

**From:** [Debra Fisher](#)  
**To:** [planningdepartment](#); [seawatch\\_hoa@yahoo.com](mailto:seawatch_hoa@yahoo.com)  
**Subject:** Resolution PC-20\_07-PUD-01  
**Date:** Thursday, August 27, 2020 2:14:38 PM

---

Darryl & Debra Fisher  
22 Sea Watch  
Florence Or 97439

Dear City Of Florence,

We still have a lot of concerns with this proposed project. Here are some questions we would like addressed in your process that we would like asked before this is represented again on Sept 8th.

1. Will what was recommend from GSI Water solutions be heeded? They said no storm water is to leave the site. What we heard from the developers expert is they addressed this but GSI Water Solutions said different. How are we as a community at Sea Watch Estates to be assured that the water drainage plan will not jeopardize our homes in anyway from their project? And most importantly, is there a way to actually achieve what GSI Water Solutions is recommending? If this cannot be done there is no reason to entertain the idea of putting the project in at all.

2. Fairway estates have preserved the existing vegetation on the frontage of Rhododendron drive except in the front gate area for obvious reasons. Are you as a board at least going to make it a condition that at the very least for continuity that they are to do the same as Fairway Estates? Planting "native plants" will never be the same as leaving a preserved amount of frontage vegetation. It will look so ugly and out of place and as we stated before will ruin the integrity of our beautiful scenic corridor.

3. The impression we got from the meeting that if this is done in two "phases" then it seems that the traffic and the water situation would be relaxed. Is this a true assessment?

4. We changed our CC&Rs to not allow short term rentals. We had one here and it caused a lot of issues here from brawls and excessive parking issues, to garbage left out for the bears to get into to noise and lots of police calls. As Mercedes presented in the meeting this is suppose to be more housing for the folks in the community. She also said that they have nothing planned to be implemented to restrict vacation rentals in their CC&R's. This would be counter productive to our community if this will become a vacation rental resort to supplement out of town golfers to the community. Will you make this a condition if approved?

5. Lastly the traffic report was so poorly done this is going to cause so many issues for this stretch of road. The issue of the report not addressing Coast guard station road is huge! Will you make a condition that the road is either widened for three lanes which is also dangerous with two blind curves and a left hand turn lane with a traffic light to

**Exhibit L34**

Coast guard station road? There are homes on Rhody that have a hard time getting on to the road now. Please consider we have a Coast Guard Station that also uses this road and also this is a local tsunami zone but also other disasters such as fire ect, should be taken into consideration. We are in a retirement community its unrealistic to think people will not try and drive out of here. A good majority of this community are not capable of walking out to safety in the event of a major earthquake or any other disasters . Another concern is the speed at which people travel on Rhody is a big concern. We suggest maybe putting in those yellow grids to slow down the traffic if this project is approved and a third lane and/ or multiple traffic lights. There is a major traffic issue now. It will be magnified greatly by the addition of this project and where it is located on a main outlet. This is going to cause more burden. Please protect us here, your decisions are life changing as we foresee that it could be deadly.

Thank You for your time,

Darryl & Debra Fisher

cc: Sea Watch Estate HOA

**From:** [Kelli Weese](#)  
**To:** [Dylan Huber-Heidorn](#); [Roxanne Johnston](#); [Wendy Farley-Campbell](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Meeting Aug 25  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 01, 2020 10:36:08 AM

---

FYI - Kelli

---

**From:** Kathryn clark <kathryn85768@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 31, 2020 7:01 PM  
**To:** Kelli Weese <kelli.weese@ci.florence.or.us>  
**Subject:** Meeting Aug 25

I enjoyed the Planning Commission Meeting of Aug. 25.

I thought the commission did a great job addressing some of the issues facing the surrounding neighborhoods.

I myself have had experience in negotiations and after listening to the rebuttals that were given, I must say I really feel the commission is being lead down the rosy path.

I don't feel that the traffic issue can be resolved in that area. There does not appear to be enough available space to improve the current roads in a manner that would support a community of the type which is being presented.

The issue of emergency evacuation can in no way be resolved with the current road conditions. The amount of people which is projected to be living in that area would never be able to evacuate using the current roads. Major improvements would be necessary if it is even possible.

Thanks for listening

Kathryn

**From:** [Eva Pinkavova](#)  
**To:** [planningdepartment](#)  
**Subject:** Resolution PC 20 07 PUD 01 & Resolution PC 20 08 SUB 01-Tentative Subdivision (SUB) Plat  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 01, 2020 6:54:44 PM

---

I watched the public hearing on August 25, 2020 re: Resolution PC 20 07 PUD 01 & Resolution PC 20 08 SUB 01-Tentative Subdivision (SUB) Plat, and I would like to make some comments based on what I heard.

I greatly appreciate that the Planning Commission has asked for a better Transport Impact Analysis and Stormwater management plan from the applicant and that the hearing will resume on September 8<sup>th</sup>, 2020. I recognize that you have a difficult job balancing the current and future needs of our City and the community. In principle I am in favor of appropriate workforce housing in our City.

Unfortunately, I believe the proposed location of this high density development is problematic for two reasons:

1. Rhododendron Drive is the only access road for all other planned development communities north of 35<sup>th</sup> St. and there are no other roads connecting this area to HWY 101 until Heceta Beach Rd. much further north.
2. There is currently no effective way of managing stormwater in this area during periods of high rainfall, such as the winter of 2016/2017.

For these reason I believe that the Planning Commission should not grant many of the 10 modifications requested, especially the "increased density" modification and the related necessary reductions in lot size, ROW, reduced width of the multi-use path on Rhododendron Dr. and so on. The development should be reduced by about 15 units to keep to the medium density code limit of 12 units per acre. Fewer units would reduce the volume of traffic and allow space for a turn lane or similar on Rhododendron Dr. and space for more effective stormwater management.

I heard the applicant say words to the effect that future traffic created by future development is not their problem. Nevertheless, it is an issue that the City needs to consider and resolve. Once these homes are built, it will not be possible to widen Rhododendron Dr. when traffic volumes increase. If the City plans to continue to allow further construction in communities north of 35<sup>th</sup> & Rhododendron Dr., now is the time to anticipate and make allowance for higher traffic volumes. If the City believes that high density housing is required now, then I suggest that high density developments should be located in areas which are already zoned accordingly and have adequate street access and stormwater drains.

Thank you for your consideration of these issues.

Sincerely,

Eva Pinkavova

60 Spyglass Ln.

Mariners Village

Tel: 541-991-7187



**From:** [Steve WILLIAMS](#)  
**To:** [planningdepartment](#)  
**Subject:** Coast Guard Rd. Info  
**Date:** Thursday, August 27, 2020 10:35:31 AM

---

Re: Resolution PC 20 07 PUD 01 Rhododendron Drive  
From: Steve Williams, 18 Sea Watch Place, Florence, OR 97439  
bc: Sea Watch Hearing Grp.

Subject: Additional information concerning the intersection of Coast Guard Road and Rhododendron Drive

To the Planning Commision: (request cc to Jim Hanks - peer review - if appropriate)

In the meeting of Aug 8th, the developer TIA person made several statements:

1.  
The intersection of Coast Guard road and Rhododendron has issues - probably related to the angle of approach.
2.  
The TIA did not address these because there would be no significant traffic from the development going Northbound.
3.  
The TIA is a qualitative study, not a safety analysis. Safety is a City issue.

We'd agree with #1. The intersection does have issues - mainly safety.

We disagree with #2.

Again, the developer has not considered the traffic pattern to the recreational areas just 2 miles to the north (Beaches, River views, ocean view restaurant, etc). People living in the new development (with little to no yards) will want to get out and do something - and with so much 5 minutes away to the north, they will.

Also, anyone going North on Hwy 101 will probably use the Rhododendron to Heceta route.

Estimating from our own population:

The regular North traffic would be about 5-8%.

Our estimate of Weekend traffic to the North would be 35% for each weekend day or 9.8% total traffic. That would be 14-18% of total traffic heading North, conservatively.

I'm sure this figure could be debated. Also, the developer regards this as a non issue. But I have to ask - did the TIA give any logic why they could discount the North bound traffic totally?

We at Sea Watch believe that the main threat is the left hand turn issues -getting rear ended and blocking traffic in total going north. This could be resolved with a left hand turn lane so we could safely pull out of the traffic stream and wait, without impacting others.

To do this (either now or in the future), the City could ask for a road easement from the Development to allow enough space to put in a turn lane in the future. That would keep the remediation options open for a solution should this become an issue related to the Development or future traffic growth from other developments North.

If not done now, there would be no way to fix this later.

We think this would be a practical approach for all, especially with the issues of the TIA and lack of real data. We would also suggest a 3 lane easement from 35th to Coast Guard. Most of the PUD entrances have a deceleration area for their entrances to allow cars to quickly get off a 40 mph traffic flow and not get rear ended or impede others.

The need for these will be evident on occupancy.

Left hand turns (or lack of) from the East to get on Rhododendron going south are an issue. My Brother-in-law was in the left hand queue at 35th and Rhododendron three deep - it took 10 minutes to get through. Granted it was Sunday, but things are getting congested out here. 82% of the traffic of the new development will be facing this issue without a left turn lane. People will be pushed to take chances to get to work, accidents will happen.

Hope the City will consider.

Sincerely, Steve Williams - Sea Watch HOA

PS Note:

Our Hearing group works as a collaborative effort so we don't flood the planning commission with redundancy of 15 responses on the same subject. I use a BC to avoid "reply all" issues. I've been coordinating to date, and redistribute city responses to the group. Hope this works for the City.





**From:** [Robin Sullivan](#)  
**To:** [Roxanne Johnston](#)  
**Cc:** [Wendy Farley-Campbell](#)  
**Subject:** PUD at 35th and Rhododendron  
**Date:** Thursday, September 03, 2020 12:58:20 PM

---

“Neither Pity nor Charity can inspire the acts of Government. The interests of the Community as a whole must direct them.” W.S. Churchill

Our concerns to date have been about traffic, but as we have had more time to reflect on what is being proposed by APIC (Asia Pacific Investment Corporation) and the many letters, editorials and newspaper reports, there are some other issues for consideration.

1. To erect 126 homes of various sizes on 9 acres of land and to believe that you can also provide a pavilion, picnic areas, play area, walking trails, dog park, pocket gardens, alleyways for at least 200 people is delusional. And, where will visitors cars be parked assuming a one-car parking space is provided for owners/users?
2. Mr. Harklerode, current president of Florence Habitat for Humanity believes that this PUD will provide decent affordable housing in Florence - we all agree there is a shortage. The mission of FHFH is to provide decent affordable housing. Elenor is a past-president of FHFH and sincerely believes everyone has a right to decent affordable housing, but from what we are to believe from APIC this PUD is not an altruistic gesture to the City of Florence but it is a ‘for profit’ development. The razing of existing flora is distressing!
3. With at least 126 cars driving in and out each day, children will neither be able to learn to ride their bikes in the neighborhood nor play in the street with friends - activities so very American.

Planning Commissioners, please consider the delightful City of Florence before you approve this concrete development to be put in place.

Thank you for your consideration and sincerely,

Richard and Elenor Sullivan  
1 Sea Watch Place  
Florence

Sent from my iPad

From: [Steve WILLIAMS](#)  
To: [planningdepartment](#)  
Subject: Traffic / Drainage  
Date: Sunday, August 30, 2020 2:51:12 PM

---

Re: Resolution PC 20 07 PUD 01 Rhododendron Drive  
From: Steve Williams, 18 Sea Watch Place, Florence, OR 97439  
bc: Sea Watch Hearing Grp.

Subject: Followup - Fisher submission.

Dear Planning Department,

We distributed Debra Fisher's submission as she is a part of our group and watched the whole hearing that some had missed.

From our group, I have received some comments from people who wanted to add issues related to Debra's submission and are also very interested in any responses she gets from the City.

**Traffic (please forward to Mr. Hanks - peer review - if appropriate)**

It was noticed that traffic counters were put out on Rhododendron, and a few days later they were removed approximately 11:45 am Friday. Our concern is that no weekend traffic flows are being evaluated. Again, because of the recreational areas depending on Rhododendron for access, this has a significant impact on traffic flows. Weekend traffic is very noticeably increased compared to weekdays.

The Wilson's ask me to relay this to the City regarding traffic considerations (paraphrased)- **"The utmost regard should go to the Coast Guard operation logistics. They are our first responders, many also work as volunteers for fire and rescue - what happens if they are delayed from traffic trying to provide services to the City in an emergency ?"**.

Again the issue came up on why our Intersection of Rhododendron and Coast Guard is excluded from the TIA. It does not even reference that there is a critical HomeLand Security operation impacted. South Bound traffic waiting to make a left hand turn into the development will stop all traffic until the turn is made (plus a deceleration factor). Would it not make sense to consider a design that would give a path to 35th street (and on to the hospital) to be as traffic efficient as possible. Should it at least be looked at as a factor in the TIA?

**Drainage**

From what we heard discussed at the beginning of the meeting Aug. 25th, was that

the City (Mr. Miller) was aware of the situation and was taking steps with GSI. ,which we greatly appreciate. We thank the City for receiving our information and how it may relate to Title 9 chapter 5-3-2-D.

If this is going to be contested by APIC, we can supply the City and with additional information and Geologic reports to support our position. We also have some information from the Coast Guard and how the clearing of Fairway Estates affected them and how it was remediated. - Please let us know if this is needed.

Sincerely, Steve Williams, Sea Watch