

Javoronok, Sara

From: Javoronok, Sara
Sent: Wednesday, January 16, 2013 9:20 AM
To: Sonnen, John
Subject: CDC-12-02

The HRB reviewed the code amendments last night. They did not recommend changes on the projecting signs or docketing. They also reviewed the public notice requirements – most HRB projects are Class B notices. They recommended retaining the existing 100 foot notice requirement and recommended adding a requirement that the site must be posted with a sign.

Sara



CITY OF West Linn Sustainability Advisory Board

Memorandum

Date: February 15, 2013
To: West Linn Planning Commission c/o Planning Director John Sonnen
From: West Linn Sustainability Advisory Board
Subject: Comments on Proposed CDC Amendments

Please find below our comments on the proposed amendments to the West Linn Community Development Code.

Public notice requirements -

Comments: We feel that the scope and duration of proposed actions and development should be taken into consideration when deciding the range of property owners to notify. If the project is commercial in nature and/or will last for a significant amount of time we feel that notifying all property owners of record within 500 feet of the site perimeter would be prudent. If the project is a small-scale residential one then notifying all property owners of record within 300 feet of the site perimeter would suffice.

Sidewalk use -

Comments: The proposed changes appear to benefit local businesses and economic development in the city while not negatively impacting the residents and visitors of West Linn so we support this amendment.

Docketing -

Comments: We support a docketing system that allows for public engagement, ensures that all citizens are heard and allows for the greatest level of efficiency for the city. We would like to stress that we feel that citizen voices need to be heard and that we would only support a docketing process that allowed for this.

Residences in commercial districts -

Comments: We support an amendment to allow for one and two unit dwellings in commercial buildings in the GC district and single family residences above permitted uses in the NC district.

Design review submittal requirements -

Comments: We support the aspect of this amendment that eliminates inconsistency and places regulations in one logical location. We would recommend that neighborhood meetings be required for subdivisions with 4 or more lots as suggested and multifamily projects with 3 or more units: not just multifamily projects with more than ten units.

Stormwater control on single family and duplex lots -

Comments: We support an amendment requiring stormwater treatment for all projects that involve more than 500 square feet of new impervious surface.

Javoronok, Sara

From: Javoronok, Sara
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2013 3:59 PM
To: 'Elizabeth Rocchia'
Subject: RE: sports field signage

Thanks, Elizabeth. I'll add this to the record. There will be the opportunity for public comment at the Planning Commission and City Council hearings. You're welcome to testify at that point.

Sara

From: Elizabeth Rocchia [<mailto:erocchia@comcast.net>]
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2013 3:54 PM
To: Javoronok, Sara
Subject: sports field signage

Hello Sara,

Thank you for alerting me to the proposed amendments. Here are my comments on sports field signage: The banner signs put up at Fields Bridge Park each spring by the West Linn Baseball Club represent their sponsors. This habit may be customary in other areas, in school fields and in commercial ball parks but I find this inappropriate for a community park in a city where off premise advertising is prohibited.

There are frequently more than 24 banners on the back wall which remain in place from April through August. Baseball games are occasional whereas the advertising signs are constant.

There are other ways the WLB Club could honor its sponsors...a memory book for its young players with ads and photos, for example

Commercial advertising banners in a public park seem inappropriate in my opinion. In addition their use could set a precedent for other advertising.

Essentially, I consider this situation to be private use of public space.

I would be happy to come to the Planning Commission Meeting to testify if asked to do so.

Thank you,

Elizabeth Rocchia
503-657-5666

Sonnen, John

From: Marylhurst Neighborhood Association
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 3:05 PM
To: Sonnen, John
Subject: feedback on code change draft

Hi John,

It turned out that Marylhurst didn't have a quorum, so we didn't make any resolutions about the proposed code changes in our February meeting. However, the six people present had a good discussion and came up with these questions/suggestions:

Would a change to a neighborhood plan need to go through the docketing process? We thought maybe the NH Plans could be a special case where NAs might like to make changes without waiting.

Are erosion control items such as screens considered temporary structures?

We discussed that a multi-family unit has a lot of impact in a neighborhood like ours, and we think changing the definition to 10 family from 3 is a poor choice. If a developer is putting in a multi-family unit in our NA, we think they should be willing to have a meeting with us as traffic and other aspects could be impacted. 10 family seems very high.

Are PUDs considered developments? I.e., would we have a meeting with a developer putting in a six-lot PUD? (are PUDs a sub class of development?)

Thanks for keeping the draft open until after our meeting.

Thanks
Jef Treece
MNA President

Marylhurst Neighborhood Association
<mailto:MarylhurstNA@westlinnoregon.gov>

,
P: (503) 657-0331
F:
Web: <http://http://westlinnoregon.gov/marylhurst>

West Linn Sustainability Please consider the impact on the environment before printing a paper copy of this email.
Public Records Law Disclosure This e-mail is subject to the State Retention Schedule and may be made available to the public.