

On May 22, 2018, at 9:55 PM, kristi chapman <chapmanhoodriver@gmail.com> wrote:

I apologize that I couldn't attend last night's meeting and was hoping to submit my comment in writing. Please let me know if this is not the appropriate way to do this or if this should be addressed to others.

Kristi Chapman
4290 Alpenglow
Hood River

In looking at the agenda for the meeting I am concerned about a few things. The general public has no idea which of the pieces and parts that you will be addressing. "possible amendments" that may apply outside of the study area.... may include updates to various sections of the comp plan? This is the most generalized agenda wording I've ever seen. The public has no idea if you will be discussing rezoning areas or design standards or parking. How is anyone supposed to weigh in their testimony when they don't have any idea what will be discussed?

There needs to be a transparent conversation on how the commission is going to guarantee the citizens of Hood River a quality of life that they were presented when they purchased property here. They knew that their land was zoned X, that their neighbors was zoned Y, and around town was zoned Z. I believe that it is a bait and switch, or theft, if the commission recommends or adopts a blanket zone change anywhere. As it currently stands, if a land owner wanted to change their zoning, they can go through a process to do so. It takes time and consideration because it should. Not only does it affect the owner, but the neighborhood, the city and the county.

As a reminder, the Housing Needs Analysis stated that our buildable lands in Hood River were sufficient with careful planning. No up-zoning is necessary whatsoever. This didn't even include the updated *drop* in population forecast.

But again, I have no idea if that is going to be discussed under agenda item A or not.

When I started digging into the Westside Plan, I found that I am mainly concerned about a few things besides a blanket up-zone. I apologize for the length.

1. Minimum density requirements. I read this to imply that if I purchased a R-2 property I would be required to build two units. If I am reading this incorrectly please clarify. In a hot market like today, there isn't an issue with this - of course you would want to maximize your profit and 2 units on a lot will generate more profit for the developer. The issue I see with this is what happens when the market is depressed and down. As it currently stands a developer could look at the demand and choose to build 1 or 2 units on R-2 and I think that should remain their right to choose based on what the current (not today's) demand is. And the neighbors of the land have a sense of understanding knowing that next to them the maximum units that would be out their window would be 2. (A good example of this is my former neighborhood off of Rand and Montello - zoned R-2 but has single family homes there, because when they were built, that was what people wanted.)

2. *Parking requirements.* I agree that cities need to encourage alternative transportation and it should be addressed. We live in a unique town that has everything from tourism to agriculture. The citizens of this town happily bike, weather permitting. But as a commission you need to remember a few things. A. This is a gear and outdoor town. People need to be able to haul their gear and toys with a vehicle. I do not know any family that relies on a single vehicle. In fact, I know many that have more than 2, along with a camper/van. I don't know many people that park in their garage because it is full of "the toys" B. We have hills and weather. Asking a mom to haul her kids around in the winter on a bike is not going to happen. Unless we adopt a major public transportation overhaul, we need to be real that we are not San Francisco or Beaverton or Portland and people *use* their vehicles here and while they may have bikes, they will also have multiple vehicles. I also know from growing up in a developer family that once they pencil for profit a project, they look to the low hanging fruit of the ways they can cut costs to further profit. The city should absolutely hold strong to "considerations" by developers. They've already figured their profit and it was worthwhile to begin the process without any considerations or financial favors they ask of the city.

3. *Lot coverages.* I see the construction happening where the units max out the lot. While elderly people may enjoy this in pocket areas, young families only tolerate it because it is what they can afford. The other population that loves the little to no yard idea is investors and second home purchasers. People do not enjoy being packed in like sardines and crave some sort of privacy. Packing in units to major maximums is only going to encourage people that do not live here to purchase here. Recently, the developer of a proposed development had a meeting with surrounding owners. He was asked what his solution was about the increased traffic on such a narrow/steep/highly utilized road. He responded that they would mostly be second homes anyway so he doesn't anticipate regular traffic increases.

Thank you so much for your time. I appreciate your service and know you are spread very thin without much of a support crew. I am constantly puzzled how a town of so much recreation/tourism/agriculture/industry have districts financially struggling so much.

Respectfully,
Kristi chapman