

Aaron Harris

From: Lynn Fredricks <lynn.fredricks@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 24, 2024 10:51 AM
To: Aaron Harris
Subject: [EXTERNAL] LU22023-00844 Southridge Park Extension

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the City of Beaverton. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links from unknown senders.

Hi Aaron,

I just tried calling your number and you weren't there. The deadline for comments on this is today at 5:00 PM so I wanted to ensure that I reached out to you in a timely way. I received the Type 2 Notice of Development Proposal in the mail for this extension. My concerns are below the ---

Best regards,

Lynn Fredricks

When the original notice was made available, there was significant feedback provided by neighbors and myself. My assumption here is that an 'extension' preserves those concerns as a matter of public record. My primary concern I brought up at an in-person meeting with city planners and several other neighbors, at your office. One member of your team even said to the effect "We don't have a solution for that yet."

My primary concern was the creation of the intersection at 133rd & Bluebell Ln, but generally related to the new street.

Here are the relevant issues:

- 1) The angle of the intersection was so acute that it did not seem to me to be in line with state requirements - my original comments which were attached to the original proposal that this extends explains this. The new intersection does not form a complete "T" intersection. There are no traffic details given either that take into account extremely limited visibility for traffic originating from the north (from the corner of 133rd and Lancewood. Why this is a problem:
 - The park is expressly created for small children that are likely to end up in the street (between cars, entering / existing cars, walking around cars)
 - The 90 degree angle of the road is very tight and, there is parking allocated on the south and west along the road. When cars are present, there isn't much room for two vehicles to pass each other, and if you observe it, you'll see drivers almost always cut the corner.
 - Oncoming traffic originating from the proposed, new road would not be easily visible for traffic originating from Lancewood, increasing the probability of a pedestrian-vehicle accident

This risk to the lives of children that use the park is very, very concerning, and it is concerning to neighbors that Beaverton City Hall is not also concerned about it

- 2) The lack of on street parking on the new, proposed street creates a significant burden and risk.

- Limited parking for the park was created when the park was built. It was inadequate from the start. Scheduled events at the park (such as children's soccer) fill all of this, and then much more. On street parking on the north and south side

of the park becomes impossible for residents. Home owners along Davies often complain that park visitors are trespassing on their property by parking on their property.

- Waste and recycling containers - where do they go? This hasn't been addressed and, there is no reason why they should not be required to be placed adjacent to the homes on the street. This needs to be resolved as placing them at either end of the new street means a loss of on street parking and a burden on the existing neighborhood. Because of the complexity of the new intersection, at best, it would go at the new intersection on Davies, potentially take up parking spaces for the park.

- New parking for new homes. The new street does not accommodate on street parking, which means each of the nine homes will burden parking on existing streets and parking for the park. Behaviorally, home residents park on their driveway or the street. In 'high parking' times like holidays, two groups of visitors for each home increase the burden on neighboring streets by an additional 18 cars. I should note also that, as seen during the recent snow / ice storm, the presence of cars on the street increase the chance of auto collisions.

No work should be allowed to commence while there is 'no solution yet' to the obvious danger created under these circumstances