

From: Mark Knox [mailto:knox@mind.net]
Sent: Tuesday, August 27, 2019 2:21 PM
To: Maria Harris <maria.harris@ashland.or.us>
Subject: RE: open space standards

Sorry for the late response Maria. In review of the latest Open Space draft, here are my comments:

- 1) 18.4.2.030 H.2.c.ii. Location: I do have some concerns we may be eliminating opportunity or for that matter creating non-conforming parks. I definitely understand the intent, but parks along main streets would be prohibited? I'm thinking of all of the parks that now exist, such as Mountain, Heresy, Kestrel Park, etc. In fact, I'm developing a master plan in Medford with a 5 acre park along what one day could be a pretty busy collector with the thought of the open space/park being a "break" from the auto centric environment, but also a buffer for the residences. I would suggest, common open space less than ? 10,000 sq. ft.?? Again, I just believe "most" parks and common space play a very important role in traditional planning.
- 2) 18.4.2.030 H.2.e. Surfacing: I worry this forces applications to "turf" (water consumptive landscaping). I really believe shrubs, rose gardens, etc. can be considered "useable", especially in light of our climate concerns.
- 3) 18.4.2.030 H.2.f. Fences: what if the open space abuts a neighbor who desires his/her 6' fence? (Yes, I know, staff and PC are reasonable/logical ☺);
- 4) 18.4.2.030 H.2.h Credit for Proximity to Park: This is really innovative, especially in a compact urban town. Should it also include public parks that are planned, but yet improved? Is this too obvious?
- 5) 18.4.2.030 H.3.b. Ground floor dwelling units (finished grade): Is this a vertical or horizontal dimension? What's the rationale?
- 6) 18.4.2.030 H.3.c. Upper-Floor Dwelling Units: Why 4' and not 6'? 4' is too narrow and simply becomes bike storage or worse. 6' should be the minimum as it's the minimum dimension in multiple case studies.

Overall, I think the draft is definitely becoming clearer and more user friendly. Best of all, I think it will produce better results, especially with the above comments incorporated.... Hahaha. Good luck with it and thank you for the opportunity to weigh-in. -- Mark

