUDs are historically fairly inconsistent with neighborhood fabric.
Cheryl Leeman	08/11/2023	Email	6. Use Standards	Table 6-A: Uses in Residential Zones	Demolition of existing structures NOT addressed as a prohibition to achieve proposed changes.	The drafts do no generally prohibit demolition.
Karen Snyder	08/12/2023	Email	6. Use Standards	Table 6-A: Uses in Residential Zones	Example #2: Allowing an Easier Time for More Commercial Business/Non-Residential Use Businesses in RN-5 (formerly R6) Rather than Focusing on Long Term Residential Housing. In Table 6-A: Permitted and Conditional Uses in Residential Neighborhood Zones (page 36), in following document link First Wave Changes - Comments — ReCode Portland, Planning Dept is relaxing how many commercial business and non-residential use businesses can be allowed in residential neighborhoods. For example: 1) Planning Department thinks it is okay to only allow most non-residential use businesses such as: bed&breakfasts, hostels and lodging houses (aka sober houses in RN-5(formerly R6) to RN-7 but yet NOT allow them in the other residential zones of RN-1 to RN-4. How is this fair and equitable? The "Lodging House" definition on Page 9 of document states: " A house, building, or portion thereof containing two or more rooming units, as well as common area, and providing individuals on not less than a monthly basis for compensation". From my understanding, Lodging housing (aka Sober houses) are considered temporary housing for people (Note: They don't even have to be Maine residents). This type of housing is considered transient and "non-residential use" business (besides also the Bed/Breakfasts and Hostels) will only remove more long-term residential housing units within the RN-5 (formerly R6) to RN-7 residential neighborhoods. Let us be very clear, long-term residents do NOT want to live next to transient housing such as: lodging houses, sober houses, bed& breakfasts or hostels. Long-term residents want to live in stable residential neighborhoods where there is an actual residential community and not a transient community which are less safe. 2) In addition, currently, there is no transparency to easily identify in the land use code what residential properties are currently being used as non-residential use businesses such as lodging/sober houses or group homes. Note: There have been at least manually identified over 20 lodging/sober houses within residential neighborhoods without notifying residents that this type of transient housing businesses is actually operating in residential neighborhoods. 3) It also needs to be clear how many and how far apart these commercial businesses and non-residential use businesses are allowed in residential neighborhoods. For example, the Planning Department has removed restrictions that group homes cannot be located within 500 ft of each other. What will happen? Not only Airbnbs are unregulated but now the City of Portland will allow an unlimited amount of non-residential use businesses with no restrictions to the number of Bed&Breakfasts, hostels, and lodging houses that can operate in residential neighborhoods. Consequently, with no restrictions, these types of non-residential businesses can overwhelm a residential neighborhood and remove long term residential housing units rather than ensuring there is enough long-term residential housing being built or created.	The first wave drafts generally reflect existing use permissions with respect to these uses in the R-6.
Karen Snyder	08/12/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	Table 6-A: Uses in Residential Zones	In Table 6-A: Permitted and Conditional Uses in Residential Neighborhood Zones below are the following concerning an inequitable observation: 1) There are being proposed a substantial increase of "non-residential uses" being allowed in RN5 (formerly R6) than previously allowed in R6. For example, Bed and Breakfast, Hostels and Lodging Housings will ONLY allowed in RN5 (formerly R6) to RN-7. However, there is no clear definition of what lodging houses actually consist of within this document. From my understanding, Lodging housing (aka Sober houses) are considered temporary housing and a non-residential use (besides Bed and Breakfasts and Hostels) which removes long term residential housing units within the RN5-RN7 residential neighborhoods. Currently, there is no way to identify in the land use code what properties are currently being used as non-residential uses of Bed/Breakfast, Hostels, or lodging/sober houses. Note: There have been at least manually identified over 20 lodging sober houses within residential neighborhoods without even notifying abutters that this type of housing is being installed. 2) It also is NOT fair and equitable to allow these type of non-residential uses in RN-5 to RN-7 but yet NOT allow them in the other residential Zones of RN1-RN4. How is this "fair and equitable"? 3) The Planning Dept also removed the 500 ft rule so these types of non-residential uses can proliferate within RN5-R7 residential neighborhoods taking away from long term residential housing needs. What will happen? Consequently, this is NOT considered a complete neighborhood when non-residential uses could remove long term residential housing units rather than ensuring there is enough long term residential housing being built or created.	The first wave drafts generally reflect existing use permissions with respect to these uses in the R-6.
Urbanist Coalition Portland (c/o Todd Morse)	10/11/2023	Email	6. Use Standards	Table 6-A: Uses in Residential Zones	Combine multi-family, multiplex, two-family, and single-family dwelling uses into a single use (dwellings) and allow that new use anywhere the old uses were allowed, with the exception of island zones. For the island zones, create a new use "Island Dwellings" which are limited to single-family dwellings and apply them wherever single-family dwellings were allowed in island zones to preserve existing standards.	This would be a way of simplifying use standards, but would preclude some of the nuance between uses in the existing residential zoning that ReCode tries to maintain.
Peter Brandon	10/11/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	Table 6-A: Uses in Residential Zones	I feel these should be condensed to "Residential Dwellings (1-4 Units)" and allowed in all zones. As another commenter posted, there is no shortage of dimensional standards and other red tape that will protect the character of neighborhoods. There's a lot of talk in this recode effort about improving housing availability but this just looks like more of the same but with more complicated language.	This would be a way of simplifying use standards, but would preclude some of the nuance between uses in the existing residential zoning that ReCode tries to maintain.
Jim Wolf	07/17/2023	Email	6. Use Standards	Table 6-A: Uses in Residential Zones	It does not appear from reading that a great deal is being done to stimulate development in the current R-2 zone. If I am reading correctly the lot size is remaining the same and the only change is duplex construction will be allowed. In contrast, in the R-3 zone not only are duplexes being allowed, the density for multi development is much less restrictive.	Under recently adopted LD 2003 changes, up to four units would be allowed in all mainland residential zones, plus two ADUs.
Damon Yakovleff	08/04/2023	Email	6. Use Standards	Table 6-A: Uses in Residential Zones	Based on my reading of the proposed changes, it appears that the new RN1, and possibly the RN2 zones, are not considered the "growth area" because they do not allow 4 or more units. I would suggest that the "growth area" should be defined as "anywhere in mainland Portland served by public water and sewer". All of these locations should be zoned for medium to high residential densities. Separate considerations for the islands make sense.	Under recently adopted LD 2003 changes, up to four units would be allowed in all mainland residential zones, plus two ADUs.
Cheryl Leeman	08/11/2023	Email	6. Use Standards	Table 6-A: Uses in Residential Zones	Removed from current Use Standard Table is Off-street parking as Conditional use "to insure compatibility with the immediate neighborhood."	Under the drafts, off-street parking would no longer be permitted as a principal use within residential zones. This is in keeping with policy direction both on parking and on housing creation.
Connect Portland	07/19/2023	Email	6. Use Standards	Table 6-A: Uses in Residential Zones	Have PRUDs been eliminated?	Yes.
PIC	1/9/24	Email	6. Use Standards	Table 6-B: Uses in Island Zones	The PIC opted not to put forward detailed recommendations for use permissions for now, as it is a complex issue that weneed to spend further time on. As you all know, this is certainly something that the community is interested in, as there are unique complexities to running businesses on Peaks Island.	General comment.

NAME	DATE	SOURCE	ARTICLE	TOPIC	COMMENT	RESPONSE
Peaks Councilors & Housing + Zoning Subcommittee	10/10/2023	Email	6. Use Standards	Table 6-B: Uses in Island Zones	Light industrial zoning + I-B + allowable uses - One of the most widely discussed zoning issues in all of our discussions is the need for more commercial space. Property values are so high and our business district so small (and filled with residential homes) that it is nearly impossible to start a legal business on Peaks. - In the next phase of ReCode, serious consideration needs to be given toward establishment of a light industrial zone and expansion or alteration of the current I-B zone. Our H&Z Committee recommends looking at land adjacent to the Transfer Station. - Is there consideration to open up allowable uses of IR1 or IR2 at all to allow for more mixed used zoning?	See some proposed changes in zone boundaries under mapping.
Peaks Councilors & Housing + Zoning Subcommittee	10/10/2023	Email	6. Use Standards	Table 6-B: Uses in Island Zones	Sewer - Are there any concerns about how many new housing units the current sewer system can support? - Do you know when the Planning Department/Public Works are looking at another phase of sewer extension on Peaks?	There are concerns about the adequacy of infrastructure on the islands, which is part of the reason that they are defined as outside the 'designated growth area' and permitted uses are limited.
Tanya	7/18/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	Table 6-B: Uses in Island Zones	Shouldn't there be studios for artists and craftspeople allowed in IR-1 and IR-2 zones? At least studios that create minimal noise and/or smells	These uses have been added in revised drafts.
Peaks Councilors & Housing + Zoning Subcommittee	10/10/2023	Email	6. Use Standards	Table 6-B: Uses in Island Zones	Multi-family units + LD2003 - Was there consideration to allow multi-family units in IR2 or IR1? Or at least up to four-units? - This was discussed at the last PIC meeting and there was not any pushback to idea of allowing more multi-families. The reality is that the limiting factors of property values and available land on Peaks mean we are very unlikely to see a surge in building even with new zoning allowances. The character of the island is not in danger. - How is LD2003 being dealt with here? Is there a reason the multi-family allowance of the state bill is not being extended to Peaks?	Under recently adopted LD 2003 changes, up to three units would be allowed in all island residential zones, plus two ADUs.
Peaks Councilors & Housing + Zoning Subcommittee	10/10/2023	Email	6. Use Standards	Table 6-B: Uses in Island Zones	Two family allowance: - The H&Z committee and the PIC unanimously support island-wide two family allowance. This would increase housing choices, for renting and home ownership, and would not alter the character of the island. We have found widespread support for this throughout the community— including unanimous support of community members who attended the last two PIC meetings.	Under recently adopted LD 2003 changes, up to three units would be allowed in all island residential zones, plus two ADUs. These have been integrated into the adopted code and are reflected in the revised drafts.
Laura Glendening	10/17/2023	Email	6. Use Standards	Table 6-B: Uses in Island Zones	Regarding the PIC recommendation for a multi-units in all residential areas this committee recommends further investigation as the survey results did not show support for this allowance.	Under recently adopted LD 2003 changes, up to three units would be allowed in all island residential zones, plus two ADUs. These have been integrated into the adopted code and are reflected in the revised drafts.
Joe Walsh	10/13/2023	Email	6. Use Standards	Table 6-C: Uses in Mixed-Use Zones	B-4 Zone Draft: I am highly supportive of allowing multi-family development in this zone. I am a property owner in a B-4 zone on Warren Ave and there is so much vacant land out here that could be housing, and would be suitable for large apartment buildings. And having no setbacks opens lots more possibilities. What is the proposed minimum area/du? Again, I bring up the question of missing middle housing. Large apartment complexes will certainly be built if this change passes. But how about 4-plexes on the smaller lots in this zone? What can the City do to encourage this type of housing?	First wave drafts modified use permissions to allow more housing within the B-4 zone.
Cheryl Leeman	08/11/2023	Email	6. Use Standards	Table 6-C: Uses in Mixed-Use Zones	RP zones added "residential" as permitted use whereas in the current language it states, "any residential use permitted in the nearest residential zone."	Provisions that refer to 'nearest residential zone' were eliminated in the first wave drafts in favor of clearer, more direct language.
Julie Dubofsky	08/17/2023	Form submission	6. Use Standards	Table 6-C: Uses in Mixed-Use Zones	I would also like to suggest that Emergency Shelters and Residential Care Facilities (small) be permitted/conditional in RN-4 due to the presence of a fixed route transit service on Stevens and Brighton Ave, or to consider adding them as permitted/conditional uses to the B-1 Neighborhood Business zone allow for families experiencing homelessness to be sheltered (allowed in B-2) near their schools and services. Smaller facilities have a better chance of facing less NIMBY opposition, and would support the city's greater efforts in Housing First adoption and opportunities for new housing development with social service providers. Thank you very much for your consideration and the extensive work to marry land uses with all the policy efforts of the city.	Revised drafts add small residential care facilities as a permitted use within the B-1, and to allow large and small in the B-4. Housing first projects have historically simply been permitted as multi-family housing.
Joe Walsh	10/13/2023	Email	6. Use Standards	Table 6-C: Uses in Mixed-Use Zones	B-1 Zone draft - Our City needs more of this type of Zone. Why not eliminate the single-family as a possibility in this zone? I would assume B-1 zones would be surrounded by RN-4, RN-5 and in some areas RN-1 & RN-2 zones - so to allow single family to be built by right in B-1 seems redundant.	Revised drafts eliminate single- and two-family as permitted uses in these zones.
Jaime Parker	10/11/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	Table 6-G: Uses in Open Space Zones	Trails, Byways, neighborhood connections. Paved or unpaved.	These are generally not treated as principal land uses.
Ryan Johnson	07/14/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards	Table formatting/key	Suggest incorporating this key on the table itself for easier reference.	The revised drafts make this change.
Liz Trice	10/11/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards		Seems like we should be able to have fewer than 6 business zones.	Some consolidation of mixed-use zones has been proposed.
Jaime Parker	10/11/2023	Konveio	6. Use Standards		Trails, Byways, neighborhood connections, pocket-parks, street-side tiny parks and associated amenities (benches, signs and maps, artistic or landscape features should be an allowed "use" in all zones. ALL new development should support connectivity and outdoor social spaces, and connections to and through developments should be required, or if an exception is made, there should be a commensurate improvement to nearby connectivity via bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, trails, etc....	Under drafts, parks would be allowed in almost every zone. Trails, byways, benches, etc. are generally treated more like site amenities or infrastructure improvements that might be required under subdivision or site plan.
Karen Snyder	08/12/2023	Konveio	7. Dimensional Standards	7.2 "Average grade"	This is a confusing definition. Is average grade connected to pre-development grade? It assumes a structure is in the lot. What if it is an empty lot? How can an average grade be calculated if there is no structure in the lot?	Both the 'pre-development grade' and 'average grade' definitions refer to structures, since both definitions are central to calculations of height, which is only relevant to structures.

NAME	DATE	SOURCE	ARTICLE	TOPIC	COMMENT	RESPONSE
Portland Foreside (c/o Mary McCrann)	10/13/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	7.2 "Height"	Propose that the City consider, as a resiliency measure, allowing developers to convert height restrictions in feet to a maximum number of stories. This change would allow for the increase in floor to floor height of lower floors (thereby providing mitigation from the impacts of flooding) and encourage the thoughtful placement of mechanicals without negatively impacting uses and floors above. To qualify for additional height, a project should be required to demonstrate that the extra height is used for resiliency measures. The City could consider requiring that certain other sustainable development practices be met as well.	See Article 8, where the draft Coastal Flood Resilience Overlay Zone proposes to allow some additional height where DFE affects first floor elevation.
					<p>The HP board has at least twice in recent times run into building height limitations for pitched roofs, which ends up making the building look squat as a result.</p> <p>The first example I have was new construction on Danforth Street. This preceded my time on the HP board, but as you can see the new building on the right had a lower height allowance than both of its historic abutters. I heard the HP board at the time recommended the pitch of the roof should be steeper to match its abutters but City height limits prevented that so it needed to stay squat. It looks a little silly.</p> <p>The second example is a Munjoy Hill attic conversion to living space proposal that's come up recently. In order to accommodate head-heights in the new living spaces, dormers need to be added, reducing the slope of the roof. It would make sense to raise the pitch of the roof to maintain the proportions of the house, but the house runs up against the building height limits. The project would be so much improved if the building's proportions could be retained after this renovation, and all it would take is another few feet to make it right. (This project won't be affected by ReCode, but it's an example that's likely to come up again in the future).</p> <p>--> My idea is allowing a roof pitch to exceed building height limits (below an additional 5' 8") if the project is subject to design review (by staff or board) and the height allowance best serves the composition of the building (as opposed to the programmatic desires of the applicant -- I don't want to turn this into a pent house grab).</p>	
Robert O'Brien	10/06/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	7.2 "Height"	Maybe there's another way to approach it. But it's too bad we've run into a couple of these honest examples that could have benefitted from a couple feet of flexibility.	The preferred approach is for applicants to design projects to meet existing height standards as well as design standards.
Urbanist Coalition Portland (c/o Todd Morse)	10/11/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	7.2 "Height"	If a building is on a hill where one side is at sidewalk level, allow height to be measured from that sidewalk instead of the average height of the lot.	The ReCode drafts generally maintain the existing approach to measuring height, but add some clarity around how to measure grade.
MHNO (c/o Barbara Vestal)	10/11/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	7.2 "Height"	3. HEIGHT REGULATION IS NOT IMPROVED; HEIGHTS SHOULD BE MEASURED FROM PRE-DEVELOPMENT GRADE. Measurement of heights in Portland has been problematic for at least a decade. Rather than fixing the source of the controversy, the proposed draft further embeds the misguided approach. For both the islands and mainland, dimensional height limits should be applied from pre-development grade as existed as of a certain date, such as January 1, 2000. Instead, the proposed draft imposes absolutely no limits upon a developer importing fill or otherwise proposing to alter the site prior to calculating allocable height. That makes the height limits de facto non-existent and defeats the reason for having height limits in the first place. Similarly, the proposed draft does not adequately define the point of measurement; applied details such as planters should not be treated as if they are a foundation.	The ReCode drafts generally maintain the existing approach to measuring height, but add some clarity around how to measure grade.
GPL Advocacy Committee	12/10/23	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	7.2 "Height"	We feel strongly that the definition and/or rules of measurement for building height should be measured from predevelopment grade, to ensure that no development can game the system and achieve a height vastly out of scale with its neighbors. We referenced the Bangor LUC language as an example of another Maine community's handling of this issue: "Height is measured from the vertical distance from the top of the highest roof beams of a flat roof or the mean level of the highest gable or slope of a hip roof to the average grade adjoining the building footprint prior to construction."	The ReCode drafts generally maintain the existing approach to measuring height, but add some clarity around how to measure grade.
MHNO (c/o Barbara Vestal)	10/11/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	7.2 "Height"	4. THERE SHOULD BE A CAP ON HOW MUCH GAIN CAN BE REALIZED FROM AVERAGING GRADE. The code needs to recognize that a high percentage of the sites in Portland that remain to be built upon are on steeply sloped land. In the last several years some buildings have been proposed or built on these steeply sloped sites, which take maximum advantage of grade averaging and produce buildings that are greatly out of scale with their context. These buildings should serve as cautionary examples and the proposed code should be adjusted to establish a maximum amount of height above the lowest grade that can be picked up by averaging grade, such as 4 feet. A cap like that will further context sensitivity from both the uphill and downhill perspectives.	The ReCode drafts modified the rule of measurement to ensure measurement at regular intervals, which will help to standardize the methodology.
MHNO (c/o Barbara Vestal)	10/11/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	7.2 "Height"	5. PORTLAND'S CODE NEEDS TO INCORPORATE A METHODOLOGY FOR MEASURING GRADE THAT IS CONSISTENT WITH STANDARD ENGINEERING PRACTICES AND IS NOT AS VULNERABLE TO MANIPULATION BY APPLICANTS. The proposed definition of "grade, average" proposes minor improvements over current, but the methodology is incomplete. "Foundation" is not operationalized. Using the perimeter of the building as the element to be measured allows for heights to be "gamed" by proposing a building that is heavily crenelated or repeatedly indented on the highest part of a site, giving extra weight to that part of the perimeter. A more standard methodology for measuring grade is in order.	The ReCode drafts modified the rule of measurement to ensure measurement at regular intervals, which will help to standardize the methodology.

NAME	DATE	SOURCE	ARTICLE	TOPIC	COMMENT	RESPONSE
Mary Costigan	10/11/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	7.2 "Height"	<p>Sun Life was recently denied approval of a proposed rooftop occupancy due, in part, to the City's determination that their proposed paver system was a "structure" above the height limitation that was not on the list of approved rooftop appurtenances in the Code. We did request an amendment to add paver systems to the list for ReCode, but it appears that it did not make it into the draft. We are therefore writing to ask that it be added to the list of rooftop appurtenances.</p> <p>With the growing popularity of rooftop occupancy, we believe it is important for the City to consider amendments to its allowed list of appurtenances in order to allow for occupancy. Many rooftops are sloped for drainage and therefore need to have a flooring surface that is on adjustable pavers to create a level walking surface. The paver system, just like tiles laid directly on the surface are simply additional roofing material and do not add any significant height to a structure. Rather, they create an even, safe surface to walk on.</p> <p>Finally, because of the popularity of rooftop occupancy, the issue of what types of structures can go on the roof to support the occupancy is likely to continue. It seems logical that shade structures, attached furnishings, and other accessory structures associated with rooftop occupancy should also be allowed as appurtenances, provided they do not exceed the height of the penthouse or other approved parapet for screening rooftop mechanical systems.</p> <p>We have drafted the following amendments for your consideration.</p> <p><u>Section 7.7.1. Height</u> <u>E. Exceptions for Rooftop appurtenances. Unless otherwise noted, rooftop appurtenances for the housing of elevators, stairways, tanks, fans, or other building operating equipment not intended for human occupancy, deck railings or guards, pedestal paver roof deck systems, skylights, steeples, flag poles, chimneys, smokestacks, radio or television masts, water tanks, or silos may be erected above the height limitations herein prescribed. Shade structures, attached furnishings, and other appurtenances associated with rooftop occupancy may also be erected above the height limitations provided they do not exceed the height of the rooftop penthouse or other approved parapet for screening of rooftop mechanical systems.</u></p> <p>Add a new definition to Section 3: <u>Pedestal paver roof deck system: flooring system consisting of pavers which are laid over a pedestal support (fixed or adjustable height) which raises the tiles or pavers off the existing surface to create a level, elevated deck.</u></p>	The revised drafts include changes to the height exceptions for rooftop appurtenances to include pedestal paver systems up to 18" and other similar furnishings that support rooftop occupancy while maintaining the effect of the established height limit.
Karen Snyder	08/12/2023	Konveio	7. Dimensional Standards	7.2 "Height"	Why is Planning Dept using a pre-development grade for the Islands but a confusing "average" grade for calculating the height of a building?	This has been the long-standing approach to calculating height within the land use code.
Amy Oberlin	10/11/2023	Konveio	7. Dimensional Standards	7.2 "Landscaped open space ratio"	Green roofs are expensive to construct -- there should be a benefit in terms of counting towards some fraction of landscaped open space to incentivize them.	Green roofs are incentivized elsewhere in the code and related regulations (e.g. within stormwater management requirements).
Karen Snyder	08/12/2023	Konveio	7. Dimensional Standards	7.2 "Landscaped open space ratio"	There is no clear definition what landscaped actually consists of. Does it mean planting pollinators or yard scaping with perennials? Does it mean adding trees, etc.	Open space' is defined in Article 3 as 'land and water areas designed and reserved for use as active or passive recreation areas or for preservation purposes,' and landscaped would carry its common meaning. The rule of measurement does specify some things that do not qualify as landscaped open space.
Connect Portland	07/11/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	7.4 Alternative Development Options	New Alternative Residential Development Options (Conservation and Cottage Court developments) that allows small lot development, does it apply to all zones? Should it be added to the Use and Dimensional Tables?	As written, these options don't apply across all zones, and they have not been added to the use tables, as these options don't represent 'uses' per se, but more a change in dimensional standards. Because the dimensional standards for these alternative options are complex, they lend themselves to text, rather than a table.
Acorn Engineering (c/o Will Savage)	10/13/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	7.4 Alternative Residential Development Options	Would the City consider Private Roads to meet the City Frontage requirements? Given the goals of this section, and potentially elsewhere, it may be advantageous for the City (and Developer) to construct a private street to provide access, utilities, stormwater, street frontage, etc while not being constrained to 50' ROW widths and technical standards. The ownership and maintenance of the private roadway would be the responsibility of a homeowner's association.	Revised drafts refer to frontage on a 'private way' as well as a street.
Jaime Parker	10/11/2023	Konveio	7. Dimensional Standards	7.4.1(D) Conservation residential development	Considering Conservation or Open Space related to development, there should be a requirement for permanent public access and connectivity from the development to, and through the open space.	This is a conveyance option, but has not been added as a requirement.
Nathan Miller	10/12/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	7.4.2(D) Cottage court development	Why limit this to 25%? Cottage courts sound amazing, why wouldn't we allow an entire cottage court development that is nothing but duplex units (meeting the other requirements), to help reduce per-unit costs and increase energy efficiency (shared walls)?	Cottage court is a way to do more units on a lot with some relief on minimum lot size, meaning that buildings by nature will be smaller. This form is not meant to replace multi-family.

NAME	DATE	SOURCE	ARTICLE	TOPIC	COMMENT	RESPONSE
Peaks Councilors & Housing + Zoning Subcommittee	10/10/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	7.4.2(D) Cottage court development	Cottage Court zoning - We have heard broad interest in Cottage Court zoning on Peaks. This could aid in our desperate need for year-round rental housing, while preserving adequate open spaces. ADUs are already of course not allowed to rented short-term on Peaks. This was also supported unanimously by the PIC and H&Z committee.	The revised drafts add cottage courts as a development option within the IR-2 zone.
Betsey Remage-Healey	10/12/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	7.4.2(D) Cottage court development	Why isn't cottage court zoning proposed for IR1 or IR2 ? Surely an important option for small/tiny house clusters. I believe a number of islanders have requested this.	The revised drafts add cottage courts as a development option within the IR-2 zone.
Nathaniel Ferguson	10/11/2023	Konveio	7. Dimensional Standards	7.5.2(A) Pedestrian passage required	This standard for "pedestrian access" is counterproductive. The current street grid is already sufficient for providing pedestrian access. This requirement would reduce the buildable lot area when a sidewalk is added to a street. Parking lots should also not count as a factor requiring pedestrian passage. Importantly, this standard does not allow for walking through the actual building to count as pedestrian passage. Because of this, both the Cross Insurance Arena and City Hall would not comply with this standard. Also, for mid-block connectivity, many existing streets in Portland have more than 300 feet of continuous storefronts, but since they are separate (touching) buildings, they would not be subject to this standard. Please remove this entire standard.	The revised drafts modify this requirement to allow some flexibility.
Publius Portland	07/09/2023	Form submission	7. Dimensional Standards	7.7 Space and bulk exceptions	You should permit the planning board to waive the "step-back" requirements in the RN-5 Zone in the event the lot is an "in-fill" and a finding that there is no material adverse visual impact from the waiver. There are several lots in the current R-6 that could and should be built to 45 feet tall and would fit appropriately in the neighborhood, and requiring the step-back adds construction complexity for very little value.	Stepbacks have generally been successful in mitigating height and mass.
Tim Wells	10/13/2023	Konveio	7. Dimensional Standards	7.7.1(E) Height exceptions (rooftop appurtenances)	How can decking to build a deck not be included? How can the City allow deck railings and guards but not allow the deck itself? Why are decks not allowed on a rooftop? What problem is this solving? Who is deciding that roof decks are immoral or harmful? If the City doesn't want roof decks just say they are not allowed. It is very misleading to allow deck railings, which suggests that a building may have a roof deck, but not allow the actual decking itself. This is not making the code clear, concise, easy to understand. When the decking is below the parapet does it really impact the neighborhood or neighbors? The answer is obviously no. So who thought this one up? Who is making the judgement that roof decks are bad? Roof decks are outdoor space. On multi-unit buildings, where people are using 435 sf or 725 sf of land per home, not 5000 or 10,000sf, and giving up a huge yard for their own personal use, the City is trying to restrict flexibility to create outdoor space. Effectively penalizing people who live in multi-home buildings. Encouraging single-family home purchase and suburban development patterns by making more urban neighborhoods less appealing. Why? How does this conform with the stated aspirations in the Comprehensive Plan? How is this equitable? How does this help address the issues of affordability and availability of homes? Why would decking that isn't even visible and doesn't add height to a building not be allowed? Especially after COVID and the lockdowns, where we learned that people need balconies and safe, private outdoor space would we be ignoring these lessons? I am not sure what the impetus is for this omission to effectively disallow roof top decks. Especially when more height is needed to meet the challenges of climate change and reducing floor to ceiling heights is moving in the exact opposite direction of where we need to be heading. Baffling!!	The revised drafts include changes to the height exceptions for rooftop appurtenances to include pedestal paver systems up to 18" and other similar furnishings that support rooftop occupancy while maintaining the effect of the established height limit.
Portland Foreside (c/o Mary McCrann)	10/13/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	7.7.1(E) Height exceptions (rooftop appurtenances)	Exceptions for Rooftop appurtenances. Unless otherwise noted, rooftop appurtenances for the housing of elevators, stairways, tanks, fans, or other building operating equipment not intended for human occupancy, deck railings or guards, pedestal paver roof deck systems, skylights, steeples, flag poles, chimneys, smokestacks, radio or television masts, water tanks, or silos may be erected above the height limitations herein prescribed. Rooftop pools and associated infrastructure, shade structures, unenclosed structures, attached furnishings and other appurtenances associated with rooftop occupancy may also be erected above the height limitations provided they do not exceed the height of the rooftop penthouse or other approved parapet for screening of rooftop mechanical systems.	The revised drafts include changes to the height exceptions for rooftop appurtenances to include pedestal paver systems up to 18" and other similar furnishings that support rooftop occupancy while maintaining the effect of the established height limit.
Rachel Conly	07/13/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	7.7.3(A)	1. In section 7.7.3.A "Small Island Lots". Can you please clarify if this section is ONLY applicable to development on vacant lots, and not applicable to existing non-conforming previously developed small lots in IR-2? For instance, is it possible to apply the new dimensional standards to a remodel/addition in the IR-2 zone for properties that are less 20,000 SF? Or, can a previously existing single family in the IR-2 be converted into a 2 family?	Revised drafts reorganize this language to clarify that the standards would be applicable to both existing residential lots and to vacant lots in certain cases.
PIC	1/8/24	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	7.7.3(A)	The PIC voted unanimously in favor of recommending a 2,500 sq ft lot size for small island allowance. Our Housing & Zoning committee supported us in this decision as well. In examining lot sizes throughout the most dense year-round residential streets on the island, we see 2,500 sq ft as reasonable in keeping with the current neighborhood lay-outs. It would not bring all lots into conformity, as there are many under 2,000 sq ft, but it would make some progress there, as well.	The revised drafts establish a 3,000 SF minimum lot size for small island lots.
Will Savage	10/13/2023	Konveio	7. Dimensional Standards	7.7.4(A) Setbacks	Taller bulkheads (>24") should be considered.	Based on experience, most bulkheads meet this standard.
Rachel Conly	10/13/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	Accessory structures	Following the current ADU regulations on Peaks, I would also like to see other accessory structures, which benefit the health and well being of people and the planet, be exempt from lot coverage requirements. Things such as greenhouses, sheds (for bikes and gardening, we don't have garages out here, and most people don't have basements), and porches (covered and uncovered) should be allowed to improve the health and well being of occupants. I would also argue that artist spaces and home offices should fall into this category. In addition to removing the barrier of lot coverage restrictions, I would also like to see setback requirements either removed, or radically changed for these particular uses. Most properties cannot add any of these accessory structures legally to the lot. This includes ADUs. While the ADU regulations removed lot coverage requirements, most IR-2 properties (which includes a population of people that could really use extra income and age in place) are still unable to add ADUs due to the setback restrictions. The lots in IR-2 are very small!!!!	Revised drafts reduce setbacks for detached accessory structures (and small island lots), and increase the lot coverage to 60%, as adopted under LD 2003.
Portland Foreside (c/o Mary McCrann)	10/13/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	Accessory structures	A comprehensive set of accessory structures and uses should be clearly defined within the Code – This should include temporary accessory structures that could be renewed with certain time intervals.	The first wave drafts include new language for accessory uses and structures.

NAME	DATE	SOURCE	ARTICLE	TOPIC	COMMENT	RESPONSE
Joe Walsh	10/13/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	Building code	What can the city do to encourage triplexes and four-plexes? Often, these projects don't get built because of sprinkler requirements, min lot sizes and setbacks. If I understand correctly, some of the sprinkler requirements are set at the state level, but I hope we are doing all we can to lessen/streamline this particular burden wherever possible. I know we have to be conscious of safety, but there are diminishing returns at some point and safety needs to be balanced with cost.	Under recently adopted LD 2003 changes, up to four units would be allowed in all mainland residential zones, plus two ADUs.
Nate Howes	08/09/2023	Form submission	7. Dimensional Standards	Downtown height map	The block at the NE corner of Cumberland and Elm is under-zoned (85' max height) compared to the block on the NW corner of Elm and Cumberland (105' max height), especially given its location immediately across the street from the Metro transit hub. Portland should be prioritizing density along busy corridors like this in the core of the downtown peninsula. The 105' height overlay should be applied on the NE corner block.	Revised height map includes change in this area.
Ashley Keenan	10/13/2023	Konveio	7. Dimensional Standards	Downtown height map	The fact that this map is the only one available leads me to believe that the focus is, as ever, on trying to Manhattanize the peninsula instead of encouraging reasonable middle-density housing across the city. We don't need skyscrapers, especially in our regulatory environment. We need the city as a whole to be brought up to parity with the most lovable neighborhoods in the city. Completely wrong-headed approach. I understand that the perception is that we peninsulars are less likely to object, but this poverty of confidence can't be allowed any further to choke our city. I wish a fraction of the effort here was put into upzoning the mainland.	The comprehensive plan supports additional development downtown, close to jobs and services, as the center of the region and an element of a smart growth approach.
Michael Erickson	11/21/21	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	Downtown height map	My name is Mike Erickson and I am the General Manager of Holiday Inn By The Bay (88 Spring St). I recently learned that the city is considering increasing some downtown height limits, and I am writing in hopes of having our parcel included in said height increase. This increase would allow us to activate our rooftop and open a great space to enjoy views of Casco Bay. We hope to add to the city's food and drink scene by making our space available to both visitors and locals while operating in our existing footprint. Please let me know if there are any more formal steps I can take to support this, or if you have any questions for me.	The revised drafts include changes to the height exceptions for rooftop appurtenances to include pedestrian paver systems up to 18" and other similar furnishings that support rooftop occupancy while maintaining the effect of the established height limit.
Ashley Keenan	10/13/2023	Konveio	7. Dimensional Standards	Figure 7-J: Tower setback	As I mentioned elsewhere, setbacks are aesthetic preference that are often presumed to be architecturally insignificant. This isn't the case. Each setback requires significantly more load-bearing elements than would otherwise be necessary from an engineering point of view. The reduction in square footage, then, is even greater than it at first appears, not to mention the additional cost of construction. If we must have setbacks, it should be at most a single setback, and at a generous height.	Setbacks have generally been successful in mitigating height and mass.
Portland Foreside (c/o Mary McCrann)	10/13/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	General	Consider developing bonus provisions within the residential and mixed-use zones to encourage sustainable construction and/or a walkable, urban environment – Regulatory incentive (density bonuses and/or height increases), Tax (TIFs), economic, financial (grant programs, support for infrastructure) should be considered for projects that include a mix of uses and prioritize walkability.	The principles of mixed use and walkability are fundamentally supported through the standards of the mixed-use zones.
Acorn Engineering (c/o Will Savage)	10/13/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	Heights	Encourage taller height limits across most zoning districts. This recommendation is due to the new average grade calculation. While the new definition/calculation does provide a more consistent measurement and makes sense from a policy standpoint, it will likely result in lower average grade planes, and thus shorter buildings. The recommendation for taller heights is also being made because of the need for housing and the limited horizontal space available on most lots available for multifamily development.	See proposed changes to height limits within the downtown height map.
Portland Foreside (c/o Mary McCrann)	10/13/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	Resiliency	Evaluate dimensional standards and uses permitted throughout the city in the context of risk and resilience. Developing regulatory incentives and requirements for projects in low risk and high risk areas should be differentiated. Resiliency overlay zones should be flexible and dynamic due to and consider flood zones, stormwater and heat islands. Including flood tolerant landscaping, requiring utility systems to be flood resistant are examples of some regulatory options.	See Article 8, where the draft Coastal Flood Resilience Overlay Zone proposes to address flood risk due to sea level rise and storm events.
Joe Walsh	10/13/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	Setbacks	I'm very much in support of reducing setbacks wherever possible and glad to see it happening in several zones with these changes - it's frustrating to see good lots go unused, or gentle increases in density not happen, because of a few feet of setback. Particularly, excessive front setbacks, which are detrimental to a human-scale streetscape.	Setbacks have been modified in drafts to provide flexibility.
GPL Advocacy Committee	12/12/23	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards	Two recent planning initiatives, Portland's Plan 2030 and One Climate Future, identify sustainability as a key goal and priority for the city's future. We are concerned that the more permissive dimensional standards may, as the city experienced on Munjoy Hill after the 2015 zoning changes, unintentionally encourage teardowns and exacerbate the loss of diverse affordable housing options in the city's residential neighborhoods. Teardowns also have adverse environmental effects, including increased solid waste and energy impacts that do not support the City's sustainability goals.	The ReCode drafts generally do not prohibit tear downs, as the comprehensive plan acknowledges a future of change.
MHNO (c/o Barbara Vestal)	10/11/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Building Length	6. THE PROPOSED RN-5 75' BUILDING LENGTH DIMENSIONAL STANDARD IS INADEQUATE TO ADDRESS THE SCALE OF NEW BUILDINGS. The new building length dimensional standard is inadequate to control the scale of new construction. In 2020, the peninsula neighborhoods proposed approaching context sensitivity through regulating lot consolidation in order to retain a development pattern typical of compact lot development. In the alternative, they proposed that lots could be purchased by a common owner but proposed that the maximum dimensional requirements would be established by the maximum that could have been built upon the separate, non-merged lots of record. While this 75' maximum building length restriction may attempt to get at a similar problem, 75' is too big for the Munjoy Hill neighborhood context. 50' would be more in keeping with a typical building size. Similarly, the definition does not specify that a setback would be required between two or more buildings. Theoretically, a technical break of one foot would suffice under the proposed definition. That is not sufficient. To be contextually appropriate, a full setback on each side of the midline should be required for each building even if they are on a single large lot under common ownership.	Revised drafts reduce the maximum building length in the RN-5 to 60' and eliminate the maximum building length in the RN-7.
PHA (c/o Sarah Tatarczuk)	10/12/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Building length	Maximum Building Length in RN-5 and RN-7 set at 75' • IMPACT/EFFECT: This new requirement would severely hinder – and potentially cripple – future mid-rise multifamily development in these zones. Affordable projects would be particularly harmed because they depend on economies of scale gained from multifamily's efficient construction approach and dense use of land. Buildings would need to be significantly smaller and shorter to comply, thereby losing those efficiencies. This regulation would have disallowed many valuable multifamily buildings that were recently built. PHA's new developments in East Bayside have been well over the proposed 75' building length standard, including Bayside Anchor (±144') and Solterra Apartments (±135'). The result of this regulation would be fewer affordable projects and significantly fewer affordable units built in the RN-5 and RN-7 districts. • RECOMMENDATION: A standard of 75' is unrealistically short and arbitrary. We recommend the City eliminate all Maximum Building Length requirements for affordable multifamily projects. If this standard must remain, we encourage the City to a) create an exception process for affordable housing projects; b) significantly increase Max Building Length standards; and/or c) remove this requirement from ReCode and include it in the Design Manual.	Revised drafts reduce the maximum building length to 60' in the RN-5, which generally has a finer-grained lot and building pattern, and eliminate the maximum building length in the RN-7.
Acorn Engineering (c/o Will Savage)	10/13/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Building length	Strongly encourage increasing or eliminating the max 75' building length in the RN-5. This is a new dimensional standard and would negatively affect certain projects (especially those with a high ratio of lot frontage to lot depth) causing either a smaller building and thus less housing units, or would require the developer to build two buildings on one lot, which would be cost prohibitive in many cases because it is much less efficient to build 2 buildings vs 1. Instead, rely on the measures already in place such as setbacks, height limits, and the City's Design Standards to guide the appropriate scale and massing. Ultimately, this new standard will result in less housing units being constructed, while creating a nonconforming condition for a multitude of projects that have already been constructed.	Revised drafts reduce the maximum building length to 60' in the RN-5, which generally has a finer-grained lot and building pattern, and eliminate the maximum building length in the RN-7.

NAME	DATE	SOURCE	ARTICLE	TOPIC	COMMENT	RESPONSE
MHNO (c/o Barbara Vestal)	10/11/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Building Length	<p>7. THERE IS INSUFFICIENT ATTENTION PAID TO WHAT THE LAND USE CODE CAN DO TO RETAIN EXISTING HOUSING AND/OR MAKE AFFORDABLE HOUSING MORE LIKELY.</p> <p>So far, the sections of the proposed changes to the land use code seem to focus on new construction. More attention needs to be paid to how the land use code can foster and incentivize retention of existing housing because that is where the "missing middle", "naturally occurring affordable housing" and "workforce housing" is typically found. New construction will be expensive, and frequently in Portland the new "luxury housing" that is built is a second (or more) residence for a non-resident. The creation of luxury housing is unlikely to result in "trickle-down housing" in the Portland market which will be available to middle income residents. Perhaps the rewrite of the section on non-conforming structures will identify some opportunities for the repurposing of formerly non-residential structures into residential uses, or the retention of existing housing with upgrades or additional units which can be part of addressing the shortage of affordable housing.</p> <p>In addition, more attention needs to be paid to how building heights and other dimensional standards can incentivize workforce housing. The (now repealed) Munjoy Hill Neighborhood Conservation Overlay Zone contained some height differentiations that should be studied for possible inclusion in the proposed ReCode changes. Instead of allowing 45 feet as of right (as proposed in ReCode II), in the MHNCOZ at least one workforce unit had to be included to increase allowable height from 35' to 45'. This was too generous; it should have required a percentage like 25% rather than a single unit to qualify for the height bonus.</p> <p>The other dimensional requirements should be studied to see what other workforce housing incentives can be incorporated. Perhaps lot area per multi-family unit (725 SF/unit) could be reduced if all units (or a certain high percentage) were workforce housing.</p> <p>But any adjustments to dimensional standards also need to be coupled with intensive scrutiny of the standards for what qualifies as workforce housing. For example, for proposed workforce condominium units, the ordinance should ban the practice of monthly condominium fees being assessed on a per capita basis. Instead, monthly condominium fees should be regulated so they reflect that the workforce unit is smaller, in a less desirable location, has different appliances or finishes, etc., as applicable. It defeats the intent unless the monthly carrying costs are affordable.</p>	<p>The ReCode drafts create more opportunity for housing across the city, including in downtown Portland and in off-peninsula residential zones. This approach should help relieve some pressure on the zones that have historically seen most demand. The drafts generally allow conversion of existing residential and non-residential structures into higher-density residential uses. Per the changes adopted under LD 2003, the workforce and affordable housing density bonuses in Article 17 have been expanded to all mainland zones where residential is allowed.</p>
Tim Wells	10/13/2023	Konveio	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Building length (RN-5)	<p>Why should a building be limited to 75 feet? Look at historic homes around Portland, Maine and the Northeast. Many are 100 or 120 feet long and built 100 or 200 years ago. This puts a limit for underground parking, for multi-home buildings to 6 or maybe 7 on each side. This limits the attractiveness of multi-home living. We are in a period of transition, both in terms of reducing dependence on cars and on the stigma for families to live in apartments and condos. But to make a walkable neighborhood where businesses can survive and to combat climate change we cannot continue to put up barriers to multi-home projects. 1 parking space per unit is still going to be a minimum expectation for years to come. Because we don't have walkable neighborhoods yet. Underground parking is much preferable to surface parking. It allows for more homes and doesn't add to heat-sink and to impermeable surface. It should be accommodated not discouraged. Restrictions like this prevent the City from meeting climate and livability goals. It encourages single family, suburban type living and development patterns. Exactly the opposite of where we need to be heading. Why? If there is a limit, it should be no less than 95'. Same applies for width. It needs to accommodate 18" wall thickness, 20' each side for parking and the 24' aisle width so 67' for parking. Then let the architects, engineers and developers make the right decisions for the situation. Let the PB make exceptions if there needs to be compromise on lowering requirements for say aisle width. This flexibility will improve the quality of design and building.</p>	<p>Revised drafts reduce the maximum building length to 60' in the RN-5, which generally has a finer-grained lot and building pattern, and eliminate the maximum building length in the RN-7.</p>
James Pratt	10/12/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Corner side setback	<p>After looking over the proposed edits, it appears you are making the Side Setback, corner more restrictive than it was previously. The new standards list a dimension or the depth of abutting lot, whichever is greater. The old table listed a dimension or the depth of the front yard directly abutting the lot. Am I understanding this correctly? Won't this potentially make many new nonconforming structures? If something was previously allowed to be built to the depth of abutting front yard but these new rules require a greater setback, you have essentially reduced the use of the property.</p> <p>As an owner of a corner lot in Portland, it concerns me that you are making tighter restrictions to corner lots when I thought part of the point of recode is to make more sensible rules and reduce non-conformance. Why shouldn't the minimum setback of a corner lot still be determined by the depth of the front yard abutting the lot? Shouldn't it be reworded to read a set dimension or the depth of adjacent front yard, whichever is less?</p>	<p>This was an error. Revised drafts change this language to refer to 'whichever is less.'</p>
Emma Rubin	07/16/2023	Konveio	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Corner side setbacks	<p>Setbacks for RN-1 and RN-2 should be 10ft to be consistent with RN-3 and RN-4 and allow for more ADU development/housing density.</p>	<p>These zones currently require 20' or average depth of abutting yard. A reduction to 15' or the average will allow some flexibility while maintaining some of the existing lot and building pattern.</p>
Joe Walsh	10/13/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Density	<p>Missing Middle Housing: I'm so happy to see the inclusion of duplexes and tri-plexes in many of these zones. I haven't seen the lot area per dwelling unit requirements, but I would submit that they need to be set such that at least a duplex is possible by-right on any lot where a single-family can be built. So in RN-3, for example, with a min lot size of 6,000 SF, lot area per DU ought to be no more than 3,000SF. It ought to be even lower if we really want to encourage the building of triplexes and four-plexes. Given the cost of construction and land, I see duplexes as a key element of solving the housing crisis.</p>	<p>As structured, single- to four-family residential would be subject to no density standard, just a minimum lot size.</p>
John Voyer	08/16/2023	Form submission	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Density	<p>I attended the Open House in the Library and went home and looked over the draft Recode. I may be overthinking what I see in Table 7-A, but it appears that there is an ambiguity for Zone RN-2. It says that only one- and two-family housing is allowed, but then, under "Multi-family," the table indicates that for RN-2 there is a minimum size of 1,200 SF per unit. At a minimum RN-2 lot size of 6,500 SF, that would come out to potentially 5 units on an RN-2 lot (6,500 SF/2,000SF = 5 +/-).</p>	<p>Multi-family as adaptive reuse is currently allowed in the R-3/RN-2 as a conditional use. This density standard is necessary to address that situation.</p>
Urbanist Coalition Portland (c/o Todd Morse)	10/11/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Density	<p>Eliminate Lot area per dwelling unit and lot area per rooming unit dimensional standards.</p>	<p>The ReCode drafts essentially take this approach with single- to four-family dwellings in residential zones and all residential use types in mixed-use zones, where no density standard would be applied. The density standard has been retained in residential zones where multi-family (5+) is allowed.</p>

NAME	DATE	SOURCE	ARTICLE	TOPIC	COMMENT	RESPONSE
Christian Milneil	10/12/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Density	<p>My first request is that the City consider minimum density thresholds – e.g. a minimum of 1 housing unit per 2000 square feet of built gross floor area – for the R-6 and R-7 zones. In the past decade, I've witnessed a number of previously-affordable rental properties on the peninsula converted from multifamily to single-family. This is not an appropriate land use for the peninsula: we shouldn't allow high-wealth households to hoard real estate and reduce housing opportunities in some of Maine's only walkable neighborhoods.</p> <p>While the city has made a lot of positive progress on reforming zoning to make affordable housing practical under the zoning code (at least on the peninsula), we're increasingly finding that the bigger barriers, now, are financial. The high real estate costs of property acquisition, which are driven upwards by the high end of the market, make building new housing impractical for low- and middle-income price points, even if it's otherwise allowed under the zoning code.</p> <p>There are plenty of residential zones in Maine – pretty much all of them – where high-income people can build 3000 square-foot McMansions. So there's no good reason to permit them in the R6 and R7 zones, especially when we consider that those McMansions block other people from living here.</p>	<p>The ReCode drafts make some significant changes around residential use permissions and dimensional standards across the city. Whether additional, much more significant changes are necessary in the future will depend on the success of these current efforts.</p>
Twells	10/11/2023	Konveio	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Density (RN-3)	Why would we not reduce this to 5000 sf. Portland is a city not a suburb.	<p>The ReCode drafts include significant changes to use permissions while largely respecting existing lot and development patterns. Portland's minimum lot sizes are significantly smaller than many surrounding communities.</p>
Liz Trice	10/11/2023	Konveio	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Density (RN-3)	I don't see any reason to not have a 500 sf coffee shop on a 2,000 sf lot	<p>The RN-3 is a residential zone. There is opportunity within the RN-3 as drafted for neighborhood non-residential reuse, as well as new commercial opportunities in newly mapped B zones.</p>
Twells	10/11/2023	Konveio	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Density (RN-5)	This should be reduced to 500 sf/du to allow a 4 unit on a 2000sf lot.	<p>The drafts would allow 4 units as a 4-family on a 2,000 SF lot.</p>
Tim Wells	10/13/2023	Konveio	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Detached accessory structure height (RN-4)	Why couldn't this be increased to 25' if the structure is 15' off the property line? Wouldn't this add to the design flexibility and value of ADUs making them more attractive w/out harming neighbors?	<p>See above re ADUs. The revised drafts added flexibility for ADUs over existing structures, but otherwise new detached accessory structures would be subject to a height limit of 18', which bears a relationship to their reduced setbacks.</p>
Liz Trice	10/11/2023	Konveio	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Front setbacks	[Response to Todd Morse] front setbacks don't make any sense. It would be better to build ADUs in front yards as it's very expensive to run utilities to a back yard, and most front yards are useless spaces. People tend to hang out and garden in their back yards. I also think the artificial lack of diversity of setbacks is kind of creepy.	<p>Front setbacks have been maintained as a regulatory tool.</p>
Cameron Thompson	07/07/2023	Konveio	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Front setbacks	How would these apply in a greenfield setting, or where there are no adjacent front yards?	<p>See rules of measurement in Section 7.2, which establish minimum setbacks in cases where there are no lots available for averaging.</p>
Twells	10/11/2023	Konveio	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Front setbacks	[Response to Todd Morse] Too large front setback. Forces the house to be built towards the middle of the parcel reducing future flexibility.	<p>Setbacks have been modified in drafts to provide flexibility.</p>
Todd Morse	10/11/2023	Konveio	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Front setbacks	Setbacks are barriers to housing and creating pleasant walkable places, they should be universally reduced. This makes current setbacks even stickier.	<p>Setbacks have been modified where the context supports it to allow more flexibility.</p>
Todd Morse	10/11/2023	Konveio	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Front setbacks	Changing setbacks to be entirely determined by neighbors is needlessly complicated and leads to weird scenarios where you can theoretically lose some of your setback based on what your neighbors chose. It seems like it will make measuring more of a challenge as well.	<p>The draft approach is to use the context to inform the setbacks, which is a fairly common practice.</p>
WB	10/11/2023	Konveio	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Front setbacks	The Oakdale, Libbytown neighborhoods have an assortment of front setbacks, with very little consistency. The 20 foot setback in the RN-4 zone is a waste. Especially if you're not allowed to use it for parking spaces because of the codes specific to side and rear parking.	<p>The drafts do not propose a 20' front setback in the RN-4.</p>
Cameron Thompson	07/07/2023	Konveio	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Front setbacks	"±/- 5 feet" This is confusing and needs some clarity here or in the preceding definition of setback averaging. e.g. If the average is 15 feet, does that mean the actual setback is 10 or 20 feet?	<p>The revised drafts clarify this language.</p>
Urbanist Coalition Portland (c/o Todd Morse)	10/11/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Front setbacks	Allow people to reduce their own setbacks if they have unanimous agreement from their neighbors.	<p>This approach would be difficult to administer.</p>

NAME	DATE	SOURCE	ARTICLE	TOPIC	COMMENT	RESPONSE
Twells	10/11/2023	Konveio	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Front setbacks (RN-2)	This should just be 5 feet. The average of adjacent leaves too much to be questioned and to be challenged in court. It adds requirements to Staff. Make it simple.	The draft approach is to use the context to inform the setbacks, which is a fairly common practice.
Damon Yakovleff	08/04/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/General	Generally speaking, I'd suggest that all the dimensional requirements should be relaxed in all zones and density increased. For example, there's no need for a 5 ft. setback for 250sf accessory structures - this can be reduced to 3', etc.	Accessory setbacks have generally been maintained, with some revisions to create flexibility in the case of ADUs.
Connect Portland	07/11/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/General	The ReCode II evaluation in the "overview" of zones grouped all neighborhoods within their respective zones which does not fairly distinguish the differences between them. For example, neighborhoods in the R-5 such as the USM area, Deering Highlands, Back Cove, East Deering, North Deering, Oakdale, Deering Center are all very different. One size does not fit all in established neighborhoods within the same zone but in different city locations, and evaluation and recommendations are NOT sensitive to differing neighborhood context as an identified land use objective. How can this issue be addressed?	Neighborhoods in the city vary. The drafts address some variation in form by proposing context-based dimensional standards (see setbacks, for instance).
Connect Portland	07/11/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/General	How do these proposed changes align with the ReCode II recommendations which stated that pretty much all residential zones should be evaluated for bringing zone standards closer to historic patterns of development with decreased lot sizes, reduced dimensional requires, zone changes and allowances for a diverse range of housing types across the city's neighborhoods to make Portland a more "equitable" city? All mainland residential would permit at least two-family dwellings (R1, R-2 and R-3) does not appear to pass the "straight-face test" for fair and equitable diversity in expanding housing opportunities within residential ones. The R-5 residential zone is being proposed for the most significant changes as is R-4 in the Western Prom.	The revised drafts integrate the recently adopted LD 2003 changes, which broadly permit additional housing in residential zones across the city.
Urbanist Coalition Portland (c/o Todd Morse)	10/11/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Height	Allow a little bit more height per floor by looking at all height standards, calculating the number of allowed floors. Based on the allowed number of floors add slightly more height per floor to allow for more insulation between floors.	Height in residential zones has not historically been the point of most pressure. Changes to heights in mixed-use zones are proposed.
Urbanist Coalition Portland (c/o Todd Morse)	10/11/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Height	Increase height minimums in R-5, R-5a, and R-3 zones to allow for four stories instead of three.	Height in residential zones has not historically been the point of most pressure. Changes to heights in mixed-use zones are proposed.
Tim Wells	10/13/2023	Konveio	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Height	These heights are set by old, outdated thinking and a focus on single family homes. They do not take into consideration adaptations in building design and building methods, in response to climate change. Building entries may need to be a few feet higher to adapt to heavy rainfalls and flash flooding, building walls, floors and roofs are much thicker for insulation values, structural design flexibility, noise mitigation and higher floors to allow for more natural light in multi-home buildings. 45' doesn't allow for 4 floors in a well-designed, resilient, adaptable, high-performing multi-home building. Allowances need to be made. An extra 4-5' needs to be added when a building is built to certain performance standards. Not for the sake of extra height or another floor but to make buildings that are more livable, more sustainable and more resilient. It has no negative impact on the neighborhood, its character but it matters greatly to the people choosing to live in these homes, adoption by families desiring to live in multi-home buildings, creating walkable neighborhoods and fighting climate change. It is an easy and necessary change. So increase the height but limit the floors.	Height in residential zones has not historically been the point of most pressure. Changes to heights in mixed-use zones are proposed.
PHA (c/o Sarah Tatarczuk)	10/12/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Height stepback	2) Height Stepback in RN-5 and RN-7 above 35' <ul style="list-style-type: none"> IMPACT/EFFECT: This new requirement would harm the financial feasibility of 4-story or taller buildings and significantly raise the cost of mid-rise multifamily development. Efficient multifamily construction depends on "stacking" units so floor plans are consistent vertically throughout building, as well as minimizing unnecessary envelope detailing. Typical affordable multifamily construction targets 4-6 story buildings for cost and construction efficiency reasons. This change to height stepbacks would interrupt "stacking" on buildings with 4-6 stories, thereby complicating simple building envelopes and increasing design and construction costs at a time when affordable housing resources are scarce and construction costs are rising rapidly. PHA's Bayside Anchor (4-stories) and Solterra Apartments (6-stories) were only financially feasible because there were no required height stepbacks. The result of this regulation would be fewer affordable homes built in the RN-5 and RN-7 districts. RECOMMENDATION: We recommend the City eliminate all Height Stepback requirements for affordable multifamily projects. If this standard must remain, we encourage the City to a) create an exception process for affordable housing projects and/or b) significantly increase the height at which the stepback standard is triggered. 	This is an existing dimensional standard within the R-6 (RN-5). In the R-7 (RN-7), height has been increased from 50' to 65'. Stepbacks were added with that change to address the potential for sheer buildings.
Tim Wells	10/13/2023	Konveio	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Height stepback (RN-7)	Why add this provision? What problem does it solve? The extra costs and potential problems with water leaks associated doesn't make sense. Let architects, engineers and developers figure this out.	In the R-7 (RN-7), height has been increased from 50' to 65'. Stepbacks were added with that change to address the potential for sheer buildings.
Ashley Keenan	10/11/2023	Konveio	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Height stepbacks	Stepbacks are extremely inefficient from an engineering standpoint, requiring more load-bearing elements to absorb the staggered weight. This is an outdated aesthetic preference.	This is an existing dimensional standard within the R-6 (RN-5). In the R-7 (RN-7), height has been increased from 50' to 65'. Stepbacks were added with that change to address the potential for sheer buildings.

NAME	DATE	SOURCE	ARTICLE	TOPIC	COMMENT	RESPONSE
Nathaniel Ferguson	10/11/2023	Konveio	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Landscaped open space ratios	Why are landscaped open space ratios being added to lower density residential zones that were not present in the prior version of the land use code? I don't think lawns should be required by law.	Impervious surface ratio is used within the existing code in some zones; landscaped open space is used in others. Restricting unbuilt impervious and requiring lower-impact development is a city policy goal.
Cheryl Leeman	08/11/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Lot area	Only decrease in lot size of any significance is in the R-5 (RN-4) from 6,000sf to 5,000sf with addition of three and four family dwellings including conversions.	The ReCode drafts include significant changes to use permissions while largely respecting existing lot and development patterns. Portland's minimum lot sizes are significantly smaller than many surrounding communities.
Urbanist Coalition Portland (c/o Todd Morse)	10/11/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Lot area	Cut all existing lot area minimums in residential zones except those in the R-6 zone in half, allowing all existing lots to be split. In cases where the lot area per dwelling unit is identical to the minimum lot size it serves as a de-facto minimum lot size so it is also reduced to match the new minimum lot size. Lot width is also divided by slightly more than halfway to allow for splitting. Street frontage minimums are reduced to 20 ft across the board to allow for a configuration where you split the back of your lot and allow access to the street via a thin path or driveway.	The ReCode drafts include significant changes to use permissions while largely respecting existing lot and development patterns. Portland's minimum lot sizes are significantly smaller than many surrounding communities.
Joe Walsh	10/13/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Lot area	Lot sizes: I'm happy to see the 15,000 SF minimum of R1 be eliminated as part of this zone's merging with R-2. Why not make RN-2 and RN-3 lot sizes both 6,000SF - why 500sf more for RN-2? Just thinking about streamlining, and maybe it gently opens the possibility for a bit more density.	The ReCode drafts include significant changes to use permissions while largely respecting existing lot and development patterns. Portland's minimum lot sizes are significantly smaller than many surrounding communities.
Ryan Johnson	07/14/2023	Konveio	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Lot area (RN-6)	Lot area requirement for RN-6 is way too high - unless you mean "1,200/unit and a minimum of 40,000sf" - clarify	Drafts have been revised to clarify 1,200 SF and a minimum of 40KSF.
Liz Trice		45210 Konveio	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Lot area (RN-6)	[Response to Ryan Johnson] this is very confusing; why couldn't you build a 5 story tower of 500 sf units on a 3,000 sf lot?	Drafts have been revised to clarify 1,200 SF and a minimum of 40KSF.
Karen Snyder	07/12/2023	Konveio	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Lot coverage	The Lower R zones should have higher density lot coverage.	Lot coverage is a way to control the amount of a lot that is covered by building. Current maximum lot coverages in the R-1 and R-2 are 20%. Per the recently adopted LD 2003 changes, lot coverage for residential uses in mainland and island residential zones has been increased to 60%.
Ryan Johnson	07/14/2023	Konveio	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Lot coverage	Is this total lot coverage (i.e. impervious surface) or just building coverage? Likely too low across the board if total lot coverage.	Lot coverage is defined as the area covered by building footprint.
Urbanist Coalition Portland (c/o Todd Morse)	10/11/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Lot coverage	Increase all lot coverage minimums in residential zones except those in the R-6 zone. Increases are designed to gently increase coverage as zones increase in density.	Per the recently adopted LD 2003 changes, lot coverage for residential uses in mainland and island residential zones has been increased to 60%.
Acorn Engineering (c/o Will Savage)	10/13/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Lot coverage	Encourage increasing the 30% allowable Lot Coverage in the RN-6 (previous R-5a) to promote housing over parking	Per the recently adopted LD 2003 changes, lot coverage for residential uses in mainland and island residential zones has been increased to 60%.
PHA (c/o Sarah Tatarczuk)	10/12/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Lot coverage	4) Max Lot Coverage of 60% in RN-5 and RN-7; and 40% in RN-4 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> IMPACT/EFFECT: This Lot Coverage Max would restrict dense development of walkable neighborhoods, especially in East Bayside and at Sagamore Village. This would severely crimp a multifamily project's ability to utilize the entire parcel for affordable housing construction. In lieu of building more homes, this regulation would likely push developers to build more surface parking lots on the unused land and no net decrease in impervious area would occur. This regulation would likely result in fewer affordable homes built and increased vehicular surface parking, and would not necessarily decrease stormwater runoff. RECOMMENDATION: We recommend the City eliminate all Lot Coverage requirements for affordable multifamily buildings in RN-5, RN-7 and RN-4 districts. If these standards must remain, we encourage City to a) create an exception process for affordable housing projects; b) significantly increase max lot coverage percentages; and/or c) remove this requirement from ReCode and include it in the Design Manual or Technical Manual. We also encourage the City to handle stormwater management via calculations and not through limits on lot coverage. 	Per the recently adopted LD 2003 changes, lot coverage for residential uses in mainland and island residential zones has been increased to 60%. The revised drafts propose a lot coverage of 100% in the RN-7.
Acorn Engineering (c/o Will Savage)	10/13/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Lot coverage (RN-5)	Strongly encourage increasing the 60% allowable Lot Coverage (which includes all structures on a lot including sheds/decks/balconies) in the RN-5 (previous R-6) to promote housing over parking. Stormwater management will still be held to the same standard and the allowable impervious area would not change. This revision would simply result in more housing.	60% is the existing lot coverage in the R-6. This standard has been retained in light of other city goals, but the drafts increase the lot coverage in the RN-7 to 100%.

NAME	DATE	SOURCE	ARTICLE	TOPIC	COMMENT	RESPONSE
Tim Wells	10/13/2023	Konveio	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Lot coverage (RN-5)	60% lot coverage is less than was historically allowed. Many of the older buildings covered 65% to 80% of the lot. People love that historical building pattern. If green roofs are used, multi-home buildings should be able to utilize 70-75% of the lot on lots less than 10,000sf.	60% is the existing lot coverage in the R-6. This standard has been retained in light of other city goals, but the drafts increase the lot coverage in the RN-7 to 100%.
Todd Morse	10/11/2023	Konveio	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Rear setback (detached accessory structures)	These limits should be expanded to include larger detached accessories (such as all conforming ADUs).	Accessory setbacks have generally been maintained, with some revisions to create flexibility in the case of ADUs.
GPL Advocacy Committee	12/11/23	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Setbacks	The proposed front setback language of "average of adjacent front yards, +/- 5 feet", along with extra height allowances has the potential to exacerbate the feeling of a new dwelling being out of context. We suggest some additional language, for example "Front setbacks for new structures that exceed the height of adjacent structures by 15% or more shall be 5 feet or the average setback of adjacent structures, whichever is greater."	The draft approach is to use the context to inform the setbacks, which is a fairly common practice.
Urbanist Coalition Portland (c/o Todd Morse)	10/11/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Setbacks	Make small reductions to front and side setbacks in all residential zones.	The drafts suggest small changes in setbacks.
Acorn Engineering (c/o Will Savage)	10/13/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Setbacks + Lot coverage	Encourage reducing the 10' rear setback in the RN-5 to 5' in tandem with an increased lot coverage allowance.	10' is the existing rear setback in the R-6/RN-5.
Karen Snyder	07/12/2023	Konveio	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Side setbacks	How is it that majority of R zones have minimum side setback corners except for RN-5 (formerly R6)? How livable besides fair and equitable is this for long term residents living in RN-5 (formerly R6)?	Currently no side setback required on side street, so this reflects existing policy.
Cameron Thompson	07/07/2023	Konveio	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Side setbacks	My understanding is that RN-4 is replacing the current R5 zone, which includes the R5 small lots (see CITY OF PORTLAND LAND USE CODE 7-5). This new dimensional standard is more strict than the previous one for the R5 small lots. Minimum setback is 7 ft and "The width of one side setback may be reduced 1 ft. for every foot that the other side yard is correspondingly increased, but no side yard shall be less than 4 ft. in width." This proposal is more strict than the previous codes and that runs counter to the set goal of relaxing dimensional standards.	Revised drafts modify the setbacks to 7' with some flexibility.
Peaks Councilors & Housing + Zoning Subcommittee	10/10/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-B: Island Zone Dimensional Standards	Lot coverage: We looked at a few streets in IR2 as examples, and the draft numbers are still low enough that a considerable amount of homes would still be non-conforming, seemingly the majority of many blocks in IR1 and IR2. - Is there consideration for raising the allowable lot coverage, given that it would not change the current feel of neighborhoods? - At the least, for non-island small lots, can an additional percentage be granted when quality of life enhancements" such as unenclosed porches, deck, greenhouses, and tool sheds?	LD 2003 has resulted in modified lot coverage for residential uses.
Rachel Conly	10/13/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-B: Island Zone Dimensional Standards	The proposed changes are a nice gesture, but not impactful. Many of the lots in the IR-2 zone are very, very small (2,500SF, 3,000SF, 4,000 SF). The "small island lot" idea is great in concept, but not really helping. I think we need a bigger change on setbacks and a bigger change on lot coverage. The IR-2 Zone is not too dissimilar from other residential neighborhoods that border downtown. The IR-2 is more like Munjoy Hill, the West End, or parts of Deering. It is a residential neighborhood that houses people who work in Portland. The proposed 30% lot coverage is not enough to make an impact. If I use my own house as an example (1,200 SF, story and a half cottage), which is on a 4,200 SF lot (larger than several of my neighbors), I would only be able to add about 80SF of footprint based on lot coverage and even less if I am to meet these setbacks. I have no room for a shed, porch, ADU, etc... At minimum, I would like to see the allowable lot coverage increase to 35% (like Deering) or more ideal, up to 60% (like Munjoy Hill). I use my house as an example because I know it best. I believe it is representative of the majority of my neighbors in the IR-2 zone.	The revised drafts modify small island lot standards to reduce lot size, setbacks, and other dimensional standards.
Peaks Councilors & Housing + Zoning Subcommittee	10/10/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-B: Island Zone Dimensional Standards	Lot area: We support the spirit of the small island lot, but wonder about its proposed size. - How many more lots would become available if the lot size is reduced to 3,500 sq ft? Or 3,000 sq ft? - Is ReCode considering any provisions that would ensure these new lots would be developed for owner-occupied use (not short-term rentals)? Or is this something the City Council would have to legislate?	The revised drafts reduce the size of small island lots to 3,000 SF. No provisions are considered here regarding short-term rentals. Those regulations are in Chapter 6 of the COP Code of Ordinances.
Cheryl Leeman	08/11/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-C: Mixed-Use Zone Dimensional Standards	Major changes to Business zones with elimination of density limits to encourage residential urban compact, high-intensity development with increased heights from 45ft to 65ft. (B-2 are major parcels of land abutting neighborhoods such as Shaw's, Hannafords, Northport, Allen Avenue intersection, Ocean Avenue, former Rainbow Mall on Washington Avenue, Congress Street, Forest Avenue, Woodfords/Morrills Corners and St. John Street). NOTE: Does not reference "density bonuses" that will impact the height (perhaps a footnote).	Changes to height and density within mixed-use zones are based on policy guidance focused on placing jobs and housing near transit.

NAME	DATE	SOURCE	ARTICLE	TOPIC	COMMENT	RESPONSE
Cheryl Leeman	08/11/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-C: Mixed-Use Zone Dimensional Standards	Removed distinction from Dimensional Standards between on-peninsula and off-peninsula in B-1, B-2 and B2-b zones. There should be a softer approach to transitioning urban, compact development that about highly residential areas.	Draft dimensional standards acknowledge transitions to residential using modified setbacks, setbacks, and height. Allowing more to happen within these mixed-use zones off-peninsula supports policy objectives around both complete neighborhoods and placing concentrations of people and jobs near transit.
Portland Foreside (c/o Mary McCrann)	10/13/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-C: Mixed-Use Zone Dimensional Standards	Consider opportunities to refine height controls within the Land Use Code's mixed-use zones – Instead of just thinking about refining height controls, think about where additional density and height makes sense for the urban fabric and walkability of the City and allow flexibility for certain types of projects or projects that meet specific requirements.	Revised drafts allow additional height in locations that align with city goals.
Richard Marino	08/14/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-C: Mixed-Use Zone Dimensional Standards	Regarding the recoding of Portland I would like to make several comments and suggestions. I believe many of the recommendations are fine. Especially in respect to ADUs. My biggest concern is the increase in height and density in B1. As an abutter in a R6 neighbor zone it will dramatically affect my residence. I and my neighbors were prepared to live under the current situation. In our particular development of Munjoy Heights we have 29 townhomes on 68000 square feet. If the proposed changes go thru our neighbor at 165 Washington Avenue could develop most of 70,000 square feet to a height of 50 feet. It probably would in effect be a building of 5 stories as opposed to 4 stories. All of this without any input from the people it affects most. From an aesthetic perspective and density perspective this is too much. I understand the need for more housing in Portland. There has to be a balance between the citizens that live in the city and the community of special interests that will gain financially from development. I do have a recommendation for B1 as it pertains to 165 Washington Ave. I can't speak to other areas in the B1 zone. I would suggest a height of 40 feet (average existing grade for a benchmark as suggested in the recode). I would also recommend an increase in height up to a maximum of 60 feet as long as it does not increase the net total of square feet. Any increase on part of a building would be offset by a decrease on other parts to maintain the 40 foot average. This could make the building more interesting by getting away from the monolithic boxes that are being built now. This would give the developer an opportunity to develop 260,000+ square feet.	The city's policy guidance supports additional density and growth in zones like the B-1 as a way to encourage housing, mixed-use, and complete neighborhoods. Regarding height, the long-standing practice has been to measure height to a single point for ease of administration. Stepbacks help to achieve some of variation in form.
PHA (c/o Sarah Tatarczuk)	10/12/2023	Email	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-C: Mixed-Use Zone Dimensional Standards/Height stepback	3) Height Maximum in B-2 district at 50' when within 25' of RN-4 • IMPACT/EFFECT: This regulation would limit the future development potential in certain corridors. In particular, PHA is concerned this would curtail future affordable housing projects at Sagamore Village along Brighton Ave., which we anticipate will be rezoned to B-2. This location is adjacent to a major corridor with existing infrastructure and transit available and could support redevelopment with increased density of new affordable apartments. The result of this regulation may be somewhat fewer new affordable homes built at Sagamore Village and elsewhere within the B-2 district. • RECOMMENDATION: We recommend that the City eliminate the height restriction in the B-2 when abutting within 25' of RN-4 for affordable multifamily projects, or allow for an exception for affordable housing projects.	These stepbacks are designed to help manage the transitions between increased height in mixed-use zones and adjacent residential neighborhoods.
Portland Foreside (c/o Mary McCrann)	10/13/2023	Email	8. Overlays	MHNCO	Consider the continued applicability of the Land Use Code's overlay zones – Consider eliminating the Munjoy Hill Neighborhood Conservation Overlay Zone now that the Munjoy Hill Historic District has been adopted.	This zone was eliminated by prior Council action.
Virginie Stanley	10/18/23	Email	N/A	In general/miscellaneous	Just a question do you happen to know when the Recode might go into effect, or is it so political that it is [hard to say.]	Adoption will depend on the public, Planning Board, and Council review process.
Rhonda Berg	11/14/23	Email	N/A	In general/miscellaneous	When will new set-back and lot size rules go in to effect? Our lot is in the IR-1 zone. The public sewer stops one house short of ours. 7 houses all with bigger lots could benefit from public sewer on Pleasant Avenue. Is there any plan to extend it? Would it make a difference if the property owners say they are willing to add ADUs should the be able to hook-up to the sewer? Thank you.	Adoption will depend on the public, Planning Board, and Council review process.
Phyllis Guevin	08/11/2023	Form submission	N/A	In general/miscellaneous	Could you please provide the traffic studies that should coincide with any city growth considerations .We need to limit the number of people in our city to avoid adding more traffic until road widening,overpasses,and extensive planning for more cars which our current roads cannot handle as they ave not been widened since the forties.Let's concentrate on comfortable ,safe ,wide roadways to accommodate auto traffic while keeping population growth in the city at a minimum.There is a great need for population growth in northern maine to fill vacant jobs.We can make bike trails in the woods and parks to keep our roads safe for car travel the most practical mode of transportation in our wintry state.Iam not in favor of taller buildings due to blocking our views.Again overcrowding residential lots is not [sic]	Changes to encourage more housing are based on policy guidance from the Council-adopted comprehensive plan, which set a growth target.
Karen Snyder	08/14/2023	Email	N/A	In general/miscellaneous	Recode Phase 2- First Wave Question #1: How is the City of Portland Planning Department Ensuring that a Socioeconomic Diversity of Long-Term Residential Housing will be built especially for the "Missing Middle"? There is no factual evidence that the Planning Department proposed Recode Phase 2 First Wave recommendations will ensure that long term residential housing will be created especially for the "missing middle" or even to protect existing working- and middle-class housing stock. Proof of this is the failed 2015 R6 zoning change recommendations made by City of Portland Planning Department which primarily targeted Munjoy Hill. For example, Between 2016 to 2020, it is estimated that over 50 apartment rentals were removed from 19 demolitions to be replaced with over 100 luxury housing units mostly part-time housing with only 1 laughable "affordable" housing project at 65 Munjoy St which consisted of 8 housing units where people have to be making 120% of AMI which is approx \$80,000/ annual income for a single person. The biggest consequence of the 2015 R6 Zoning change which primarily affected Munjoy Hill were: (1) the increase of luxury condos and luxury single family homes, (2) an accelerated property value assessments of existing housing stock with the highest avg property tax increase of 40% in the city, and (3) the price gouging and accelerated rents on existing rental units, and (4) the rampant increase in Airbnbs as the City continues to ignore enforcing the illegally operated Airbnbs These above consequences have caused Munjoy Hill to NOT be a complete neighborhood but a transient place where long-term residents have decreased with an increase of property investors and temporary residents made up of part time luxury condo owners and Airbnbs' dragging their suitcases through the streets. What will happen? These proposals will only motivate developers to continue to demolish in order to either create property investment luxury housing for the wealthy and/or subsidized low-income housing and push out even more middle-class tenants and property owners similar to what happened with the 2015 R6 zoning changes which resulted primarily in a proliferation of luxury condos and a reduction of long-term residents on Munjoy Hill.	Changes to residential uses and dimensional standards city-wide will help to create opportunities for additional housing across neighborhoods, some of which will represent small increments and some of which are likely to be more significant. Altogether, these changes should help create opportunities for 'naturally-occurring' affordable housing, in addition to housing at other price points.

NAME	DATE	SOURCE	ARTICLE	TOPIC	COMMENT	RESPONSE
Karen Snyder	08/14/2023	Email	N/A	In general/miscellaneous	Ultimately, it appears the City of Portland Planning Department does not want actual long-term residents but a "Disney Land" city where the housing density is for property investment use and to cater to commercial and non-residential business owners. Long term Portland residents need to realize the City of Portland is registered as a corporation in which policies are NOT meant to ensure long term residential housing and long-term residents but instead policies are created to favor businesses that cater to property investors, real estate, tourists, wealthy, non-profits and restaurant industries at the expense of long-term residents and the environment	Changes to residential uses and dimensional standards city-wide will help to create opportunities for additional housing across neighborhoods, some of which will represent small increments and some of which are likely to be more significant. Altogether, these changes should help create opportunities for 'naturally-occurring' affordable housing, in addition to housing at other price points.
Karen Snyder	08/14/2023	Email	N/A	In general/miscellaneous	Unfortunately, until the City of Portland Planning Dept can prove otherwise, this Recode Phase 2 First wave proposals will once again cause Munjoy Hill and possibly other residential neighborhoods to become more of temporary enclaves for the wealthy and/or subsidized housing while continue to pushout even more working- and middle-class long term residential property owners by continued unfair and inequitable property tax increases which will be passed to their tenants without protecting or ensuring long term residential housing is being created especially for the missing middle.	Changes to residential uses and dimensional standards city-wide will help to create opportunities for additional housing across neighborhoods, some of which will represent small increments and some of which are likely to be more significant. Altogether, these changes should help create opportunities for
David Lehman	10/19/2023	Email	N/A	In general/miscellaneous	I hope you are doing well. My wife and I moved to Maine last June for my Residency training at Maine Medical Center, and we were surprised by how difficult it was to find affordable housing. After having seven offers on different homes in the greater Portland area rejected we were extremely lucky to purchase a home in north Westbrook. Since that time I have been thinking about others that are in a similar situation that weren't as lucky. I strongly want to help create opportunities for others that simply cannot due to lack of inventory in the market. I have been looking for land to create an affordable housing subdivision with the goal being to create a community of 1-2 bedroom homes with 800-1200 sqft per home in an effort to help as many as possible. I have talked with 50+ young medical trainee's and nurses who are currently renting who would do anything to have the chance to buy a home. Would a project like this be feasible for the property at 4 Oramel Ave? Are there zoning restrictions? If so, how can I participate in advocating for changing zoning laws? Or, are there other areas that you know of that would be able to accommodate a subdivision like this?	Drafts include use and dimensional changes designed to support many additional housing typologies.
Gabriel Ruffin	08/14/2023	Email	N/A	In general/miscellaneous	I haven't learned much about the changes that the City of Portland is making to the zoning laws, but from what I understand I am in support of the new changes. I really appreciate the changes to areas that were previously single-family-zoning exclusive to allow for double-family residents. I also appreciate the addition of Transit-Oriented-Development zones, one of the places in which I believe Portland has the most room for improvement. I believe the addition of more complex family housing into our existing neighborhoods will help all Portland residents with walkability, rent control, and quality of life. The current state of many of the "Single-Family" zoned spaces in Portland are being rented out, sometimes to upwards of 3 different tenants. With spaces zoned for additional residents to begin with, we may find that the price of some of these Attic and Basement 1-bedroom apartments will adjust to a new market normal, helping all Portland renters, esp. low-income folks. This effect is even greater when designing and zoning for multiple-family-zoning above 3 or 4 families, and so I am in favor of the City of Portland zoning additional space for those developments. With changes such as these on the horizon, I think Portland could be stepping towards a brighter, more affordable, easily walkable future.	Revised drafts generally continue to support many of these concepts.
Robert Kahn	09/05/2023	Form submission	N/A	In general/miscellaneous	My comment and concern is that the city puts a lot of time and resources into the zoning code and then ignores zoning when a large development proposal comes before it. This happens time and again. Height limit was exceeded at the apartment building under construction behind the Congress St post office. For what reason? That building is way out of scale with the surrounding buildings. With the mega-project at the base of Munjoy Hill, the developers have submitted one plan which they ignore and do what they want and as they please. Who's watching? Will there be any meaningful enforcement? Yet, if homeowners request a small allowance to building or zoning codes, they are hit over the head with the code books.	The land use code applies to all development in the City of Portland.
Tim Wells	10/13/2023	Konveio	N/A	In general/miscellaneous	A lot of really good work has been done to make this document more usable. Kudos to staff for all that work. It is obvious that a lot of thought and discussion has taken place. I believe there is room for improvement to more aggressively address urgent challenges like climate change, livability and affordability and availability of a multitude of home choices. Re-writing zoning code is a rare event having last been done 55 years ago. The stakes are high. So comments, by definition, are suggesting change and may have a tone of criticism but this process of collaboration is a healthy back and forth to seek clarity for the reasons behind decisions in the spirit of improving outcomes for Portland.	Revised drafts continue to fine-tune changes meant to address these types of comments.
Laura Glendening	10/17/2023	Email	N/A	In general/miscellaneous	Are you aware of an official Housing Needs Assessment for Peaks Island that has been completed recently? Our committee is interested in seeing a needs assessment for the Island.	Assessments of housing needs are always welcome.
GPL Advocacy Committee	12/15/23	Email	N/A	In general/miscellaneous	Although we have identified several areas of concern above, we also have areas of the proposed land use code revisions that we support. We support proposed dimensional changes that build upon the characteristics of Portland's neighborhood's that were of necessity built close to a variety of destinations, including public transit. We believe neighborhoods like those off Brighton, Washington, and Forest Avenues are good models for a more transit-oriented city. These neighborhoods contain examples of multi-family and mixed-use buildings that support the city's goals to create opportunities for a variety of housing types and denser neighborhoods. We also support proposed changes that would permit commercial uses at strategic locations in residential neighborhoods to recreate the historic mix of land uses that organically developed in Portland's neighborhoods in the late 19th and early 20th centuries.	The revised drafts continue to support a variety of housing types, particularly around transit, as well as neighborhood scale commercial. See also map changes proposed under the 'second wave' of ReCode changes.
Liz Trice	10/11/2023	Konveio	N/A	In general/miscellaneous	Good job cutting it down; I think it needs another pass to reduce # of words by another 50%. There are so many special exceptions.	One of ReCode's major goals is to simplify the code.
Laura Glendening	10/17/2023	Email	N/A	In general/miscellaneous	What is the City's position regarding limiting short term rentals such as Airbnbs? It seems as if short term rentals have had a negative influence on available housing stock on the island – as homes once owner occupied year-round are now being purchased for the business of short term rentals.	Short-term rentals are regulated under Chapter 6 of the City's Code of Ordinances, the building code.
PIC	1/11/24	Email	N/A	In general/miscellaneous	This is obviously a major issue on the island, and one with a great diversity of opinions, as the Casco Bay Islands are theonly part of the city that has effectively no regulation of STRs. After a great deal of community lobbying, the PIC has madea commitment to examining this issue closely through a new committee. There is interest among the Housing & ZoningCommittee for ReCode to take a look at STRs on the island, however the PIC's approach may end up leading straight tocity council and the ordinance revision process.	Short-term rentals are regulated under Chapter 6 of the City's Code of Ordinances, the building code.
Phyllis Guevin	08/15/2023	Form submission	N/A	In general/miscellaneous	Everything I just read is counter to what native Portlanders want, seniors need, and the Maine climate requires, i.e., improved and widened roadways with removal of bike lanes and decreasing unnecessary streetparking.This is a foolish idea and will be voted down.	The comprehensive plan supports additional, walkable growth.

NAME	DATE	SOURCE	ARTICLE	TOPIC	COMMENT	RESPONSE
GPL Advocacy Committee	12/10/23	Email	N/A	In general/miscellaneous	<p>While much of the conversation has been on how the proposed changes might catalyze new construction, equally important to us is how the new rules will 'legalize' non-conforming historic buildings, especially in older neighborhoods off the peninsula. The land use code should incentivize retention of existing residential structures, in furtherance of sustainability and protection of local fabric.</p> <p>In those limited circumstances when new construction is appropriate in older neighborhoods (vacant lots, non-residential structures, non-contributing structures) our concern is that new construction should not just fill the permitted building envelope, but should integrate into the existing fabric, even if it is larger in height or mass. The design standards, their focus on the examination of context, and their application will be crucial to facilitating that integration. We look forward to seeing the updated design standards manual in the new year and hope they will be brought forth for adoption in tandem with the land use code. We also feel strongly that referencing the design standards explicitly within the dimensional standards section will be important to alert any developer or building owner that both sets of standards must be met.</p> <p>We agree with the statement in the Camiros' Recode Phase II Land Use Code Evaluation Report "Further, it can include thinking carefully about the design and context of development in Portland, helping to ensure that the essential historic fabric of the city remains intact and that — though architectural styles may vary — new development remains authentic to the local character and complementary to the Portland vernacular."</p> <p>We also agree with the goals of encouraging "compatibility and context sensitivity" which are referenced in the draft residential neighborhoods purpose statements. But we find that those concepts are only partially operationalized in the current draft and note that they are particularly absent in the proposed RN-5 zone. As noted above, an essential part of the operationalization requires finalizing the updated design standards and incorporating them into the land use code by appropriate references stating that a proposed development must meet both zoning dimensional standards and the design standards.</p>	The dimensional standards proposed under ReCode are not generally designed to radically reshape the built environment, but to allow a degree of flexibility and change that acknowledges that additional housing and mixed-use are goals of the comprehensive plan. The drafts allow conversions and adaptive reuse as well as new construction.
PIC	1/12/24	Email	N/A	In general/miscellaneous	<p>It is unlikely that there is a higher density of unresolved paper roads anywhere else in the city than there is on Peaks, dueto convoluted decades of city planning (...unplanning, deplanning, replanning...) and the intersection of shoreline access.This is a critical issue to many islanders and one the PIC is continuing to look at. As it intersects with the PlanningDept's work, do keep us in loop.</p>	The legal status of paper streets is a larger city issue. However, Article 6 does address policy around the construction of roads within paper streets for the purposes of building on adjacent lots. These provisions have been revised under ReCode.
George Katilus	10/11/2023	Email	N/A	In general/miscellaneous	<p>I am a resident of North Deering off of Allen's Corner. I think Allen's and Morril's need serious revitalization. At their current state, they provide little to no value to the dense population surrounding the immediate areas. Instead, I feel as these areas are only oriented towards the vehicle traffic that passes through. I wish there could somehow be a redirection of traffic to reduce congestion in the area; more locally owned small businesses, stores, restraints, and cafes; increased priority to pedestrians (it is a scary, ugly, loud place to walk); a reduction and prevention of any more drive-thorough fast food chains and overall a more community-oriented approach to development with mixed use-multi-story buildings.</p> <p>In short; I would see protected bike lanes, transit, walkability, greenery, and local business that makes this area attractive to residents rather than a dangerous, congested thoroughfare serving only those passing by.</p>	The zoning is related to this issues. The revised drafts, when coupled with proposed map changes, are designed to provide more opportunities for pedestrian-oriented mixed-use in areas like these.
Peaks Councilors & Housing + Zoning Subcommittee	10/10/2023	Email	N/A	In general/miscellaneous	<p>Sprinklers - This may be too minute for ReCode to touch, but currently there is a rule that if you touch over 50% of a building you must put in sprinklers. Could this requirement be exempted for some island homes? Such systems make either city supplied water or a well with a pump necessary, which isn't possible in all situations on Peaks. This makes it impossible for many homes to be renovated without an astronomical expense, leading to only wealthy buyers being able to make the numbers work.</p>	This is a building code issue.
Kellan	07/16/2023	Konveio	N/A	Map	<p>The existing zoning map has too many business deserts. The new map needs to allow for more small scale low impact businesses (~ < 1200 sqft) to operate within these large exclusively residential zones. Any carveouts that happen to have been grandfathered in as B-1 are wildly popular with residents who by and large would prefer to walk to businesses when given the option.</p>	Policy goals around complete neighborhoods and access to neighborhood business has been address through the creation of a neighborhood nonresidential reuse category and through additional B-1 mapping.
Patrick Hess	08/09/2023	Form submission	N/A	Map	<p>Oxford St in West Bayside offers good opportunities for infill development, especially of much-needed housing, close to transit, services, and amenities on peninsula. The zoning however is inconsistent. For example, between Chestnut and the block between Cedar and Elm, the City should consider rezoning to extend the adjacent B7 found along Oxford east of Chestnut.</p>	See map changes released under the 'second wave' of ReCode edits.
David Eaton	1/24/24	Email	N/A	Map	<p>I am working with a developer on a multi unit apartment project on Saunders Street near Woodfords Corner. The current zoning is B-2, except the parcel is partially split into the R-5 zone. With what we know about ReCode, thepotential to add up to 15 units to this 30 unit project with the proposed new 65' height limits, is affected by the newrequirement for a 50 foot setback from the zoning boundary for floors above 45', which would prohibit about half of theadditional units if the zoning line is not moved to the property line. Will situations such as this be addressed in the zoningmap boundaries as part of recode? Should we be seeking a map amendment in the meantime? You can call me at 841-5894 if you would like to talk about it.</p>	See map changes, which have resolved many split lots.
Rachel Conly	10/13/2023	Email	N/A	Map	<p>I know that revised maps have not yet been proposed, however, I want to also take this opportunity to makea comment about the IB Zone on Peaks Island. Business development is nearly impossible out here as aresult of the geographic location of the IB zone which comprises mostly waterfront properties. The propertyvalues are far too high for most small scale entrepreneurs. I think allowing accessory structures (and uses)in the IR-2 as noted above could help, but I also think expansion of this zone is needed. The non-residentialreuse proposal would not have much impact out here, if at all.</p>	Some limited expansion of the I-B proposed under map changes.
PIC	1/10/24	Email	N/A	Map	<p>While the PIC has not deeply investigated this topic yet, our Housing & Zoning Committee has suggested the PlanningDepartment look at light industrial zoning by the Transfer Station with the creation of a city-owned parking area in thesame area that will allow for the permitted parking of industrial vehicles.</p>	No light industrial is proposed on the islands at this time.
Sheila Mayberry	08/16/2023	Email	N/A	Process	<p>I am writing to you today to share my impressions of the Open House I attended lastnight at Lyseth. The Recode Portland presentation was difficult to watch and ingest for avariety of reasons. The information presented in the powerpoint was too tiny and denseto even read. The man presenting the information spoke quickly and used too muchplanning board jargon. The overall leader of the workshop was not responsive to theattendees in the room. She was dismissive and she lacked a willingness to listen to therequests of the people in attendance. Overall it felt like the goal was to just go throughthe motions to say there had been public input. In addition, the Open House was poorlypublicised which honestly appears to have been intentional. Code proposals of this magnitude need to involve all stakeholders throughout the city inorder to have a true understanding of the impact on homeowners in everyneighborhood. Transparency in this process appears to be lacking which will only lead topoor overall results. I encourage you to revisit the way information is being disseminated to the public andimprove the transparency of this process.</p>	Additional 'zone guides' were developed following the open houses to help provide some guidance on the proposed 'first wave' drafts.

NAME	DATE	SOURCE	ARTICLE	TOPIC	COMMENT	RESPONSE
Julie Dubofsky	08/16/2023	Form submission	N/A	Process	My apologies for not getting to drop a comment - I blame my toddler - but I meant to relay a positive comment on the extensive work and excellent website. I brought my parents along and in case they don't relay their feedback, I wanted to jot it down. 1. Zoning is intimidating - Maybe a poster or a Zoning 101 video to add to the videos on the Resources page and something at the workshops to help the general audience understand. 2. "What's it mean to me?" - I bet everyone is asking for a map showing the zone changes. I did nudge a stranger to pick up the binder of the existing code to look at the use changes, but maybe a sign being as blunt as that to help someone see what it means for their neighborhood would help. 3. "they're banning single-family homes" - just because you don't understand something, doesn't make it stupid, which is what I should've said to the lady who called all this work stupid because they're "urbanizing the city." She lived by the elementary school and even my mom's efforts to point out that their neighborhood had lots of types of housing, didn't relieve the fear this neighbor expressed. So maybe something showing the changes to the dimensional standards in the more suburban (nay, ruralish) areas might help relieve some of those fears? Excellent work overall and excited to see "residential neighborhoods" and the new uses - the neighborhood non-residential reuse category especially. Visuals of existing contexts and landscapes, by corridor, node or zone, is always helpful to illustrate changes across audiences. Hate to suggest the CNU transect, but even Portland has one and there are great local illustrators who may be interested in showing it (see Maine Needs' recent drawing contest as an example).	Additional 'zone guides' were developed following the open houses to help provide some guidance on the proposed 'first wave' drafts. See zone guides at www.recodeportland.me .
Mary McCrann	07/06/2023	Email	N/A	Process	What is the timeframe currently for accepting public comment on the First Wave of ReCode? Also, what is the schedule/timeframe for the project moving forward? When are other phases coming out? When will you go to the Planning Board?	Adoption will depend on the public, Planning Board, and Council review process.
Jim Wolf	07/12/2023	Form submission	N/A	Process	Do you know when the city plans to enact the recode. Thank you	Adoption will depend on the public, Planning Board, and Council review process.
Holly Perry	09/03/2023	Form submission	N/A	Process	Hello, when does the City anticipate these changes being released and officially adopted into the Land Use Code? Thanks!	Adoption will depend on the public, Planning Board, and Council review process.
WPNA via Anne Pringle	08/08/2023	Email	N/A	Process	On March 9, 2015, the WPNA sent a formal letter (below) expressing concerns about the then-proposed (later-enacted) density changes to the R-6. On its face, it made sense to conform zoning to the then-existing development pattern, which would not have been allowed under the existing zoning. Unfortunately, we believe that the "unintended consequences" we foresaw have come to pass on Munjoy Hill. And now, it appears that the density proposals in ReCode II might follow the same approach and thwart the policy objective that failed on Munjoy Hill – to produce more affordable housing. Before going forward with the public review process, we formally urge that you slow the process down and take stock of what has happened on Munjoy Hill since the density was change. These questions must be answered: ~~~How many existing units were demolished? What was the location and assessed value of each of those units? At the then-assessed value, were these units considered "affordable"? ~~~How many new units were created, either on cleared land or vacant land? What was the sale price of each unit created? ~~~How many "affordable units" were created on Munjoy Hill? How many units were affordable to "the missing middle" vs. subsidized housing? ~~~If developers opted out of creating the required affordable units, how much money was contributed to the Duson Housing Fund? How many "affordable" units, in aggregate, would those donations have created in this expensive construction market? ~~~Was there a net loss of affordable units on Munjoy hill? ReCode II could produce very significant and unintended changes in Portland's housing stock and affect the composition of its residential neighborhoods, as the R-6 changes sis on Munjoy Hill. Let's take time to "get it right".	Changes to residential uses and dimensional standards city-wide will help to create opportunities for additional housing across neighborhoods, some of which will represent small increments and some of which are likely to be more significant, some of which may occur as conversions and some of which may result from new construction. Altogether as a whole, these changes should help create opportunities for "naturally-occurring" affordable housing, in addition to housing at other price points.
Laura Glendening	07/11/2023	Email	N/A	Process	In the community meeting we see the need for your department to highlight: How the draft ReCode changes zoning on Peaks Island. How the draft ReCode will assist with the development of affordable housing. And to hear from the community the zoning needs on the island, to allow for community input in the development of the new Land Use Code.	These topics were discussed at the Peaks Island open house.
Phyllis Guevin	07/18/2023	Email	N/A	Process	This video is useless. I want to read about any changes and their legality word fir word in a written document.I learned nothing from the useless video and could not read for myself the tiny print.Also why is the code being changed and who authorized it and for what purpose?I hope nit to jam more housing in Portland.we need wider roads,overpasses,more traffic lanes and a comp,etc traffic oriented restructuring of the city and a moratorium on any more people settling in Portland.It's way overcrowded.I know.I was born and raised here and little has been done to manage traffic except paint ridiculous lines.we need a new engineer team brought in from other cities that are truly growing their roadways while limiting overcrowding.The bollards have to go.they are a driving impediment and dangerous distraction.Roads are built for cars and sidewalks for pedestrians.Hire a new engineering team first and foremost!Lets get Portland driver friendly.Thank you.email me the documents and the info I requested.Phyllis Guevin.	The city's comprehensive plan supports additional growth.
Priscilla Doucette	08/14/2023	Form submission	N/A	Process	Could you give me a brief summary of the proposed changes for zoning are free.	See zone guides at www.recodeportland.me .
Connect Portland	07/11/2023	Email	N/A	Process	A meeting was organized for housing developer "stackholders" on ReCode. Will there be similar meetings for affected neighborhood resident "stackholders" in order to engage the community for their feedback on ReCode?	In-person events were held in mid-August, and a virtual event in mid-September. Staff has also met with various groups upon their request throughout the fall and winter.
Connect Portland	07/14/2023	Email	N/A	Process	Thank you, Nell. What Recode mailing list are you referring to? Who is on this list? We would like a copy. How will you notice beyond referring people to the ReCode website as most people are not aware and it is a very complicated document especially for the lay person? How will you reach a city-wide audience given the implications to every neighborhood in the city?	Join the ReCode mailing list here: www.recodeportland.me/contact-us
Damon Yakovleff	08/04/2023	Email	N/A	Process	Generally speaking, please work to include more information about how Portland is complying with LD2003 on the recode website. Look to relax dimensional requirements. And also clear up ambiguity with the RN2 zone, and provisions around the 2.5x density bonus.	LD 2003 changes were adopted by the City Council in late 2023. More information can be found on the ReCode website: www.recodeportland.me
Damon Yakovleff	08/04/2023	Email	N/A	Process	I have a few questions regarding how the changes interact with the requirements in LD2003. Specifically, it seems that the "growth area" is a key consideration. It is not clear exactly where the growth area is located. Please make sure this is clearly identified in the website.	LD 2003 changes were adopted by the City Council in late 2023. More information can be found on the ReCode website: www.recodeportland.me

NAME	DATE	SOURCE	ARTICLE	TOPIC	COMMENT	RESPONSE
Cheryl Leeman	08/11/2023	Email	N/A	Process	<p>More public engagement is needed! Although there have been videos and there are 3 planned Open Houses, it is not enough. There should be more outreach to neighborhood groups and additional forums in the neighborhoods affected by an urban planning approach to land use codes with sweeping changes that in some cases does not appear to "respond to each areas context." And it is unfortunate that the Planning Board will not have the benefit of public comment from these forums for their Workshop.</p>	More public engagement will occur during the review of the 'second wave' of edits.
					<p>As a Portland resident, I am writing to encourage you to slow down the rapid-fire rush to approve Recode Phase 2 until all constituents have ample time to review and comment upon the sweeping changes in this proposal and their potential negative impacts on the city.</p> <p>Many of the Recode Phase 2 elements fly in the face of the City's Portland Plan 2030 adopted by the City Council in June 2017.</p> <p>Specifically the comprehensive Portland Plan, developed with input from city-wide stakeholders, recognizes Portland's built environment and natural environment are inseparable in any consideration of sustainable quality of place</p> <p>The Portland Plan calls for creation of complete neighborhoods by improving livability while retaining the key characteristics that make neighborhoods unique maintaining and enhancing the uniqueness and integrity of our neighborhoods maintaining our character through preservation, innovation, and excellence in design for the built environment developing land use policies which support complete neighborhoods</p> <p>Yet the Recode Phase 2 plan would do away with conserving the existing housing stock and residential character of neighborhoods....and controlling the scale of external impacts of professional offices of non-residential use permit increased height from 45ft to 65ft or 50ft if there is first floor commercial use in the B-2b zone along Washington Avenue & Bayside reduce set-backs so that the amount of trees and plantings would be left to a developer and might well be minimal not make Portland any more equitable or affordable not facilitate the type of housing and business Portland residents desire</p> <p>The Portland Plan also acknowledges that Diverse forums for community engagement will remain essential to a strong civil society. Yet three rushed meetings crammed back-to-back in three days hardly constitutes adequate and diverse forums for community engagement.</p>	
Leslie Hart	08/13/2023	Email	N/A	Process	<p>Please provide more time and opportunities for the public to engage. And please respect the vision for Portland that was established in 2017 by the Planning Board, the City Council, Office of the City Manager, all under the leadership of Project Manager Christine Grimando.</p>	More public engagement will occur during the review of the 'second wave' of edits.
					<p>Question #3-Recode 2 First Wave: Recode II First Wave Public Feedback Time is Charade of Public Engagement and is Nothing but Theater. City of Portland Planning Department headed by Planning Director, Christine Grimando, and Special Project Director, Helen "Neill" Donaldson, claim they want public feedback prior to going to Planning Board workshop is disingenuous. Below is the City of Portland Planning Dept timeline for Recode Phase 2 First Wave public feedback.</p> <p>Friday, 6/23/2023 - Email from City of Portland Planning Dept announcing their proposals for Recode Phase 2 First Wave Changes</p> <p>Wednesday, 8/16/2023 - Planning Dept Open House on Recode Phase 2</p> <p>11am - 1pm Portland Public Library</p> <p>5pm-7pm Lyseth Elementary School Library</p> <p>Thursday, 8/17/2023 - Planning Dept Open House on Recode Phase</p> <p>11am-1pm - Peaks Island Library</p> <p>Thursday, 8/17/2023 Planning Dept Planning Board First Recode Phase 2 Workshop (Same Day as Last Public Open House Meeting, How can Planning Dept incorporate any public feedback changes in a day?)</p> <p>Hybrid Planning Board ReCode Meeting • City of Portland Meetings & Agenda Portal • CivicClerk</p> <p>What will happen?</p> <p>This above public feedback timeline only proves that the City of Portland Planning Department is only wanting to "tick the boxes" by quickly holding public feedback meetings in the summer when they know residents are not engaged at inconvenient times and inconvenient places then immediately holding the first Planning Board Recode Phase 2 First Wave the same week in order to slip by as much as possible passed Portland residents.</p>	
Karen Snyder	08/14/2023	Email	N/A	Process		More public engagement will occur during the review of the 'second wave' of edits.
Steve Whorf	07/01/2023	Konweio	N/A	Process	<p>Suggest directly linking the headline of the zoning section of the document to an interactive map that tells you the zone and immediately links to the description and rules applicable to that zone.</p>	More interaction between the web-based version of the code and the zoning map is a goal coming out of ReCode.
Anne Pringle	07/09/2023	Email	N/A	Process	<p>In the text below, you note that emails comments are welcome and that in-person meetings will be held "during the summer". I STRONGLY urge you to push the public process out to September. We are now well into the summer and many people will be away and/or on vacation in August. "The City" will be roundly criticized for, after two+ years of development, putting these very important changes out for public process at the worst possible time.</p>	Public engagement on the 'first wave' edits continued into the fall.
Amy Oberlin	06/30/2023	Konweio	N/A	Process	<p>Where is the accompanying map of the new zones? It is impossible to evaluate what effect these proposed changes will have without it, particularly in regard to brand new zones like TOD.</p>	See map changes released under the 'second wave' of ReCode edits.
Amy Oberlin	6/30/2023	Form submission	N/A	Process	<p>Will you be releasing an updated zoning map to show where these new zones will be located and how the existing zones have changed? It's hard to evaluate these potential changes without knowing where they will apply.</p>	See map changes released under the 'second wave' of ReCode edits.
Rob Foster	07/03/2023	Email	N/A	Process	<p>Hi - I'm looking over the most recent recode changes. Is there an updated zoning map that shows where the new transit-oriented development zones will be?</p>	See map changes released under the 'second wave' of ReCode edits.
Virginie Stanley	07/05/2023	Email	N/A	Process	<p>Thank you for sending out a draft of the Portland Recode. One item is confusing. It looks like R-5 is changing to RN-5, R-5a is changing to RN-6, R-6 what does this change into? R-6a is changing to RN-7. Do you have an updated zoning map showing where the Transit-Oriented Development Zone is located?</p>	See map changes released under the 'second wave' of ReCode edits.
Rachel Conly	07/13/2023	Email	N/A	Process	<p>I do not see any proposed island maps for reshaping the existing zoning boundaries. Should I assume that the boundaries are not changing?</p>	See map changes released under the 'second wave' of ReCode edits.
Kimberly MacDonald	07/18/2023	Email	N/A	Process	<p>The ReCode Portland first wave changes page on the website state that the zones look different—some new, some consolidated and the names of the zones have shifted (ex R-3 to RN-2). However, I can't find a map of the new zones on the website. Where have they consolidated, changed or been added? Can you direct me to a link to the proposed new zoning maps so that I can view how the zones have been changed/re-defined?</p>	See map changes released under the 'second wave' of ReCode edits.

NAME	DATE	SOURCE	ARTICLE	TOPIC	COMMENT	RESPONSE
Laura Glendening	10/17/2023	Email	N/A	Process	When will ReCode be publishing draft maps and will City owned shoreline access land and pathways be a part of this?	See map changes released under the 'second wave' of ReCode edits.
MHNO (c/o Barbara Vestal)	10/11/2023	Email	N/A	Process	1. THE PIECEMEAL APPROACH OF RECODE II IS A BARRIER TO MEANINGFUL CITIZEN PARTICIPATION. It is difficult for citizens to meaningfully participate in the ReCode II drafting process because the "First Wave" is only definitions, zones, uses and dimensional standards. We are "in the weeds" without any context. There are no maps, no development review standards, and the rest of the land use code is missing. Without a draft of the entire land use code document, it is difficult to tell what is intended by staff and the consultant for later sections. We will need the ability to go back and comment on the "First Wave" once later sections are released. It needs to be an iterative process.	The 'second wave' includes the sum total of the changes proposed, so that they can be viewed in their totality.
Cheryl Leeman	08/12/2023	Email	N/A	Process	NO analysis of impact of these changes regarding traffic, parking, environment, infrastructure and city resources. Studies show that "urbanization" can cause environmental and economic strain of land and people.	The ReCode work is a direct response to comprehensive plan goals around housing, economic development, and smart growth.
Barbara Vestal	07/04/2023	Form submission	N/A	Process	As an initial matter, I need help with a couple of inconsistencies to make sure I am reviewing the right thing. Your cover intro says that you have (in my opinion confusingly and unnecessarily) re numbered the residential zones so the old R-6 is now RN-5. But the purpose statements redline in Table 5-B shows old R-6 as new RN-6 (not RN-5). Maybe the problem is with the redlining. The uses in the chart for RN-6 seem to omit things that I would expect to see. Is there a map showing what the bulk of Munjoy Hill will be designated so I can confirm it that way? RN-5 or RN-6? Are you wedded to the idea of renumbering the zones? It would seem to be much less confusing to merge R-1 and R-2 into a new RN-1, skip RN-2 and just keep the same numbering as now -- with a RN in front of it if you prefer -- for zones 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7, with R-5a/R6a to be RN-6a.	The revised drafts maintain the numbering approach. While the transition may be challenging, it will take a short time for people to adapt to the new convention.
GPL Advocacy Committee	12/13/23	Email	N/A	Process	The zoning guides and additional graphics in the proposed sections are very useful for helping citizens understand the proposed changes. We feel strongly that modeling the proposed changes in various zones, as was done during the FBC changes in the India Street neighborhood, would also be helpful for those that don't follow zoning as closely as city staff and those in the development community.	The zone guides attempt to help visualize some of the changes proposed.
Barbara Vestal	07/13/2023	Email	N/A	Process	Similarly the design standards seem to have stalled out from the 2020 or 2021 overhaul. What is the intent with regard to revisions to the design standards?	This work will progress in parallel to ReCode.
Cheryl Leeman	08/11/2023	Email	Process	In general	Use/and Dimensional Tables do not include all the proposed changes – confusing as there are changes in the text but not included in the Use Table Examples; Conversions for Non-residential and Residential, Conservation and Cottage Court Developments and no footnote references in the Use Table that corresponds with the Dimensional Table	The tables can only fit so much text, so choices have been made about how to organize content within both tables and other sections of the code.

DATE	OPEN HOUSE	ARTICLE	TOPIC	COMMENT	RESPONSE
8/16/2023	Downtown	14. Site Plan	Landscape preservation & planting standards	Need to incorporate trees/landscaping when 100% lot coverage allowed.	See 'second wave' edits to the site plan ordinance.
8/16/2023	Downtown	3. Definitions	"Dwelling, townhouse"	Dwelling, townhouse requires each unit be on separate lot so no units can be above other units? Is this compliant with LD2003?	This definition is intended to distinguish the townhouse form, which is just one way of building housing. Vertical stacking would be permitted under the multi-family definition.
8/16/2023	Downtown	5. Zones	Table 5-E: TOD Zones	Light rail down Congress or Cumberland.	This is a transportation-related comment.
8/16/2023	Downtown	5. Zones	Table 5-E: TOD Zones	The entire peninsula should be zoned TOD-2	See map changes released under the 'second wave' of ReCode edits.
8/16/2023	Downtown	6. Use Standards	6.4.26 Neighborhood nonresidential reuse	Neighborhood non-residential reuse has the right idea for supporting neighborhood businesses. Would love to see it extended beyond "reuse" to apply to all structures.	New neighborhood businesses are not currently allowed within residential areas. The neighborhood nonresidential reuse provides new flexibility that allows them in certain circumstances. Other neighborhood business needs are addressed within the B-1, B-2 or other zones located nearby to residential zones. See related map changes.
8/16/2023	Downtown	6. Use Standards	6.4.26 Neighborhood nonresidential reuse	Non-residential reuse seems too restrictive and hard/laborious to back up. I own a 3-unit on Cumberland Ave. First floor is a business and has been a business for 70+ years. This is R-6 so business use is grandfathered. The structure was originally built for residential use. There is wallpaper behind the storefront windows. One year of vacancy terminates this use. This is not good. Need to better support and encourage neighborhood scale businesses.	New neighborhood businesses are not currently allowed within residential areas. The neighborhood nonresidential reuse provides new flexibility that allows them in certain circumstances. Other neighborhood business needs are addressed within the B-1, B-2 or other zones located nearby to residential zones. See related map changes.
8/16/2023	Downtown	6. Use Standards	6.7 Temporary uses	[Like most] temporary uses!	The revised drafts continue to include a section regarding temporary uses.
8/16/2023	Downtown	6. Use Standards	Table 6-A: Uses in Residential Zones	If you want to control business in residential areas, how about limiting businesses that do not provide goods and services to the neighborhoods or are blank storefronts.	B-1 uses attempt to distinguish between larger market retail and smaller, neighborhood scale retail.
8/16/2023	Downtown	6. Use Standards	Table 6-A: Uses in Residential Zones	Can clinics be allowed in multi-family residential properties? Portland Housing Authority has a great partnership with Greater Portland Health at our projects, including Sagamore Village, Riverton Park, Franklin Towers and hopefully more. Health is housing (and vice versa). We need the ability to provide basic healthcare services to our residents on-site.	Currently would be allowed in an incidental, accessory capacity.
8/16/2023	Downtown	6. Use Standards	Table 6-A: Uses in Residential Zones	Multi-family – this should be broken into mid and large scale. 5-25 units is different than 100 units and should have more places in the city.	Currently, the code defines multi-family as 3+ units. Moving to 5+ allows the code to capture a new increment of mid-scale housing that can be easily integrated into many existing neighborhood contexts.
8/16/2023	Downtown	6. Use Standards	Table 6-A: Uses in Residential Zones	Should make it easier to build middle-density buildings (5-10 units or so). Shouldn't group 5+ units into only the highest density zones.	Currently, the code defines multi-family as 3+ units. Moving to 5+ allows the code to capture a new increment of mid-scale housing that can be easily integrated into many existing neighborhood contexts.
8/16/2023	Downtown	6. Use Standards	Table 6-A: Uses in Residential Zones	Need to catch mid-density housing types better. Small scale multi-family (5-20) is different than 100 units. Something of this scale needs to be called out.	Currently, the code defines multi-family as 3+ units. Moving to 5+ allows the code to capture a new increment of mid-scale housing that can be easily integrated into many existing neighborhood contexts. Over 5 units, scale is addressed through height and form.
8/16/2023	Downtown	6. Use Standards	Table 6-A: Uses in Residential Zones	Separation of Munjoy Hill from Washington Avenue especially by East End School and park does not reflect residential/commercial use by residents.	The B-2b zone on Washington Avenue allows a range of neighborhood- and larger scale businesses that can serve both small and larger catchment areas.
8/16/2023	Downtown	6. Use Standards	Table 6-A: Uses in Residential Zones	[Like most] added market gardens.	The revised drafts continue to include 'market gardens' as a use.
8/16/2023	Downtown	6. Use Standards	Table 6-A: Uses in Residential Zones	How do we get "complete neighborhoods" when neighborhood business is only allowed in places where the non-residential use structure already exists?	Generally, the approach to create more opportunity for small scale, neighborhood commercial is through neighborhood nonresidential reuse + mapping of more B-1.
8/16/2023	Downtown	6. Use Standards	Table 6-A: Uses in Residential Zones	Protect & encourage neighborhood business in residential areas.	New neighborhood businesses are not currently allowed within residential areas. The neighborhood nonresidential reuse provides new flexibility that allows them in certain circumstances. Other neighborhood business needs are addressed within the B-1, B-2 or other zones located nearby to residential zones. See related map changes.
8/16/2023	Downtown	6. Use Standards	Table 6-A: Uses in Residential Zones	Allow residential buildings to be used for retail as long as the building can be converted back.	New neighborhood businesses are not currently allowed within residential areas. The neighborhood nonresidential reuse provides new flexibility that allows them in certain circumstances. Other neighborhood business needs are addressed within the B-1, B-2 or other zones located nearby to residential zones. See related map changes.
8/16/2023	Downtown	6. Use Standards	Table 6-A: Uses in Residential Zones	Places of assembly should be permitted for multi-family properties especially in RN-4 through RN-7. Needed to provide resident services to low-income residents in affordable projects.	Places of assembly are listed as conditional uses in the RN zones.
8/16/2023	Downtown	6. Use Standards	Table 6-A: Uses in Residential Zones	Kill the PRUDS!	PRUDS have been eliminated in the drafts.
8/16/2023	Downtown	6. Use Standards	Table 6-A: Uses in Residential Zones	We need the "corner store" allowable in all zones and all buildings.	See map changes released under the 'second wave' of ReCode edits.

8/16/2023	Downtown	6. Use Standards	Table 6-A: Uses in Residential Zones	Allow all buildings constructed or modified for commercial use to be used for commercial.	See neighborhood non-residential reuse provisions.
8/16/2023	Downtown	6. Use Standards	Table 6-A: Uses in Residential Zones	RN-2 - concerned about converting single-family dwellings to multi-family.	The drafts would not allow multi-family as a permitted use within the RN-2, except as affordable housing or adaptive reuse of existing non-residential buildings, as is permitted under the existing code.
8/16/2023	Downtown	6. Use Standards	Table 6-A: Uses in Residential Zones	Encourage the creation of more housing through renovation and new construction.	The ReCode changes allow new residential uses to occur in both ways.
8/16/2023	Downtown	6. Use Standards	Table 6-A: Uses in Residential Zones	Allow more multi-family, especially small ones.	The ReCode edits create more opportunity for 3-, 4-, and multi-family.
8/16/2023	Downtown	6. Use Standards	Table 6-A: Uses in Residential Zones	RN-5 – will all of this just lead to more teardowns?	There is no prohibition on tear-downs proposed within the base zoning.
8/16/2023	Downtown	6. Use Standards	Table 6-C: Uses in Mixed-Use Zones	118 Congress St. got height bonuses and 1st floor retail with community support.	The revised drafts maintain the B-1 zoning, which supports mixed-use with first floor retail.
8/16/2023	Downtown	6. Use Standards	Table 6-C: Uses in Mixed-Use Zones	These storefronts are dead – e banking and showroom for high-end condo interior design. Not food, not stuff the neighborhood needs.	The revised drafts maintain the B-1 zoning, which supports mixed-use with first floor retail.
8/16/2023	Downtown	6. Use Standards	Table 6-C: Uses in Mixed-Use Zones	B-1 and B-2 should allow at least 4 units of density. No need to stop at 2! (+1)	More than four units are currently permitted within these zones.
8/16/2023	Downtown	7. Dimensional Standards	7.2 "Frontage"	Do we define frontage and encourage or demand that buildings face the street and provide primary entrance to the street?	Street frontage is defined in Section 7.2. Many design standards within the Design Manual reinforce the concept of the principal entrance facing the street.
8/16/2023	Downtown	7. Dimensional Standards	7.2 "Height"	Height – how will measurement work with punch outs?	Drafts modify the rule of measurement to standardize the methodology and ensure measurement at regular intervals.
8/16/2023	Downtown	7. Dimensional Standards	7.2 "Height"	Height measurements need to be refined to reflect new building methods and climate change and noise isolation.	Revised drafts include some changes in permitted heights, particularly within the mixed-use context.
8/16/2023	Downtown	7. Dimensional Standards	7.2 "Height"	For grade measurement it should be measured from the front façade on the street and not points around foundation.	The drafts simplify and clarify the existing height rule of measurement.
8/16/2023	Downtown	7. Dimensional Standards	7.2 "Height"	Grade should be based on street experience.	The drafts simplify and clarify the existing height rule of measurement.
8/16/2023	Downtown	7. Dimensional Standards	7.2 "Height"	Heights on mainland should be measured from pre-development topography.	The drafts simplify the rule of measurement for height.
8/16/2023	Downtown	7. Dimensional Standards	7.4 Alternative Residential Development Options	Cottage courts only allow 25% two-family structures. [the] rest must be single. Remove this requirement! Does it comply with LD2003?	Conforming lots would be eligible for units under LD 2003 provisions. Cottage courts would provide an alternative way to develop these units.
8/16/2023	Downtown	7. Dimensional Standards	7.4 Alternative Residential Development Options	[Like most] cottage courts.	The revised drafts continue to include cottage courts as an alternative development typology.
8/16/2023	Downtown	7. Dimensional Standards	7.6 Towers	Do not like the 10,000 sf maximum floor plate for towers, current (small) towers barely fit.	This language has been maintained in revised drafts.
8/16/2023	Downtown	7. Dimensional Standards	7.6 Towers	10,000 floor plate is too limiting.	This language has been maintained in revised drafts.
8/16/2023	Downtown	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards	RN-5 needs standards for compatibility and context sensitivity.	Dimensional standards have been modified in small ways to promote context sensitivity. See height standards adapted from the MHNCO.
8/16/2023	Downtown	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards	[Like most] integrity of built environment in R-6.	The ReCode drafts, including the recently-adopted LD 2003 changes, expand the residential uses permitted in residential zones, particularly the lower-density residential zones, while largely respecting existing lot and development patterns.
8/16/2023	Downtown	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Density	Max lot sizes are too small in some zones. ReCode seems to aim to permit density that would be bare minimum for walkable 10 min. neighborhoods where basic goods and services are available to neighborhoods	The drafts do not include maximum lot sizes. The ReCode approach is generally to allow more units without dramatically altering the existing building pattern.
8/16/2023	Downtown	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Height	Max. height limits seem too low. (City desperately needs to increase housing supply?)	Some RN heights have been adjusted (e.g. the RN-7). Others have been kept at 35', which is common in residential zoning.
8/16/2023	Downtown	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Lot area	Lots should not have to be any bigger than 5,000 sf in any part of the city.	The ReCode approach is generally to allow more units without dramatically altering the existing lot and building pattern.
8/16/2023	Downtown	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Setbacks	Update setback to allow addition to homes on smaller lots to keep families in the community that need a little more space.	The drafts include some modifications to setbacks to allow more flexibility around addition.
8/16/2023	Downtown	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Zone Dimensional Standards/Building length	RN-5 – consider lot merger controls instead of building length to deal with scale and mass.	Length of buildings along street frontage is the impact that is at concern here; the standards have been written to address this impact.
8/16/2023	Downtown	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-C: Mixed-Use Zone Dimensional Standards	We failed on Eastern Waterfront redevelopment. Smaller lots encourage human scale and architectural variety. No more block-sized buildings and no more stupid street names like Freedom Way and Thames.	Changes proposed in Article 7, including new rules of measurement, are designed to help manage scale and form.
8/16/2023	Downtown	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-C: Mixed-Use Zone Dimensional Standards	What is the character of Bayside?	Under the ReCode drafts, the existing B-7 zone would be removed and the B-7 would be rezoned to B-3, the downtown zone.

8/16/2023	Downtown	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-C: Mixed-Use Zone Dimensional Standards	Also, the draft standards would reduce developable area when sidewalks are extended to a lot. Leads to bad incentives for walkability.	Revised drafts increase lot coverage for small island lots to 60%, as adopted under LD 2003.
8/16/2023	Downtown	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-C: Mixed-Use Zone Dimensional Standards/Building length	Building length restrictions – the problem isn't that buildings are too long, the problem is that they are too far apart.	Building length limits are meant to reinforce finer-grained contexts.
8/16/2023	Downtown	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-C: Mixed-Use Zone Dimensional Standards/Building length	Building lengths – will these make PHA properties non-conforming? Should there be a carveout for affordable housing? Lot coverage may also be an issue. Make affordable housing bonuses across all zones, match LD2003.	Revised drafts reduce the maximum building length in the RN-5 to 60' and eliminate the maximum building length in the RN-7.
8/16/2023	Downtown	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-C: Mixed-Use Zone Dimensional Standards/Height	Concerned about change in height in B-2b.	Drafts include changes to heights within mixed-use zones as a way to promote mixed-use, housing, and people and jobs near transit corridors, in alignment with the comprehensive plan.
8/16/2023	Downtown	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-C: Mixed-Use Zone Dimensional Standards/Lot coverage	For sustainability and equity, all zones, but particularly the downtown zones, need more trees, greenery and open space. Instead of 100% lot coverage how about 99%? Or some other way to	Street trees are required, as is stormwater infrastructure.
8/16/2023	Downtown	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-D: TOD Zone Dimensional Standards/Building length	Max. building lengths in TOD-1 zones are way too small. 75 ft. should be 200 ft. (+1)	Revised drafts adjust building lengths.
8/16/2023	Downtown	N/A	In general	Support waterfront industrial uses (fishing, marine repair, etc.)	Drafts include few changes to existing waterfront zoning.
8/16/2023	Downtown	N/A	In general	Bayside – need to plan with sensitivity to existing neighbors (single-family homes) in Bayside. Development (height, views, parking) can change the neighborhood and push out the little houses, trees.	Under the ReCode drafts, the existing B-7 zone would be removed and the B-7 would be rezoned to B-3, the downtown zone. Areas of Bayside which are currently zoned R-6 and B-2b would remain under those zoning designations (or their equivalents).
8/16/2023	Downtown	N/A	In general	Expand Metro for young and old.	This is a transportation-related comment.
8/16/2023	Downtown	N/A	In general	Parkside cannot expand land.	General comment.
8/16/2023	Downtown	N/A	In general	Old Port retail is failing.	General comment.
8/16/2023	Downtown	N/A	In general	Marketing waterfront is important.	General comment.
8/16/2023	Downtown	N/A	In general	[Like most] more permissive dimensional standards.	The revised drafts maintain the approach of allowing more flexibility around dimensional standards in ways that generally match the existing context, particularly in residential zones.
8/16/2023	Downtown	N/A	In general	[Like most] more permissive [dimensional standards].	The revised drafts maintain the approach of allowing more flexibility around dimensional standards in ways that generally match the existing context, particularly in residential zones.
8/16/2023	Downtown	N/A	In general	[Dimensional standards] better support integrity of built environment.	The revised drafts maintain the approach of allowing more flexibility around dimensional standards in ways that generally match the existing context, particularly in residential zones.
8/16/2023	Downtown	N/A	In general	[Like most] anti-sprawl.	The ReCode drafts generally support additional density across the city, as well as in transit nodes and along transit corridors, which aligns with smart growth goals.
8/16/2023	Downtown	N/A	In general	Not aggressive enough to address pressing challenges. Need for housing affordability and climate change.	Revised drafts create new opportunities for housing city-wide and include new regulatory responses to sea level rise and climate change.
8/16/2023	Downtown	N/A	Map	In R-6, some businesses are grandfathered in current R zones. Long-standing business uses are threatened with tenant turnover. Should be B zones (ie. Cumberland, Franklin, and Washington).	See map changes released under the 'second wave' of ReCode edits.
8/16/2023	Downtown	N/A	Map	Look at area behind Moran's Market on Forest Avenue for more B-1, B-2 or RN.	See map changes released under the 'second wave' of ReCode edits.
8/16/2023	Downtown	N/A	Organization	Have the [dimensional standards] terms and language been vetted with legal counsel for clarity to avoid future lawsuits? Clarity for builders and property owners.	Corporation Counsel has reviewed drafts.
8/16/2023	Downtown	N/A	Organization	[Like most] consolidated terms.	The ReCode drafts streamline use categories and terms.
8/16/2023	Downtown	N/A	Organization	[Like most] streamlined presentation [of uses]. (+1)	The revised draft maintains this approach.
8/16/2023	Downtown	N/A	Process	Geared to interests of developers over residents.	General comment.
8/16/2023	Downtown	N/A	Process	The staff did a very nice job!	General comment.
8/16/2023	Downtown	N/A	Process	Additional ways to engage the public.	Review of 'second wave' will include additional opportunities for public engagement.
8/16/2023	Downtown	N/A	Process	I think it would be useful to include old standards next to new standards.	See zone guides at www.recodeportland.me .
8/16/2023	Downtown	N/A	Process	Process [is] rushed.	The public engagement on the 'first wave' continued throughout the summer and into the fall. The review of the 'second wave' of changes will also involve many opportunities for the public to engage.

8/16/2023	Downtown	N/A	Process	Why was there no opportunity for public comment? After hearing 'presentation' hard to see how it relates to the needs and desires of current Portland workforce?	There was a long public comment period for the 'first wave' of ReCode edits. A similar process will occur for the 'second wave.'
8/16/2023	Downtown		Map	B-2b zone from 295 to Congress along Washington Avenue does not reflect Munjoy Hill neighborhood – walking, green space. Should be rezoned	The map changes released under the 'second wave' of ReCode edits retain this area as B-2b.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	3. Definitions	"Place of assembly"	Place of assembly at 8? Too restrictive. (+1)	8 persons aligns with the adjustment to the definition of family in the code from Phase I, which reduced the number of unrelated individuals in a family from 15 to 8. .
8/16/2023	N. Deering	4. Nonconformities	Lots of record	RN-2 – 6,500 sf – what about lots that are below that minimum? Make nonconformity provisions refer to "legal when created."	The revised drafts modify this language.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	4. Nonconformities	Lots of record	Lots of record to 1957? Go away with that date!	The revised drafts modify this language.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	5. Zones	Table 5-B: Residential Zones	I like the changes for R1 and R2.	The revised drafts continue to propose consolidating these two existing zones.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	5. Zones	Table 5-B: Residential Zones	[Like most] R1 + R2. ♡	The revised drafts continue to propose consolidating these two existing zones.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	5. Zones	Table 5-B: Residential Zones	R-4 should be R-6. (It is mansions only.)	The R-4 zone has been maintained as the RN-3.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	5. Zones	Table 5-B: Residential Zones	R-5 should be R-6.	The R-5 zone has been maintained as the RN-4, with some geographic expansion. See map changes.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	5. Zones	Table 5-B: Residential Zones	RN-3 talks about Western Promenade but it also covers a lot of residential Portland?	The RN-3 is generally confined to the West End.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	5. Zones	Table 5-D: Mixed-Use Zones	[Concerned about] B-2 and B-2b consolidation.	These have been maintained as distinct zones.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	5. Zones	Table 5-E: TOD Zones	[Like most] added TODs.	The revised drafts continue to include TOD zones. See map changes released under the 'second wave' of ReCode edits.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	5. Zones	Table 5-E: TOD Zones	I like TOD zones.	The revised drafts continue to include TOD zones. See map changes released under the 'second wave' of ReCode edits.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	5. Zones	Table 5-E: TOD Zones	Love the ideas of TODs!	The revised drafts continue to include TOD zones. See map changes released under the 'second wave' of ReCode edits.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	5. Zones	Table 5-E: TOD Zones	[Like most] TOD Zones.	The revised drafts continue to include TOD zones. See map changes released under the 'second wave' of ReCode edits.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	5. Zones	Table 5-E: TOD Zones	No need for TOD.	The revised drafts continue to include TOD zones. See map changes released under the 'second wave' of ReCode edits.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	5. Zones	Table 5-E: TOD Zones	[Like most] TOD at Allen's Corner!	The revised drafts continue to include TOD zones. See map changes released under the 'second wave' of ReCode edits.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	5. Zones	Table 5-E: TOD Zones	[Like most] height near transit!	The ReCode drafts generally place most height in mixed-use zones and TOD zones, which are designed to be applied near transit.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	6. Use Standards	6.4.12(A) Multi-family conversion standards	Multi-family reuse in RN-2 shouldn't be limited to non-residential. What about massive old Victorians? (+1)	The multi-family reuse language in the RN-2 is based on the existing code. Under the adopted LD 2003 changes, 4 new units would be allowed on a conforming lot in this zone.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	6. Use Standards	6.4.26 Neighborhood nonresidential reuse	"Reuse" is arbitrary and limiting. (+1)(+1)	New neighborhood businesses are not currently allowed within residential areas. The neighborhood nonresidential reuse provides new flexibility that allows them in certain circumstances. Other neighborhood business needs are addressed within the B-1, B-2 or other zones located nearby to residential zones. See related map changes.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	6. Use Standards	6.4.26 Neighborhood nonresidential reuse	Reuse is conditional downgrade from B-1b. (+1)	New neighborhood businesses are not currently allowed within residential areas. The neighborhood nonresidential reuse provides new flexibility that allows them in certain circumstances. Other neighborhood business needs are addressed within the B-1, B-2 or other zones located nearby to residential zones. See related map changes.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	6. Use Standards	6.4.26 Neighborhood nonresidential reuse	Look at non-residential reuse in RN-2. Why can't a non- residential be reused as a 3-family or 4-family?	This would be allowed under the recently adopted LD 2003 changes.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	6. Use Standards	6.6.2	I am concerned that the deed restriction requirement will hinder the development of ADUs. Please strike out 6.6.2.A.7. See AARP's model ADU ordinances/best practices.	This language has been eliminated in the revised drafts.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	6. Use Standards	Table 6-A: Uses in Residential Zones	No hotels in residential neighborhoods.	Hotels' are not permitted within residential zones.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	6. Use Standards	Table 6-A: Uses in Residential Zones	Ban religious buildings.	Places of assembly are broadly permitted.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	6. Use Standards	Table 6-A: Uses in Residential Zones	Want small businesses in new construction. (+1)	See map changes released under the 'second wave' of ReCode edits.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	7. Dimensional Standards	7.2 "Blank wall"	Please clarify that "blank wall" doesn't include side elevations.	The draft rules of measurement state that this standard is 'measured along a street frontage.'
8/16/2023	N. Deering	7. Dimensional Standards	7.4 Alternative Residential Development Options	[Like most] cottage courts!	The revised drafts continue to include cottage courts as an alternative development typology.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Density	Still arbitrary density limits in R- zones. Why not higher?	The ReCode approach is generally to allow more units without dramatically altering the existing building pattern.

8/16/2023	N. Deering	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Density	Need to delete dimensional standards for 3- and 4-units in RN-1 and RN-2 in dimensional table.	The revised drafts align permitted uses and dimensional standards.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Density	Don't limit number of units. Let dimensions control.	ReCode changes use a combination of use, density, and bulk controls to address housing potential. This is consistent with existing approach to residential zoning and the approach used in many communities throughout the country.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Lot area	Lot minimums still too big.	The ReCode approach is generally to allow more units without dramatically altering the existing lot and building pattern.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Lot area	Lot sizes too big.	The ReCode approach is generally to allow more units without dramatically altering the existing lot and building pattern.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-A: Residential Neighborhood Zone Dimensional Standards/Setbacks	Setbacks too high.	The drafts include some modifications to setbacks to allow more flexibility around addition.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-C: Mixed-Use Zone Dimensional Standards/Height	Additional height in B-2b is extremely useful in allowing modular to be an option since it has a 2x unusable premium space (1" – 10" typical vs. 12" for stick built).	Drafts include changes to heights within mixed-use zones as a way to promote mixed-use, housing, and people and jobs near transit corridors, in alignment with the comprehensive plan.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-C: Mixed-Use Zone Dimensional Standards/Height	[Concerned] about increasing height from 45 ft. to 65 ft. [in B-2/B-2b].	Drafts include changes to heights within mixed-use zones as a way to promote mixed-use, housing, and people and jobs near transit corridors, in alignment with the comprehensive plan.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-C: Mixed-Use Zone Dimensional Standards/Height	Need more height at the corner of Elm and Cumberland (105').	Drafts include changes to heights within mixed-use zones as a way to promote mixed-use, housing, and people and jobs near transit corridors, in alignment with the comprehensive plan.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-C: Mixed-Use Zone Dimensional Standards/Height	Advocating for more height on corner of Elm and Cumberland. Increase from 85' to 105'.	Drafts include changes to heights within mixed-use zones as a way to promote mixed-use, housing, and people and jobs near transit corridors, in alignment with the comprehensive plan.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-C: Mixed-Use Zone Dimensional Standards/Height	Excited for the new height maximums.	The revised drafts include some modifications to permitted heights.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-C: Mixed-Use Zone Dimensional Standards/Height	Heights along Franklin should relate to width of new Franklin Street.	The drafts increase heights along the Bayside portion of Franklin. More work could be done under future Franklin Street planning effort.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	N/A	In general	Need evaluation of potential impacts [of use changes]!	Changes to encourage more housing are based on policy guidance from the Council-adopted comprehensive plan, which set a growth target.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	N/A	In general	How many people can the city manage?	Changes to encourage more housing are based on policy guidance from the Council-adopted comprehensive plan, which set a growth target.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	N/A	In general	[Concerned about] impacts of urbanization (noise pollution, increased traffic, environmental stress on city resources).	Changes to encourage more housing are based on policy guidance from the Council-adopted comprehensive plan, which set a growth target.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	N/A	In general	Too aggressive- urbanization of off-peninsula.	Changes to encourage more housing are based on policy guidance from the Council-adopted comprehensive plan, which set a growth target.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	N/A	In general	Infrastructure – our roads, sewer, water and all other systems are not keeping up with the growth.	Changes to encourage more housing are based on policy guidance from the Council-adopted comprehensive plan, which set a growth target.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	N/A	In general	More homes, town houses, condos on smaller lots means more traffic, pollution and depletion of natural resources. The continual state of global warming is devastating to our neighborhoods, our ocean, lakes, rivers, air. We will become like Florida or any other state. That is not why we live in Maine.	Changes to encourage more housing are based on policy guidance from the Council-adopted comprehensive plan, which set a growth target.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	N/A	In general	The transition between zones – if homes about commercial land, we need greater and larger buffer zones of green, trees and nature to protect the homes. Airport area is perfect example of noise, air pollution and more with little protection from further expansion.	Drafts address mixed-use to residential transitions within dimensional standards.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	N/A	In general	Yes to more housing! Yes to ability to build 2 or more units per lot! Yes to higher density!	The ReCode drafts generally support additional density.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	N/A	In general	[Concerned about] unintended consequences.	General comment.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	N/A	In general	Love market gardens.	The revised drafts maintain 'market gardens' as a use.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	N/A	In general	[Concerned about] some of the language in the text.	General comment.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	N/A	In general	[Concerned about] on-/off-peninsula??	Drafts remove some of the on-/off-peninsula distinctions in zones like the B-2 within the existing land use code, reflecting the policy goal of additional growth in mixed-use zones off-peninsula.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	N/A	In general	What type of structures are allowed in each zone?	See use and dimensional tables in Articles 6 and 7.

8/16/2023	N. Deering	N/A	In general	Does not address affordable housing.	The drafts promote housing writ large, and include revisions to Article 17 (Housing).
8/16/2023	N. Deering	N/A	In general	I would like to see discussion of affordable housing.	The drafts promote housing writ large, and include revisions to Article 17 (Housing).
8/16/2023	N. Deering	N/A	Map	Please look at parcels that awkwardly split zones and choose one (ex. Washington Ave. and Hammond St.	See map changes released under the 'second wave' of ReCode edits, which generally address split lots.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	N/A	Map	Westminster Edgeworth plat - move R-3 to R-5.	See map changes released under the 'second wave' of ReCode edits.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	N/A	Organization	[Like most] clarity [in definitions].	General comment.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	N/A	Organization	[Like most] easy to read.	General comment.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	N/A	Organization	Consolidated and clarity is good. Could go further.	General comment.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	N/A	Organization	Clickable links in PDF of code TOC [Table of Contents].	General comment.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	N/A	Process	Process!	General comment.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	N/A	Process	What if non-english speaking members came tonight? A verbal presentation of each article presented on picture boards and opportunity for questions. Hard to understand the language on the boards.	The public engagement on the 'first wave' continued throughout the summer and into the fall. The review of the 'second wave' of changes will also involve many opportunities for the public to engage and will focus on providing what is very technical material in a variety of forms.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	N/A	Process	I appreciate that the city is going to hold more meetings and opportunity for more information, clarification, and question and answer periods. It is crucial to us residents – especially since we do not get to vote on this.	The public engagement on the 'first wave' continued throughout the summer and into the fall. The review of the 'second wave' of changes will also involve many opportunities for the public to engage.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	N/A	Process	Tables do not match up with proposed changes.	General comment.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	N/A	Process	It would be helpful to have comparison charts (What you can do now, what will change).	See zone guides at www.recodeportland.me .
8/16/2023	N. Deering	N/A	Process	We need to have comparison tables and charts not just recode charts.	See zone guides at www.recodeportland.me .
8/16/2023	N. Deering	N/A	Process	Zoning changes not equitable across the city.	The draft changes affect all zones, trying to create opportunities for housing and small businesses, as well as other changes that meet comprehensive goals, across the city.
8/16/2023	N. Deering	N/A	Process	Process – do neighborhood meetings everywhere.	The engagement on the 'first wave' of changes included meetings with all neighborhood associations that requested them.
8/17/2023	Peaks Island	2. Administration	Variances	Get rid of current clause that declares that no lot size variances can be granted in IR-1 or IR-2.	Revised drafts eliminate this language.
8/17/2023	Peaks Island	6. Use Standards	Table 6-B: Uses in Island Zones	More information on “lodging or boarding” houses on Peaks Island please.	Lodging houses' are a use defined in Article 3, with use standards in Article 6.
8/17/2023	Peaks Island	6. Use Standards	Table 6-B: Uses in Island Zones	Need opportunities for neighborhood non-residential.	New neighborhood businesses are not currently allowed within residential areas. The neighborhood nonresidential reuse provides new flexibility that allows them in certain circumstances.
8/17/2023	Peaks Island	6. Use Standards	Table 6-B: Uses in Island Zones	Nonconforming lots – open up to place of assembly.	Nonconforming lots are subject to the use regulations of the zone in which they lie. See Article 4.
8/17/2023	Peaks Island	6. Use Standards	Table 6-B: Uses in Island Zones	Consider low-impact industrial as a permitted use (support, landscapers, truck parking.	Revised drafts add low-impact industrial as a permitted use in the I-B zone.
8/17/2023	Peaks Island	6. Use Standards	Table 6-B: Uses in Island Zones	Clarify ways artists can have functional studios (with sales) in IR-1 and IR-2.	Revised drafts add studios as a permitted use in island zones.
8/17/2023	Peaks Island	6. Use Standards	Table 6-B: Uses in Island Zones	Want more flexibility for density for affordable housing – duplexes?	The recently adopted LD 2003 changes allow up to three units on conforming lots in island zones.
8/17/2023	Peaks Island	6. Use Standards	Table 6-B: Uses in Island Zones	[Concerned about] flexibility for IR-2 uses -access units.	The recently adopted LD 2003 changes allow up to three units on conforming lots in island zones.
8/17/2023	Peaks Island	6. Use Standards	Table 6-B: Uses in Island Zones	[Concerned about] flexibility for IR-2 zone - ADUs, increase density.	The recently adopted LD 2003 changes allow up to three units on conforming lots in island zones.
8/17/2023	Peaks Island	6. Use Standards	Table 6-B: Uses in Island Zones	Would like even more flexibility to allow for greater density on island.	The recently adopted LD 2003 changes allow up to three units on conforming lots in island zones.
8/17/2023	Peaks Island	6. Use Standards	Table 6-B: Uses in Island Zones	Revisit permitting 2-family conversion on the island.	The recently adopted LD 2003 changes allow up to three units on conforming lots in island zones.
8/17/2023	Peaks Island	7. Dimensional Standards	7.4 Alternative Residential Development Options	Allow cottage courts on Peaks.	The revised drafts add cottage courts as a development option within the IR-2 zone.
8/17/2023	Peaks Island	7. Dimensional Standards	7.4 Alternative Residential Development Options	Add IR-1 and IR-2 to permission for “cottage court” development.	The revised drafts add cottage courts as a development option within the IR-2 zone.
8/17/2023	Peaks Island	7. Dimensional Standards	7.4 Alternative Residential Development Options	Cottage courts should be allowable on islands also.	The revised drafts add cottage courts as a development option within the IR-2 zone.

8/17/2023	Peaks Island	7. Dimensional Standards	7.7.4(A) Setback exceptions	Space/bulk exceptions (e.g., entry porch provision) – consider adding similar language for other types of spaces.	Revised drafts include some changes around setbacks to allow more flexibility.
8/17/2023	Peaks Island	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-B: Island Zone Dimensional Standards	Minimum lot size for residential is still too big.	Revised drafts reduce the small island lot size to 3,000 SF.
8/17/2023	Peaks Island	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-B: Island Zone Dimensional Standards	Reduce minimum lot size in IR-2 for small island lots.	Revised drafts reduce the small island lot size to 3,000 SF.
8/17/2023	Peaks Island	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-B: Island Zone Dimensional Standards	Reduce minimum lot size in IR-2 for small island lots to 3,000.	Revised drafts reduce the small island lot size to 3,000 SF.
8/17/2023	Peaks Island	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-B: Island Zone Dimensional Standards	Is 4,000 small enough for small lot provision?	Revised drafts reduce the small island lot size to 3,000 SF.
8/17/2023	Peaks Island	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-B: Island Zone Dimensional Standards	Nonconforming lots – minimum lot sizes in IR-1 and IR-2 are still too small.	Second wave' drafts include some changes to rules around nonconforming lots, with the aim of simplifying and allowing more flexibility.
8/17/2023	Peaks Island	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-B: Island Zone Dimensional Standards	IR-2 small island lots – sewer not likely. What uses might be allowed. Note: They adjoin an unused – 50' wide paper road. Could the paper road somehow influence how the lots (15 sf total) be used?	The existing approach has generally been maintained in the 'second wave' drafts.
8/17/2023	Peaks Island	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-B: Island Zone Dimensional Standards	Small island provisions in IR-2 – open to non-residential?	These are meant as a tool for residential development within a residential zone. I-B provides opportunities for non-residential.
8/17/2023	Peaks Island	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-B: Island Zone Dimensional Standards	What about a non-residential structure on a “small island lot”?	These are meant as a tool for residential development within a residential zone. I-B provides opportunities for non-residential.
8/17/2023	Peaks Island	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-B: Island Zone Dimensional Standards	IR-2 small lot (5,000 sf) could be put on sewer. Could an alternate use be a historical society building? If so, what parking would be required, if any?	These are meant as a tool for residential development within a residential zone. I-B provides opportunities for non-residential.
8/17/2023	Peaks Island	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-B: Island Zone Dimensional Standards/Lot coverage	Increase lot coverage under small lot provisions.	Revised drafts increase lot coverage for small island lots to 60%, as adopted under LD 2003.
8/17/2023	Peaks Island	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-B: Island Zone Dimensional Standards/Setbacks	Consider reducing setbacks on land parcels that border “undevelopable land” like PILP land or wetlands.	Revised drafts include some changes around setbacks to allow more flexibility.
8/17/2023	Peaks Island	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-B: Island Zone Dimensional Standards/Setbacks	Side setbacks and rear setbacks on small lots – consider provisions to allow trading one side for other.	Revised drafts include some changes around setbacks to allow more flexibility.
8/17/2023	Peaks Island	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-B: Island Zone Dimensional Standards/Setbacks	Accessory structure setbacks are too large.	Revised drafts include some changes around setbacks to allow more flexibility.
8/17/2023	Peaks Island	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-B: Island Zone Dimensional Standards/Setbacks	10 ft. setbacks for accessory structure in IR-2 is too big.	Revised drafts include some changes around setbacks to allow more flexibility.
8/17/2023	Peaks Island	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-B: Island Zone Dimensional Standards/Setbacks	ADU setbacks are too large.	Revised drafts include some changes around setbacks to allow more flexibility.
8/17/2023	Peaks Island	7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-B: Island Zone Dimensional Standards/Setbacks	Accessory building side setbacks under small lot – reduce like the mainland.	Revised drafts include some changes around setbacks to allow more flexibility.
8/17/2023	Peaks Island	N/A	In general	Values are changing.	General comment.
8/17/2023	Peaks Island	N/A	In general	Allow building on paper streets.	See section 6.4.1.
8/17/2023	Peaks Island	N/A	In general	Integrate with the legal department a public forum on paper roads and development vs. conservation.	This conversation would occur outside of the ReCode process.
8/16/2023		7. Dimensional Standards	Table 7-C: Mixed-Use Zone Dimensional Standards/Height	Prefer Temple Street to be consistent 325'.	See some revisions to downtown height map.