
case #222 Woodrail Terrace

1 message

tamatwood@aol.com <tamatwood@aol.com>
To: Russell Palmer <rusty.palmer@como.gov>

Wed, Aug 23, 2023 at 6:26 PM

- My concerns, objections:

1) Set-back variance: Instead of a 10-foot set back they are seeking a 5-foot set back. That is unreasonably close compared to a standard setback and for what was originally planned in this area. The 2004 re-plat of lot 14 has the single family homes on 14B&C at the north end of the lots, not on the south end, with towering side walls five feet away from my lot line, in direct line of sight from the back of my home. The lots to the north of 14B&C have 10 foot set backs or more, much more on the NE side. The proposed proximity to my lot is unlike anything else in this area. No one walks out their back door to the wall of a house. The location of the homes at the north end of the lot preserved an openness. It did not create a boxed in home to the south. All other homes on this street have more than standard set-back regardless of how many units. The very minimal between homes is 25 feet. The proposal seeks an exception here, not just from the code, but to what has been built. These are the last two lots, why make an exception now. The neighborhood has a certain integrity that deserves to be upheld.

2) The massing: the size of the proposed units per acreage. The scale of the multi-units to the lot will be overwhelming. The foot print of the units leaves very little green space or void when accounting for structure, garage and driveway for four cars. This oversized structure makes for inappropriate planning where a variation in set-backs is the only way out. It's the reason why these variances are being sought...in order to over-build the lot. To land grab. The 2004 plat shows the three homes arranged around the perimeter of the lots. There was some open space towards the center where all three lots meet, space to look up and not see building. With this proposed massing there is no room to do that. There is no room to have a home at one end of the lot and garage at the other, because the footprint is too big. The current concept, the one I bought into has an open area where the three lots meet.

3) The density: the increase in number of units per acre. The crowding of lots that are already small. The re-platting in 2004 was done showing single family homes, not multi-units, or attached single family units with zero lot line, or whatever you want to call more than one home on the lots as drawn. The increase conflicts with the intended land use when lot 14 was divided into three parcels.

4) Storm water system: buried and in place on 14B and running through C. Halfway up lot B is a collection basin for storm water, directly next to the party wall. It is drained by a 12-15 inch pipe that goes down lots B&C and then goes in front of my garage and eventually empties out into the storm drain in front of my house. The underground system includes a cistern currently in place on the border of 14C my lot 14A. This was done so that water would not go towards my house. The cost was shared by all the property owners of lots AB&C. Any disturbance, damage, removal of this drain system will have affect my property. To Date, I have Not had water issues in my home, basement, backyard, sideyard, in any way shape or form. Not a damp spot or corner anywhere. The system that has been in place (BioGuard installed) has worked well. The area around the cistern is the only area that has had dirt loss because runoff water naturally flows into it due to the slope of 14C. The cistern has kept run-off off my lot.

5) The removal of the party wall between lots 14B&C: The wall provides some infrastructure to the portion of wall connected to the perpendicular section along my property line and is holding back earth on both sides to the east and west and it is holding back the earth above my back yard. The water collection basin and drainage pipe referred to above is also next to the wall. I am worried about impact on the remaining wall in my yard and damage to or any affect on the drainage system.

6) The diminishment to my property value and to the immediate area. Crowded structures on small lots are an eyesore and deviation from the norm. The loss of enjoyment having such large structures directly behind me...two buildings within an arms reach. Social distancing for covid is farther. The loss of any privacy: both buildings would loom directly over my only patio area. No binoculars needed. No one else has a building with neighbors able to peer down. This is another diversion from the current site PD for lot 14. The removal of all landscaping, especially along the east lot 14C: there are a few trees planted in a berm over 20 years ago. All have been a help with the water flow and provided some natural buffer that cannot be added back after construction. There will not be room between homes if exceptions to set-back are allowed, nor will anything grow tall enough in my lifetime to provide comfort or disguise. There will be a loss of local flora and birds that keep this from being a cement jungle the middle of a golfing area,

7) No architectural plans were submitted: Size and number of units is already at odds with the original PD, but how are these to look? Our Homeowners' Association does have an Architectural Committee. I would like for them to meet and to review actual plans for these lots.

8) Proposed timeline after approved plans: This is an ambitious project for a residential area that has a narrow U-shaped street. Ongoing construction on two sides of the U (directly behind me on both sides of the peninsula) creates a construction zone from east to west along the southern tip. How is that to be managed if vehicles are in the way or if we have damage to personal property as a result of such construction? If construction halts for any reason, what recourse does the neighborhood have?

Measures that would mitigate my concerns:

1) Proposal of Architectural plans for one single family residence with a standard set-back of 6 feet or more or the architectural proposal of a two-unit, attached single family, with a set-back of 10 feet or more. Something approaching the observed distance between homes, a distance between homes that is consistent with Woodrail Terrace, would work better than the proposal. More void, more green space as the result of an appropriate, beautiful build that suits the lots alleviates the need for a variance. A reasonable sized home on C and duplex on B... without maxing out these not so big lots because some 1975 application of code is used mathematically to take advantage of density allows it.

2) The bulk, the massive part of the structures placed farther north on the lot as the re-plat of 14 shows...proposal homes that do not box me in on either side but especially to the east. I am downhill from these lots. That boxed-in scenario was avoided in the original planning. I bought a home that was part of a plan that was not pressured from all sides in such a claustrophobic manor. I had planned live my life out here, but not if I am expected to walk into two towering side walls. Side walls of 35 feet on top of a retaining wall, within five feet of my property line, presents a problem. (btw They cannot drop their sites to the elevation of my home. That would put them below the street level. Someone from P&Z needs to visit this site if that has been suggested.)

3) I would like the drainage system that has kept water away from my home left intact. If modified or damaged then replaced or repaired to accommodate any new build and ensuing drainage from both lots. Water is going to be diverted from any new structures in a new way; land absorption will be missing. I do not want water from those lots draining onto my property when it has been successfully diverted for over 20 years. I do not want to see erosion where there has been none. This is a very important structural issue. Many measures were taken to avoid water problems with this house and they have worked.

4) Any subsequent damage from the removal of a portion of the party wall, large or small, or any collapse will be addressed as soon as it happens. Any cost to repair or replace wall, damaged fencing, landscaping would be covered by the builder. Any damage to personal property related to building would be recovered by any Woodrail Terrace resident...tires are expensive. This process will take a long time and overwhelm the street on two sides for perhaps more than a year.

5) I would like the Homeowners Association, specifically the Architectural Committee to have the opportunity to review the actual Architectural plans for both sites and respond back to the city.

6) If trees along the berm were to remain on 14C, the east lot, and subsequent building were to be to the north of that, then a natural buffer could remain that is not very far off of an appropriate set back. This would serve not only to help aesthetically, but it would aid in water control. If removed for building, there will be no landscaping trees or buffer planted that will grow tall enough in time to matter. I would also like to be able to get out of my back gate in case of emergency (and to garden or mow in summer).

7) I want to feel like my personal property is not diminished by a project so overreaching that it was turned down initially, then just through rewording and re-platting two small lots into yet two more small lots is still able to achieve its mission. I would expect any builder to take into consideration the character for this long established area. The lots are for homes, not just for profit at our expense. Reasonable concessions are fair. But, when an aggressive proposal seems to take advantage of land that I am adjacent to and part of, being 14A, then I feel a certain responsibility to myself and the neighborhood to stand up for that.

Regards,
Tracey Atwood

-
-

-
- ,
-
- or
-

Fwd: Case #222-2023, Lots 14B & 14C, Woodrail Terrace PD Plan

1 message

Lee Russell <wde1967@gmail.com>
To: rusty.palmer@como.gov

Thu, Aug 24, 2023 at 12:54 AM

Hi Rusty,
I entered the wrong email address.
Sorry
Lee Russell

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Lee Russell <wde1967@gmail.com>
Date: August 24, 2023 at 6:35:53 AM GMT+1
To: rusty.plamer@como.gov, Patrick Zenner <patrick.zenner@como.gov>
Subject: Case #222-2023, Lots 14B & 14C, Woodrail Terrace PD Plan

Dear Mr. Palmer,

I apologize for this late email submission to the P&Z Commission. I am returning from time out of the country. Please pass this bit of information on to the Commissioners.

I agree 100% with Ms. Atwood's email communication with you and comments regarding this PD Plan for these small lots on the tiny peninsula on Woodrail Terrace. The density and strain on the infrastructure here would remove the neighborhood feel to our little street. There are a number of families with small children here who play at that safe end of the peninsula.

We have not seen any plans or architectural renderings for this case. There have not been meetings with our HOA. Furthermore, nothing has been submitted to our Architectural Control Committee, of which I am a member. We have been ignored by this developer.

Please ask this developer to take a step back, revise this plan and follow our covenants.

I will be present at any future Commission meetings and most definitely be present at any City Council meeting regarding this very small piece of land.

Sincerely,
Lee Russell
3456 Woodrail Terrace

Sent from my iPad