

August 1, 2016

Planning and Sustainability Commission
Attn: CC2035 Testimony
1900 SW Fourth Avenue, Suite 7100
Portland OR, 97201

RE: CC2035 Testimony

Emma Pelett
Coho Crossing LLC.
109 SE Salmon Street
Portland, Oregon 97214

133 SE Salmon Street
Portland, Oregon 97214

The spot zoning of the proposed Salmon Springs scenic view corridor would drastically limit the otherwise allowed height of structures on specific properties in the Central Eastside. If this change is made, the full economic potential of the affected properties would never be realized and millions lost would be the opportunity cost of this view.

The decision to value a rivers edge view of Mt. Hood at Salmon Springs, which sits 36 feet above sea level, over the rights of property owners, job growth, the natural development and growth of the neighborhood is disappointing. What is more disappointing is the disingenuous nature of this last minute zoning change. The Salmon Springs view corridor was not revealed until the June 20, 2016 in the Bureau draft of recommendations. I attend the Planning and Sustainability meetings for the Southeast Quadrant 2035 comprehensive plan for over a year and this zoning change was never discussed. Had this major decision of changing the build-able height from buildings in this area from 175' to 45' been discussed, I likely would not have purchased this property, as the proposed zoning change drastically devalues the property.

The Bureau of Planning and Sustainability's February 2016 draft recommended that this view corridor should not be protected. Out of 133 view corridors in Portland only 3 are prohibited, Salmon Springs is one of those. The impact of the Salmon Spring's decision to protect, limit or allow conflicting resources was not appropriately weighed. A specific Economic, Social, Environmental (ESE) analysis for Salmon Springs was never conducted. The Salmon Springs view corridor should be removed from the planning process and a specific ESE analysis completed. This would allow for the creation of clear design guidelines that would not impede the view. The balancing of legitimate state interests against individual due process rights is extremely important. The last minute change creates genuine inequities and deprives isolated landowners of due process while forcing the brunt of this economic loss upon them.

This decision has real life financial consequences for individuals like myself. I personally saved for years to purchase property on Salmon Street. I selected this property for a number of reasons including location and zoning. My dad always told me, "To begin with the end in mind" and this decision was no different. I carefully selected this property with the intention of redeveloping it. The block to the East of my property is not included in the view corridor and has

a “no limit” height designation. I’m requesting that my property be reexamined for its relationships to the view corridor. If it is absolutely necessary to be included in the view corridor I request that the height limits follows the exact cuts of the view corridor. To some it may see inconsequential but to me this decision alters my financial future. With so much at stake I would like the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability to be certain about how much, if any of my property, will truly impede this view.

Below is the photo used on page 135 of the Amended Proposed Draft of the Central City Scenic Resources Protection Plan. It clearly show my property identified by a yellow arrow, the tan building with red strip, is outside of the red Mt. Hood view box.



It is costly to draw any line, physical or conceptual. In drawing this we must carefully consider all members of our community including property owners. If your mind is already made up and this, as it feels to most property owners in the proposed view corridor, is a done deal then I ask you to please move forward with integrity. If you are creating a financial hardship and diminishing economic development why not supplement it back to owners in the form of height or FAR transfers in the amount each property owner would have taken away from them? The “public good” prevails and the view is maintained while the cost of this public amenity is lessened for the few private property owners “paying” for it.

Requests:

1. The Salmon Springs view corridor removed from the planning process, and ESE analysis completed before a decision is made to prohibit building heights.

2. I'm requesting that my property be re-examined for its relationships to the view corridor. If it is absolutely necessary to be included in the view corridor, I request that the height limits follows the exact cuts of the view corridor.

3. Consider compensation for the regulatory taking of imposing a new height restriction by allowing affected property owners to sell or transfer the lost height.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Emma Pelett