From: Tim G

To: Ext - Planning

Subject: Fwd: re: PMA 21-0001 (corrected copy)

Date: Wednesday, December 15, 2021 5:21:06 PM

Corrected copy with minor mistakes fixed from original email:

Dear Tualatin Planning Commission (city employees only)

#### References:

- a. www.tualatinoregon.gov/planning/pma-21-0001-tualatin-heights-apartments
- b. Tualatin Heights Apartment Site Plan, 8/27/21
- c. Kittleson & Associated Parking Assessment, 8/16/21

I write this with sincerity and concern regarding the move to push forward on substantially increasing the number of residential units at the Tualatin Heights apartment complex without sufficient consideration of the impact to the surrounding neighborhood.

It is also my view that this submission is clearly skewed to move the proposal from concept to approval as quickly as possible, disregarding our concerns as homeowners which were previously stated.

I reviewed the submitted planning documents and believe the Exhibit C parking study is - plain and simple - hogwash. On the site plan, the proposed new Building A has 24 new units and five new parking spaces. The proposed Building B has 108 new units and 100 new parking spaces. Simple math - 132 new units and only 105 new parking spots. Simple translation is 27 units will not have parking which will overflow into the surrounding neighborhood - and that is assuming (incorrectly) that each new unit occupant will only have one vehicle. If we consider that half of those new units will have two vehicles, than it is obvious that the surrounding neighborhood will become congested in front of homeowners' houses with over 90 - yes, NINETY - tenant vehicles congesting our streets on SW Sagert, SW Apache, SW 93rd, SW Umiat, and beyond. This is unacceptable.

The parking study is flawed because it does not address this type of information stated above, and because it was conducted by a group hired by the developer to put the best light on the current situation - for the developer's sake - and disregard or wash over stated/polled concerns of homeowners in the area.

Simply put, we do not want our streets in the surrounding neighborhood congested even more with overflow vehicles from the Tualatin Heights apartment complex. It is less than tolerable now, and will be INSUFFERABLE if this development is allowed to proceed without identifying additional parking space on the Tualatin Heights land itself.

I will attempt to rally other homeowners to fight this development - tooth and nail - if it continues to proceed as a rubber-stamped, preordained process without sufficiently addressing our concerns as homeowners in the area.

Tim G SW Tonopah Street

PS: I do not wish to hear back from any organization hired by the developer in response to this

email. This is addressed to the city workers in the Tualatin Planning Commission.

#### Attention Keith Leonard:

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the application to rezone Tualatin Heights Apartments at 9301 SW Sagert Street - to higher density. Let me start out by saying I fully support the City of Tualatin's Housing Needs Analysis (HNA) and this project's ability to help meet the city's housing needs. My concern is over traffic and public safety at the intersection of 93<sup>rd</sup> and Sagert. Below is my description of the problems and my suggested solutions. It's already a crowded intersection and a new housing development in the immediate vicinity will make it worse. And the added traffic from this apartment expansion proposal will make it far worse.

#### Background

The proposal would add 116 units of additional multi-family housing on top of the current 220 units for a total of 336 units. Tualatin Heights is right across the street from the intersection of Sagert and 93<sup>rd</sup> (the street I live down). The area already experiences problems at the intersection of 93<sup>rd</sup> and Sagert and I've seen extremely high speeding 60+mph vehicles traveling north on 93<sup>rd</sup> as motorists try to take shortcut routes to avoid traffic that backs up on Avery street west of Boones Ferry road and similarly drivers trying to avoid backups on Boones Ferry, they'll exit on Sagert and take 93<sup>rd</sup> south.

#### Ditch and lack of sidewalk

*Problem* – On the east side corner of 93<sup>rd</sup> and Sagart, there is a fairly deep ditch along 93<sup>rd</sup> with no sidewalk. When I'm traveling north on 93<sup>rd</sup> near the stop sign, I must be extra cautious around that area – especially if there is a westbound driver turning left onto 93<sup>rd</sup> from Sagert and they are cutting the corner just as I am arriving to the stop sign at Sagert. The only way I can avoid the vehicle cutting across my stop line is to quickly swerve toward the ditch at the last second.

*Proposed Solution* - Fill in the ditch and add a sidewalk similar to work recently completed on the west side of 93<sup>rd</sup>'s corner.

## Parking on south side of Sagert near 93rd

*Problem* - Drivers trying to turn right or left from 93<sup>rd</sup> have difficulty seeing traffic coming from either direction because vehicles are allowed to park too close to the corners on Sagert. It has recently been a bit better with improvements on the SW corner, but the SE corner sometimes has vehicles parked past the corner – protruding into 93<sup>rd</sup>. This forces drivers from 93<sup>rd</sup> to carefully inch out past the stop sign, keep looking both ways and slam their brakes if a car is suddenly coming.

*Proposed Solution* – Paint the Sagert curb yellow on the SE corner of Sagert and 93<sup>rd</sup> and disallow parking on Sagert near that corner.

# **Exiting vehicles from the apartment complex**

*Problem* - As if the aforementioned problems aren't enough for drivers to navigate near the stop sign on 93<sup>rd</sup> - as they attempt to turn left or right onto Sagert, they must also contend with trying to guess when and which way vehicles are turning as they exit Tualatin Heights from its two exits on either side of them. Currently a driver stopped at the 93<sup>rd</sup> and Sagert stop sign must take into account the possibility of vehicles coming at them from 4 different directions:

- 1) Eastbound Sagert drivers
- 2) Drivers in front of them exiting the west side driveway of Tualatin Heights
- 3) Drivers in front of them exiting the east side driveway of Tualatin Heights
- 4) Westbound Sagert drivers

As a driver stopped at the 93<sup>rd</sup> stop sign, I often have to guess what all these drivers are intending to do. Did they forget to turn their blinker on or off – are they are going to turn onto 93<sup>rd</sup> or will they keep going? Is the driver coming out of the west side driveway of Tualatin Heights crossing Sagert to get directly onto 93<sup>rd</sup> or will they turn right toward 92<sup>nd</sup> or left and drive in front of me on Sagert? By the time I'm done figuring it out, there's often another car coming.

# Several Proposed Solutions:

- Make the stop signs normal-sized for traffic exiting Tualatin Heights.
- It has become a de facto 4-way intersection at 93<sup>rd</sup> and Sagert with 93<sup>rd</sup> practically in line with the west side drive way of Tualatin Heights. So the city should make it official by making it a true 4-way stop at that intersection. As part of added densitity construction at Tualatin Heights, require that the west side driveway align better with 93<sup>rd</sup> so it's more clearly a 4-way intersection.
- If the city does agree to make it an official 4-way stop, then remove the 3-way stop on Sagert at the Apache Dr intersection. Leave only 1 stop sign for Apache Dr. It is ridiculous that the city forces drivers on Sagert to stop at Apache Dr. I have lived in Tualatin for 15+ years and not once has there been a vehicle stopped at the Apache Dr stop sign while I am stopped going east or west on Sagert. Because of this, many people never come to a complete stop going east and west on Sagert and many motorists just sort of coast through it because it's such a joke. The city should consider why it continues to have stop signs on Sagert there. I'm sure if the city used technology to measure simultaneous stops, it would learn it is unnecessary to continue stopping Sagert traffic at Apache Dr. There is far more traffic currently coming in and out of Tualatin Heights than Apache Dr. And after the higher density allowance there will be even great traffic coming in and out of the apartment complex.
- If the city chooses not to create an official 4-way stop at 93<sup>rd</sup> and Sagert, then:
  - Do not remove the 3-way stop at Apache Dr. because that at least helps slow down
     Sagert motorists to some degree.
  - O Consider requiring Tualatin Heights exiting vehicles to only exit from the east side driveway. The east side could be for entering and exiting vehicles, but the west side driveway would be entrance only. From Sagert and 93<sup>rd</sup>, the driveway's signage should make it clear it is one way traffic so it's clear it is not an exit. The west side driveway is directly across from 93<sup>rd</sup> and that is what makes it a de facto 4-way stop. If the city won't make it official, then don't allow vehicles to enter onto Sagert from that driveway.

Thank you,

Gerry Preston
Resident within 1,000 feet of increased density project

From: corsage.vogues 0l@icloud.com

To: <u>Nicole J. Morris</u>

Subject: Tualatin Heights Apartment City Council Meeting

**Date:** Monday, January 24, 2022 3:29:21 PM

## Hello!

I am so glad that my neighbor found your information via the Internet as your contact information was not included in the flyer sent out to our complex!

This expansion of Tualatin Heights seems to be one that was hastily drawn and not thought about when it comes to residents of both the complex, in addition to the residents of Sagert and 53rd. I highly suggest that this be rethought. We are one of the only green spaces in any of the complexes and it has been nice having space. I don't actually understand why two new three-story buildings need to be erected and in such awful placements. I feel sorry for the residents of Sagert who will have to look at these eyesores.

Not to mention, none of the residents signing these leases agreed to losing the garage spaces in favor of some parking which will still not help our current parking headache. Please don't approve this!

From: corsage.vogues 0l@icloud.com

To: Nicole J. Morris

Subject: PMA 21-0001 Tualatin Heights Apartments
Date: Monday, January 24, 2022 3:21:49 PM

## To whom it may concern,

We received a letter a week ago about the planned updates to the Tualatin Heights complex. On the letter we given the person to contact to write comments/concerns however it was very interesting to see that no contact information was included. I had to look up this information myself.

I am an extremely concerned resident as the complex and its officials already cannot manage the amount of residents it currently houses yet is looking to expand further? During covid times, they expected the entire apartment community to crowd into one of their two pools and refused to open another yet considered this to be best practice? The parking is atrocious as it stands and nothing is monitored even though it is a "permit only" complex. Guests have to park on the street as the maybe 10 guest spots for the \*entire\* complex are taken always thus crowding the residential parking. This just seems like an excessive venture to add more units. In addition, residents of 53rd are concerned about the traffic as it stand...yet UDR wants to add more traffic? This does not seem to be well thought out, the opposite in fact.

Concerned Resident

# **Keith Leonard**

From:

Lindsay Marshall < limarshall07@gmail.com>

Sent:

Monday, January 24, 2022 4:34 PM

To:

Nicole J. Morris

Subject:

Fwd: Tualatin Heights Apartments Public Hearing 1.24.2022

## Council -

I am writing in response to the following January 24, 2022 meeting agenda item:

Consideration of Approval of a Plan Map Amendment (PMA-21-0001) and Adoption of Ordinance No. 1464-22 to Rezone the Tualatin Heights Apartments Site Located at 9301 SW Sagert Street (Tax Map 2S123DC, Tax Lot 600) from the Medium Low Residential (RML) Zoning District to the Medium High Density Residential (RMH) Zoning District

I am a Tualatin resident whose home is within 1,000 feet of the Tualatin Heights Apartments.

However, my concern is <u>not</u> with the rezoning of the district – I believe that creating relatively affordable attached single-family housing and multi-family housing should be a priority of the City.

# Concern:

My concern focuses on the parking calculations (as provided by the parking study provided by Angelo Planning Group), which will undoubtedly impact both residents of Tualatin Heights Apartments and neighboring residents (SW Sagert, SW 93rd and streets off of SW 93<sup>rd</sup>, and SW Apache and streets off of SW Apache).

- 1. Currently, Tualatin Heights Apartments allows one parking space free of charge per each dwelling unit, additional parking for \$25/month. If Tualatin Heights Apartments are considered to be "affordable" housing, residents may not be able to spare the extra \$300/year for an extra parking space. Therefore, they may (and many do) choose to park along the streets of nearby residential neighborhoods. This reduces parking for the residential neighborhoods, who then cannot find parking close to their homes.
- 2. If Tualatin Heights Apartments are considered "affordable" housing, they should be affordable in all ways. In the proposal, Angelo Planning Group cites the HNA's demographic trends in "relatively affordable housing":

- The key demographic trends that will affect Tualatin's future housing needs are: (1) Baby Boomers 2) Millennials, and 3) Growth in the number of Latinx households, which are more likely to be larger than average, with more children and possibly with multigenerational households. (Source: 2019 HNA)
- Considering these demographics (households with aging members and households with multiple drivers and potentially small children), parking close to the home would be of extra importance.
- 3. The parking study provided by Angelo Planning Group and Kittelsen and Associates found:
  - Peak apartment complex parking utilization was 79% during a mid-weekday and 81% on a Saturday, but segments of SW Sagert Street (between SW 95th Ave and SW 93rd Ave) experience parking occupancy levels at 100% or close to 100% for most study hours.
  - However these numbers do not delineate between the type of parking spaces available in the complex (assigned with unit, extra cost, or guest). What was the utilization percentage of those parking spaces that come with the each unit (1 per unit)? Comparatively, what was the utilization rate of those spaces that are technically available, but only for an extra monthly charge? It may very well be that the 1 space per unit parking was 100% full, but additional charge parking was relatively empty, which can skew the overall final usage percentage.
  - If residents are not able to pay for extra parking space, utilizing free on-street parking on neighboring streets makes sense (and happens).
- 4. At the Neighborhood/Developer Meeting that was held in June 2021, parking was a major concern from apartment residents and neighbors. Given that parking is already an essential issue with the number of current units, the proposal to add more units should focus very specifically on working to address these concerns rather than saying that everything is adequate according to numbers. Simply because the numbers on the page say something, actual lived experiences from residents and neighbors often tell a vastly different story one that should be a high priority to address in terms of quality of life.
- 5. The proposal shows that there are nine (9) bus stops located within a quarter mile from the site. It can take approximately 6-10 minutes to walk longer if people have mobility issues, when carrying heavy loads, or with small children. These bus stops are across and along major intersections (Boones Ferry and Tualatin Sherwood Road), which may not feel safe or easily accessible. A bus stop along Sagert St should be considered, as having a bus stop within 100-500 feet of the apartments would drastically increase the usage of public transportation and perhaps help to alleviate the need for vehicle parking for some residents of the apartments (as well as residents of the surrounding neighborhoods).
- 6. The proposal cites Title 12 Protection of Residential Neighborhoods protects existing residential neighborhoods from pollution, noise, crime, and provides adequate levels of public services and reports that it has been addressed. Extra parking nearby neighboring homes could result in increased pollution from additional cars starting and idling in front of homes.

7. Tualatin is a suburban city. While public transportation is available, we are still very much vehicle based. Residents – anywhere in the City – should have access to reliable and close by parking, regardless of income.

Thank you for your consideration. To reiterate, affordable housing should be a major priority for the city – but the livability of that housing should be a key component of that process.

L.M - Resident of Tonopah St

----- Original Message -----

From: Tim G < <a href="mailto:hadasaugh@comcast.net">hadasaugh@comcast.net</a>>
To: Keith Leonard <a href="mailto:kleonard@tualatin.gov">kleonard@tualatin.gov</a>>

Date: 02/03/2022 7:34 PM

Subject: PMA21-0001 additional input prior to 14 February 2022 meeting

#### Dear Tualatin Planning Commission:

Thank you for delaying the vote on the PMA21-0001 development proposal of Tualatin Heights at 9301 SW Sagert. There is much more to address about the parking issue overflowing onto the surrounding streets that has not been adequately addressed by the developer and/or representative for the owner of that complex.

First, it must be made clear that parking within the Tualatin Heights complex is fee-based when the owner representatives are discussing unoccupied parking spaces presently on their lot. I don't believe that was adequately conveyed during the last meeting when it was stated that something like 20% parking remains available. That 20% parking likely represents individuals who do not want to pay for parking and for units that are presently unoccupied. Full disclosure of facts needs to be conveyed by all parties, instead of cherry-picking details.

Second, I have attached photos that show common areas where tenant vehicles from Tualatin Heights park on both SW 93rd and SW Sagert (I've witnessed individuals walking to and from those cars from the Tualatin Heights complex). I've also attached a photo of "creative" homeowner solutions to keep their curbs clear of congestion on both SW 93rd and SW Sagert, by spreading out their garbage containers and leaving them on the street permanently. Last year, one homeowner left large branches on the street and curb in front of his house for over three months to ensure there was parking for his family and friends. This shouldn't be necessary, but this is what is happening now, and has been happening for the past year or more. All photos were taken on Sunday, 30 January 2022, mid-morning.

Third. Referring to the planning documents, it is still quite obvious that there will not be enough parking to accommodate the proposed new buildings. Count the spaces and compare them to the new units. There is a clear deficiency. And this deficiency does not factor in tenants with multiple vehicles and overflow parking for THEIR guests.

Fourth. If this proposal is approved, there will need to be consideration for overflow parking during construction as well. This, to my knowledge, has yet to be discussed. That overflow parking should not burden the surrounding neighborhood; it should be a burden placed on the owner and his representatives to resolve and to provide adequate alternative solutions for their tenants.

Fifth and final. It is my belief that an independent parking survey and study should be conducted which not only addresses congestion of Tualatin Heights tenants parking on our streets, but also addresses shortfalls within the Tualatin Heights complex itself, and looks for solutions to address it inside the

borders of their property - and not on our streets (i.e., underground parking beneath the proposed large apartment building, or clearing of additional areas to free up more space on their lot).

If nothing is done to address the parking issue now, it will become a major problem in the future if this development is approved as is presently outlined and planned.

Sincerely and respectfully, Tim G SW Tonopah Street (photo attachments)





