

July 5, 2024

Members of the Planning Commission  
City of Beaverton, Oregon

RE: Project LU32023-00667 Pointer Rd. Park

I will be unable to attend the Commission's July 10 hearing on the application of Tualatin Hills Parks & Rec (THPRD) to develop Pointer Rd. Park. Please accept this letter into the public record of the hearing.

I live at 2060 SW 75th Ave. and have owned this home for 34 years. The southeast corner of my property abuts the access road which is the western boundary of the proposed park. As a long-time property owner and immediate neighbor of the proposed park, I am asking the Planning Commission and the City of Beaverton to address the following with THPRD:

THPRD conducted public meetings and surveys, and also met with neighbors of the site, ostensibly to engage us in the new project. What they heard was an overwhelming preference for a simple open green space. It now appears that THPRD was already determined to build a playground (duplicating already established playgrounds in our area). This most inauthentic process is as disappointing to neighbors as the plan that THPRD now proposes to the City of Beaverton. If you're a government agency, don't propose "citizen participation" if you don't mean it.

Question: How did THPRD incorporate community input in their plan? Examples?

The current plan includes amenities that may attract public nuisance, notably a shelter and a water feature that would attract people who do not have a place to live.

Question: What consideration did THPRD give to these public safety concerns in developing the plan for the new park?

Question: When public safety concerns at the park result in more calls to the police, will THPRD share that additional law enforcement cost with the City of Beaverton?

The current plan for the new park will certainly be more expensive to build as well as more expensive to maintain than the simpler green space the community prefers.

Question: Is there some kind of formula used to rationalize spending the additional taxpayer money on the "amenities" in the current plan, especially given that it's not what the community prefers? If so, what is the formula (e.g., are shelters and water features automatically included in plans for new parks)?

Thank you for your consideration and attention to these concerns.

Sincerely,

/s/

Rachel Jacky