

From: MICHAEL GOLDMAN [mailto:michaelgoldman17@outlook.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 07, 2020 11:50 AM
To: Planning Commission - Public Testimony <PC-public-testimony@ashland.or.us>; derek.severson@ashland.or.
Cc: kentpr675@gmail.com
Subject: "May 12 PC Hearing Testimony"

[EXTERNAL SENDER]

Dear Ashland City Planners and others regarding Development Plans for 210 Alicia Ave, public comments:

I would like to hereby register my name, **Michael Goldman, at 198 Alicia Ave**, as an opponent to the proposed 12 house development just a few houses away from my home on Alicia Ave.

There are many reasons why this proposal is not proper for this location, several listed here are:

1. Too dense and too much traffic for this tiny-winding street (Alicia Ave).
2. Not enough designated on-site parking for the approximate 24 vehicles expected (at just 2 vehicles per home).
3. Not enough sewer capacity to accommodate 12 additional houses.
4. Not a significant amount of egress in case of fire or other emergency for 12 families to escape danger.

Please be sure to register my complaints, **and my name**, for any further public meetings, so that I am afforded the ability to speak.

Thank You,

Michael Goldman

Michael Goldman Agency
michaelgoldman17@outlook.com
P.O. Box 1286, Ashland, OR 97520
541-890-7701



From: Kent Patrick-Riley <kentpr675@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 7, 2020 11:59 AM
To: Derek Severson <derek.severson@ashland.or.us>
Subject: Re: Please postpone May 12, 2020 meeting to discuss 210 Alicia St development

[EXTERNAL SENDER]

Thanks.

On May 7, 2020, at 10:48 AM, Derek Severson <derek.severson@ashland.or.us> wrote:

Kent,

Thank you for bringing this to our attention. The PC-public-testimony@ashland.or.us e-mail should be fixed to accept e-mails now, and I've passed your e-mail on to the Community Development Director and will discuss with him further.

- Derek

Derek Severson, *Senior Planner*
City of Ashland, Department of Community Development
51 Winburn Way, Ashland, OR 97520
PH: (541) 552-2040 **FAX:** (541) 552-2050 **TTY:** 1-800-735-2900
E-MAIL: derek.severson@ashland.or.us

This e-mail transmission is the official business of the City of Ashland, and is subject to Oregon's public records laws for disclosure and retention. If you've received this e-mail in error, please contact me at (541) 552-2040. Thank you.

From: Kent Patrick-Riley <kentpr675@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2020 05:16 PM
To: Derek Severson <derek.severson@ashland.or.us>
Cc: MICHAEL GOLDMAN <michaelgoldman17@outlook.com>
Subject: Please postpone May 12, 2020 meeting to discuss 210 Alicia St development


[EXTERNAL SENDER]

Hi Derek,

I just received this response when I sent my email in for public testimony on the 210 Alicia St.

As this did not go through to the designated email address that the city identified in the notice, I request that you forward my email to the commission hat I just sent re 210 Alicia St cottage development.

I ask that you postpone this meeting until proper public notice procedures are enacted for the hearing on the proposal. Here is my justification:



1. The notice states that people can access the project documents at a website that does NOT link the documents. After spending 15 minutes trying to find them, as I mentioned in my email, I had to call the city and have a staff navigate through the city website in order to find the documents. These documents were very hidden unless someone knew just how to find them.

2. The staff how I talked with at the city seemed to think the hearing was not going to happen, as the developer came in today and said he wanted to put it on hold. She suggested I contact you to verify. As you were out of the office, I left a voice mail for you. In the interim time until I heard from you, I sent an email to neighbors affected by the development, and said that it seemed to be on hold. When you called back you said it was NOT on hold.

3. My comments for the commission to consider were refused acceptance, as apparently I am not an allowed sender. This is inexcusable.

For these significant reasons, I request that the commission postpone the meeting until proper and legal public notice are given and that the city has established a reasonable way for people to provide testimony.

Please respond to this email by tomorrow, May 7, 1020 by 5 pm so I know how to proceed. I will contact other officials and others unless this processed fairly and correctly.

Thank you, Kent Patrick-Riley

Begin forwarded message:

From: <postmaster@ashland.or.us>
Subject: Undeliverable: May 12 PC Hearing testimony
Date: May 6, 2020 at 4:57:22 PM PDT
To: <kentpr675@gmail.com>



Your message to pc-public-testimony@ashland.or.us couldn't be delivered.

The group [pc-public-testimony](mailto:pc-public-testimony@ashland.or.us) only accepts messages from people in its organization or on its allowed senders list, and your email address isn't on the list.

Action Required

Sender not allowed

How to Fix It

It appears you aren't in the same organization as the group (or a sub-group) you're sending to or your email address isn't on the group's

allowed senders list. Ask the owner of the group to grant you permission to send to it, and then try again. If the group belongs to a different organization than yours, contact the organization's customer service department for assistance. If the group is in your organization and you don't know who the group owner is, you can find it by doing the following in either Outlook on the web or Outlook:

- Open your Sent folder and select the original message.
- If you're using Outlook on the web, select the group name located on the To or CC line. If you're using Outlook, double-click the group name located on the To or CC line.
- In Outlook on the web, from the pop-up dialog box, choose Owner. In Outlook, choose Contact. The owner's name is listed under Owner.

The owner of the group may have intentionally chosen to restrict who can send messages to it, and they may not want to adjust the existing restriction. In this case, you'll have to contact the group members by some other means, such as sending an email message to their individual email addresses or contacting them by phone.

Was this helpful? [Send feedback to Microsoft.](#)

More Info for Email Admins

Status code: 550 5.7.133

This error occurs when the distribution group, security group, or Office 365 group is configured to accept messages only from authenticated senders (senders in the same organization or those added to the group's allowed senders list).

To fix the issue, the recipient's email admin or the group owner must add the sender's email address to the group's allowed senders list or change the group's delivery management setting to accept messages from senders inside and outside of the organization.

Usually this issue can only be fixed by the recipient's email admin or the group owner.

For more information and steps to fix this error, see [Fix email delivery issues for error code 5.7.133 in Office 365](#).

Original Message Details

Created Date: 5/6/2020 11:57:03 PM
Sender Address: kentpr675@gmail.com
Recipient Address: pc-public-testimony@ashland.or.us
Subject: May 12 PC Hearing testimony

Error Details

Reported error: *550 5.7.133 RESOLVER.RST.SenderNotAuthenticatedForGroup; authentication required; Delivery restriction check failed because the sender was not authenticated when sending to this group*
DSN generated by: BY5PR09MB4101.namprd09.prod.outlook.com

Message Hops

HOP	TIME (UTC)	FROM	TO	WITH
1	5/6/2020 11:57:15 PM	kents-imac.lan	smtp.gmail.com	ESMTPSA
2	5/6/2020 11:57:18 PM		mail-pj1-f65.google.com	SMTP
3	5/6/2020 11:57:18 PM	mail-pj1-f65.google.com	DM3GCC02FT009.mail.protection.outlook.com	Microsoft : cipher=TL!
4	5/6/2020 11:57:19 PM	DM3GCC02FT009.eop-gcc02.prod.protection.outlook.com	BN3PR09CA0054.outlook.office365.com	Microsoft : cipher=TL!
5	5/6/2020 11:57:19 PM	BN3PR09CA0054.namprd09.prod.outlook.com	BY5PR09MB4101.namprd09.prod.outlook.com	Microsoft : cipher=TL!

Original Message Headers

Received: from BN3PR09CA0054.namprd09.prod.outlook.com (2603:10b6:400:3::22) by BY5PR09MB4101.namprd09.prod.outlook.com (2603:10b6:a03:1db::13) with Microsoft SMTP Server (version=TLS1_2, cipher=TLS_ECDHE_RSA_WITH_AES_256_GCM_SHA384) id 15.20.2979.27; Wed, 6 May 2020 23:57:19 +0000

Received: from DM3GCC02FT009.eop-gcc02.prod.protection.outlook.com (2a01:111:f400:7d04::209) by BN3PR09CA0054.outlook.office365.com (2603:10b6:400:3::22) with Microsoft SMTP Server (version=TLS1_2, cipher=TLS_ECDHE_RSA_WITH_AES_256_GCM_SHA384) id 15.20.2979.27 via Frontend Transport; Wed, 6 May 2020 23:57:19 +0000

Authentication-Results: spf=pass (sender IP is 209.85.216.65)
smtp.mailfrom=gmail.com; ashland.or.us; dkim=pass (signature was verified)
header.d=gmail.com; ashland.or.us; dmarc=pass action=none
header.from=gmail.com; compauth=pass reason=100
Received-SPF: Pass (protection.outlook.com: domain of gmail.com designates
209.85.216.65 as permitted sender) receiver=protection.outlook.com;
client-ip=209.85.216.65; helo=mail-pj1-f65.google.com;
Received: from mail-pj1-f65.google.com (209.85.216.65) by
DM3GCC02FT009.mail.protection.outlook.com (10.97.8.187) with Microsoft SMTP
Server (version=TLS1_2, cipher=TLS_ECDHE_RSA_WITH_AES_256_GCM_SHA384) id
15.20.2979.27 via Frontend Transport; Wed, 6 May 2020 23:57:18 +0000
Received: by mail-pj1-f65.google.com with SMTP id ms17so1796997pjb.0;
Wed, 06 May 2020 16:57:18 -0700 (PDT)
DKIM-Signature: v=1; a=rsa-sha256; c=relaxed/relaxed;
d=gmail.com; s=20161025;
h=from:mime-version:date:subject:cc:to:message-id;
bh=N+yTnRDr0JAiHoSmS8TxFZBSA6K3zuH/ukk3gYuLhCE=;
b=hubEpfJD5D/bq4Esb6zkoCvs1bEPsKsn5mPVeOQkoHDd/kIajTHn2PTCLaSjepk9QF
GiDmH/4QeeaV1xLT+htskCfw13WznjEMcy58Uejj/Wa2/8E681sxW19BomEhLRh4kEBP
tnCkTe0xUkhG8Hw8d1vsIKvNoUi3tgPbLZ/8NPofuljKTYdKNe40h1Uae14yQS6mPDqR
6PYVHmELvmiqo/A5yf3csm5k4wJKsSRkHSzGvbo9FUJq0JgMY2EwWyhp4TDMLjT/RZS6
GLmC/soHTLY5jzOHQvJrvN6rXaVOLTMaeU6WngKkAfpGuZC627L12kfmTGnJY3/6BXQC
n5iA==
X-Google-DKIM-Signature: v=1; a=rsa-sha256; c=relaxed/relaxed;
d=1e100.net; s=20161025;
h=x-gm-message-state:from:mime-version:date:subject:cc:to:message-id;
bh=N+yTnRDr0JAiHoSmS8TxFZBSA6K3zuH/ukk3gYuLhCE=;
b=qMVi ICSKX8UNBObnqyg1XXKCVC8x7qKn3uVchEpYQmLHns+pUjEb2sRKl+2aHQ5FI f
IyX23mSUGoy3bFvg7Si8J2+rj34a/P/N+1oQ3t8cDm7uoNEdfsYjJI5f5E3ccwAag0h2
3QLjs9TjK1XTfse5+F5Hk69EqV2iqV+qbPBYrjk0Ru3/wmrb/enUARipT/Ja0RmS/pz1
GG0PMTByVYn2BRQt3odwaRPYBbI+Z2VxPuZv4nnqoTJQnQbXV7geVjleZNox2DJPF60Y
EzTjYNXXWiqQ5hoxoJYWEYVyAaE2gxiPdOAKNMkvHWMwtuAMhXtg7yc6W59tRMSz91cJ
r/CA==
X-Gm-Message-State: AGi0PuYCyEn0nPa9EAnEazaRP7xq1RO1XN1fOy9exscwapCtMcrZSAvn
x87yM1a6zHf9MZvTL13TACs4pw/5
X-Google-Smtp-Source:
APiQypKLhKJeoFaNP4mnL//m5oUkDN4gOvTAt6K08z+ORv5zXJpmCqHY46jK+v4EOuz7I2WE/qQID
w==
X-Received: by 2002:a17:90b:601:: with SMTP id
gblmrl0735698pjb.148.1588809437347;
Wed, 06 May 2020 16:57:17 -0700 (PDT)
Return-Path: kentpr675@gmail.com
Received: from kents-imac.lan ([63.155.62.64])

by smtp.gmail.com with ESMTPSA id
x132sm2946230pfc.57.2020.05.06.16.57.04
(version=TLS1_2 cipher=ECDHE-ECDSA-AES128-GCM-SHA256 bits=128/128);
Wed, 06 May 2020 16:57:15 -0700 (PDT)
From: Kent Patrick-Riley <kentpr675@gmail.com>
Content-Type: multipart/mixed;
boundary="Apple-Mail=_8086615F-4F9B-4E8B-AE69-9D7E1A55A941"
MIME-Version: 1.0 (Mac OS X Mail 12.4 \ (3445.104.14\))
Date: Wed, 6 May 2020 16:57:03 -0700
Subject: May 12 PC Hearing testimony
CC: Colleen Patrick-Riley <colleenpatrickriley@gmail.com>,
"jaffesa@gmail.com" <jaffesa@gmail.com>,
"danandclaudiavandyke@gmail.com" <danandclaudiavandyke@gmail.com>,
"martymorlan@gmail.com" <martymorlan@gmail.com>,
"auntpjc10339@gmail.com" <auntpjc10339@gmail.com>,
"rguff79@gmail.com" <rguff79@gmail.com>,
"shwndog@gmail.com" <shwndog@gmail.com>,
"den ro 97520@q.com" <den ro 97520@q.com>,
"Steven M." <srm844@excite.com>,
Matias Perret <Matiasnperret@gmail.com>
To: pc-public-testimony@ashland.or.us,
derek.severson@ashland.or.us
Message-ID: <DFA600A0-D6F1-4D07-B74F-93175A7D59E8@gmail.com>
X-Mailer: Apple Mail (2.3445.104.14)
X-EOPAttributedMessage: 0
X-EOPTenantAttributedMessage: 8112a28b-0dd9-48a1-9779-21c0560fe809:0
X-Forefront-Antispam-Report:
CIP:209.85.216.65;CTRY:US;LANG:en;SCL:6;SRV:;IPV:NLI;SFV:BLK;H:mail-pj1-f65.google.com;PTR:mail-pj1-f65.google.com;CAT:SPM;SFTY:;SFS:;DIR:INB;SFP:;
X-MS-PublicTrafficType: Email
X-MS-Office365-Filtering-Correlation-Id: f7d6cd07-42fb-4381-c02e-08d7f21935e7
X-MS-TrafficTypeDiagnostic: BY5PR09MB4101:
X-MS-Oob-TLC-OOBClassifiers: OLM:10000;
X-Microsoft-Antispam: BCL:0;
X-Microsoft-Antispam-Message-Info: =?utf-8?B?ZDd0aTFvVXh4eHRWTUpRdXJlYWx1MHU1TT1PQz1FNX1TNGN3NUYwSDFjcU1H?=
=?utf-8?B?Skt6b3ZGeThrWWQwaW4yTXp5ZW03WUhiem0yU1R6aFZpWVZPeGdad3J0VXdM?=
=?utf-8?B?NG9LbWhIbVhYbFZSb1AzdFNkVW5wTUNQsX1lL3NPNTZscn1Sc1N5U1h0OVV1?=
=?utf-8?B?UDJyOG9WQTRjNTRjMUZmenhKcXgvanRCTW5aTFBhMU1KTG1QeGY0aEJabVVC?=
=?utf-8?B?VFkrYXh5S2hDTkp2ZEVYUUhTdEcrTnUrMmhZTUdJeEcyFVhUzRsUnhDSmdw?=
=?utf-8?B?Qj1CR0NtNzF1RH1wS0NBtisZzhzdXVvd1BNaTNjM11yQ1FKeFJ4ckdBUU5J?=
=?utf-8?B?Nmp6WnJHUnBpdU9MOG1ZQXRUZxhBL2VOT3Q0TFJub3RJanVLeVhWR21Rak1o?=
=?utf-8?B?OC9tb1czQlJHTVErbVEvd1Z0YUdjBVBLOVZpeE1nU1U1SEpUK25We1NTZkdO?=
=?utf-8?B?YkRvWXBFekFiRk5pMGhVbWE1SWg0MENIdG1VN11mZm1SM3I5SVJLRmVJRjU2?="

=?utf-8?B?T2VXVTY2Z1IzZGdRdzg1OGEreVlIdEZBT1oxZDZzcFhFeDYrbDBEVUpiZDMw?=
=?utf-8?B?YisrazVXbTl3MFowVVEyamR6c1RXaHA0dDgrZWtsaFdqRmF3Mn5wMV1ZTTZK?=
=?utf-8?B?cXU4K3ZCNHdq2FQYmUwbkZZTnNJVU1NbkxLYVpxKzQvUFdRQmcyah1VQ1Y1?=
=?utf-8?B?SVZ3QWxjdDNRmk1OaHdOMH1FUFI1VUs4bzBoQmo4ckFleWI4MTdHNndxTTZu?=
=?utf-8?B?a3pJaXkxTHBUdlF2Q3RMWUZuQmQ3S1hVT2pRc0ZqKytKSU5ZVUFmRVZwUFFr?=
=?utf-8?B?Y2Z6d1Z6RVIwM1I3SFFXcWEvZDBhZ0M1SzsNsUEs5VFFYMUJGNGpBYW1SWUdv?=
=?utf-8?B?azAxY0RmaE8wQOQ2UUY1OXpQZm5mNm10dkFVQjRWUXJVeWNoV1BMQ1k5MDRj?=
=?utf-8?B?WH1NZGtHdEpNa1JJM1lMdVj1NXJmeXM4dmZITHZKVWpUYUJPMORISXAwbXFB?=
=?utf-8?B?eXVyR242WDZ0MmhMY1hvK0FYVEVWczg4TENOWXNFwM9NR2dOV1hYmVhDK3ZQ?=
=?utf-8?B?dzdWUEQ5MEQ3YnBYaFp0RHRpdENLUk1QVD1UcjRnU1UxSFhWcjY5TEExRdFMY?=
=?utf-8?B?Z1htWVBRSU5vL1d4bTZiRWpsZ1JkKWutzaUxqMEVBdG4wNnc5U1N5UENON1lZ?=
=?utf-8?B?c1FUbmhPSUhvSXdbmHFZwkr3aENtNUE1Ym1hc2JVOTVpVfD1d3hoVfHJbmtT?=
=?utf-8?B?Uz1mTWVxYmxBUE85WHk3U2Z1UmdGeks4RUJyNU1iWWFwWnFhRnYrWnI2ZXJz?=
=?utf-8?B?cUdEV2ZHY3pGQ2d3TEJhQnp1Mzg5L2hzZz1ZeGdOUGtRYW4zM0pmVGxVRUpV?=
=?utf-8?B?UEd5RkN1bDBTOVVJdjKxYFTT01NT3JncmpZa1lYY2FQeDg0Q0g1UW1kQmVp?=
=?utf-8?B?UHoyM2QzK2xyY2kvOU5SY2YvS1owUUt3UUFTcXQ2V0dzQXEwMWpPQXBUrnc2?=
=?utf-8?B?ZzZzcHE3LzVKQ01LSnNIUGsrTWJOdmZTldHWUdKb1Z4aFVCU1YrMGFrWJ5?=
=?utf-8?B?dU1vbnVLMThWNHpod2p2ZGNoQzdUcm05K0IxOVZxaVvjeKd5bms5MEphQzRG?=
=?utf-8?B?Vk4rRVZEST1PSkJIeVp3SnNLavFIMnM0ZDFZbGdVS09ue1NINkI0YkFISG85?=
=?utf-8?B?ZGtZR2FYVkp31pT3c2Z2VTZTdeQ1prcVlQMmZUUGJ4Zk4zNU1pdW1tQUNz?=
=?utf-8?B?MmtxNTR5YkptcWV3VnpvRndTQWVWYTI0RFJGeWtjY2Z1TXcwQWVmaG1MSTdK?=
=?utf-8?B?N1l5WWRZUXZVMm9aYVJWa3ZNOE9GNUpKYnkzeDU1Tk5aVUZBZTdlZXRUVOVi?=
=?utf-8?B?N2cxUmFRbkRoelZYWEJVRmFVTXRYXRGzTZTWTBhUGd6bD15cEljVWEvV2tE?=
=?utf-8?Q?3sIsQ+PDxA=3D?=#

X-MS-Exchange-Transport-Forked: True
Reporting-MTA: dns:BY5PR09MB4101.namprd09.prod.outlook.com
Received-From-MTA: dns:mail-pj1-f65.google.com
Arrival-Date: Wed, 6 May 2020 23:57:19 +0000

Final-Recipient: rfc822;pc-public-testimony@ashland.or.us
Action: failed
Status: 5.7.133
Diagnostic-Code: smtp;550 5.7.133 RESOLVER.RST.SenderNotAuthenticatedForGroup; authentication required;
Delivery restriction check failed because the sender was not authenticated when sending to this group

From: Kent Patrick-Riley <kentpr675@gmail.com>
Subject: May 12 PC Hearing testimony
Date: May 6, 2020 at 4:57:03 PM PDT
To: pc-public-testimony@ashland.or.us, derek.severson@ashland.or.us
Cc: Colleen Patrick-Riley <colleenpatrickriley@gmail.com>, "jaffesa@gmail.com" <jaffesa@gmail.com>, "danandclaudiavandyke@gmail.com" <danandclaudiavandyke@gmail.com>, "martyMorlan@gmail.com" <martyMorlan@gmail.com>, "auntpj10339@gmail.com" <auntpj10339@gmail.com>, "rguff79@gmail.com" <rguff79@gmail.com>, "shwndog@gmail.com" <shwndog@gmail.com>, "den_ro_97520@q.com" <den_ro_97520@q.com>, "Steven M." <srm844@excite.com>, Matias Perret <Matiasnperret@gmail.com>

[EXTERNAL SENDER]

As I just mentioned in our phone conversation with Derek Severson, this weekend we received a public notice stating there would be an electronic meeting of the planning commission on May 12 to discuss a new cottage

development at 210 Alicia St. This communication is for the Rublic Record, to state that I and my wife Colleen strongly oppose this development. We own and live at the largest property adjacent to the proposed developmen. Our names and address are Kent and Colleen Patrick Riley, Carol St, Ashland OR. 97520

I unsuccessfully tried to find the meeting documents at the http site cited in the notice. I then called the city to talk to Derek as he was cited in the notice for contacts. As he was out of the office, I talked to another person, who guided me through the city website to find the documents. She mentioned that the commission may not discuss it on May 12, as the owner had come in today to put it on hold. She wasn't sure, so asked me to contact Derek. I did and he clarified in our phone call that the discussion is NOT on hold and the proposal WILL be discussed at the meeting.

In a very quick review of the project description documents, I saw significant issues that should be considered. I pasted in the document's text below from pages 16 and 17 that caught my attention.

1. On page 16, the document states that there have been no reported capacity issues with the 6 inch sewer line servicing the area. I believe this is untrue. At the site meeting last summer with the previous developer I heard several people state there have been problems with the line's capacity. I thought they had also reported it to the city. I know there were city representatives at the meeting who heard it also.

The document also acknowledges that line is overcapacity and the city's master plan calls for putting in 8 inch lines for new facilities.

Then it concludes that putting 12 more units on the line won't cause problems! This is a highly significant issue that should stop the development planning unless it is resolved.

2. The document describes the driveway as 20 feet wide, and states this should be enough for 14 parking spaces. I don't understand how 14 cars can park on a 2 lane driveway that is only 20 feet wide. It seems to me that no cars could park on a driveway that narrow."

3. The document states that the properties to north, south and west are developed as single family residences. Our property is on the the entire southern boundary and that portion of the property is zoned OPEN SPACE . The proposed development is inconsistent with that zoning.

Currently the neighborhood where the property is proposed is quiet, has dark night skies, abundant bird and wildlife, and is fairly unique in the Ashland area as it provides people affordable housing in an area with uncrowded aesthetics. Perhaps that is the reason the city council passed an ordinance in 1993 designating the property as Open space in the Comprehensive Map pla. For your convenience I have pasted it in below.

4. In reviewing this development proposal, also consider the fire safety of the neighborhood. Last summer the tenant living on the west side of the property threw a cigarrated on the grass and started a grass fire. The initial emergency response was not through that property, but came right through the middle of our property. The crowded nature of the proposed development will increase the likelihood of a fire starting, and I do not believe that the extreemely constrained access drive to the cottages units would allow sufficient and timely emergency response to prevent a fire from reaching our house and adjacent houses.

Development of Ashland has gotten rid of so many wonderful physical and biological features that are essential as we move forward into the future with climate change. This area is a rare oasis away from the hubbub of crowded living that is going on throughtout the world and our community. I ask that you deny the request for cottages as it is incompatible with the areas's existing use and would require

After I have read the documents I may have further comments. Please include the information in this email in record the for materials for the May 12 planning commission meeting.

<page50image4649888.png>
<page50image24700880.png>

<page51image24700256.png>
<page51image4319744.png>
<page51image24701296.png>
<page51image24701920.png>

<page52image4652688.png>

From: Peggy Callaghan [mailto:auntpjc10339@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 07, 2020 3:41 PM
To: Planning Commission - Public Testimony <PC-public-testimony@ashland.or.us>; Derek Severson <derek.severson@ashland.or.us>
Subject: May 12 PC Hearing

[EXTERNAL SENDER]

Dear Ashland City Planners and others regarding Development Plans for 219 Alicia Ave.

My name is Peggy Callaghan, my home is at the opposite end of Sylvia where the proposed 12 cottage project is being planned. I am very much against this project for several reasons.

While this will not impact me like the homes at the south end of Sylvia, I am still very concerned about this. I have already mentioned it to the fire department when they sent out a questionnaire regarding fire safety in our neighborhood.

Putting in 12 units of any size in the space proposed will do nothing but create a very serious traffic problem. Most of homes in this neighborhood with single lane driveways, must park one vehicle in the street as it is. Adding another 12 or more vehicles in an already congested narrow street will cause nothing but chaos.

My main concern is FIRE! There are only two exits from our 2 block neighborhood, Oak Lawn and Sleepy Hollow. Both exit onto Oak Street, heaven forbid any thing would prevent accessing Oak St during a fire or this entire neighborhood would be land locked, with no escape. (Granted I may be a little paranoid over this as I am over 80) The area where you propose this housing project, exits onto Alicia, a very narrow curvy street which connects to Oak Lawn then out to Oak St. It isn't easy to navigate this now, let alone with 12 or more cars parked on the sides.


Besides the traffic, congestion and fire issues, more people (possible crime) it will totally ruin a beautiful nice quite neighbor that some of us have called home for 25/30 and in my case 40 years.

I realize the need for more housing, especially low income, and I am not against change or well thought out projects that benefit the majority but I don't believe it should be at the expense of other peoples well being. This proposed project is not for the benefit of anyone, plus I understand it has been zoned "open space" and may have water and sewer issues, and you want to approve building 12 new homes?

I sincerely hope you will reconsider this project and take it off the table completely, and record my name as being AGAINST this project.

Respectfully

Peggy Callaghan
770 Sylvia Street
541-951-9776



From: Derek Severson
Sent: Thursday, May 07, 2020 4:34 PM
To: Peggy Callaghan <auntpjc10339@gmail.com>
Cc: Planning Commission - Public Testimony <PC-public-testimony@ashland.or.us>; Colleen Patrick-Riley <colleenpatrickriley@gmail.com>; jaffesa@gmail.com; Kent Patrick-Riley <kentpr675@gmail.com>; MICHAEL GOLDMAN <michaelgoldman17@outlook.com>; danandclaudiavandyke@gmail.com; martymorlan@gmail.com; rguff79@gmail.com; shwndog@gmail.com; den_ro_97520@q.com; Steven M. <srm844@excite.com>; Matias Perret <Matiasnperret@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: May 12 PC Hearing testimony

Peggy,

If you send your e-mail to PC-public-testimony@ashland.or.us by 3:30 p.m. on Monday, May 11th, we'll get it to the Planning Commissioners to consider during the hearing. Please put "May 12 PC Hearing Testimony" in the subject line.

The meeting will be televised. You can watch the meeting on local channel 9, on Charter Communications channels 180/181, or you can stream the meeting on-line by going to rvtv.sou.edu and selecting 'RVTV Prime'.

I hope that helps,

- Derek

Derek Severson, *Senior Planner*
City of Ashland, Department of Community Development
51 Winburn Way, Ashland, OR 97520
PH: (541) 552-2040 **FAX:** (541) 552-2050 **TTY:** 1-800-735-2900
E-MAIL: derek.severson@ashland.or.us

This e-mail transmission is the official business of the City of Ashland, and is subject to Oregon's public records laws for disclosure and retention. If you've received this e-mail in error, please contact me at (541) 552-2040. Thank you.

From: Peggy Callaghan <auntpjc10339@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 7, 2020 10:01 AM
To: Kent Patrick-Riley <kentpr675@gmail.com>
Cc: Planning Commission - Public Testimony <PC-public-testimony@ashland.or.us>; Derek Severson <derek.severson@ashland.or.us>; Colleen Patrick-Riley <colleenpatrickriley@gmail.com>; jaffesa@gmail.com <jaffesa@gmail.com>; danandclaudiavandyke@gmail.com <danandclaudiavandyke@gmail.com>; martymorlan@gmail.com <martymorlan@gmail.com>; rguff79@gmail.com <rguff79@gmail.com>; shwndog@gmail.com <shwndog@gmail.com>; den_ro_97520@q.com <den_ro_97520@q.com>; Steven M. <srm844@excite.com>; Matias Perret



<Matiasnperret@gmail.com>

Subject: Re: May 12 PC Hearing testimony

[EXTERNAL SENDER]

Kent,

Thanks for sending the into to all of us. I'm not sure who to address my comments to or where exactly to send it and in what form, probably email? sorry to be so ignorant but I am also very opposed to this project and would like to express that to he city. It seems we need to do this immediately if the meeting is this Monday. Can you supply this information so I can voice my opposition.

Best regards,
Peggy Callaghan
770 Sylvia St

On Wed, May 6, 2020 at 4:57 PM Kent Patrick-Riley <kentpr675@gmail.com> wrote:

As I just mentioned in our phone conversation with Derek Severson , this weekend we received a public notice stating there would be an electronic meeting of the planning commission on May 12 to discuss a new cottage development at 210 Alicia St. This communication is for the Rublic Record, to state that I and my wife Colleen strongly oppose this development. We own and live at the largest property adjacent to the proposed developmen. Our names and address are Kent and Colleen Patrick Riley, Carol St, Ashland OR. 97520

I unsuccessfully tried to find the meeting documents at the http site cited in the notice. I then called the city to talk to Derek as he was cited in the notice for contacts. As he was out of the office, I talked to another person, who guided me through the city website to find the documents. She mentioned that the commission may not discuss it on May 12, as the owner had come in today to put it on hold. She wasn't sure, so asked me to contact Derek. I did and he clarified in our phone call that the discussion is NOT on hold and the proposal WILL be discussed at the meeting.

In a very quick review of the project description documents, I saw significant issues that should be considered. I pasted in the document's text below from pages 16 and 17 that caught my attention.

1. On page 16, the document states that there have been no reported capacity issues with the 6 inch sewer line servicing the area. I believe this is untrue. At the site meeting last summer with the previous developer I heard several people state there have been problems with the line's capacity. I thought they had also reported it to the city. I know there were city representatives at the meeting who heard it also.

The document also acknowledges that line is overcapacity and the city's master plan calls for putting in 8 inch lines for new facilities.

Then it concludes that putting 12 more units on the line won't cause problems! This is a highly significant issue that should stop the development planning unless it is resolved.

2. The document describes the driveway as 20 feet wide, and states this should be enough for 14 parking spaces. I don't understand how 14 cars can park on a 2 lane driveway that is only 20 feet wide. It seems to me that no cars could park on a driveway that narrow."

3. The document states that the properties to north, south and west are developed as single family residences. Our property is on the the entire southern boundary and that portion of the property is zoned OPEN SPACE . The proposed development is inconsistent with that zoning.

Currently the neighborhood where the property is proposed is quiet, has dark night skies, abundant bird and wildlife, and is fairly unique in the Ashland area as it provides people affordable housing in an area with uncrowded aesthetics. Perhaps that is the reason the city council passed an ordinance in 1993 designating the property as Open space in the Comprehensive Map pla. For your convenience I have pasted it in below.

4. In reviewing this development proposal, also consider the fire safety of the neighborhood. Last summer the tenant living on the west side of the property threw a cigaratted on the grass and started a grass fire. The initial emergency response was not through that property, but came right through the middle of our property. The crowded nature of the proposed development will increase the likelihood of a fire starting, and I do not believe that the extrelemely constrained access drive to the cottage units would allow sufficient and timely emergency response to prevent a fire from reaching our house and adjacent houses.

Development of Ashland has gotten rid of so many wonderful physical and biological features that are essential as we move forward into the future with climate change. This area is a rare oasis away from the hubbub of crowded living that is going on throughtout the world and our community. I ask that you deny the request for cottages as it is incompatible with the areas's existing use and would require

After I have read the documents I may have further comments. Please include the information in this email in record the for materials for the May 12 planning commission meeting.

From: den_ro_97520 [mailto:den_ro_97520@q.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 07, 2020 5:33 PM
To: Planning Commission - Public Testimony <PC-public-testimony@ashland.or.us>
Subject: May 12 PC Hearing Testimony

[EXTERNAL SENDER]

My wife and I live at 773 Sylvia St. Just down the street from 210 Alicia. We have lived here for over 30 years as have many of our neighbors. Adding 12 units with occupancy of 24+ people and cars to this small neighborhood poses many problems including, ingress and egress danger in emergency situations, sewer overload and excessive traffic problems in this closed area with the only exit onto Oak street. With the recent addition of the park/trail path at the north end of Sylvia street, we have already seen way more strangers in our neighborhood. Please recommend not approving this development. Also, in an area of single family homes, this will certainly lower the value of the existing homes here. Please don't ruin our senior years in the town we love.
Sincerely,

Dennis Glover and Rosemary Carvalho
541 482 3090

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone



From: Alex [mailto:acensor@fastmail.net]
Sent: Thursday, May 07, 2020 10:10 PM
To: Planning Commission - Public Testimony <PC-public-testimony@ashland.or.us>; Derek Severson <derek.severson@ashland.or.us>
Subject: "May 12 PC Hearing Testimony"

[EXTERNAL SENDER]

This is a request that you register my name, Alexander Censor at 185 Oaklawn Avenue, as opposed to the to the proposed 12 house development plan for 210 Alicia Avenue.

My opposition is not just a knee-jerk "not in my backyard" response.... I'm all in favor of diversity of housing in Ashland. Nor am I opposed to multi-home building on that property. Twelve homes is simply too many.


Reasons this proposal is undesirable for this location include these::

1. It's likely insufficient parking on-site based on just two cars per home. The excess will spill over onto the rest of Alicia, Sleepy Hollow, and Oaklawn, creating an untenable parking situation. .
2. That street parking in turn will exacerbate the separate problem of increased traffic on those streets that comes with 12 homes back there in the corner of the culdesac.
3. It's questionable if there's enough sewer capacity to accommodate this development, and when that become the case the development will manifest a classic case of a commercial activity profiting by offloading its collateral costs on the community/public. In the hopefully unlikely event that this is allowed to proceed in its present form I would suggest a condition of the permit include upgrading the sewer capacity be funded by the development.
4. Last, but perhaps most important: In the event of need for a quick emergency evacuation as a result of a fire or possible dam breakage emergency egress not just for the development but the whole neighborhood could be critically slowed or gridlocked by the existence of multiple residents in 12 homes tucked back there with only one route out. We saw what happened in Paradise with the fast moving fire plus small road one way egress.

Log my concerns and opposition **and my name**, for notification for any further public meetings, so that I am afforded the ability to speak.

Thank you for your time, help, and consideration.

Alex Censor
Computer Doctor of Ashland, LLC
acensor@fastmail.fm
541-488-4683/2539




From: Tina Lang [mailto:tinal8@frontier.com]
Sent: Saturday, May 09, 2020 10:22 AM
To: Planning Commission - Public Testimony <PC-public-testimony@ashland.or.us>
Subject: May 12 PC Hearing Testimony

[EXTERNAL SENDER]

To the Planning Commission with regard to 210 Alicia St:

1. A driveway to access 12 housing units seems inadequate. Perhaps an additional (alternate) ingress/egress route is called for.
2. Consider the impact of this development on the existing neighborhood. Traffic will greatly increase. Will there be sewer problems as a result of the additional housing units? The infrastructure in this neighborhood is already quite aged.
3. Parking spaces of 14 for a total of 12 units is inadequate, since most buyers will own at least 2 cars. The overflow parking that will be needed for 12 units will undoubtedly cause friction in the neighborhood.
4. The Planning Commission should consider reducing the number of cottage housing units allowed in this situation, for the reasons I've outlined above.

Respectfully,
Katherine (Tina) Lang
754 Sylvia Street




From: Marty Morlan [mailto:martymorlan@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, May 10, 2020 10:23 PM
To: Planning Commission - Public Testimony <PC-public-testimony@ashland.or.us>
Subject:

[EXTERNAL SENDER]

Dear Sirs. I am writing in concerning the 210 alicia st. cottages proposal .. I have lived on 766 sylvia st. since 1980. myself and several neighbors have lived in this quiet low density very peaceful area for 40 years. I understand that urban growth is happening all around us ,but putting in a high density project in such a confined area on our street is very frightening for us.. there are only two small streets that access to that spot and they are extremely narrow ..we have no sidewalk or gutter space which is extremely dangerous if there were to be a fire!! The proposal as we see it does not have enough space for adequate parking for that many cottages.. which means the cars will be forced to envelope our spaces in front of all of our houses incurring major congestion and chaos in our so peaceful and serene neighborhood I have loved for 40 years. Please consider these major factors. On a side note ...I own a restaurant downtown on the plaza for 30 years and have been helping the city bring in our meals tax defiantly from the beginning. When they started, a big portion of it was to be used for OPEN SPACE of which I fully supported... as so our beautiful town would not be over taken and built up like we've seen towns in California. Believe me I would love more people coming in to my eatery but I think we need to step back and stop people from developing at such a pace where were losing focus on the original reason we brought in the meals tax in the first place. It seems to me that this precious OPEN SPACE lot on 210 alicia st. so close to downtown is the exact reason we need to preserve.. save... and treasure! Thankyou for your time for reading this Marty

--

Marty Morlan
Macaroni's Ristorante
Martino's Lounge/Bar
www.martinosashland.com



From: Sue Jaffe [mailto:jaffesa@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, May 10, 2020 3:08 PM
To: Planning Commission - Public Testimony <PC-public-testimony@ashland.or.us>
Subject: May 12 PC Hearing Testimony

[EXTERNAL SENDER]

Dear Ashland City Planners and others regarding Development Plans for 210 Alicia Ave, public comments:

I would like to hereby register my name, Sue Jaffe, at 206 Alicia Ave, on the proposed 12 house development, that surrounds 2 sides of my property.

I have had several very positive conversations with David Scott and his associates. I understand that current plans to develop the property, other than in gardens, are on hold. I feel that we will be able to work amicably on whatever concerns or differences may arise in future developments.

My questions/concerns include, but are not limited to the following:

1. The accuracy of the property line between my property (at 206 Alicia) and 210 Alicia along the existing fence by out building and Ornamental Plum Tree (east?). This will need to be determined and possible new fence erected on the true property line.
2. I do not advocate the removal of the Ornamental Plum along the above-mentioned fence line. It needs pruning, but is a beautiful old tree that would be beneficial in maintaining privacy between the 2 properties.
3. Any proposed buildings, but especially towards Mt. Ashland, from my property, that might block my view and possible solar access, if applicable.
4. The proposed development is too dense and promises too much traffic for this small neighborhood.
5. There is not enough designated on-site parking for the number of vehicles that will be associated with the 12 homes. The spillover parking would present problems for current residents at Oak Lawn, Alicia, Sylvia and Sleepy Hollow Streets.
6. Is there enough sewer capacity to accommodate 12 additional houses?
7. Is there enough allowance for ingress/egress for emergency vehicles or for 12 households to be able to safely exit in the event of an emergency.
8. How will service vehicles, sanitary services, etc. enter and exit the community?

Please be sure to register my ideas, and my name, for any further public meetings, so that I will be able to speak, if applicable.

Thank you -

Sue Jaffe
jaffesa@gmail.com
206 Alicia | Ashland, OR 97520
541-601-5808



From: Betsy Krausnick [mailto:betsy_krausnick@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2020 1:49 PM
To: Planning Commission - Public Testimony <PC-public-testimony@ashland.or.us>
Subject: May 12 PC Hearing Testimony

[EXTERNAL SENDER]

I live on Alicia street, a house away from the proposed 12 cottage development. Even though the cottages have a small footprint, I think the idea that each residence will only need one parking space is not feasible. Our street is already used for parking by the houses on it, if we have 3-4 more cars parking on the street, we won't have space for our cars to park. Also, the wear and tear on the street for all of the construction vehicles should be addressed too. There should be a plan to repair/repave the street once all the construction is finished if there has been pothole damage.

I think the house infill it too much for the area.

Betsy Krausnick
204 Alicia Street



From: Claudia Van Dyke [mailto:claudiavandyke@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2020 1:53 PM
To: Planning Commission - Public Testimony <PC-public-testimony@ashland.or.us>
Subject: May 12 PC Hearing Testimony

[EXTERNAL SENDER]

Attached please find a word document of my comments for the Ashland Planning Commission Meeting scheduled for Tuesday May 12, 2020. I have also copied it below. Please register me for all future communication, documents and meetings regarding 210 Alicia St.

Thank you for consideration of our concerns.

Claudia Van Dyke
732 Sylvia St
Ashland OR 97520
541-552-9113

Re: Planning Action PA-T2-2020-00017, 210 Alicia St

Request that Ashland institute a Residential Parking Permit Program


My husband and I live directly next door to the proposed high-density cottage development at 210 Alicia St. We are extremely concerned there is insufficient parking for the high number of cottages proposed in the development plan. Overflow parking from the development will seriously impact our small neighborhood and already congested street.

We urgently propose that Ashland institute an optional Residential Parking Permit Program to help alleviate the inevitable congestion that will ensue if this development proceeds and to help existing homeowners retain parking in front of their own homes.

The proposed development is on a lot tucked well into an older and smaller established neighborhood on a very short and curvy street. The proposed development is not like other high-density developments in Ashland that were built either directly on or right next to larger main streets, accommodating overflow parking.

The development plan indicates there will be 12 cottages with only 14 parking spaces. That is simply not enough parking for so many units, regardless of what rules developed for larger metropolitan cities may allow. Ashland is not a large metropolitan city with public transportation available on every corner. In fact, the closest bus stop is downtown and far away from our neighborhood. Using rules developed at the state level to address the needs of large cities and then applying them verbatim and to the fullest extent in a smaller city like Ashland is both negligent and cruel to the established suburban neighborhoods they impact.

It is extremely idealistic and shortsighted to assume that each cottage in the proposed development will use only one parking space and that only two additional parking spaces will



be sufficient to meet the needs of the whole development. Cottage residents who have second cars and any guests they entertain will attempt to park as close as possible to the entrance of the development to avoid a long walk to their cottages. This will create tremendous congestion at the entrance of the development where there is already very limited parking.

Homeowners directly adjacent to the entrance will be particularly affected and burdened by the increased number of cars attempting to park in those parking spaces. There will be fierce competition for the prime parking spots. The whole neighborhood will be affected as everyone is pushed to parking in front of other people's homes.

In this tiny neighborhood we have parked in front of our own homes without any problems for over forty years. Many of us have only single car driveways and our homes were designed to allow additional parking in front. If the proposed cottage development proceeds we will be forced to compete with cottage residents for parking space in front of our own homes. This will most certainly create unnecessary emotional distress and physical burden on existing residents that would be easily alleviated by instituting an optional residential parking permit program. And it could be alleviated by building far fewer cottages.

Many of us are elderly and have mobility needs that necessitate parking in front of our homes. For some of us there will also be safety issues if we are forced to park too far away from our homes because cottage residents have taken our parking spaces. We chose to buy homes in this neighborhood specifically because it is small and quiet and there is sufficient and easily accessible parking. All of this will be destroyed if the cottage development proceeds and the city does not institute some kind of parking permit program to protect existing homeowners.

If Ashland is going to pursue high-density housing like larger metropolitan areas then it also needs to do what is done in those areas to address parking in a way that causes the least amount of disruption to established neighborhoods and is fair to everyone.

We formally request that Ashland follow the lead of many cities like Eugene and immediately institute a residential parking permit program. These programs are highly successful and give residents peace of mind, while at the same time recognizing the need for growth. These programs do very well in older established neighborhoods where infill is occurring and parking is at a premium.

Parking permit programs pay for themselves through permit fees. Property owners that want to reserve parking space in front of their own homes pay an annual fee to the city. Not all owners will want or need to do that which then opens up the space for others to park there. Also the City makes money from issuing permits. It is a win-win for everyone!

We urgently recommend that such a parking permit program be developed and put in place immediately. Many people purchasing homes in Ashland come from areas where such

programs are already in place. They are familiar with them and support them. It reduces conflict and builds good neighborhood relations.

We firmly believe Ashland will get better community support for cottage developments and infill if such parking permit programs are available to help ease established resident's concerns. It will show that Ashland cares about its older neighborhoods and their residents while also embracing mandated growth, infill and increased housing. It will reduce friction and promote harmony while also accommodating change.

From: Julie Gillis [mailto:juliejezebel@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2020 2:25 PM
To: Planning Commission - Public Testimony <PC-public-testimony@ashland.or.us>
Subject: May 12 Public Testimony

[EXTERNAL SENDER]

I am opposed to building 12 small houses on the 1 acre property at 210 Alicia street. It will be far too crowded, not enough egress for those folks to be safe, and will cause undue stress and noise in a very quiet neighborhood.

--
Julie Gillis
“The only recognizable feature of hope is action.”
— Grace Paley



From: Kent Patrick-Riley [mailto:kentpr675@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2020 2:50 PM
To: Planning Commission - Public Testimony <PC-public-testimony@ashland.or.us>
Cc: Colleen Patrick-Riley <cpr@ak.net>; Derek Severson <derek.severson@ashland.or.us>
Subject: May 12 PC Hearing testimony

[EXTERNAL SENDER]


On May 6, I attempted to send electronic comments to the email address that was identified in a City of Ashland public notice regarding the proposed development at 210 Alicia St. It was rejected by the City Server saying I was not authorized to send comments. Subsequently I sent an email to Derek Severson and this address asking that the hearing be postponed, as this was one of three problems I encountered in trying to make comments on the development:

1. The City's Public notice listed an incorrect site for reviewing the project information. After spending 15 minutes unsuccessfully trying to find the information on the City website, I contacted the city to attempt to talk with Derek Severson to find out where the info was. He wasn't in; a co-worker stepped me through the process to find it. Without her help I never would have found it, as it required several steps with no logical menus .
2. The co-worker told me that she thought that the hearing would be postponed because the applicant had come into the office earlier in the day and said they were going to put it on hold. She said I should confirm it with Mr. Severson, but he wasn't in the office until later in the week. I left a voice mail for him, and when I didn't hear back in an hour, I sent an email to neighbors telling them where to find the info but that it seemed the project was on hold. After I sent the email, Mr. Severson called me and said the project wasn't on hold.
3. I wrote up comments and sent it to the website for public notices. My message was rejected by the server saying I wasn't authorized to comment to that site.

After experiencing these three significant obstructions and misinformation, I sent an email to Mr. Severson requesting the City postpone the hearing. Neither me nor any other neighbors (that I am aware of) had known of this proposed development until last week and these were unexcusable obstructions to getting information on the project and responding to with comment given the very short time-frame.

Mr. Severson did not postpone the hearing, but instead sent me an email saying the City sites had now been fixed. He did not say if my earlier comments had been forwarded to the commission.

I am unsure if my earlier comments made it as part of the testimony, so I have included them at the bottom of this email. I am also adding the following additional comments that I ask to be considered. At the bottom of the email I have attached photos to document these points.



1. Last week there was extensive excavation on the property and trenches about 3 feet deep were dug all around the proposed perimeter of the development. It was then lined with hardware cloth. When I talked with the City planning office on May 6, a city rep said they had complaints about the unpermitted excavation, and when code enforcement visited they were told by the developer that they were just putting in a garden. I have never seen a garden lined with a deep trench lined with hardware cloth. Some work for the development appears to have already been done without the correct approvals or permits. If so, then it is concerning that the developer may believe they can do begin development without approval.

2. The trench on the west side of the property had already filled with 1-2 feet of water. This is not surprising, as it appears that this area is wetland as grass was always green there and grew well during most of the summers even though it wasn't being watered. Also a very large stand of willows grew in the property, but they were cut down last winter - I don't know if that habitat removal work was one with the proper permits if the area really is a wetland. The project description's report also said that a wetland survey indicated there may be wetlands on the property but the surveyors said they'd verify that in April or May but no excavation should be done until they verified it. I don't know if the verification was done. The property description said they thought the wet nature may have been due to a ditch that ran through the property. However the developer filled that ditch and piped the water last winter. We have had little rain this year, and virtually none in the last few weeks, so the water is not coming from the ditch or recent rains.

3. The project report said that a very large willow tree is not healthy and is a hazard tree. The tree appears to be quite healthy and not a hazard tree, as the attached photo indicates. This tree is used extensively by wildlife and birds throughout the year.

4. In my earlier comments I stated that the proposed cottage development will be in conflict with existing uses and neighborhood. Here are some of the conflicting uses:

4a . We have a large organic garden along the south boundary of the property. I use extensive chicken manure as fertilizer on the garden. Throughout the growing season there will be frequent odors coming from the manure. Given that the back of most of the cottages will be within 10 feet of my garden, there will be very frequent odors coming to their houses and backyards. I also keep my compost bins close to the fence. Although we do what we can to keep it from generating odors, cottage residents may oppose the compost being so close. We also very few frequently run a small yard tractor and other equipment to maintain our garden and trees. At times they will be running 10 feet from the houses.

4b. We park our cars facing the eastern part of the proposed development. While most of the proposed development bounds our open space area, about 30 feet bounds our homesite area. Our cars are about 8 feet from the property line. My wife and two sons live here, so we have four cars parked there. We often go to the gym at 5 am, and may

return late at night. Whenever we go, our headlights shine into the area where the cottages are proposed, strong lights will illuminate the houses from a short distance away.

4c. Given that the area of the development has always been wetter than other areas, we anticipate that if the development goes forth, then water may be diverted to our property and potentially flood our house

4d. Wildlife have used our property and the 210 Alicia St property extensively. The vegetative removal that began last winter has already had these impacts:

- deer have been pushed off that property onto ours and others. We have had 8-12 deer here every day, which we have never seen. As their food and habitat have been removed, they have been eating many plants on our property that they formerly avoided, resulting in damage to our trees and plants.

- we are seeing many more rabbits on our property, as their food and habitat have also disappeared.

- the removal of many shrubs and small willows has resulted in a noticeable decline in bird populations

I also expect the cottage residents to be impacted by the wildlife that has been on the area and will continue to come from our open space. We regularly have skunks, opossums, foxes, coyotes, large snakes, skinks, and bobcats on our property; and I have seen them on the proposed property too. If residents of the development become concerned with these animals coming into their areas and use poisons to control them, then the poisons will enter the food chain and impact our organic garden.

5. I know two + years ago that the city hastily changed the zoning of our single-family residential area to allow cottages. This was not done without adequate time or effort for people in our area to review and comment, and to my knowledge no one from the city tried to reach out to get comments on the proposed changes. Given that we have the only private open space in Ashland (that I am aware of), it was imperative and responsible that they should have done so. This would have avoided setting up conflicts such as this

I question the need for cottages in this area. Last year, a similar development was completed near Laurel St. I just drove by it, and it looks like few, if any, of the properties have been sold. The market has been soft for a year+, which may partially explain their lack of sales. But given the problems with the national economy, with regional fire danger, with loss of OSF, and the coronavirus, I don't see how the market will improve in the foreseeable future. Therefore, this cottage development is not needed. Given all the potential downsides to it, if the market improves then there still will not be a need that will offset the problems it has

For the reasons above (and those earlier, which are below), I strongly urge the commission to deny this project. If for some unknown rationale, the commission still wants to consider it, then at least postpone an approval until these issues have been satisfactorily addressed: wetlands, safety, lack of sewer capacity, lack of parking, and conflicts with existing uses. I further ask that the commission not go forward with

considering this proposal or others until the city has corrected its poor communication processes. Furthermore, I request the city review all the past work that has been done on the property to make sure it has been done with appropriate city, state, and federal permits.

Thank you,

Kent Patrick-Riley and Colleen-Patrick-Riley, owners of 675 Carol St., which bounds the entire south edge of the development.\

Below is the text of comments to the commission in my May 6 email that was rejected by the City Server:

As I just mentioned in our phone conversation with Derek Severson, this weekend we received a public notice stating there would be an electronic meeting of the planning commission on May 12 to discuss a new cottage development at 210 Alicia St. This communication is for the Public Record, to state that I and my wife Colleen strongly oppose this development. We own and live at the largest property adjacent to the proposed development. Our names and address are Kent and Colleen Patrick Riley, Carol St, Ashland OR. 97520

I unsuccessfully tried to find the meeting documents at the http site cited in the notice. I then called the city to talk to Derek as he was cited in the notice for contacts. As he was out of the office, I talked to another person, who guided me through the city website to find the documents. She mentioned that the commission may not discuss it on May 12, as the owner had come in today to put it on hold. She wasn't sure, so asked me to contact Derek. I did and he clarified in our phone call that the discussion is NOT on hold and the proposal WILL be discussed at the meeting.

In a very quick review of the project description documents, I saw significant issues that should be considered. I pasted in the document's text below from pages 16 and 17 that caught my attention.

1. On page 16, the document states that there have been no reported capacity issues with the 6 inch sewer line servicing the area. I believe this is untrue. At the site meeting last summer with the previous developer I heard several people state there have been problems with the line's capacity. I thought they had also reported it to the city. I know there were city representatives at the meeting who heard it also.

The document also acknowledges that line is overcapacity and the city's master plan calls for putting in 8 inch lines for new facilities.

Then it concludes that putting 12 more units on the line won't cause problems! This is a highly significant issue that should stop the development planning unless it is resolved.

2. The document describes the driveway as 20 feet wide, and states this should be enough for 14 parking spaces. I don't understand how 14 cars can park on a 2 lane driveway that is only 20 feet wide. It seems to me that no cars could park on a driveway that narrow.'

3. The document states that the properties to north, south and west are developed as single family residences. Our property is on the the entire southern boundary and that portion of the property is zoned OPEN SPACE . The proposed development is inconsistent with that zoning.

Currently the neighborhood where the property is proposed is quiet, has dark night skies, abundant bird and wildlife, and is fairly unique in the Ashland area as it provides people affordable housing in an area with uncrowded aesthetics. Perhaps that is the reason the city council passed an ordinance in 1993 designating the property as Open space in the Comprehensive Map pla. For your convenience I have pasted it in below.

4. In reviewing this development proposal, also consider the fire safety of the neighborhood. Last summer the tenant living on the west side of the property threw a cigarrated on the grass and started a grass fire. The initial emergency response was not through that property, but came right through the middle of our property. The crowded nature of the proposed development will increase the likelihood of a fire starting, and I do not believe that the extrelemely constrained access drive to the cottage units would allow sufficient and timely emergency response to prevent a fire from reaching our house and adjacent houses.

Development of Ashland has gotten rid of so many wonderful physical and biological features that are essential as we move forward into the future with climate change. This area is a rare oasis away from the hubbub of crowded living that is going on throughtout the world and our community. I ask that you deny the request for cottages as it is incompatible with the areas's existing use and would require

After I have read the documents I may have further comments. Please include the information in this email in record the for materials for the May 12 planning commission meeting.

ORDINANCE NO. 274

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN MAP OF THE CITY OF ASHLAND, MODIFYING THE DESIGNATION OF PROPERTY AT 675 CAROL STREET FROM SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL TO OPEN SPACE. (Bill J. and Gloria P. Richey, Applicants)

THE PEOPLE OF THE CITY OF ASHLAND DO ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. The Ashland Comprehensive Plan Map as adopted by Ordinance No. 2227 is amended by changing the designation of a portion of tax lot 39-1E-04CA-1400 (675 Carol Street), as indicated on attached Exhibit "A", from Single Family Residential to Open Space.

The foregoing ordinance was first read on the 18th day of May, 1993 and duly PASSED and ADOPTED this 1st day of June, 1993.

N. E. Franklin
N. E. Franklin
City Recorder

SIGNED and APPROVED this 1st day of June, 1993.

Catherine M. Golden
Catherine M. Golden
Mayor

Approved as to form:
Paul Nolte
Paul Nolte
City Attorney











To: City of Ashland Planning Department

From: Dan Van Dyke
732 Sylvia St, Ashland, Oregon
541-552-9113
danandclaudiavandyke@gmail.com

Re: Planning Action PA-T2-2020-00017, 210 Alicia St

The development of housing at 210 Alicia Street is the best use of the property and is consistent with a variety of city objectives. My comments and recommendations are mostly directed at the city, and the continued effort by city staff to not simply encourage infill, but to promote very high density infill that is not compatible with existing neighborhoods. The planning commission has the opportunity guide development in a successful manner that meets the needs of the developer, incoming residents, and the residents in the existing neighborhood. I urge your support and response to the following.

Comments

1. Parking is inadequate
 - Adequate parking must be provided in the new development. There should be enough parking onsite for two vehicles per unit and some capacity for guest parking. This may mean that fewer houses should be built on the property.
 - The documents state that more open space (28.86%) is being planned than is required by ordinance (20%). This additional area must be removed from open space for the development and placed into parking area to minimize impacts on the existing adjacent neighborhood. Infill is about protecting open space outside the urban growth boundary, not maximizing benefits for the new development while maximizing impacts on neighbors to the development.
 - The planning documents state that streets in the existing adjacent neighborhood have a 47 foot right of way with 20 feet of pavement. This standard must be applied to the new development as well. There is no reason why the 20 foot wide driveway/entry road cannot also have a right of way that will allow additional parking (for guests, etc).
 - Reading the planning documents it appears that cottage housing development standards allow a range of units to be built. I am not aware that there is a mandate that the maximum number of units be constructed. If the smallest lot size in the existing adjacent neighborhood is applied to 210 Alicia, then 7-8 homes would be built on this property. It is very likely that adequate roads and parking could be provided with this level of development.

2. The proposed density is a miss-use of cottage housing development standards because of impacts to the existing adjacent neighborhood.
 - Reading the planning documents it appears that cottage housing development standards allow a range of units to be built. I am not aware that there is a mandate that the maximum number of units be constructed. If the smallest lot size in the existing adjacent neighborhood is applied to 210 Alicia, then 7-8 homes would be built on this property.
 - Public concern about the extraordinarily high housing densities Ashland appears ready to approve under "cottage housing" is often written off by planning staff as a failure by the



community to understand the concept of infill. That attitude shows a complete lack of understanding by staff. Development happens. Development that harms livability in existing neighborhoods does not have to happen. That is a city choice.

- Existing and natural features of the land should include compatibility with the existing adjacent neighborhood, including: maintaining a portion of the viewshed and minimizing privacy impacts on neighbors. A 12 unit development does not provide compatibility.
3. Staff do not provide data to support any conclusions regarding impacts of the proposed density on the streets in the existing adjacent neighborhood.
 - The planning document states the following: “A residential development of this size does not require a Traffic Impact Analysis, however the existing street is estimated to be well below the designed capacity for a neighborhood street”; and “Staff have contacted the City Engineering Division to determine if trip counts were available in the neighborhood, and it was noted that while no trip counts were available for Alicia Avenue, Engineering staff would estimate that trips were around 100 ADT. A residential neighborhood street is assumed to be able to accommodate up to 1,500 ADT. Staff believe a finding can reasonably be made that the street has adequate transportation capacity to serve the 12 proposed small homes.”
 - My response to the planning document: I am more than a bit incredulous that staff are guessing about the transportation capacity in this neighborhood. Any city engineer that believes our neighborhood roads can handle 1500 trips per day has clearly never been on our streets. This is not Oak Street--the existing adjacent neighborhood is unique, in that the homes are built around a loop road. In roughly 830 feet of road length (Alicia to Sylvia to Oak Lawn and back) there are 4 right angles. Sight lines are not good as traffic makes these corners currently. The proposed density will double the traffic at least. The proposed density in the new development cannot meet street standards for safety given the unique nature of the road system.
 - Paving of the streets in the existing adjacent neighborhood was funded by the local residents, not the city. We now have cracks in the roadway where vegetation grows. I have called asking for some maintenance from public works—just some tar in the cracks to help the longevity of the road surface. Nothing has been done. I have to say that no response seems to be a typical response to residents in this part of Ashland. I include this as supporting evidence for my speculation that engineering has not even been to our neighborhood.
 4. Solar opportunity is missed due to the very high density.
 - Solar power is not just about solar panels, but also about home design and passive solar benefits. Reducing the number of homes to be built would allow for an orientation of the homes to maximize solar exposure.
 5. Good neighbor actions
 - Because of the odd angle of the property line compared to the existing home at 732 Sylvia Street, I request that the 2 eastern-most houses along the northern property line (if not the eastern-most 4 houses), be angled slightly more to the east to direct views away from the existing home. There may be benefits to doing this along the southern boundary as well.
 - All windows on the north side of homes along the northern boundary should be no higher than 10 feet above grade at the top of the window.

6. Sewer impacts must be mitigated

- There seems to be some question about the capacity of the existing sewer line to handle the load from the proposed development. All I know is that the city does not have a good record in protecting its citizens from sewage mistakes. If a problem develops, then either the city or the developer needs to fix the problem.

Recommendations

1. Deed restrictions and/or CC&Rs for this development must prohibit the following in order to minimize impacts to the existing adjacent neighborhood:
 - Expansion to multiple stories
 - Use of the homes for short term vacation rentals
 - RV parking within 2 miles of the development
 - Cannabis/hemp production
2. The city must guarantee homeowner parking on Alicia/Sylvia/Oak Lawn.
 - Either homeowners in the existing adjacent neighborhood are allowed to designate a spot for personal use, or the city must implement a parking permit program for interested homeowners.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

From: Shawn OGrady [mailto:shwndog@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2020 3:31 PM
To: Planning Commission - Public Testimony <PC-public-testimony@ashland.or.us>
Subject: May 12 PC Hearing testimony

[EXTERNAL SENDER]

Dear Ashland City Planners,

We would like to register our names, Sean and Shawn Decourcy O'Grady as opponents to the proposed 12 house development at 210 Alicia Ave. We live at 740 Sylvia St. just a few doors down from the lot.

Parking -

Cottages are only provided parking for one vehicle each. This will create parking problems for all the houses in the neighborhood. The new residents will have to walk quite a distance to reach their houses. They will want to park in front of the houses closest to them, some of which only have single car driveways and need that access already. The lot is big enough to provide more parking. Profit is the only reason to pack in so many units. The living conditions for the new people as well as those already here will be affected.

Emergencies -

The roads here are narrow and winding. Emergency vehicles could have trouble getting in and could block others who may also need to get out of the area.

Sewer -

The sewer capacity will need to be increased. We do have some sewer issues now.

Traffic -

The corner of Oak and Oak Lawn is the access point to our houses. The new development would double the number of cars wanting to go through there. The roads are narrow, short and winding. The big increase of residents will create traffic congestion. There would be only one exit from the development itself to Alisha Ave. This is a recipe for disaster.

Again - Profit is the only reason to pack in so many houses in. The units are not going to be cheap. Even if there is only one person and one car initially per unit, eventually that will change. Think long term. Why so many?

What will this development look like in 10 years?



From: Jason Robustelli <jason.robustelli@ashland.or.us>
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2020 6:05 AM
To: Karl Johnson <karl.johnson@ashland.or.us>
Subject: RE: Sewer Issues in Alicia/Sylvia Neighborhood?

Those lines are very flat in that neighborhood no major problems as long as nobody flushes the wipes.

From: Karl Johnson <karl.johnson@ashland.or.us>
Sent: Friday, May 8, 2020 11:50 AM
To: Jason Robustelli <jason.robustelli@ashland.or.us>
Cc: Michael Morrison <michael.morrison@ashland.or.us>
Subject: FW: Sewer Issues in Alicia/Sylvia Neighborhood?

Jason,
Has there been any issues with sewer backing up into houses in the Alicia/Sylvia neighborhood? I hadn't heard anything, even in passing, but I don't always hear about stuff like this. Let me know and I can pass on any information that you have to Derek. Thanks.

Karl Johnson, E.I.T., Associate Engineer
City of Ashland, Public Works/Engineering
20 East Main St, Ashland, Oregon 97520
P: (541) 488-5347, TTY (800) 735-2900
F: (541) 488-6006

This email transmission is official business of the City of Ashland, and it is subject to Oregon Public Records Law for disclosure and retention. If you have received this message in error, please contact me at (541) 488-5347. Thank you

"Have you ever noticed that anybody driving slower than you is an idiot, and anyone going faster than you is a maniac?" – George Carlin

From: Derek Severson <derek.severson@ashland.or.us>
Sent: Friday, May 8, 2020 10:52 AM
To: Karl Johnson <karl.johnson@ashland.or.us>
Subject: Sewer Issues in Alicia/Sylvia Neighborhood?

Karl,

When we discussed sewer capacity in the Alicia/Sylvia neighborhood, my takeaways were that Public Works does not believe that this development will be putting enough new flow into the system to negatively impact downstream capacity, and that the Wastewater Collection Supervisor had indicated that they were fine with the proposal as the development will be draining to the trunkline east of Sylvia so it will not impact Oak Street until a point north of Nevada Street in a section going to the WWTP that does not have known issues at this time. I essentially put the summary above in the draft findings for Planning Commission.



Neighbors are raising concerns that there have been sewage back-up's into homes due to capacity issues in the neighborhood in the recent past, that these problems have been brought to the attention of the city, and they've also expressed concerns that any further development will exacerbate these issues ultimately requiring costly repairs and that neighbors will need to participate proportionally in repair costs. In reviewing the Comprehensive Sanitary Sewer Master Plan and the Wastewater Facilities Plan, I didn't see mention of the Alicia and Sylvia neighborhood as having identified concerns, so I just wanted to confirm if you were aware of any reported on-going capacity issues in that neighborhood.

Thanks,

- **Derek**

Derek Severson, *Senior Planner*

City of Ashland, Department of Community Development

51 Winburn Way, Ashland, OR 97520

PH: (541) 552-2040 FAX: (541) 552-2050 TTY: 1-800-735-2900

E-MAIL: derek.severson@ashland.or.us

This e-mail transmission is the official business of the City of Ashland, and is subject to Oregon's public records laws for disclosure and retention. If you've received this e-mail in error, please contact me at (541) 552-2040. Thank you.