

Central City 2035 Plan Testimony
8/9/2016 Hearing

We live in the West End, having moved here for its unique livability: mixed use, historic character, variety of people-friendly-sized buildings. And we thank staff that the “West End” is now a recognized planning area.

1. We support parts of the proposed CC Plan changes that support this livability, e.g.:
 - i. Various policies that encourage **historic preservation** (e.g. including it as a FAR bonus option – although we support a FAR of 7:1 for the West End).
 - ii. The Plan’s expressed need for a park, schools and a community center in the West End (please consider the city-owned block on Morrison and 10th for this purpose).
2. We oppose parts of the proposed Plan that undermine existing livability, and urge:
 - i. Building heights in the **West End should be capped at 100’**.
 - a. “Dense” development does not require 250-400’-tall buildings. 100’-tall buildings *do support density*. European cities harbor high population density and do it with 6-8-story buildings (under 100’ tall). And remain on a human-friendly, compact scale.
 - b. A 100’ cap would protect “view corridors” now threatened by higher allowed building heights.
 - c. A 100’ cap in the West End would support the CCP’s Neighborhood Transitions policy, creating a “step-down” between, e.g., lower-zoned Goose Hollow and the corporate downtown district.
 - ii. Building heights on the east side of the **South Park Blocks need to be lowered to a maximum of 100’**. Nothing could detract more from the “urban refuge” character of this wonderful area than a line of very tall buildings (up to 370’) along the park’s edge, blocking sunlight (mornings) and creating blinding reflections for park users (afternoons). This supports Goal 5.C’s call for “human-scaled... streets, ... parks, [and] open space...”
 - iii. Related to the above - buildings should be **required to preserve sunlight** on all public open spaces.
 - iv. Again related – zoning of the east side of the Park Blocks should NOT be changed from RX to CX. The uses here are more residential than commercial, and should remain so.

We remain disturbed by the **undisclosed potential conflicts of interest in the West Quadrant Stakeholder Advisory Committee** that recommended increasing heights in the CCP– and persisted in falsely equating “density” (which we support) with “very high buildings” – which we feel will do nothing but raise costs of housing and seriously damage the livability of our neighborhood. Many SAC members *did* have potential conflicts of interest (including advocating for changing City policy to increase

bridgehead heights, e.g. at the Morrison Bridge for a development planned by the employer of two members). And yet they did not submit a disclosure to the Ombudsman's after-the-fact "remedy" for failure to declare these conflicts during the SAC meetings. (It is also notable that West End residents did not have a single representative on the SAC.) **For many residents, this situation calls into question the validity of the SAC's recommendations, most of which are included in the proposed CCP.**

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Deanna and Wilfried Mueller-Crispin
1221 SW 10th Ave., Unit 1013
Portland, OR 97205
deanna@involved.com