

Debra Andreades,
Senior Planner
City of Lake Oswego

Dear Debra,
Please include my comments regarding File no. LU 15-0017

1. Definition of "Lot", The new definition seems to fail to recognize lots created in compliance with all legal requirements in effect and applicable at time of creation are still a "legal lot of record" or as being a "lot".
2. Would owners of "substandard lots" have a Measure 49 claim.
3. For several years LO has been working to try to (as per state law) create a code that is "clear and objective". This new ordinance seems to go against that.
4. Perhaps all projects should go through this compatibility check.....is this the same as "design review"....if so what is, and who will write the objective criteria? And if such is written, then why should not all projects in a zone be subject to that criteria? It seems to me that in some cases ministerial or staff review and approvals have gone against compatibility.
5. Most of the issues with incompatibility in our neighborhood (ENA) an R-7.5 zone have been with the lots that are larger than 7500 sq ft. Those new homes built in the last 8 or so years on the 7200 square foot lots, (the norm in this area) fit in very nicely. The large homes on larger lots are the ones that demonstrate the least compatibility. The existing dimensional standards have served quite well for most of the development in the ENA for the average 7200 sq ft lots.
6. The proposal to limit new projects on substandard lots to 22' is problematical. Staff now interprets 22' as the potential starting point for the "completion of a roof form or element". Originally this rule was to allow dormers, towers or other interesting roof details. Now it is interpreted as the completion of a gable roof allowing another 6' of height or 28'. This unfairly rules against a substandard lot. The lot coverage, FAR rules, side setbacks etc seem to be able to do a better job of governing height than an arbitrary 22' especially when it is meaningless if an additional 6' is sort of automatic. (See 850 Cedar Street DRC discussion. Regarding 22 feet average height that was calculated by the surveyor. Staff indicated that that meant that the new house could be 28' tall.)
7. Limiting floor area to a percentage: this already occurs if the existing FAR are applied.

RECEIVED 04/27/15

8. The discussion about parking and the 600 square foot allowance: developers are using a number of tricks to use some of this extra sq. footage as living space instead of in a double or single garage that is actually useable...resulting on no cars in the garage anyway. Separate garage bonuses etc should be studied.

9. In a PD development where the lot area includes the access road, in my opinion these should have even more stringent review or standards.

10. Finally, if all substandard lot owners wanting to redevelop were required to pay the fees for review and take the time for same. Then they are being unfairly treated.

Thank-you,
Paden Prichard
204 6th st.
Lake Oswego
97034