

# Exhibit R1

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: Friday, January 6, 2023 5:16 PM  
To: Planning Department <PlanningDepartment@ci.florence.or.us>  
Cc: [REDACTED]  
Subject: Comments/questions for January 10, 2023 Meeting

My name is Sylvia Duran and I live with my husband, Joe Wilson, at 4131 Dunbar Way, Florence, Or 97439 in Fairway Estates. I plan to attend your meeting on January 10, 2023 and would appreciate your consideration of the questions below that I am sending to you in advance.

Regarding Resolutions PC 21 39 SUB 03 and PC 21 40 PUD 02 and Tentative Subdivision and AR 21 21 SIR 14 (Site Investigation Report).

#### 1. Traffic Questions:

A. Background: There have been 2 traffic impact studies done, one in 2015/2016 by Fred Wright Consulting and one in 2022 by Sandow Engineering. Neither report found any mitigation necessary. Sandow actually added in additional needs of Phase II and growth projections through 2029. The most recent study focused on the intersection at 35th and Rhododendrum, but I am unsure if the study included the entry to Fairway Estates (FE).

Question: Can you advise whether the entrance to Fairway Estates was considered?

B. Background: The FE entrance is impacted by oncoming northbound cars driving fast near the Coast Guard Road and the FE gate. There is a blind spot that creates a traffic hazard with these northbound oncoming vehicles.

With 80 more homes and residents in PII, and only one gate to service, it may end up being a concern for entrance and exit. Under the statute, the Planning Director can determine that a Traffic Impact Study is necessary because adjacent neighborhoods and other areas will be adversely impacted by proposed development.

Question/s: Did the traffic impact study address the ingress/egress at the FE gate? If not, can we request that the Planning Director determine another limited study is necessary?

2. Final Staff Report - Phase II: I am asking to be copied in on the final staff report for Phase II when available. By statute it should be available to the public 7 days after the Notice of Decision is provided.

According to statute I must ask to be copied in and included in the distribution.

Question: How can the public access both Phase I and Phase II Final Staff Reports? Are Staff Reports available electronically?

3. Wetlands. There is an original proposed development plan for PII.

Question: Has it been amended to address the wetlands and where can we access it?

Question: Is there replatting for the PII development? Is it available to the public? Question: Has the State Lands Commission approved any wetlands mitigation offered by the developer

4. Timelines: According to statute, final development plans for PII is supposed to be approved within 2 years after PI was approved.

Question: Has it been extended?

Question: When is the final approval expected?

5. Oversizing: By statute (10-36-3 [D]) for development in phases, subsequent infrastructure such as water, sewer and drainage is to be taken into consideration during the previous development.

Question: Was oversized required in PI to accommodate the needs of PII?

6. Gate between SandPines West and Fairway Estates on Royal St. George Drive.

Background: There is a gate between SP West and FE where SP West has both ingress and egress access. FE has no access. In the original easement/staff reports, the City encouraged SP West to allow access but did not require it. To date, FE has not been able to negotiate an amendment to the Easement that would allow access to FE residents. What is the process to have the City reevaluate this gate usage due to the increased residential traffic from PII (80 more homes) and the need for an emergency exit in the event of fire, tsunami or earthquake? FE does not have a designated emergency exit.

Your time and consideration is appreciated.

Thank you,

Sylvia Duran, homeowner - FairWay Estates Phase 1.



# Exhibit R2

Florence Planning Department/Traffic

Tom Faber

Concerning the Fairway Estates Phase 2-3-4

4205 Caddington Ln Florence

I was looking at the Traffic Study provided with the original application for approval for preliminary PUD, tentative subdivision and associated SIR for Fairway Estates Phases 2-3-4 and have a few questions. As I opened the Traffic Study as an attachment and the cover sheet showing as page 1 of the attachment my questions began with the data on;

Pg. 9 it's a table regarding crashes but the asterisk at the bottom indicates "crashes/million entering vehicles". Were they looking at crash rate percentage of how many cars out of a million? Is it reasonable to believe that there has not been any type of crash in the last 5 years at Rhododendron and 35<sup>th</sup>?

Pg. 15 Re: in progress development..."To be conservative a growth rate of 1% was used". Should the growth rate used have been conservative? Is it realistic? Is it unfairly low to the developer's advantage?

Pg. 24 Re: findings..The addition of the development does not trigger mitigation....does not increase queuing conditions. The site accesses (pl) will operate safely. The site will have safe and adequate access for pedestrians and bicycles to and within the site. They are referring to 35<sup>th</sup> and Rhododendron! It is definitely not safe to walk or bike from there to Tournament. There are no improvements, no bicycle lane or sidewalk and the weedy area is dangerous to dogs, bike tires and people's feet. It is loaded with "goat heads"! Are these findings conclusive based on accurate and reasonable data?

Pg. 31 The city referenced is Veneta Date Feb 2022

Pg. 35 The city referenced is Veneta Date Feb 2022

Pg. 41 The city referenced is Florence Date August 2020 (covid restrictions)

Pg. 45 The city referenced is Florence Date October 2022 All the above data was used in the same study. Is this data consistent and reliable?

Pg. 52 The Seasonal trends table includes the following foot note refers to covid conditions and states, "The 2020 table is based on 2019". Then 2020 should not have been used in the study anywhere.

Pg. 54-57 Estimated trip distribution date August 27 2020 see above question.

Pg. 59-109 queuing and blocking report of fifty pages based on the dates of Jan 5<sup>th</sup> 2022 ( Sunday) and Jan 6<sup>th</sup> 2022 (Monday) Is this a reasonable time frame for this study?

I am not a Traffic Engineer, just a common lay person and this report left me confused and questioning its validity. I feel fortunate that I can rely on those persons at the Traffic Department to look this study over and confirm its validity or that I am just a lay person and totally misinterpreted it.

Thank You

Tom Faber





# Exhibit R3

To the Florence Planning Commission

Concerning Fairway Estates Phases 2-3-4

Tom Faber

Florence Or. 97439

I am writing today to ask the Planning Commissioners to deny the application seeking approvals for the preliminary PUD, tentative subdivision and associated SIR for Fairway Estates Phases 2-3-4. The Fairway Estates at Sand Pines West project has been in development for almost 20 years. It has had multiple developers and changes over that time. It has also had multiple issues. It is in the best interest that the developer, the city and the prospective home purchasers all have a clear understanding of the requirements and expectations. The current application fails to meet the criteria of several sections of the Florence City Code as listed below and should be corrected before continuing.

#### Chapter 34 and subsets (Preserving the Natural Beauty of Florence)

Is the development going to conserve, enhance and be compatible with the Coastal Village Character of Florence? While the original plat included substantial areas of natural beauty, the current proposal indicates continuing with the clear cutting (a majority has been done, purportedly in error already. Any future vegetation clearing permits should follow 10-34-2 and include a Type 2 review to avoid violations of 10-1-1-6-2). The proposed plat has maximized the areas for homes but eliminated all the features that give Florence its character, including Open Space.

#### Chapter 10-1-1-3

The City of Florence' definition of Open Space states they "may include natural lands such as wetlands". There is an area that has been researched and defined as a wetland in the northeast corner. The developer has applied for a Removal-Fill permit. Denying that permit will encourage preserving the natural beauty and provide an opportunity to include the wetland in the required recreational Open Space, 10-23-5. The application also contains language regarding the "nature trails connections" shown as running along the rear of most properties including those on the west side adjacent to the Mariners Village neighborhood. This area is currently a well-developed living "Green Screen" separating the two developments. The applicant is indicating they will cut down portions of the vegetation to create these "nature trail connections". Attempting to walk/hike directly behind multiple homes will result in a sense of trespassing as we disturb those people's privacy and pets. It is apparent that the residents will not be willing to use these "connections". Residents in Phase1 and their future neighbors in Phases 2-3-4 will continue to use the sidewalks and streets to walk to get their mail, to stop and visit with their neighbors who are sitting on their front porches and to walk their pets. This makes us a village. We need an Open Space that is inviting, easily accessible, including for strollers, folks with walking aids and even wheelchairs. The developer may have to give up a prime lot or two but the result will be a more attractive, desirable and livable neighborhood that complies with the City's clear requirements.

The Oregon Planning Commissioner Handbook explains that Planning is about making decisions. Those judgements may be about community priorities, or about housing needs, natural resource protection, or appropriate widths for local streets. Whatever the content of the decision, they are primarily about making effective, efficient, and appropriate determinations that achieve the desired results. Planning is



therefore a decision-making process. I hope that you will seriously consider the things I've written here and encourage the developer to make our "Pocket Park" a reality. The "Nancy Pearson Park" has a nice ring to it.

Thomas M. Faber

**From:** Renee LoPilato  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 07, 2023 2:28 PM  
**To:** Planning Department  
**Subject:** Fwd: Fairway Estates Phase 2 Review on Jan. 10

## Exhibit R4

Below are comments submitted for consideration by the city staff of the Planning Dept. before the Jan. 10th meeting whose agenda includes the review of the Preliminary PUD and the Tentative Subdivision Plan of Phases 2-4 for Fairway Estates:

1. Since April, 2022, my wife and I have lived at 410 Tournament Drive in Fairway Estates Phase 1. Phases 2-4 propose a similar development of expensive, custom homes of 42 houses; given the stated wishes of both the citizens of Florence and the city council's often repeated need for "affordable housing" within city limits, I urge the Planning Dept. to either block or reduce the size of these second phases.
2. The current traffic analysis for Phases 2-4 does not include the dozens of daily trips by contractors, construction workers, cement trucks, and all the other required personnel to sell, develop and service a development of this size over the next few years. As currently proposed, all of us already here, and all of those entering and exiting from the adjacent Sandpines West HOA and all future traffic have only one access and exit through the gate at the end of Tournament Drive. In the event of one lightning strike, one fire, tsunami or a necessary evacuation, all of us will be trapped at the front gate accessing Rhododendron Drive. I strongly suggest an updated analysis by the city staff to include these factors.
3. It appears that Phases 2-4 do not offer any access to open spaces, bike paths or nature trails for future residents. That is also consistent with the development of Phase 1.
4. It appears that there has been extensive removal of native trees and shrubs by the developers in violation of city codes. How will sand/soil be prevented from blowing across the 10 acre lot into new homes and into nearby developments that surround the new development? Can the planning department require replanting of that landscape to contain soil erosion, expand carbon sinking and offer some mitigation to offset habitat destruction?

Lastly, we thank the city Planning Department and staff for their comprehensive review and careful scrutiny of this proposed development and look forward to watching the process go forward.

Renee LoPilato

Karen Stanley



Florence OR. 97439

(Fairway Estates Phase 1)

**From:** Nancy Rhodes  
**Sent:** Sunday, January 08, 2023 4:17 PM  
**To:** Planning Department  
**Subject:** January 10 meeting re Fairway Estates

**Exhibit R5**

Attn: Planning Department or Wendy Farley Campbell

I want to confirm that the January 10 scheduled meeting to discuss Fairway Estates is still on the agenda. Please let me know if it again gets postponed. Thank you.

Also, I tried to find the planning details for the FE planned walking path but wasn't able to find anything I could read. There is too much to sort through and many of the Exhibits were shrunk so small (Like Exhibit D) I couldn't read them.

I am concerned about the location of the walking path. I want to confirm it will not utilize any of their 20-ft green belt. My understanding is that Mariners has a 10-ft green belt and Fairway Estates has a 20-ft green belt. Therefore, I want to make sure said walking path will be no closer than 30-ft from my property line, AND will not interfere with drainage on either property.

I am also concerned (as I expressed at the November meeting) that the developer doesn't clear trees and vegetation in unauthorized areas - as he did with Phase I.

Thank you for your kind attention.

Nancy Rhodes  
[Redacted]