

From: [JEAN LASALLE](#)
Sent: Tuesday, January 29, 2019 11:51 AM
To: [Pete Walter](#)
Subject: OCMC 17.21

29 January, 2019

Hello Pete;

It has come to my attention that there are requests to remove the residential design standards specific to the Park Place Concept Plan Area in OCMC 17.21. I am very concerned about the possibility of this deletion because it has the effect of destroying the spirit of why the Concept Plan was developed. I can understand the developers concerns for the requirement of side or rear entry garages. I have thought about that from when I first read the Plan. I agree, that part should be eliminated as most impracticable. However, to eliminate the Code in it's entirety would be a mistake for the following reasons:

1. It is stated that the architectural requirements are limiting and hard to sell. I find that very hard to believe. If the architecture listed in the Concept Plan don't work there are additional choices as stated in 17.21.010 Purpose; "The 2006 Historical Review Board's Design Guidelines for New Construction include additional architectural descriptions of historic single-family structures in Oregon City" This shows they have other choices and the architecture is on of the things that will make the Park Place Concept Area unique and not just a "cookie cutter" look.

2. This request will eliminate Section 17.21.040 Modulation and massing. One of the requirements is paragraph A "Houses with footprints over 1200 square feet shall provide for secondary massing (such as cross gabled wings or sunroom/kitchen/dining room extensions) under separate roof lines." Why eliminate this?

3. It will also eliminate Section 17.21.050 Porches and entries. Paragraph A states "Each house shall contain a front porch---at least eighty square feet." Why eliminate this neighborhood friendly requirement? Paragraph C states "Each dwelling shall have a separate---pedestrian connection. The pedestrian connection shall be separate from s driveway." This makes for a better appearance and is pedestrian friendly. Why eliminate it?

4. It eliminates Section 17.21.060 Architectural details. There are many to choose from listed as A through H. The builders are not very restricted in this area.

5. It eliminates Section 17.21.070 Approved siding materials. This Section gives the builder a good selection. Why eliminate it?

6. It also eliminates Section 17.21.080 Windows. What's wrong with this section. I don't think these window requirements will "break the bank" for the builders costs.

The elimination of an entire Chapter is unreasonable and merely destroys the purpose of a major part of the Park Place Concept Plan. Most sections can be appealed for an exemption to the Community Development Director. I recommend this be done in regard to garages, but to eliminate the entire Chapter is asking too much of the Concept.

Many people put in countless hours to put this Concept Plan together and it was passed and adopted in 2008. To have it torn apart piece by piece when it is finally near fruition is a slap in the face of those people and totally unnecessary.

Let the developers/builders make their case in small, acceptable steps, not in sweeping eliminations of well thought out concepts.

I urge that this proposition of the elimination of OCMC Chapter 17.21 not be allowed for the above reasons. Affordable housing can be accomplished without that elimination. As stated earlier, I agree with the elimination of the requirement of side or rear facing garages. That is the only thing that won't work in the Concept Plan.

I request that this correspondence be made a part of the record.

Most Sincerely

Bob La Salle

Oregon City Resident