**Alamo Manhattan Blocks**

**LU 20-102915 DZM GW AD; PC # 19-225732**

This is to support the appeal by Henry de Tessan, Yvonne Meekcoms, and Mary Henry de Tessan in opposition to the proposed Alamo Manhattan development.

There are several important criteria that suggest that the current design of the project is poorly conceived.

1. Integration with the natural beauty of Portland

In reference to the South Waterfront District, Portland’s Central City Plan 2035 states that development should “create an exemplary open space network that embraces the river as the district’s ‘front yard’” (POLICY 5.SW-2). The design of the buildings does not do this.

As Portland prides itself on its natural beauty and its river, it is a shame to block the river with the tall building in front. The design of the Alamo Manhattan Blocks can be altered to still achieve the same square footage, if desired, but with a more appealing design that places the taller buildings further from the water and the smaller buildings closer to the river. This would allow for a more natural step-down architecture that would complement the river’s scale and would be more agreeable to the design of the existing community with an orientation towards the river, permitting a natural neighborhood involvement with the water.

1. Complement to the existing architecture of the area

The project should complement the existing architecture of the area. It does not do that, with its long tall walls that run the length of the block. The high walls of the proposed tall buildings and the placement of the buildings also will impact the neighborhood’s sunlight, creating a shadow of darkness during the day for many residents and visitors to the area.

1. Traffic issues

Traffic has become a nightmare with significant backups. Getting to work in the morning is difficult due to the limited opportunities in and out of the neighborhood. Approving a project with 125 feet of bonus height, significantly increasing the number of individuals originally planned to live in the area, without doing a traffic assessment from the increased square footage, is fundamentally flawed and a mistake that will negatively impact the entire neighborhood. This cannot be overstated. As part of the approval process for increased height variance, significant consideration of traffic and the effects on the neighborhood should occur with a remedy for the stresses that will be placed upon the neighborhood. It is the right thing to do. Not doing so will render the neighborhood increasingly unlivable.

Additionally the number of parking places within the project is limited, which will further stress street parking opportunities.

For these reasons I support the appeal and believe that the project’s scope and design should be reworked. Thank you for consideration of my comments.

Ellen Lippman