
From: John Hollister <jhollister@greatergiving.com>
Sent: Monday, March 06, 2017 4:32 PM
To: Gushard, Mike; BDS Hearings Clerk
Subject: RE: REVISED STAFF REPORT - LU 16-153002

I feel like the public has been let down by the system with regard to this project. The public's contention, with over 100 petition signers, is that the proposed building is not compatible in height with the adjacent historic buildings. I am a bit frustrated with the approval process so far. Here is a brief review of the process from my vantage point:

- At the pre-application meeting the applicant was told 75' was the maximum height the building was allowed
 - I believed what was said and I was satisfied that the city had the public's back; balancing development with historic preservation
 - I didn't think I needed to be prepared to give my testimony re the building height because 75' was/is a compatible height.
 - I didn't think I needed to get the Neighborhood association involved
- At the DAR meeting the staff supported 100' which was a shock to me and all of the people in the neighborhood that I had told about the pre-application meeting
 - I was told I could testify my concern at the meeting but I wasn't prepared (why should I have been if 75' is what I thought the building height was going to be?)
 - I was told I'd have another opportunity to prepare my testimony and present it at a future meeting
 - I was confused at the end of this meeting because even though I was told I'd have another chance to give testimony, but it seemed like they approved the height at the DAR. These types of decisions are typically made at land use meetings not DAR meetings
- I began to prepare for the Land use meeting
 - I discovered comparative historic district building heights listed and used in the applicant's DAR presentation were inaccurate
 - Buildings outside of the historic district were used as comparable building heights
 - Visual drawings made the proposed building seem smaller than it really is. In one picture it seems the KEEN building is taller than the proposed building
 - I researched Landmark annual meeting reports
 - I researched City decisions on block 136
 - Etc.
- At first land use meeting I gave my testimony. Main points:
 - I presented my findings above

- Highlighted that landmarks commission felt current district guidelines were not best representing the neighborhood
- The city made the decision in block 136 to limit building height on 13th Ave to 75' to respect historic district (a stepdown into historic district)
- 93% of buildings in district were under 75'
- Once I finished, commission basically said decision was made last meeting and moved on to materials
- At second land use meeting
 - I had more information and facts
 - Commission acknowledged and appreciated what I put together
 - I was told if the info was brought to them earlier they might have been able to have a different conversation

I attended every meeting that was publically available so I don't know how I could have presented information earlier to the commission. I want to be an active public participant but I don't feel the system was helpful and I can see how other people in the public get frustrated and drop out of these types of city involvement.

I don't think the information I presented should be looked at as too late. The building owner has been spoken to and they don't believe construction will start on this building for 3-5 years.

I don't think the commission should make this approval without a deeper look at the site and a deeper understanding of the public opinion

If you must approve this project I request that you waive the \$5,000 appeal fee to City Council

Thank you,

John

John Hollister

REGIONAL SALES MANAGER | GREATER GIVING INC.

T: 503.597.0355 | F: 503.597.0580 | JHOLLISTERS@GREATERGIVING.COM

SERVICE. DRIVEN. COMMERCE

NOTICE: This email message is for the sole use of the addressee named above and may contain confidential information.

Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure, distribution or duplication of this message or any attachments is expressly prohibited.

If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies and backups of the original message

-----Original Message-----

From: Gushard, Mike [mailto:Mike.Gushard@portlandoregon.gov]
Sent: Friday, February 24, 2017 9:21 AM
To: John Hollister <jhollister@greatergiving.com>; BDS Hearings Clerk <BDSHearingsClerk@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: RE: REVISED STAFF REPORT - LU 16-153002

John,

I thought you were still working on your graphic and that you would present it at the hearing. So, I did not forward it to the Commission. I can send that version in advance if you'd like.

I'm sorry we were not able to connect before the meeting. I have been swamped. I appreciate the update and look forward to saying hello at the hearing.

Mike

-----Original Message-----

From: John Hollister [mailto:jhollister@greatergiving.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 23, 2017 12:29 PM
To: BDS Hearings Clerk <BDSHearingsClerk@portlandoregon.gov>
Cc: bhedberg@spechtprop.com; MPerson@mcknze.com; sstanley@mcknze.com; Sieber, Mark <mark@nwnw.org>; carolyn@explorethepearl.com; president@nwnwboard.org; planning@pearldistrict.org; pkisling@mcknze.com; sstanley@mcnze.com; Gushard, Mike <Mike.Gushard@portlandoregon.gov>; Zhuang, Ye <Ye.Zhuang@portlandoregon.gov>; Krantz, Dawn <Dawn.Krantz@portlandoregon.gov>; Kersens, Ben <Ben.Kersens@portlandoregon.gov>; Cermak, Abigail <Abigail.Cermak@portlandoregon.gov>; Montalvo, Teresa <Teresa.Montalvo@portlandoregon.gov>; Moore, Mari <Mari.Moore@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: Re: REVISED STAFF REPORT - LU 16-153002

Mike,

Were you able to send out the comparable NW 13th Ave historic building heights graphic I handed you at the previous cancelled/rescheduled landmarks review?

Btw... My graphic got a lot of attention from the public. Over 100 people signed a petition saying they think the building height isn't compatible with adjacent historical buildings. I invited them all to the hearing Monday. some of them were pretty passionate but I'm not sure how many will attend...

They thought the 75 ft height limit for the entire district that the landmarks commission originally proposed at the CC 2035 plan was much more compatible.

Just thought you should know.

John

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 23, 2017, at 10:52 AM, BDS Hearings Clerk

<BDSHearingsClerk@portlandoregon.gov<mailto:BDSHearingsClerk@portlandoregon.gov>>
wrote:

Hello,

The Revised Staff Report is now available. To view the report, click the following link:

LU 16-153002 HRM AD<<https://www.portlandoregon.gov/bds/article/629329>>

Reply Directly to the Case Planner, Mike Gushard

Thank you,

BDS Hearings Clerks

Shelia Noland

Laura DuVall

BDS Hearings Clerk

City of Portland - Bureau of Development Services Land Use Services Division

1900 SW 4th Ave, Suite 5000

Portland, OR 97201