

To: Elena Sasin, Associate Planner
Anna Slatinsky, Planning Division Manager

From: Deborah Stewart

April 21, 2020

Subject : APP2020-0002 Appeal of Southridge Park Subdivision Minor Adjustment (ADJ2019-0018)

Additional Comments to the Planning Commission

The developer pointed out that the photos shown comparing street frontage from Riverside Homes in Hillsboro with homes in the surrounding neighborhood of proposal show different lot sizes due to different zoning. I would ask the commission to consider that this is exactly what we are appealing in the approval of the reduced lot size in that these lots as designed and proposed do not fit in this neighborhood in Beaverton. This builder has not built in Beaverton so I would argue that the homes they build are not compatible with the vision of an established Beaverton neighborhood. In approving this, this development as proposed, the commission is communicating to the citizens of Beaverton that they really are only interested in a developer getting the most bang for their buck and not in actually caring about what a neighborhood might actually look like as a result of the approval of a development.

Regarding the street proposal, one commission member asked the question of whether this street extension is included in the city's transportation plan. City staff representative did not in fact answer this question but instead referred to the Engineering Design Review and the conditions of approval that have been added regarding safety issues.

The answer to the question asked by the commissioner is in fact no. This street extension is not and has never been in the city's transportation plan. The idea for the street originated within the planning department at a pre approval conference with the developer and not from a revision in the transportation plan. It should be noted again that previous unsubmitted design proposals did not include the street extension but that through discussions with city staff, the suggestion of the street extension was made by city staff within the planning department. Again the neighbors' objection to the approval of this adjustment and development overall is that proposals were suggested and then approved in contradiction to existing transportation plans for the area and then arcane engineering design criteria regarding block lengths was brought in to justify an internal change to transportation policy that has heretofore not been part of a public planning process. This has contributed to the sense that the neighbors have that city staff are making decisions that are not in the interest of the residents of the city as a whole.

The issue of safety of the new street frontage of the extension of SW 133rd, along Meadow Waye Park has not been adequately addressed by either the developer or by Tualatin Hills Parks and Recreation District or by city staff beyond acknowledging that the existing sidewalk/path through the park meets the requirement for sidewalk code. As neighbors and park users where should these concerns be addressed? Which entity is responsible?

The residents of this neighborhood do sincerely hope that the commission will make a decision that takes into account the long-term vision and impact , not only on our neighborhood but the city overall.