

From: [Jamin Moore](#)
To: [Christina Robertson-Gardiner](#)
Subject: Comments on 19701 S Leland rd land use change
Date: Monday, November 06, 2017 5:38:37 AM

1. I note that there is no park to be included in the new addition to the subdivision. Currently there is no park or access to a park for the neighborhood. The neighborhood is predominantly families with small children and as such, this creates a dangerous situation where children cross S Leland road (which has no crosswalk) to go to Wesley Lynn park. There is also no sidewalk access to the park after crossing S Leland. Please explain how this does not violate **12.04.199 - Pedestrian and bicycle accessways** and **12.04.245 - Street design—Pedestrian and bicycle safety**.

This situation also appears to be contrary to goals 2.4.2, 2.4.3 and 2.4.5 found in the Oregon City comprehensive plan.

In addition please explain how denying residents a safe pedestrian access to a city park is consistent with the American with Disabilities Act.

It is further noted that the City will be encumbering a 50 wide and 1000ft long plus section of Wesley Lynn park with a paved access easement to benefit several soon to be built houses and not the public interest. In effect the city is increasing the number of people who will use the park while shrinking its size. This also appears inconsistent with Oregon City Goals found in the comprehensive plan

2. In the proposed plat, lot 3 is an extreme size for a single family residence. As it exists in the ROW, it seems lot 3 is best suited to use as a neighborhood park. Has Oregon City followed policy 8.1.14 and encouraged or required the developer to create a park?

If not, lot 3 offers a unique opportunity to do so for several reasons. First open space in the ROW is likely preferred by the utility company. Second, an extreme lot size-unless completely fenced - is likely to become a children's play area regardless of ownership. An extremely large lot is also likely to be neglected leading to a nuisance situation. Third- as lot 3 can be split -the developer can still build the same number of houses in the tract and the city can have a park. It's a true win-win scenario that deserves a serious look.

Thank you for your time

Jamin Moore