Public Comments Attachment D

Sept. 23, 2020

Dear Planning Commissioners,

My property is 3114 lot 2 on Eugene Street. I have concerns about the proposed development because the proposed drainage pond will be directly behind my backyard fence. I hope care will be taken so that pond will not flood my backyard. I have spent a lot of time building the yard of my dreams. For most of my life, I spent in low-income housing but with a reversal of fortune, I was able to buy my first home. I have been happily living in my home for four years. I know that more affordable housing is needed in Hood River but hope that it can be done in a safe way that won't cause damage to our homes down the hill on Eugene St.

Sincerely,

Concerned homeowner

Shirley Stern

Mary King
3105 Eugene Street
Hood River, OR 97031
503-780-8072
maryanddrew@comcast.net

COPY

September 24, 2020

City of Hood River Planning Commission
211 Second Street
Hood River, OR 9731

RE: Proposed Zone Change for 18-Lot Subdivision, File 2020-13

Dear Planning Commissioners,

My property is directly downhill and adjacent to the proposed subdivision (tax lot #2300). I learned about this proposal for the first time when I received the Notice of Public Hearing from the City of Hood River dated September 11, 2020. Although our names and address are on the mailing list for the applicant's neighborhood meeting held in December 2019, neither I nor my husband recall receiving an invitation. I oppose the proposed rezoning.

I have significant concerns regarding potential impacts due to drainage and request that a **detailed plan be prepared to address how drainage onto my property would be controlled.** The Concept View Sections View Plan dated 8/12/2020 identifies a swale, but the section drawings do not show a swale. There is insufficient information to determine how the finished grades would affect my property, and how stormwater would be prevented from flowing onto my property. **The 3:1 finished grade shown in Sections 3 and 4 is very steep and it appears to terminate precipitously at the northern edge, adjacent to my property.** It is not clear whether a retaining wall is being proposed and how it would be drained, and whether any easements would be needed if the wall spans multiple lots. How would maintenance of stormwater facilities including the proposed pond and any swales be enforced?

There is an existing berm and drain system that currently protects my property. It is not clear how this proposal would alter the existing system. The berm and area drain appear to encroach slightly on the property where the project is proposed; the area drain appears to discharge to the rain drain at the southeast corner of my garage. This system was in place before I purchased the home in 2018.

My property has a shared driveway and access easement agreement with property to the east at 3017 Eugene Street. **Winter snow and ice on the shared driveway, and stormwater drainage impacts to the foundation, crawlspace and backyard of my home could definitely be an issue if drainage is not adequately managed.**

Seeps and drainage problems resulting in winter ice, slippery green slime, insects, odors and other hazards are evident along Eugene Street nearby to the east of 30th Street. Furthermore, **there are a lot of pedestrians who now use the portion of Eugene Street in front of my home to**

access the Westside Community Trail and off-leash dog area, and I do not want to be held liable for slippery, icy conditions on the public sidewalk due to runoff and seepage resulting from the proposed development. **Preliminary approval of this project should not be considered without a detailed drainage plan showing how these issues would be prevented in the proposed development.** What assurance would we have that future owners of the lots would actually maintain and could not modify the drainage systems?

This proposed zone change will definitely affect my life and property. I am concerned about the impacts of lighting, noise and loss of privacy. It is not clear how the wooden fence at the back of my property (which is offset from the property line) or the landscaping in my backyard would be impacted. Based on the Concept 2 section drawings dated 8/12/20, the applicant is proposing to place a substantial amount of fill. Changing from a single parcel to an 18-lot subdivision above my property seems worthy of conditions of approval and a plan for mitigation measures for my property such as privacy fencing and screening vegetation that are compatible with any proposed drainage plans. **The impact of fill placement on downslope properties should be carefully evaluated prior to considering preliminary approval. Is there a design that could better preserve the existing grade without as much fill and/or provide terracing instead?**

What assurances do I have that rigorous erosion and sediment control, both temporary during construction as well as permanent stabilization measures, would be provided to control **dust in the dry season and erosion and sediment in the wet season?** Would I be asked to provide a temporary access easement during construction if a retaining wall or swale is proposed along the property line?

Walking and bicycling are my primary modes of transportation. Notwithstanding the Traffic Impact Analysis prepared for the proposed project, the Planning Commission and City Council should be advised that 30th Street is steep and gets icy in the winter and drivers tend to go fast. The Safe Routes to School bicycle lanes on May Street end at Rand Road, and this section of road is frequently used by cyclists going to Post Canyon. Lack of sidewalks on Rand Road north of Eugene Street is a problem for pedestrians; it would help to at least keep the vegetation cut back along the road shoulder. Although ODOT improvements at the intersection of Rand Road and Cascade Avenue will provide much needed safety upgrades, short- term impacts on neighborhood traffic could be significant during construction. **Please consider pedestrian and bicycle safety in relation to the density and proposed number of lots.**

Wildlife will be impacted: I have observed deer, coyote, pheasants as well as numerous resident and migrating birds and other small animals in and around the project area. We get mice, snakes, and other animals in our house and yard. When construction commences, fleeing wildlife could be harmed, and/or cause harm to my home and pets. Burrowing animals could make drainage problems worse. If the project were to proceed, then final approval should require a **detailed plan implemented under the direction of a qualified wildlife biologist to address impacts to wildlife and neighboring properties during initial vegetation removal and habitat disturbance.** Would the proposed outfall to the creek from the stormwater pond harm wildlife?

Please be advised that Planning Commissioner Bill Irving was the realtor who represented me and my husband during the purchase of our property in 2018. Signs of water moving through the crawlspace were noted on our home inspection report, although my husband and I have not observed any problems since we moved in. Whether Bill Irving would have any conflict of interest that may necessitate his recusal from making decisions on this proposal remains to be determined.

I urge the Planning Commission to deny the application for the rezone. At this time, the applicant has failed to assure that future violations of Oregon Drainage Law and impacts to my property would be prevented. **At a minimum, preliminary plat approval should not be granted until the applicant demonstrates that there will not be a need for an additional stormwater tract for managing downslope drainage.** Any decisions regarding this proposal should ensure that I don't have to spend time or money fighting problems that can be dealt with through the land-use planning process.

Although I do not favor the proposed rezoning, if the City Council ultimately determines this subdivision is in the community's best interest, then I would welcome the opportunity to work cooperatively toward a successful outcome.

Thank you for considering my concerns. If you need more information or clarification, please do not hesitate to contact me at 503-780-8072.

Sincerely,

Mary King

Encl: photos

PHOTOS

The applicant is proposing to place approximately 10 to 15 feet of fill above my property, but has failed to show how drainage would be controlled and how the toe of the slope would be supported. These photos show the driveway I share with my neighbors at 3017 Eugene Street, looking toward the site of the proposed project.

No information has been provided about how the berm and drain system that protects my property would be altered by the proposed project. There is evidence of past stormwater movement in the crawlspace under my home, which was presumably controlled by the berm and drain system at the south side of my property. My fence is offset from the property line.

Another concern is that the numerous small animals (mice, burrowing squirrels, snakes, etc.) would need to be controlled as clearing and grading begin so they don't flee onto my property and into the Fox Hollow neighborhood. We occasionally get mice, snakes and other animals in our house, garage and garden shed.

The public sidewalk in front of my property is used by many pedestrians en route to the Westside Community Trail and off-leash dog area. If drainage is not controlled, ice and slipping hazards could affect not only my sloping shared driveway, but also public safety on the sidewalk.

Nearby on Eugene Street, other properties have drainage issues (some are year-round, others are worse in winter) that cause the street and sidewalk to be slippery and icy. These photos were taken in September after a prolonged period of dry weather.

Megan J. Barton
3017 Eugene St.
Hood River, OR 97031
(541) 490-3858
meganjbarton@gmail.com

23rd September 2020

Attn: Hood River Planning Commission and City Council
File No. 2020-13

Dear Planning Commission and City Council Members,

I am writing with regards to a proposal submitted by Integrity Building and Construction (IBC) and owner/applicant Alice Foss to change the current tax Lot #200-300 at the northwest corner of May Street and 30th streets from Zone R-1 to R-2 and preliminary approval for an 18-lot subdivision.

As a homeowner directly impacted by the proposed subdivision which will comprise the entire south end of my property line, I have some concerns. I wish to preface these concerns by acknowledging that as a nurse practitioner providing primary care in this community that the issues of affordable housing, usable green space, pedestrian and bike pathways, and protection of wildlife are extremely important to the health of our community. I do not put my needs as a homeowner above the health of my community and I hope this planning commission and city council are similarly motivated in their evaluation of this and future proposed developments.

I have lived in Hood River for 13 years and in our current home for 8 years. When we bought our home we were aware of the proposed Westside Development Plan to the farther west of us and the land ownership of the large parcel directly to the south of us, designated as low density R-1. We were in fact motivated to buy this current property because the R-1 designation assured lower density of future homes and the protection of the value of our own home. The current proposal would increase that density and we would likely necessitate two neighbors bordering our south perimeter of our property theoretically decreasing the value and integrity of the lower density aesthetics of our current neighborhood west of 30th. I do not support rezoning this subdivision to R-2. The devaluation of property and change of aesthetics is just one minor reason.

I do support affordable housing in Hood River, but I am certain after looking at the proposed housing plans that changing the R-1 to R-2 designation will not

make housing more affordable, just increase housing space. Having more housing that is not affordable still puts a burden on infrastructure and reduces the quality of life for residents who have already achieved successful housing.

I also have concerns regarding the increased density of traffic and noise which will not only affect our currently strained traffic patterns on a very steeply graded 30th street, but impact the visibility of bikers and pedestrians. While a proposal for improved traffic congestion is in the works next year with Rand Road and Cascade Avenue, the proposed Mt. Adams Avenue in the Westside Development Plan is likely years away from completion as is the extension of 30th down to Cascade Avenue. In addition to the traffic created by new homeowners; I ask IBC how they will manage traffic when construction of the proposed subdivision starts which will include use of heavy machinery and materials delivery? We have very few outlets for homeowners west of 30th and this traffic pattern will be a burden. I would like to see how the city will plan to manage this problem.

I am also a fan of the wildlife and fauna I have come to enjoy both directly to the south of my property line and in the field where the entire community of Hood River has found green space available for themselves and their children and animals on these Westside Trails. Henderson Creek is a lovely flowing waterway that attracts birds and offers noise mitigation. We will displace the coyotes, pheasant covey, rodents and the blackberries and fruits we all like to pick. This development and zoning changes will demonstrate the value we place on our green space and future developments. I do not support higher density R-2 zoning for this development because there is not a future plan in the Westside Development Plan that protects Henderson Creek and preserves any substantial green space that we now enjoy and has become so important for many Hood River residents during COVID.

I have reviewed the concept plans proposed by IBC and have some grave concerns regarding their plan to address slope drainage. As you may recall the current placement of Mt. Adams Avenue running North to South in the Westside Development Plan was originally proposed as an East to West corridor. This received heavy criticism due to the difficulty managing the slope. We currently receive a bulk of the runoff from the field behind us which is the proposed development. We have a sump pump that transfers water from underneath our home to our drainage system. This works well for us now and for the previous owners. The provided documents from IBC of Concept 2 of the 30th Street Subdivision denote a swale in the master plan behind the properties of Eugene St. and West of 30th emptying into a pond which is located to the west of our neighbor and has an overflow into Henderson Creek. I am obviously not an engineer, but the sections which address the slope and setback from Prospect St. down to Montello St. do not include the

detail of the swale as in the master plan and demonstrate some challenging grading issues as well as a precipitous drop with a wall of some mystery construction directly behind our home. Given the size of the homes and the expected slope angle to terrace these homes, there is no corresponding plan to manage all the runoff created. Without the vegetation of the hillside, I have concerns that water will pour underneath my home. Looking down Eugene St. going east, there is a problem with runoff that leads to a year round flowing waterway onto the street and sidewalk from some poor planning with that subdivision. I do not want runoff water in my driveway or backyard or to have someone slip on some frozen water in the winter because of poor planning and an increase in density of homes. I can see how a developer might move ahead with a project and leave the homeowners to solve the issues of poor planning which can be costly and affect property values.

Finally, I would like to know how IBC plans to put in the development and how that may affect my property and daily living arrangement. I have a large, mature maple tree in my backyard on the edge of my property. If the root system is disturbed, this may weaken the tree and lead to property damage if it were to be blown over. Will IBC consider having an arborist oversee any excavation around this tree? Also, because of the extreme slope of the hillside, I do not want to have excavated soil wash down into my property if left during rainy days or idle periods of construction. We also have a retaining wall that may be affected by construction. Does IBC plan to replace this retaining wall if disturbed by the new construction? Also, I would hope that IBC would recognize that the noise during construction is disturbing and would be conscious of avoiding long hours which may disrupt residents.

In closing, the salient points are that I expect that a subdivision will likely be placed at the northwest corner of May Street and 30th street but I do not support the zoning changes from R-1 to R-2. Increased density without affordable housing sets a dangerous precedent in our community. This zoning change devalues our enjoyment of green space and stresses our infrastructure and the wildlife that enjoy this small undeveloped area. This increased density also devalues my property and expectations of the aesthetics of this neighborhood for which I bought the home. Increased traffic without egress is a problem for drivers as well as pedestrians and bikers. I also cannot support increased density in a subdivision for which the developers do not have a clear plan to manage a very pitchy slope and expected runoff into my backyard.

It is my hope that the zoning remains R-1 for this subdivision and the city of Hood River reassure residents that they value input from taxpayers who would like a long term vision for growth and development of Hood River.

Sincerely,

September 23, 2020

Dear Hood River City Land-use Planning group, Hood River City Council and Mayor McBride,

My name is Alexander P. Barton and I'm a resident of 3017 Eugene Street in the CIty of Hood River and have been for the past eight years. My family and I have lived in Hood River for the past 13 years. I received notice that there is a planned 18 unit subdivision zoning and permitting process beginning directly to the South of our property. I wish to ask a number of questions for clarification prior to your consideration of permitting this development. While I understand the City's acute housing shortage pressure both on a personal and a professional level (I work for the local community mental health program), I respectively request that you address and answer these concerns.

1. We were apprised on a very short time frame (week of sept 23rd) by one of our neighbors of this change. Did we miss a meeting or announcement? I am on an email list from the county on development but did not receive any notice of this proposed City change. Please outline how the City of Hood River attempted to communicate with affected residences about this potential change.

2. Our house has a crawlspace that during the rainy season becomes saturated with sometimes up to 2 feet of standing water after a heavy rain. Clearly the hillside to our South can tolerate only so much rain before it overflows into our property and underneath our home. We have ameliorated the problem by placing a sump pump which sufficiently drains the water that collects under our entire house into our small gutter system. Please outline how the new development will assure that the existing natural drainage system will be improved or at least maintained so that our house does not annually sustain a significantly greater amount of unmanageable and potentially damaging water.

3. I assume that the City land-use commission would require studies to assure existing households would be safe from water flow change. I would appreciate a copy of any assessment, study or engineering research that was done to calculate or evaluate the hydrology of the parcel to our south.

4. We have a very large maple tree at the southeast corner of our property. The tree is approximately 80 feet tall with an extensive root system. Please apprise me of how future development will assure this tree is not damaged and create a new liability and potential hazard to my family or property.

5. Existing developmental change proposes that a 5 foot retaining wall would be built behind our home to level new the new potential lots to the south? I am no expert on civil engineering, but am I'm concerned about both the aesthetics, integrity and viability of such a structure. Please outline the architectural and environmental factors that were considered in this decision of a wall this size. Please outline what expectations of materials and designs would be needed

for the successful construction of this wall. How will the developer assure this retainer of a significant amount of backfill dirt and historically clay soil will protect both our and any newly constructed home from erosion and intrusion from the potential new house to the south.

6. There is a significant shortage of affordable housing in Hood River. I love my neighborhood and I would be honored and happy to have more low income housing residences to the South. It seems much more logical to build many smaller affordable units then the 18 planned If the city is truly committed to affordable housing. If a new zoning is changed, why did the city not propose an even more dense housing zone to allow for more low income residents to live in our neighborhood. Please advise how this decision for 18 units was set.

7. There is an abundance of wildlife on the parcel to the south. I understand that my needs for aesthetics maybe counterbalanced and overruled by the City's need for housing. I do not wish to be a 'NIMBY' who complains about development after they have a house in this wonderful town. However, there live a number of families of ringtail pheasants, coyotes, deer, raccoons, amphibians, and migratory songbirds in this thicket. What evaluations, assessments or impact statements did the City perform on this area? I would like a copy of any environmental impact statement done on the land to our south.

8. My hope is that an amicable and 'win-win' situation can be created in this proposed development. However if some of my concerns are not met or answered with satisfaction, please outline the steps of appeal to a higher land use authority I and my neighbors could undertake.

Sincerely,

Alexander P. Barton
3017 Eugene Street
Hood River, Oregon

CITY OF HOOD RIVER

Engineering Department | (509) 493-3886

1200 18th Street, Hood River, OR 97031 | engineering@cityofhoodriver.gov

ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

THIS IS NOT A PERMIT

September 18, 2020

Integrity Building & Construction
1545 Osprey Dr.
Hood River, OR 97031

Site Address:	3750 May St.
Owner Name:	Alice Foss Wilson
Legal Description:	03N10E34A00200
Subject:	Site Plan Review – Request for Comments
File #:	2020-13

Based on the conceptual Civil Drawings dated 8/3/20, Stormwater Management Plan dated 8/20, Transportation Impact Analysis dated 5/12/20, Geotechnical Investigation Report dated 3/3/20, and TPR findings dated 8/26/20 the Engineering Department has the following items to address:

1. **General:** These comments cover planning requirements for adequate public facilities and do not include engineering specifications or other more specific requirements of the City of Hood River (COHR). Other engineering and code specifications may be applicable at the time of engineered plan review or building permit application.

2. **General:** Refer to the City of Hood River Municipal Code (HRMC), Engineering Standards (HRES), Transportation System Plan (TSP), and I-84 Exit 62/63/64 Interchange Area Management Plan (IAMP) for more information and an exhaustive list of all City requirements (https://cityofhoodriver.gov/).

3. **General:** A Construction Site/Right-of-Way permit is required for this development. A complete application to the Public Works Department includes a completed permit application form, two (2) hard copies of the civil drawings, digital PDF copies of the civil drawings, stormwater management report, traffic impact analysis, geotechnical report, Site Development Engineers Cost Estimate, retaining wall design/calculations, applicable design exception requests, and payment of all applicable fees. Prior to application submittal, a pre-submittal meeting with the Public Works & Engineering Department is required.

4. **General:** Detailed engineered to scale plans showing public streets, private streets, private utilities, and public utilities shall be submitted to the City of Hood River Engineering Department. The plans shall be reviewed and signed by private utility providers. Plans shall be prepared following the drafting standards and all required elements outlined in the HRES.

5. **General:** Site Development Engineer's Cost Estimate shall be submitted prior to review of the engineering plans. A site review fee shall be paid in full prior to review. The fee is 2% of the approved Site Development Engineer's Cost Estimate and is separate from the Building Department Engineering Review Fee. After approval of the engineering plans any significant changes in the scope of the project will require updates to the engineer's cost estimate. Changes that increase the work to be performed will require additional fees to be paid. See the HRES for more information.

6. **General:** Hard copy plans/reports shall be wet stamped by an Oregon licensed Professional Engineer experienced and competent to practice in the specific disciplines of engineering (electronic copies shall have a digital seal and signature per OAR 820-025-0010).

7. **General:** The Public Works and Engineering Department will assess System Development Charges for water, stormwater, sanitary sewer, and transportation at time of permit issuance. Additional SDC's and fees may apply. SDC's and fees provided are current as of the date of this document. Fees shall be paid at time of permit issuance, current fees at time of permit issuance shall apply.

    a. 3/4 inch water SDC & connection fee $6,599
    b. 3/4 inch sewer combination & connection fee $2,130
    c. Stormwater per ERU $733
    d. Single Family Transportation $2,059

8. **General:** All utility lines including, but not limited to, those required for electric, communication, lighting and cable television services, and related facilities shall be placed underground, except for surface mounted transformers, surface mounted connection boxes and meter cabinets which may be placed above ground, temporary utility service facilities during construction, and high capacity electric lines operating at 50,000 volts or above.

    a. All new utilities required to serve the proposed development; henceforth referenced as tax lot 200, from May St. and/or 30th St. shall be placed underground within the dedicated ROW. Any existing overhead utilities currently extending through the boundary of tax lot 200 shall also be placed underground.
    b. All existing overhead utilities running parallel to tax lot 200 on 30th St. shall be placed underground within the dedicated ROW.

9. **General:** A ten foot (10') public utility easement (PUE) is required along all frontage of public streets. Exceptions to this requirement must be coordinated with all appropriate utilities and documentation provided to the City. No above ground utility structures will be allowed within the City ROW. To be completed at time of final plat.

10. **General:** Whenever existing rights-of-way adjacent to or within a tract are of less than standard width, additional rights-of-way shall be provided at the time of subdivision or development, subject to the provision of Section 16.12.050(A).

a. The City's TSP identifies 30th St. classified as a local street. The existing ROW is approximately 44 feet. The required ROW for a local street is 50' therefore, six feet (6') of ROW must be dedicated from the eastern property line of 30th St.
b. The City's TSP identifies Prospect Ave. and Montello Ave. as local streets. The minimum required ROW for the extension of these two local streets is 50'. Therefore, a minimum of 50' of ROW must be dedicated from tax lot 200 along the alignment per the proposed development. Additional ROW may be required.
c. The City's TSP identifies the future extension of Mt. Adams Ave., classified as a minor arterial. The required ROW for a minor arterial is 70' therefore, 70' of ROW must be dedicated from tax lot 200 along the alignment of the future extension of Mt Adams Ave. as identified in the City's TSP. Otherwise, the applicant shall either undertake to amend the City's TSP to provide an alternative route for the minor arterial or the applicant's development application shall enter into an administrative hold until the City has completed the City's TSP amendment process.

11. **General:** All City water, sanitary, and/or storm sewer pipes and appurtenances located outside of a dedicated public right of way must be located within a recorded easement on a form provided by the City. All easements must meet the requirements of the City Engineering Standards.

12. **General:** A representative of the design engineer, referred to as the Resident Engineer, shall be on site nearly every day throughout the construction of public/right of way (ROW) improvements in order to perform the duties of the Resident Engineer as described in the HRES. No exceptions will be made to this requirement, including allowing the Contractor to perform the RE's duties.

13. **General:** Improvement Agreements, when allowed, shall be per City Standard form. The Improvement Agreement obligates the applicant and their heirs, successors and assigns to pay for and/or construct the improvement at such time as the City requests. An Improvement Agreement must be recorded in the deed records of Hood River County before building permit authorization.

14. **General:** Waivers of Remonstrance are required and shall be per City Standard form. The waiver of remonstrance waives the applicant's and their heirs, successors and assigns' right to object to the formation of a local improvement district for any street improvements necessary now or in the future that benefit the subject tract of land, signed by the owner(s) of the tract. A waiver of remonstrance must be recorded in the deed records for Hood River County.

15. **General:** Any proposed design exception to the HRES should be discussed with the City Engineer prior to the plan submittal, followed by a written request explaining why the exception should be approved at the time of plan submittal. All approved design exceptions will be clearly listed on the cover sheet of the Final Approved Plans. It will be the Applicants responsibility to build the project consistent with the HRES unless specifically noted as a design exception on the cover sheet of the Final Approved Plans.

16. **General:** Separate permits may be required for all private improvements made under the jurisdiction of Building, Plumbing, Electrical or other Agencies requiring permits for work. Check with these departments prior to beginning any work regulated by specific codes enforced by those departments.

17. **General:** The Oregon Department of Environmental Quality requires a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) 1200 – C permit for all Planned Unit Developments (PUD) or projects that disturb one acre or more. Contact the Bend regional DEQ office at 541-388-6146 for permit application forms and more information.

18. **General:** A geotechnical report is required for all developments that propose significant structures, stormwater infiltration, the construction of public or private streets, are located in a geographic hazard zone, or in the opinion of the City Engineer soil conditions warrant geotechnical analysis. The preliminary geotechnical report provided has been reviewed for completeness only, this does not include a complete review of engineering specifications or other more specific requirements of the City, HRES and code specifications. A final geotechnical report shall be required that reflects the final engineering and site development proposal.

19. **General:** For all retaining walls and/or driveway bridges in or supporting the right-of-way please provide the following.

    a. Provide plans, profiles, cross sections, grading plans, elevations and calculations for all retaining wall improvements that are located or support improvements within the Public Right of Way.
    b. Calculations must prove adequacy of the wall system's ability to support normal traffic loadings for the areas being served.
    c. Whenever possible, walls and footings should be located outside of ROW. However, foundations of retaining walls may be allowed to be located within the ROW by Design Exception on a case-by-case situation. When Retaining walls are located parallel and adjacent to ROW lines it is the general rule that the entire stemwall portion of the wall be located outside of the ROW.
    d. Wall calculations should, at a minimum, be suitable to support a traffic surcharge loading of 220 psf.
    e. All walls shall be standalone retaining walls, not restrained, top or bottom.
    f. Wall shall meet all local seismic loading conditions.
    g. Wall designs should be suitable for the geotechnical report associated with the building permit.
    h. Please indicate how new walls will be adequate for future additions of sidewalks or frontage improvement along Sherman Ave. by note and be sure to show future sidewalk loading in supporting calculations.
    i. Please indicate how drainage will be routed from behind all to walls to the north. Show clear wall drainage routes.
    j. Plans should clearly note how utilities will be routed under or through the new wall improvements – if applicable. Will they be sleeved or protected or what minimum clearance beneath the wall will be required.

k. Please add base elevations for top and bottom of new walls on the profile or elevations with appropriate offsets and stationing along street frontage.
l. Provide typical sections for driveway at walls. Show minimum setbacks or restrictions for utilities running parallel to southern wall.
m. Show typical utility ditch compaction requirements for trenches within 5-ft from toe of retaining wall footings.
n. Driveway Approach Bridges and their foundations shall be designed according to OSSC requirements, or when no other design guidelines apply use appropriate AASHTO design guidelines.
o. All wall improvements located within or supporting the ROW must be stamped by a PE.

20. **Transportation:** The following findings and conclusions are based upon the City of Hood River City Engineer's review of a Memorandum dated August 26, 2020 and prepared by Doug Powrie, Attorney on behalf of Applicant IBC, for the IBC Subdivision; Nature's Way Vistas. The memorandum was prepared to determine if the proposed development and land use change was significant to trigger the State of Oregon's Transportation Planning Rule.

    a. The City Engineer concurs with Mr. Powrie's memorandum of August 26, 2020, stating that the proposed zoning change will have limited impact on the City's transportation system and does not trigger further investigation or transportation system planning.
    b. The City Engineer concurs with Mr. Powrie's conclusion that the traffic generated by the actual proposed development does not warrant additional traffic counts nor intersection level of service calculations.
    c. The City Engineer disagrees with Mr. Powrie's conclusion that the proposed site development does not impact the City's approved transportation system plan (TSP). Specifically the City Engineer finds that the proposed site development does not propose to provide accommodations for the future development of the minor arterial shown in the currently adopted TSP to connect Cascade Avenue to May Street. The minor arterial passes through the proposed development. The proponent has proposed to provide a lesser classification road through the development. As per OAR 17.08.050 B (1), this proposal effectively diminishes the capacity of the minor arterial called out in the City's TSP. The proposed plan significantly affects the transportation facility (minor arterial) by changing the functional classification of the planned facility. In addition, in providing a lower functional classification road, the plan will worsen the performance of an existing transportation facility (Cascade Avenue and 13th Street) that is otherwise projected to perform below the minimum acceptable performance standard within the 20 year planning horizon as identified in the City's TSP and as outlined in OAR 17.08.050 B (3) c. To mitigate the significant effects on the City's transportation facility, which the proposed development will cause, the applicant shall either undertake to amend the City's TSP to provide an alternative route for the much needed minor arterial or the applicant's development application shall enter into an administrative hold until the City has completed the City's TSP amendment process.

21. **Transportation:** A Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) will be required per HRMC 17.20.060 - Traffic Impact Analysis. The TIA provided has been reviewed for completeness only, this does not include a complete review of engineering specifications or other more specific requirements of the City, HRES and code specifications. Items missing from the TIA include the following.

    a. The site-access points and intersections adjacent to the proposed site were not included in the study area. These intersections include 30th St. @ Prospect Ave. and Montello Ave.
    b. Sight distance & sight distance triangles were not provided for the site-access points and intersections.

22. **Transportation:** Previous traffic reports have indicated that the intersections of Cascade Ave. @ Mt Adams Ave., Rand Rd., 20th St., and I-84 Exit 62 do not meet the City's minimum level of service. Therefore, these intersections do not provide adequate public facilities for the proposed development. To ascertain the impact from the development on these intersections, the TIA prepared by the applicant's traffic engineer shall calculate the additional trip ends generated by the proposed development passing through the Cascade Ave. @ Mt Adams Ave., Rand Rd., 20th St., and I-84 Exit 62 intersection. If the proposed development contributes trips through these intersections, the applicant must mitigate the development's impact to those intersections. One form of mitigation offered by the City is to pay a proportionate share for future improvements at those intersections due to the peak hour impact. Proportionate share fees provided are current as of the date of this document. The current fees at time of permit issuance shall apply.

    a. The proportionate share per trip generated through the Cascade Ave. and Mt. Adams intersection is $236
    b. The proportionate share per trip generated through the Cascade Ave. and Rand Rd. intersection is $566
    c. The proportionate share per trip generated through the Cascade Ave. and 20th St. intersection is $495
    d. The proportionate share per trip generated through the Cascade Ave. and I-84 Exit 62 WB ramp is $3,170

23. **Frontage Improvements:** The interior east-west street of the development will be designed and classified as a private alley. The final conditions must comply with the City Standards for alleys. The applicant will dedicate 20' for a public access easement. Improvements required by the applicant include 16' of pavement with 12" flush curbs on each side. Where alley abuts existing or proposed hard surfacing, alley pavement should tie into the flush curbs. Pedestrian access will be required. Coordination with Fire Department will be required regarding minimum fire apparatus access requirements to parcels accessed by these interior streets. The east west private alley shall connect to 30th St. via commercial driveway approach. The east west private alley shall connect to the public alley via 15 foot minimum allowable curb radius.

24. **Frontage Improvements:** The north-south street on the western property boundary of the development will be designed and classified as a public alley. The final conditions

must comply with the City Standards for alleys. The applicant will dedicate 20' for the required ROW. Improvements required by the applicant include 18' of pavement with 12" flush curbs on each side. Where alley abuts existing or proposed hard surfacing, alley pavement should tie into the flush curbs. Pedestrian access will be required. The north-south public alley shall connect to Montello Ave. and Prospect Ave. via 15 foot return curb radius. Full height curb on Prospect Ave. and Montello Ave. shall transition to zero exposure at the ADA curb ramps at these intersections.

25. **Frontage Improvements:** The City's TSP classifies 30th St. as a local street. The existing conditions are not compliant with the City Standards for local streets. The existing ROW is 44 feet. The Applicant shall be required to provide half street frontage improvements as outlined in the City's TSP, Figure 6E – Local Option A. The improvements required by the applicant shall include half street paving, 5' separated sidewalk, 5' planting strip, new curb and gutter, and provide new catch basin(s) aligned with the new curb line as required. Depending upon the condition of existing pavement, additional paving may be required as much as two feet (2') beyond the centerline or crown in the road. Street improvements shall be extended a minimum of 25 feet beyond the limits of the project when transitions to existing conditions are necessary.

    a. If the applicant intends to utilize the planting strip area for stormwater purposes additional ROW will be required to accommodate a nine foot (9') planting strip/swale and proposal must be approved by the City Engineering Department.

26. **Frontage Improvements:** The City's TSP classifies the extension of Montello Ave. as a local street. The required ROW dedication is 50'. The Applicant shall be required to provide full street frontage improvements as outlined in the City's TSP, Figure 6E – Local Option A. The improvements required by the applicant shall include full street paving, 5' separated sidewalk, 5' planting strip, new curb and gutter, and provide new catch basin(s) aligned with the new curb line as required.

    a. If the applicant intends to utilize the planting strip area for stormwater purposes additional ROW will be required to accommodate a nine foot (9') planting strip/swale and proposal must be approved by the City Engineering Department.

27. **Frontage Improvements:** The City's TSP classifies the extension of Prospect Ave. as a local street. The required ROW dedication is tbd, approximately 46-48'. The Applicant shall be required to provide full street frontage improvements as outlined in the City's TSP, Figure 6E – Local Option A. The Applicant shall be required to provide full street frontage improvements as outlined in the City's TSP, Figure 6E – Local Option A. The improvements required by the applicant shall include full street paving, 5' separated sidewalk, 5' planting strip, new curb and gutter, and provide new catch basin(s) aligned with the new curb line as required.

    a. If the applicant intends to utilize the planting strip area for stormwater purposes additional ROW will be required to accommodate a nine foot (9') planting strip/swale and proposal must be approved by the City Engineering Department.

28. **Frontage Improvements:** The City's TSP identifies Motor Vehicle System Project #4, the future extension of Mt. Adams Ave. between Country Club Rd. and Fairview Dr. The City's TSP classifies future Mt. Adams Rd. as a minor arterial. The applicant shall dedicate 70 feet of ROW to the City per the alignment identified in the TSP. The Applicant shall be required to provide full frontage improvements as outlined in the City's TSP, Figure 6C – Minor Arterial. The improvements required by the applicant shall include separated sidewalk, planting strip, new curb and gutter, paving, and provide new catch basin(s) aligned with the new curb line as required.

29. **Frontage Improvements:** In order to comply with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) regulations, the City has adopted a policy dictating that sidewalks, including intervening driveway approaches, be completed in full by the developer. Federal law prohibits partially completed sidewalks. Damage incurred during the course of construction must be repaired prior to final acceptance.

30. **Frontage Improvements:** The commercial driveway approach for the private alley connection to 30th St. shall be designed per the HRES and the design of the approach wings shall be detailed with grades and elevations. The approach shall meet ADA compliance. One (1) curb cut with a maximum driveway approach throat width of 29 feet will be allowed per HRMC 13.28.030 – Permit Issuance for Driveways. The width of the wings and transitions shall be adequate to meet all ADA requirements. Driveway approaches to be completed at the time of building construction, as a condition of permit issuance.

31. **Frontage Improvements:** The driveway approaches for the northern lots off Montello Ave. shall be designed per the HRES and the design of the approach wings shall be detailed with grades and elevations. The approach shall meet ADA compliance. Curb cut and maximum approach width per HRMC 13.28.030 – Permit Issuance for Driveways. Driveway approaches to be completed at the time of building construction, as a condition of permit issuance.

32. **Frontage Improvements:** Provide ADA curb ramps as necessary. At a minimum, all curb ramps will be required to meet current ADA standards at intersection of 30th St., Prospect Ave., Montello Ave., and the north-south public alley. Provide a bi-directional ADA curb ramp to the east and south on the NW corner of Prospect Ave. & 30th St. intersection. Provide a single directional ADA curb ramp to the west on the NE corner of Prospect Ave. & north-south public alley intersection. Provide a bi-directional ADA curb ramp to the east and south on the NW corner of Montello Ave. & 30th St. intersection. Provide a bi-directional ADA curb ramp to the east and north on the SW corner of Montello Ave. & 30th St. intersection. Provide a single directional ADA curb ramp to the west on the SW corner of Prospect Ave. & north-south public alley intersection. A total of eight (8) ADA curb ramps.

33. **Frontage Improvements:** Street Trees shall be required per the HRMC 16.12.050 – Street Trees at a spacing of 30 feet on center. Please refer to the City's approved street tree list.

34. **Frontage Improvements:** Per the HRES, street lighting is required at intersections, mid-block, and at a maximum spacing of 300 feet. Street light shielding, and intensity shall comply the City of Hood River Standards. Contractor to install Pacific Power standard base. Applicant to coordinate purchase and installation of street light with the Public Works Department and Pacific Power.

35. **Public Streets:** Access spacing for local streets (30th St., Montello Ave., and Prospect Ave.) require a minimum separation between driveways and other driveways of 34 feet between adjacent edge of driveway throats and the minimum distance for local street driveway from an intersection shall be 28 feet from the end of the curb return to the nearest edge of driveway throat(s). Access spacing for local streets require a minimum separation of 200 feet between public streets, as described in the HRMC 13.28.040 – Driveways and Public Street Access Spacing Standards, Table 13.28, and the HRES section 7.2C

36. **Public Streets:** Access spacing for minor arterials (future Mt. Adams Ave.) require a minimum separation between driveways and other driveways or public streets of 300 feet and 660-1,000 feet between public streets, as described in the HRMC 13.28.040 – Driveways and Public Street Access Spacing Standards, Table 13.28.

37. **Public Streets:** At the intersection of two (2) local streets, the minimum allowable curb radius shall be 20 feet, measured from the radius point to face of curb. For the intersection of a local street with any collector or arterial, the minimum radius shall be 25 feet. On all other intersections, the minimum allowable radius shall be 30 feet.

38. **Public Streets:** The ROW/property line shall have a minimum corner radius of 20 feet.

39. **Public Streets:** All utility street cuts must be repaved with a minimum of four inches (4") or match existing asphalt depth, whichever is greater. Depending on the number of street cuts and the percentage of the existing street surface being disturbed, the City Engineer may require the applicant to grind and repave the entire frontage with a two inch (2") asphalt overlay. See the HRES section 7.2O for more information.

40. **Public/Private Streets:** If allowed, inverse crowned streets shall have a concrete turnpike to facilitate paving. Catchbasins proposed on inverse crowned streets shall be high capacity concave vaned grate. Neenah Manufacturer (R-3362-L) or approved equal. Catchbasins will need to be custom built or use standard catchbasin with a poured in place channel that will accept the concave grate and connect to catchbasin.

41. **Private Streets:** All private streets shall be built to public street subgrade standards.

42. **Stormwater:** A stormwater management plan as described in the HRES will be required for this development. Water quality treatment applies to all pollution generating surfaces, existing and new. Water quality treatment is not required for infiltration systems receiving roof runoff from one single family home, but detention requirements must be met. Water quantity treatment requirements apply to all impervious surfaces, new and existing, including runoff from existing streets. Underground detention/infiltration

systems with a connection to the conveyance system are allowed, but not preferred. Except for roof drains, no underground detention/infiltration system will be allowed without an overflow connection to the public conveyance system. The City encourages low impact development methods such as small swales/rain gardens for the treatment and small storm detention and porous pavements throughout the site to reduce stormwater management requirements. Include all required infiltration testing per Appendix G of the HRES.

a. The preliminary concept of stormwater management has been deemed as feasible by the City Engineer. A determination of feasible by the City Engineer does not constitute approval of the final engineering. Prior to site development permit issuance, the final grading/site plan, stormwater report, and calculations shall be reviewed for compliance with the HRES and applicable code specifications at the time of engineered plan review, construction site/ROW permit application, and/or building permit application. Please refer to the HRES to ensure all requirements are met.
b. During final engineering and pond sizing it remains a possibility that a lot may be lost to provide adequate area for the stormwater facilities.

43. **Stormwater:** The existing 15" City stormwater infrastructure located in 30th St. is undersized for current existing conditions. Therefore, tax lot 200 has inadequate public stormwater facilities and shall be addressed accordingly. The applicant shall construct adequate stormwater infrastructure per the COHR Stormwater Master Plan.

a. The COHR Stormwater Master Plan identifies CIP #26. The portion of the project required for development includes approximately 424 feet of 24" along 30th St. from the existing manhole north of May St. to the existing manhole at Montello Ave and approximately 275 feet of 24" along 30th St. from the existing manhole at Montello Ave. to the existing manhole at Eugene St. However, the entire CIP #26 and CIP#4 must be completed in full to obtain a connection to the City stormwater system in 30th St. The completion of CIP#4 relies on coordination with applicable property owners.
b. Please refer to the HRES section 7.2O – Pavement Grind and Replacement for street standards beyond the frontage of tax lot 200.

44. **Stormwater:** The COHR Stormwater Master Plan identifies DP #10 (see attached). The portion of the project required for development includes 12" pipe along the extension of Montello Ave. from a new manhole west of 30th St. and Montello Ct. to the western property boundary of tax lot 200.

a. Option 1: Obtain a drainage easement with tax lot 400 and provide full dispersion across tax lot 400.
b. Option 2: Applicant must obtain an easement and coordinate with tax lot 400 to build the entire DP#10 project and construct a temporary outfall to the open channel until DP#5 and 6 are completed.

45. **Stormwater:** Catch basins must be located so that runoff does not flow across intersections and are at a maximum spacing of 300 feet between flow paths. Verify all inlets can adequately accept the 10-year storm event runoff, from their contributing area, without pooling.

46. **Water:** City water is available in 30th St. and the connection should be made to the 10" water line. The developer shall field verify the potential connection configuration to ensure there is no conflict with existing pipes. The water line must be constructed to City Standards, be eight inch (8") minimum, and dedicated to the City. Waterlines not located in a public ROW must be located within a 20 foot easement dedicated to the City. Maintain a minimum ten foot (10') separation from sewer lines and a minimum two foot (2') separation between all utilities in the ROW. The water line must be looped through the development and shall be in a dedicated easement under an all-weather drivable surface.

    a. The COHR Water Master Plan identifies a Near Term Developer Project for a 10" waterline constructed from the intersection of 30th St. and Prospect Ave. to the western edge of tax lot 200.
    b. Applicant shall extend an 8" waterline down proposed Montello Ave. to the western property boundary and loop an 8" waterline through the north-south street from Montello Ave. to the 10" waterline required in Prospect Ave.

47. **Sanitary Sewer:** Public sanitary sewer is not available for tax lot 200. Public sanitary sewer is available in 30th St. south of tax lot 200. The Applicant shall extend the existing eight inch (8") gravity sanitary sewer main from the existing manhole and should field verify the potential connection configuration to ensure there is no conflict with existing pipes. The sanitary sewer shall be extended the full length of the frontage along tax lot 200. Maintain a minimum ten foot (10') separation from water line and a minimum two foot (2') separation between all utilities in the ROW. Sewer laterals collecting more than one service must be public facilities and shall be placed in a dedicated easement within an all-weather drivable surface. In general sewer lines should be designed at a depth that accommodates standard manholes, cones sections, and frames and covers with grade rings. This usually necessitates a minimum cover of around five feet (5').

    a. Applicant shall extend an 8" sanitary sewer down proposed Montello Ave. to serve the lots fronting Montello Ave. The line shall extend to the western property boundary and terminate at a manhole.
    b. Applicant shall extend an 8" sanitary sewer down proposed Proposect Ave. to serve the lots fronting Prospect Ave. The line shall extend to the western property boundary and terminate at a manhole.

Thank you,

Devry Bell
City of Hood River Engineering

Riston Andrews
City of Hood River Engineering