
Planning Commission Committee Meeting Supplement

Date August 11, 2016

We have received additional public comments about the following application:

Hearing1: CUP-16-004 1916 Carol Ave, Written Comments from Sharon Gstettenbauer

Hearing1: CUP-16-004, 1916 Carol Ave, Written Comments from Judy Durkee

Please review this testimony and add this to your meeting packet for August 11, 2016.

RECEIVED

AUG 04 2016

Initial: _____

July 31, 2016

Written Comments: File No. CUP-16-004
City of Newberg
Community Development Dept.
PO Box 970
Newberg, OR 97132

To the Newberg Planning Commission:

I have lived at 1907 Carol Avenue since 1982. The Goldsmiths completed their home in 1983. As near as I can recall, sometime after that in the mid-to-late 1980s, my next-door neighbors and myself went to a City Council meeting to speak about the traffic problem back then caused by the fact that Mr. Goldsmith was running some kind of a Volvo business out of his home. Fortunately for our neighborhood, he was forced to move his business out of his home.

In regard to his current application for an accessory dwelling unit, I find it hard to believe that he could put 4 students, 4 beds, 4 desks, 4 vanities, a common living space, a common kitchen area, and then a common bathroom and shower area all into 1,000 sq. ft. It is my belief that one can only describe this dwelling as a dormitory. I believe that the intent of the Codes cited (Code Section 15.225.060 and 15.445.260) is to allow for units like a mother-in-law apartment or a bed and breakfast unit, not for a dormitory.

This application by Mr. Goldsmith seems more like a money-making scheme than a legitimate housing endeavor for George Fox students, and I oppose it vehemently as it is a deterrent to our safety and livability as a residential neighborhood.



Sharon Gstettenbauer
1907 Carol Ave.

8/7/16

RECEIVED

AUG 08 2016

To the Newberg Community Development Department;

Re: File No. CUP-16-004

Initial: _____

I recently received a notice in regards to a neighbor wanting to obtain a conditional use permit to build an accessory dwelling unit at 1916 Carol Ave to provide a dorm like residence for college students in a house across the street and in the corner to my house. I am writing in response to that notice and wish to state my objections to that permit. The accessory dwelling unit does not meet the city's codes (15.225.060, 15.445.250 & 15.445.260) for an accessory dwelling unit and I am objecting for the following reasons:

1. 15.225.060 A & 15.445.260-2: Accessory units are to be small apartment units for housing a small number of people, for example elderly family members or children returning home, etc. The unit Mr. Goldsmith wants to build is too big and is larger than allowed in the city codes. Mr. Goldsmith put in his application that the proposed accessory unit will be 986 sq feet when in fact it will be around 1,200 sq feet based on the plans filed with his application.
2. 15.225.060 A: The unit will have an impact on the capacity of street traffic and parking in the surrounding neighborhood. With the configuration of the street and houses where this dorm is proposed, five extra adults will impact the traffic and parking in this congested area. The location of the proposed accessory dwelling is in the basement of a house which is in a corner lot in which there is no street parking associated with that lot. The curve in the road where that corner is located is the busiest in the neighborhood and is where most of the traffic in the neighborhood passes (this was the case before the road closure). Due to the configuration of the street, the curve/corner in the road, the location of the fire hydrant and mailboxes, there is very limited street parking overall in this particular area. Cars parked along the street in that area when they are parked close to the curve/corner can impact the vision of drivers going around the curve in the road and leads to safety concerns. Mr. Goldsmith plans to have two parking spaces available in the back of the residence but with five adults it is highly likely there will be more than two cars. That means that the extra cars are likely going to take up the limited street parking that is normally available to current residents and their guests. The driveway to the back of the house starts near the top of Mr. Goldsmith's driveway for the main house. If someone is parked in the main driveway, those going to the back of the house have to be very careful in order to get past the car/truck making the driveway not a good/safe place to park, as Mr. Goldsmith has stated, if there is going to be an easy ingress and regress for the residents living in the dorm accessory dwelling. Five extra adults living on that lot will increase the traffic and parking in this small area.
3. 15.225.060 A: The unit is not compatible with the surrounding neighborhood and will have a negative impact on the livability and value of abutting properties and neighborhood. It does not preserve or enhance the quality of the neighborhood environment. This is a quiet family neighborhood that is zoned low-density and has single-family homes. The proposed unit is a high-density dwelling and there are no other homes in the neighborhood that have anything remotely similar to the proposed unit. The unit is designed for four but Mr. Goldsmith plans for 5 to live in it. The dorm-like unit is not compatible with the neighborhood, is not consistent with the current zoning and is not consistent with

the purposes of accessory dwellings. It does not preserve the quality of the neighborhood's environment but rather will have the opposite effect.

This dwelling could impact the value of homes around this residence and thereby effect the value of other homes in the neighborhood. Given the choice of two homes, one with a dorm across the street and people living in that dorm parking on the street around that home and a home without a dorm nearby and plenty of street parking, which home is going to be more desirable and likely to bring a higher price? This dwelling will likely effect the value of my home and the other homes around this dwelling.

The proposed accessory dwelling unit will greatly impact the quality and character of the current neighborhood along with the value of nearby homes. It is not compatible with the surrounding neighborhood and the location will impact the limited street parking available in the immediate surrounding area and possibly the flow of traffic. The unit is much larger than Mr. Goldsmith has suggested and is larger than the code for accessory dwellings allow.

Thank you for your time and consideration. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Judy Durkee
1911 Carol Ave.
503-554-1516

A handwritten signature in purple ink, appearing to be 'Judy', located to the right of the typed name and address.