

Aaron Panko

From: SDSchulke <sdschulke@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 31, 2024 6:17 PM
To: Aaron Panko
Subject: Case Number> UGA-SPR-ADJ-DAP-DR-PLA24-03. 4650 Hazelgreen Rd NE.
Attachments: Schulke LUR response.docx

Mr Panko

I recently submitted a reply on the web site attaching the same response attachment in this email. However when looking it up I couldn't see the attachment, so I wanted to be sure you received it. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or concerns related to this matter.

--

Thank you,
Steven

Case Number> UGA-SPR-ADJ-DAP-DR-PLA24-03. Permit Number: 23 121805 00 PLN

Mr. Panko,

I'm writing to express my concerns about the land use request filling effecting the area of 4650 HAZELGREEN ROAD NE. Specifically BLD 33 and the Class 2 Adjustment to adjust the fencing and tree planting requirements of SRC 702.020(b)(2) along the southern boundary where the subject property abuts a BPA (Bonneville Power Administration) easement. I ask that you deny this request.

My entire family and I have grown up and worked in this area for most of our lives. We have been contributing to the city for over 100 years. I personally have physically helped build parts of this city. My family and I give back to it not only with our tax dollars but with much of our earned revenue. I must say, to have any part of what we have worked so hard diminished by the addition of multi-family housing directly in our backyard is too much. Yet it seems that in the greed of those trying to get as much profit as possible, they would like to diminish our assets even further by not putting in the proper screening as required in SRC. I do understand the amount of revenue projects like this generate, but that said, to blatantly remove a section of code that is designed for the very purpose to help protect livability or appearance (as this is to help not diminish another's assets); is unacceptable. The open eye sore of a parking lot certainly qualifies as detracting from the *Livability* or *Appearance* of the *Residential* area.

Moreover, as the applicant states in the Narrative response, the BPA easement is an adequate buffer along with the fact that the BPA easement does not permit trees or fences within the said easement *certainly does not fulfill the requirement* of SRC 702.020(b) as stated nor qualify as an exception. Instead, *the screening should remain, running the entire length of the parking lot and take place on the owner/applicant's property.* These tax lots extend through this easement and are owned by the homeowners. Therefore, the applicant couldn't build on this area anyway rendering that a moot point. Additionally, we/us as homeowners have no way or means of being able to add any type of suitable screening from the parking lot of building 33 with the vehicle headlights at the prime location height for our living room windows, shining directly in our backyards detracting from the *Livability* or *Appearance* of the *Residential* area. Therefore, rendering the condition as not better met. The owner/applicant shall be solely responsibility for providing the full appropriate amount of screening as deemed in the SRC no closer to property line than the minimum stated in the code.

Safety is also of high concern to the RS properties-especially three of the tax lots being directly affected. Those lots are 6700, 6600, 6500 with the property lines extending through the BPA easement and they are private property. With this safety in mind, I believe the owner/applicant should agree to add additional chain linked themed fencing matching the existing area, petitioning the BPA for permission to surround the entire BPA easement starting from Lunar Dr, extending West to Countryside St. and connect to the existing fencing on the South of easement helping to detour any of the occupants or their visitors from North-place Apartments Phase 1 and 2 from entering this specific area of BPA easement as the occupants from phase 2 are to have access to the club house in phase 1.

Thank you for considering these issues. I look forward to your reply.

Sincerely,

Steven Schulke