

SUMMARY OF ICON'S CORNWALL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL MEETING

Bolton Room, City Hall, 10:00 am June 6th, 2019

Prepared by Edward Turkisher 4099 Cornwall Street

It is encouraging to note that a meeting by ICON to present a proposal for development of their property at 4096 Cornwall Street was well attended by representatives from ICON, the City of West Linn, and several neighborhood residents directly impacted by proximity to the property in question. ICON demonstrated an open willingness to communicate and collaborate with citizens and that collaboration was appreciated and returned by these neighbors. Additionally, petitions were signed by more than 65 neighbors directly impacted by development and these petitions did NOT object to development, but instead, merely asked for inclusion and communication in the development process. It is a great credit to those present, and especially ICON, that this inclusion seemed endorsed and accepted by all.

A few concerns might justifiably be considered as a take-away from this meeting. Not looking for fault, none-the-less, it seems that a couple consistent themes influence the direction this development follows. The City of West Linn has repeatedly focused on the two ideas of "connectivity" (the preference of through streets to join neighborhoods), and adhering to "code" (the following and enforcement of state, county, and city codes and statutes determining construction and related policies and infrastructure). These two issues intertwine and influence each other repeatedly and directly influence what CAN or CANNOT be accomplished.

Unfortunately, the City has taken the position that they are constrained by the "black and white" nature of decision making and the only opportunity they have is a "yea or nay" choice dependent on written code. In fact, as I will briefly demonstrate, this is simply not true. This puts a potential developer like ICON at a serious disadvantage as they try (often unsuccessfully) to navigate a process that fluctuates as capitulations and variances are granted by the City that make compliance with code frustrating and unreasonable. Likewise, the impacted residents seem oftentimes left out of decision making even though these same neighbors are the ones who have to live with the results.

When "Stonegate" was built it was apparent that a street of the recommended code width would make it nearly impossible to develop a piece of land that rests on a steep hillside both above and below the development. Houses on the downside of the slope would effectively slide off the slope into Tanner Creek below. Houses on the upside of the slope would have a cliff for a backyard and inevitable rock, water, and soil erosion into their homes. Accordingly, the city approved a street width of 24 feet to accommodate more room for home construction. These are nice homes. The residents, who purchased them, like them. Unfortunately, the narrow Landis Street directly impacts the development of future lands (ICON's 4096 Cornwall property). The City's stated policy of "connectivity" CANNOT be safely, logically, or realistically incorporated into ICON's development. That is NOT to say that the property cannot be developed. As demonstrated by this three year process and the numerous petitions supported by these residents, ICON is willing to collaborate and the residents are willing to collaborate too. But "connectivity" is both undesirable and actually dangerous. NONE of the surrounding neighborhoods want connectivity. Connectivity would increase traffic by a minimum of 500% and more

likely 1000% on a narrow road that becomes a magnet for conflict and accidents where NO TWO CARS CAN SAFELY PASS (these are figures predicted by ICON's own analysis). Adding six homes to Landis Street onto the ICON property does not significantly impact Landis Street safety **IF** connectivity to Cornwall is eliminated. Landis doesn't want it, Cornwall doesn't want it, and the Barrington neighbors don't want connectivity either.

The City claims their hands are tied. It was the City that granted a variance for Landis Street in the first place (ignoring code) and creating the problem we have today. But the notion that "code" requires "connectivity" is hypocrisy. As a couple of examples:

Just over the hill on Rosemont Road near Oppenlander Fields, Miles Drive used to connect with Rosemont Road and allowed "connectivity" through the neighborhood to Horton Dr. and Santa Anita. Miles Drive is full code width (30') with full sidewalks, planter strips, and easily supports "connectivity"...which was the status quo for many years. Somehow, City planners allowed a barricade to be constructed with concrete curbs and anchored wooden construction across the access - closing that connection to Rosemont forever. No more "connectivity". There are 28 homes with a single egress on what is now the dead end street of Miles Drive.

Down in the Willamette District heading west, turning on Dollar Street would bend around parallel to Borland Road until Dollar Street intersected Borland Road again right before the "Fields Bridge" across the Tualatin River. Dollar Street is full code width and from Ostman Road to Fields Bridge, Dollar Street has woods to the south and fenced yards with fewer than six total homes opening to the street on either side. A full sidewalk with planting strips fronts the north side of the street. Dollar Street "connectivity" to Borland Road existed for **decades**. No more. Somehow, City planners dug up the end of Dollar Street right across from what used to be a small nursery and café, and made Dollar Street a dead end.

So much for "connectivity". I'm sure the City had their reasons for exceptions to "connectivity". I am also sure that I can find more exceptions.

Landis Street and Cornwall Street should be the next exception. Miles Drive and Dollar Street can support "connectivity". Both are code compliant. Yet both were allowed to "disconnect" in conflict with stated city plans. Landis Street is substandard and Cornwall Street is basically condemned with NO city plans for improvement in the foreseeable future.

In conclusion, the City **CAN** and **HAS** manipulated code and master plans to satisfy influence and input from divergent sources we, the residents near the ICON Cornwall property, are not privy too. We are not looking for a manufactured explanation as to why the City did what they did in those two cases (and many more). We are asking that the City disallow connectivity from Landis to Cornwall as unrealistic and unsafe. ICON would benefit from a consistent and predictable plan and not continually modify efforts to adapt to an unpredictable City.

Finally, in speaking with ICON representatives at yesterday's meeting, I was informed, in front of the attending citizens, that ICON had offered to sell the property to the city at cost. That offer

was either rejected or ignored. It is negligent by City representatives, and dubious, that this information has never been relayed to the neighborhood groups interested in these proceedings. I would suggest that citizens should have been both informed of this opportunity and had the further opportunity to lobby for, and vote city wide, to acquire the open land at the bottom of Cornwall Street for City use as open space, park land, or riparian access to what West Linn *used* to be before bureaucrats got a hold of our government.

I/We anxiously await a response to my observations and summary.

Sincerely, Edward Turkisher 4099 Cornwall Street (25 years and counting)