

Clare Kurth

From: Bill Tuft [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, April 30, 2023 2:20 PM
To: Planning Department
Subject: Fairway Estates phases 2 3 4 concerns.

Safety of residents.

We need a second exit. If for some reason it is not possible at the beginning of phase 2 then the developer needs to leave dedicated space for a proper auto and pedestrian gate on the north end. The safety of current and future residents is of the upmost importance.

Road damage

Residents of phase one are concerned with the damage to existing streets by the damage by construction equipment going through our streets. Who will be responsible for the repair of the streets. Why not install a construction road from rhododendron street to the north end of phase 2 3 4.

Poor Planning

The plan submitted for the north east corner of phases 2 3 4 is not workable. You have 2 home sites with driveways that end at the proposed pedestrian walking path to the not developed city park. In the case of an emergency a walking path/trail is not sufficient. There are too many homes north of 35th street off of rhododendron. There needs to be a road that goes through from rhododendron thru the proposed city park and connect to 48th and oak street at Fred Meyer. Phase 2 3 4 could connect to that new street. Let us plan for the future.

William Tuft
Caddington Lane
Sent from my iPad

Clare Kurth

From: Cynthia Lloyd-tuft [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, April 30, 2023 2:10 PM
To: Planning Department
Subject: Fairway estates phase 2,3,4

As a resident of Fairway Estates phase 1 I have concerns.

1. The safety of the current residents not having a second gated exit. A full functioning gate with remote entry device accessible. Currently to exit onto Rhododendron to 35th would be impossible in case of an emergency of any kind with the number of home off Rhododendron.
2. The traffic impact report is over 2 years old. There have been more homes built. And more homes in process. This report is not an accurate report of current traffic. Or done during the tourist season with more cars 3. The impact of traffic and large equipment in the current residential area. And the time lines of all the disruption. We have new and expensive landscaping in most yard that will be subjected to sand and dirt blowing. Making our efforts to have a nice neighborhood impossible. There should be a solution that will have the least impact on current residents. The ability to put in a temporary construction road on the north side to be used until phases 2,3,4 are completed. With a permanent gate and fencing. Possible by that time a permanent road will be constructed towards Hwy 101.
4. The placement of open space that most of us will have difficulty accessing. The space is too isolated. Anyone purchasing a home on the golf course side would not appreciate a 5foot path behind their homes. Open space needs to be accessible to all. Or have the full functioning gate put in place instead of so much open space.
5. Exiting in place before construction can begin of any type There have been too many last minute changes to the plans submitted by this developer. Nothing makes any sense anymore. Maybe you as the commission should relook at the development for current approval.

Sent from my iPad

May 29, 2023

To: City Council Planning Commission
Subject: Fairway Estates Phase 2-3-4
April 25, 2023 Meeting

COMMENTS AND REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION

My name is Nancy Rhodes. [REDACTED]. I have attended most of the meetings concerning Fairway Estates Phase 2-3-4 and have previously submitted concerns and objections.

Before the last meeting, I reviewed the documents attached to the calendar but did not see any information presented at the April 25 meeting concerning the fire access 'road' (path?). And frankly, the information on the overhead was difficult to read. I couldn't make out the plot numbers. Furthermore, as noted before, it is difficult to hear all of the comments and testimony presented—especially Ms. Campbell's. Therefore, I may have missed key details. I noticed Mr. Pearson straining to hear comments as well. Is it possible to turn up everyone's mics?

I cannot open the link for the 2nd to last Agenda Item listed on the April 25 calendar:

https://www.ci.florence.or.us/sites/default/files/fileattachments/planning_commission/page/25127/agenda_item_5_exhibit_r_7_public_comment_redacted.pdf

Please email me this information or correct the link if there is an issue.

Please respond in writing to the following:

1. What is the exact location of the proposed Fire Access path or road. Is this intended strictly for emergency fire access?
2. Will it be paved?
3. Will there be a gate with a lock?
 - I am concerned about access by foot or vehicle by unauthorized individuals since it looks like it will connect to the 'nature trail' behind my home and others along Mariners Lots 9 through 19.

For the record, I still have concerns regarding the removal of vegetation and trees for the Nature Path. Although Mr. Pearson was kind to show me (and another neighbor) where the intended path will run and indicated most of the trees bordering my property and their 'easement' won't be removed, will someone from the City be monitoring this? Is he required to mark intended trees for removal?

I'm disappointed that the final decision for this drawn-out agenda item will be held on May 23rd. I understand you can't meet everyone's schedule, especially those not on the council, but this is

the opening day of the Farmer's Market (and plastic collection event) making it impossible for me to attend personally or electronically.

Thank you for your attention, and I look forward to your soonest reply.

Nancy Rhodes

Clare Kurth

From: Renee LoPilato [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, May 1, 2023 12:30 PM
To: Planning Department; Wendy Farley-Campbell
Subject: Resolutions Concerning Fairway Estates PUD Process

Dear Planning Director and Planning Commission Members:

I am submitting my written comments for consideration regarding the application for the future development of Phases 2-4 of Fairway Estates.

1. Based on the past year's documented back and forth between the developer and the city planning staff, it seems that various city codes have been either disregarded or argued about as not applicable. Deadlines have consistently not been met, with the developer submitting responses to the city on the day of the meetings, prolonging the process and delaying a final decision whether to approve or deny the application.
2. If you vote to allow this PUD application to move forward in its latest form, please insert clear conditions with deadlines that if not met, halt the progress of development. Also site visits by city staff would be appropriate to ensure compliance.
3. Please consider denying the current application at your May 25th meeting and requiring the developer to resubmit new plans that include the necessary roads, access and exits, open spaces, connecting trails, infrastructure and ask that these be built before Phase 4 begins, which could be years away.

Respectfully submitted,
Renee LoPilato
Homeowner
Fairway Estates Phase 1