

Date: April 16, 2019

From: Jack Wilberscheid  
Adjacent Property Owner on 2180 and 2182 13<sup>th</sup> Street  
PO Box 1524  
Hood River, OR 97031  
Mobile Phone: 541-386-9463  
Email: jak@gorge.net

Delivered in Person at 1:30 PM April 16, 2019

To: Darrell Wyss, Associate Planner  
City Hall  
22500 Salamo RD  
West Linn, OR 97608  
Tel: 503-742-6064

Regarding: 1791 Blankenship Rd. 3 Lot Minor Partition  
File No. MIP-18-06/DR-18-06

Dear Mr. Wyss:

Below is my written testimony submitted for your consideration as well as for the Director of City Planning's consideration regarding the 1791 Blankenship Road proposal to subdivide one lot into 3 lots:

1. Why change the orientation of the building lots? It seems to me that the existing lot could be subdivided with two homes facing along Blankenship Road. The street front line along Blankenship Road would be maintained and fits the natural contours for drainage, landscaping, and overall neighborhood appeal. Has this option been considered and reviewed? As well as, normal set back requirements would work.
2. I am opposed to granting side yard variances. There is no reason to allow a 7.5 foot side yard requirement to be changed to 6 foot, 6 foot, and 7 foot as well as a 12 foot set back changed to a 7 foot set back requirement. It appears that the developer is trying to squeeze one more lot on a site where the extra lot does not add to the feel of the community and crowds the neighboring properties.
3. The height of the home on Parcel 3 may block the local TV reception.
4. Parking on 13<sup>th</sup> Street is limited to the East side and is steep near this lot and has a 20 foot ban on parking near the intersection. Additional homes would impact the existing neighbors who use 13<sup>th</sup> Street for parking for their immediate vehicles and occasionally their visitors. Parents waiting to pick up children off of school buses would not have a good view of their children getting off the bus. Also, Century Link has internet hubs on 13<sup>th</sup> Street for the adjoining businesses. They often have two vans parked on the street for long periods of time to upgrade and maintain their systems.

5. The drainage calculations for the site were based on roof top area only. I could not determine if all the roof top drains were piped to the garden basins out front. If so, I am concerned that occasionally the pipe would plug and could overflow into my yard. In addition, cleaning the gutters would be a problem due to limited access. If is not piped to a catch basin; then, all the run off will end up in my backyard as it already accumulates there from 1791 Blankenship.
6. Cross section views do not adequately show the elevation difference between Parcel 3 and the backyard of 2180 and 2182 13<sup>th</sup> Street. I have estimated my backyard elevation is at 171 and the building proposed for Parcel 3 roofline is at elevation 208. This would be a 37 foot side yard wall elevation difference with only a 7 foot set back. This would impact the aesthetics of the existing backyard and not provide a natural roof elevation transition.
7. The existing development plan does not provide adequate parking as previously stated. The neighborhood currently uses 13<sup>th</sup> Street for parking and adding 3 new homes would add congestion to parking on the street. This will impact mail delivery and trash pick-up as well.
8. If the developer wants to subdivide the property, I suggest that he go with two houses to replace the existing house and provide parking for each bedroom.
9. There is no point in extending the sidewalk on the west side of 13<sup>th</sup>. There is already a nice side walk on the east side of 13<sup>th</sup>. Use that area to add parking for a third car for each unit.
10. There is one place where they state that development will be staged and another where it will not be staged. What is their commitment?
11. The soil on the existing property is hauled in un-engineered gravel. It is porous. Water that falls on the site infiltrates quickly and then hits the clay layer underneath. This causes water and ponding in the backyard of 2180 13<sup>th</sup> Street. The added development will no doubt make this worse. A solution would be an interceptor ground wall with a drain that would allow the water to flow into the storm sewer. This would remediate the site for the existing water drainage problem. However, this drain would need to go where Parcel 3 is located.
12. I would like to see the south bank terraced and landscaped even if there are only two parcels.
13. The architecture does not match the existing buildings. The eave height of the existing building adjacent to Parcel 3 is 9 feet and the peak ridge height is 14'-6". This combined with naturally elevated land amplifies the elevation difference between the new house and existing. I suggest maintaining a 20 foot set back from the south side yard of Parcel 3. This would allow proper drainage, minimize the "canyon effect" to the existing backyard, and provide greater privacy for the four existing bedrooms and two bathrooms facing Parcel 3.
14. On the Class 1 Variance Section 75-1c, the I take exception to the privacy, light, TV reception, noise, and about providing a smooth transition to existing roof lines.
15. The existing plans have labeled the cross sections view incorrectly for Parcel 3 making it difficult to review plans.
  - a. South = East

- b. West = South
  - c. East = North
  - d. North = West
16. The floor elevations on Parcel 3 are different on the cross section and on the site layout plan. The new grading contours are not shown on Parcel 3.
  17. The cross sections do not show the elevations of the surrounding properties and streets and make it difficult to make an informed decision of the impacts of this subdivision.
  18. The Survey states that the survey will not be recorded. Why? Should not a subdivided lot be required to have a recorded survey?

In summary, I do not think the existing site is suitable for three lots, 9 bedrooms, and only 3 parking spaces. The existing site could be suitable for two individual homes provided they add additional parking for each bedroom. I also do not support variations to the current minimum set back restrictions. I would like to see the character of this neighborhood enhanced and feel that two new houses would do that, but not three. I recommend that you ask for a new layout showing only two houses and that they face Blankenship Road with access allowed on 13<sup>th</sup> Street similar to what we currently have.

Thank you for taking my call and providing time for our meeting today and allowing me the opportunity for input into this planning phase.

Respectfully,



Jack Wilberscheid  
Adjacent Property Owner 30 Years