



Meeting Date: December 8, 2022

To: Planning Commission

From: Matthew Martin, Principal Planner

Subject: Public Hearing: Sunset Meadows Master Plan - Land Use File Nos. MP 22-01/SUB 22-01/MNR 22-02

I. SUMMARY

On December 8, 2022, the Sisters Planning Commission (Commission) will hold a public hearing regarding a proposed Master Planned development that includes a 71-lot residential development with 22 lots for single family detached dwellings, 48 lots for attached (townhome) dwellings, and 1 parcel for a multi-family residential development including approximately 72-124 units in the Multi-Family Residential District.

II. BACKGROUND

The Commission originally opened the public hearing on October 20, 2022,¹ and, at the conclusion of testimony, the Commission voted unanimously to continue the public hearing to November 3, 2022². At the conclusion of testimony on November 3, the Commission voted unanimously to continue the public hearing to December 8, 2022.

III. RECORD SUBMITTALS

The project record is available at City Hall and on the City of Sisters webpage³ and is presented here by reference. The November 3 Commission meeting packet included all record submittals received prior to October 27. At the November 3 Commission meeting, staff provided the Commissioners the following record submittals:

- 10-27-22 Bugbee-Reed Email Public Comment
- 10-27-22 Perlot Email Public Comment
- 10-28-22 Anonymous Public Comment
- 10-28-22 Wolff Email Public Comment
- 10-28-22 Lombardo Email Public Comment

¹ 10/20/22 Planning Commission Meeting: <https://www.ci.sisters.or.us/bc-pc/page/planning-commission-52>

² 11/3/22 Planning Commission Meeting: <https://www.ci.sisters.or.us/bc-pc/page/planning-commission-53>

³ City of Sisters Sunset Meadows Project Record: <https://www.ci.sisters.or.us/community-development/page/sunset-meadows-master-plan-record>

- 10-28-22 Medley Email Public Comment
- 10-29-22 Barnes Email Public Comment
- 10-29-22 Borick Email Public Comment
- 10-29-22 Metolius Email Public Comment
- 10-29-22 Payne Email Public Comment
- 10-29-22 Wahl Email Public Comment
- 10-29-22 Woodworth Email Public Comment
- 10-30-22 Jacobson Email Public Comment
- 10-30-22 Soja Email Public Comment
- 10-31-22 Bordonaro Email Public Comment
- 10-31-22 Gaughan Email Public Comment
- 10-31-22 Grace Email Public Comment
- 10-31-22 Wills Email Public Comment
- 10-31-22 Dell'Arciprete Email Public Comment
- 10-31-22 McLean Email Public Comment
- 10-31-22 Wells Email Public Comment
- 11-1-22 Leiser Email Public Comment
- 11-1-22 Maione Email Public Comment
- 11-1-22 Thrower Email Public Comment
- 11-1-22 Twelker Email Public Comment
- 11-1-22 Chinburg Email Public Comment
- 11-1-22 DeFazio Email Public Comment
- 11-1-22 Hughes Email Public Comment
- 11-1-22 Kostal Email Public Comment
- 11-1-22 Mallon Email Public Comment
- 11-1-22 Willis Email Public Comment
- 11-2-22 Lesko Email Public Comment
- 11-2-22 Turner Email Public Comment
- 11-2-22 Brooks Email Public Comment
- 11-2-22 Hardin Email Public Comment
- 11-2-22 Robinson Email Public Comment
- 11-3-22 Hughes Email Public Comment
- 11-3-22 Kuzma Email Public Comment
- 11-3-22 Kuzma Email Public Comment 2
- 11-3-22 Pilak Email Public Comment
- 11-3-22 O'Hern Email Public Comment

Since the November 3 Commission meeting, the follow record submittals have been received and are attached:

- 11-4-22 Sokol Email Public Comment
- 11-5-22 Burry Email Public Comment
- 11-5-22 Eagle Email Public Comment
- 11-6-22 Basile Email Public Comment
- 11-10-22 Ruby Email Public Comment.
- 11-11-22 Mason Email Public Comment
- 11-21-22 Johnson (Pine Meadow Village) Email Public Comment
- 11-25-22 Russell Email Public Comment

IV. ISSUES RAISED

A number of issues have been raised by the public and Commission during this land use review process. When evaluating these issues and the merits of the proposal, staff notes that Sister Development Code (SDC) 4.1.500(D) requires the following for the decision process:

D. The Decision Process.

1. Basis for decision. Approval or denial of a Type III application shall be based on standards and criteria in the development code. The standards and criteria shall relate approval or denial of a discretionary development permit application to the development regulations and, when appropriate, to the comprehensive plan for the area in which the development would occur and to the development regulations and comprehensive plan for the City as a whole;

2. Findings and conclusions. Approval or denial shall be based upon the criteria and standards considered relevant to the decision. The written decision shall explain the relevant criteria and standards, state the facts relied upon in rendering the decision, and justify the decision according to the criteria, standards, and facts;

The following summary lists the issues raised and is organized in three areas:

- **IDENTIFIED ISSUES** - ISSUES DIRECTED AT APPLICABLE REVIEW CRITERIA.
- **ASSOCIATED ISSUES** - ISSUES TANGENTIALLY RELATED BUT NOT DIRECTLY TIED TO REVIEW CRITERIA.
- **OTHER ISSUES** - ISSUES NOT ASSOCIATED WITH REVIEW CRITERIA.

IDENTIFIED ISSUES - ISSUES DIRECTED AT APPLICABLE REVIEW CRITERIA

(This section is organized by the Chapters or Sections of the Sisters Development Code staff believes are relevant.)

Chapter 2.3 - Multi-Family Residential District

- Building Height
- Building Mass
- Density
- Design Standards
- Garage and Carport
- Multi-Family Residential Development
- Lot Size
- Setbacks

Staff Comment: SDC 2.3.200-300 provides detailed use and development standards applicable to development in the Multi-Family Residential District.

Section 2.15.2400 - Dark Skies Standards

- Outdoor Lighting

Staff Comment: SDC 2.15.2400 provides detailed outdoor lighting standards to limit light pollution.

Chapter 3.3 - Vehicle and Bicycle Parking

- Off-Street Parking

Staff Comment: Table 3.3.300.A outlines the minimum parking requirements for specified uses, including the proposed detached and townhome single-family dwellings and multi-family residential development. SDC 3.3.400 provides specific standards for off-street parking, including required configurations and dimensions.

Chapter 3.1. – Access and Circulation

Chapter 3.5 – Public Improvement Standards

- Transportation Infrastructure
 - Traffic Impacts
 - Adequacy of existing infrastructure
 - Transportation Infrastructure Improvements
 - Cumulative impacts of existing and approved development
 - On-Street Parking

Staff Comment: SDC 3.1.300 addresses vehicular access and circulation standards, including access management, fire apparatus access, and street spacing. SDC 3.1.400 addresses pedestrian and bicyclist access and circulation standards. SDC 3.5.400 includes standards for transportation improvements. For reference, the Sisters Transportation System Plan (TSP)⁴ provides a comprehensive plan for transportation infrastructure in the City.

Chapter 3.2 - Landscaping and Screening

- Screening and Buffering
- Tree Preservation/Removal

Staff Comment: SDC 3.2.300 provides standards for screening, fences, and walls if proposed or required. SDC 3.2.500 provides requirements for tree preservation, protection during construction, and replacement if removed.

3.5 – Public Improvement Standards

- Water/Sewer Infrastructure
 - Adequacy of existing facilities
 - Cumulative impacts of existing and approved development

Staff Comment: SDC 3.5.250 provides standards for sewer and water infrastructure improvements. For reference, the Wastewater System Capital Facilities Plan Update⁵ and 2017 Water Capital Facilities Plan

⁴ Sisters Transportation System Plan:

https://www.ci.sisters.or.us/sites/default/files/fileattachments/public_works/page/22579/2021_transportation_system_plan_tsp.pdf

⁵ Wastewater System Capital Facilities Plan Update:

https://www.ci.sisters.or.us/sites/default/files/fileattachments/public_works/page/2491/2016_wastewater_capital_facilities_plan_update.pdf

Update⁶ provide comprehensive plans for sewer and water infrastructure in the City, respectively. Staff notes that updates to these plans are currently in development.

Chapter 4.3 – Land Divisions and Lot Line Adjustments

- Subdivision Layout

Staff Comment: SDC 4.3.600(A)(4) includes a general standard for the layout of preliminary subdivision plans. Staff notes there are additional specific design standards in various sections of the code.

Chapter 4.5 - Master Planned Development

- Design Standards/Aesthetic
- Modification to Standards
 - Reduction in setbacks and lot sizes
- Open Space

Staff Comment: SDC Chapter 4.5 includes standards and criteria applicable to master planned developments. Along with the development standards of SDC 2.3.300, SDC 4.5.700 requires architectural features that “...complement and enhance positive characteristics of the site and surrounding area standards that assure variety and interest along the street.” SDC 4.5.400(B) provides opportunity for modification of development standards if “...such modification will not be detrimental to the general welfare, health or safety of the City of Sisters and will enhance the visual characteristics of the neighborhood.” SDC 4.5.400(H) outlines the open space requirements.

ASSOCIATED ISSUES - ISSUES TANGENTIALLY RELATED BUT NOT DIRECTLY TIED TO REVIEW CRITERIA

- Character of Development
- Climate Change
- Noise
- Privacy
- Quality of Life
- Safety (Crime, Theft, Drugs, etc.)

Staff Comment: These issues are considered in the adoption of Comprehensive Plan policies and Development Code standards.

- Adequacy of Community Services (Fire, Police, Schools, etc)
- Wildfire Risk and Evacuation

Staff Comment: The adequacy of community services are evaluated and addressed by the individual service providers. Wildfire risk assessment and planning, including evacuations, are regionally coordinated with input and participation from local, state, and federal partners. See the Deschutes County Multi-Jurisdictional Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan⁷ for more information.

⁶ 2017 Water Capital Facilities Plan Update:

https://www.ci.sisters.or.us/sites/default/files/fileattachments/public_works/page/2471/2017_water_capital_facilities_plan_04-21-2017.pdf

⁷ Deschutes County Multi-Jurisdictional Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan: https://sheriff.deschutes.org/2021_NHMP.pdf

- Comprehensive Plan Goals and Objectives

Staff Comment: Goals are long-term outcomes the City hopes to achieve by implementing the Comprehensive Plan. They are aspirational, expressing community members collective desires and values. Objectives identify the specific aspects of the long term aspirational goals. These items address the general strategy for achieving the long-term goals via implementation of the Comprehensive Plan's policies. In addition, SDC 1.2.300, Consistency with Plan and Laws, states:

Each development and use application and other procedure initiated under this Code shall be consistent with the adopted Comprehensive Plan of the City of Sisters as implemented by this Code, and with applicable state and federal laws and regulations. All provisions of this Code shall be construed in conformity with the adopted Comprehensive Plan.

Therefore, the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan are not applicable review criteria.

OTHER ISSUES - ISSUES NOT ASSOCIATED WITH REVIEW CRITERIA

- Adequacy of Commercial Services (Medical, Grocery, Pharmacy, etc)
- Affordable Housing
- Growth/Development Moratorium
- Parks
- Scenic Byway
- View Protection
- Wildlife Impacts

Staff Comment: With respect and recognition that these issues are valuable and important to those individuals that raised them, staff believes these issues are not directed to development code criteria or standards applicable to this proposal.

- Sister Country Vision

Staff Comment: As stated in the Sisters 2040 Comprehensive Plan⁸ (Pages 5-6):

"...how is the Comprehensive Plan different from the Vision? Both plans have significant cross-over, but include key differences, such as geographic. focuses, scope, and implementation strategies."

...

"The Vision was completely community-driven without requirements from the State and is now in the implementation stage through community led action by the Vision Implementation Team."

Therefore, Sisters County Vision does not include development review criteria applicable to this proposal.

⁸ Sisters 2040 Comprehensive Plan:

https://www.ci.sisters.or.us/sites/default/files/fileattachments/community_development/page/22294/sisters_cp_2040_-_draft_15_09.14.pdf

- Western Design Standards

Staff Comment: Pursuant to SDC 2.15.2600(B), the Western Frontier Architectural Design Theme applies to all new, reconstructed or remodeled uses in all Commercial Districts. The subject property is not located in a Commercial District. Therefore, the Western Frontier Architectural Design Theme standards are not applicable to this proposal.

V. NEXT STEPS

At the conclusion of testimony, the Commission the Commission can consider the following options:

1. Close the public hearing and written record and begin deliberations;
2. Close the public hearing and leave the written record open to a date certain; or
3. Continue the public hearing to a date certain.

Attachments:

1. 11-4-22 Sokol Email Public Comment
2. 11-5-22 Burry Email Public Comment
3. 11-5-22 Eagle Email Public Comment
4. 11-6-22 Basile Email Public Comment
5. 11-10-22 Ruby Email Public Comment.
6. 11-11-22 Mason Email Public Comment
7. 11-21-22 Johnson (Pine Meadow Village) Email Public Comment
8. 11-25-22 Russell Email Public Comment

Matt Martin

From: Rebecca Sokol <rebsokol58@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 4, 2022 12:13 PM
To: Matt Martin
Subject: Fwd: Sunset Meadows.

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Rebecca Sokol** <rebsokol58@gmail.com>
Date: Fri, Nov 4, 2022 at 11:03 AM
Subject: Sunset Meadows.
To: <mmartn@ci.sisters.or.us>

To Matthew Martin and the Community Development Department,

I have been a resident of Sisters for twenty six years, and have treasured this place that my family and I are so thankful to call home. When we first moved here in 1996 the cow pasture extended to Cascade Avenue and Pine St., there was no central sewer system, and the Middle School building had just opened its doors as the new Sisters High School. Sisters has gone through so many changes since then, and yet, there is still the deep community commitment to our unique town here, and the stunning natural beauty surrounding us.

These words are in reference to

File# MP 22-01/SUB 22-01/MNR 22-02, the application by Woodhill Homes-George Hale, for the development of 70 units.

The Planning Commission meeting last night, Nov.3, 2022 was filled with both new and long term residents seeking answers and offering opinions and comments concerning this application. I sat in disbelief that apparently for the second time the developer was not present in the room or via zoom. Where does he live?

Has he ever lived in Sisters or been a part of this community? Are we really going to let this jewel of a place be turned over repeatedly to developers who in this case are simply going to strip away a swath of 400 plus trees, build low quality crammed in houses, leaving us with the eyesore of a neighborhood at the gateway to the most beautiful scenic byway? Meanwhile taking all of their profits to the bank! This is horrifying, unacceptable and this application should be rejected.

There is no doubt plenty of development taking place in Sisters currently, and we are definitely experiencing a boom in tourism as well. Our roads are congested, there is an increase in litter lining the highways, byways and forest trails, and we are in a serious drought. (Wikiup reservoir has only 3% water left and our aquifers are shrinking). It is our responsibility, the tax paying citizens of Sisters, to define the future of this treasured place, NOT greedy developers who will sacrifice our resources for their profit. The stewardship of our land will certainly be honored by future generations, and will hopefully protect the astounding beauty which constitutes the largest asset of this place. Why in the world would anyone living here want that devalued?

Please! Protect this place from becoming overrun with mediocrity.

The construction that stands out in Sisters are those who are or have been invested in our community and their families and businesses live here.

Respectfully,
Rebecca Sokol

600 West Hope Ave.
Sisters, Or.

Matt Martin

From: Pamela Burry <pamelaburry@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 5, 2022 10:00 AM
To: Matt Martin
Subject: In Opposition to Sunset Meadows development proposal.

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Matthew Martin,

As a long time resident of Sisters, and one of thousands of people who love this town and the surrounding area, I am stunned by the proposed development, Sunset Meadows.

Cut down over 400 hundred trees on one of the most sacred view corners in town?
Build 71 homes on only 12.9 acres of land?

Offer no open space, no gathering area, no playground, hardly enough room for each resident to park a car; strip a corner of town of its powerful natural beauty and merge it with a shocking housing density which is **completely antithetical to how Sisters' residents live, what this town is all about, why people moved here in the first place, and what tourists come here to experience.**

If you turn this corner on 242, you will immediately come upon a magnificent vista into the Cascade Range with the **Three Sisters Mountains standing, glorious**, watching over the town. It is a place where residents take their lunch; where families going to church or school pass by all day long knowing: **THIS IS WHY THEY MOVED HERE.**

This developer plans to mow down the corner, smash in 71 homes, all of which will be extended to the edge of their footprint, cover the 12 acres in concrete and houses **with no thought to the livability of the project, or the well-being of its residents, or the soul of this town.**

This is about one thing only: making the developer rich.

Sisters is a beautiful and strong community.

And Sisters residents are smart. We know when something will be terrible for our town. **We know what a disaster this will prove to be.**

We absolutely know the City of Sisters must reject this proposal completely.

I have attended the meetings and will be there **on the 8th of December, wondering if the developer will have an interest in finally showing up.**

Thank you for reading.

Yours,

Pamela Burry
69889 Meadow View Rd
Sisters, Oregon
97759

Matt Martin

From: Paul Basile <paul2004@mac.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 6, 2022 10:53 AM
To: Matt Martin
Subject: Fwd: MP-22-01/SUB22-01/MNR22-01

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Begin forwarded message:

From: Paul Basile <paul2004@mac.com>
Subject: MP-22-01/SUB22-01/MNR22-01
Date: November 6, 2022 at 10:42:19 AM PST
To: jseymour@ci.sisters.or.us, cconverse@ci.sisters.or.us, whickmann@ci.sisters.or.us, jnagel@ci.sisters.or.us, sdavidson@ci.sisters.or.us, ablumenkron@ci.sisters.or.us, tries@ci.sisters.or.us, ANDREA BLUM <ablum@ci.sisters.or.us>, NANCY CONNOLLY <nconnolly@ci.sisters.or.us>, JENNIFER LETZ <jletz@ci.sisters.or.us>, MICHAEL PREEDIN <mpreedin@ci.sisters.or.us>, GARY ROSS <g.ross@ci.sisters.or.us>, mmmartin@ci.sisters.or.us

Good day.

As a concerned citizen of Sisters, I am writing to request that you facilitate the performance of more due diligence on this subject than has thus far occurred. Specifically, I would appreciate a publicly available formal review/study of the impacts this subdivision (Sunset Meadows) would have on our community, including but not limited to: traffic congestion; site parking plans; wildlife habitat; dark sky ordinance; fire and related evacuation plans; crime prevention plans; and conformity to our historic western small town lifestyle.

Thank you in advance for your attention to this matter.

Paul Basile
paul2004@mac.com
505-603-5249

Paul Basile
paul2004@mac.com

Matt Martin

From: Eva Eagle <eva.eagle@mac.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 5, 2022 11:30 AM
To: Matt Martin
Subject: Sunset Meadows

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Thank you so much for the opportunity to offer my thoughts on the Subset Meadows project.

I urge the city in the strongest terms to reject this proposed project.

We have here a parcel a bit under 13 acres along a scenic byway that offers the first clear view of the mountains as we exit town. Amazingly, the developers propose to place over a 100 homes on that site after they remove over 400 trees. This project is far too dense for this location. The final development offers very little green space for the new residents and completely destroys significant woodland habitat. Is Sisters really a Tree City USA? If so, we must reject this proposal.

Sisters does not need this development. There is plenty of new building going on and we need good plans for how to handle the traffic and service needs of the increased population. We probably need more affordable housing, but the proposed prices are too high for that and, like the prices now expected at the Woodlands, will probably get higher before the homes are ready for sale.

Please, please just say no to this ill conceived and ill designed project.

Eva Eagle
17212 Pine Drive
Sisters, OR

Matt Martin

From: Frederick Ruby <fcruby@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 10, 2022 1:39 PM
To: Matt Martin
Cc: Jennifer Letz
Subject: Sunset Meadows -- Infrastructure for charging electric cars

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Re: File #s MP 22-01/SUB 22-01/MNR22-02

To: Matthew Martin, Principal Planner

Dear Mr. Martin and Planning Commission,

I am writing to comment on that portion of the proposed project that calls for 72-124 multi-family residential units. If the plans call for a standard surface parking lot to serve these multi-family units, I urge the City to require that a basic infrastructure for charging electric vehicles be installed for the benefit of these residents.

My concern about this issue is based on my current occupancy of an apartment at the new Oxbow Flats apartments located adjacent to the proposed Sunset Meadows development. Although I enjoy my apartment, I am discouraged that the surface parking area for all five apartment complex buildings (with three buildings still under construction) contains no infrastructure at all to enable a resident to charge an electric vehicle. I own a 2021 Toyota Prius Prime Plug-In Hybrid so this deficiency impacts me directly.

I appreciate that the City of Sisters has shown leadership in installing electric vehicle charging stations for use by the general public. In fact, I use the new charging stations in the City Hall parking lot to charge my vehicle. However, it takes about two hours to charge my Prius Prime using the standard Level 2 charging stations installed at City Hall. As a retiree I have the flexibility and extra time to charge my car in this manner but people who hold full time jobs need to be able to charge their cars at their place of residence for day-to-day commuting and normal requirements. Accordingly, all electric cars are sold with chargers that can utilize a regular household current to charge the car overnight while the vehicle is not in use.

At Oxbow Flats, the surface parking area does not provide any dedicated electric car charging stations, nor do the apartments contain any exterior electric outlets which would enable apartment residents to plug in a standard Level 1 charger for overnight charging.

There is a serious equity issue at play here as we undergo a national transition to electric vehicles. Where multi-family housing is allowed to develop without an infrastructure for electric vehicles, those apartment residents are relegated to a type of second-class citizenship with respect to this crucial technology. Those of us who own electric vehicles feel that we are displaying good citizenship by reducing our carbon footprint and helping our nation to reduce its dependence on foreign oil. We should be encouraged to purchase and utilize electric vehicles, but a situation such as that which exists at Oxbow Flats really makes ownership of an electric vehicle impractical for apartment residents. I ask that the City use all resources at its disposal to avoid a similar outcome at Sunset Meadows.

I am copying this email to City Councilor Jennifer Letz as I enjoyed a very positive exchange of emails with her earlier in the year concerning access to electric car charging stations.

Fred Ruby
930 W. Felicity Ln., Apt 204
Sisters, OR 97759
Cell/text: 503-317-4839

Matt Martin

From: Bruce Mason <svskyus@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 11, 2022 8:46 AM
To: Matt Martin
Subject: Sunset Meadows application

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

I am in agreement with the many comments you've already received, including but not limited to:

- . Traffic
- . Environmental and scenic concerns,
- . Code variances,
- . Impact on city services, schools, medical services, etc.
- . Impact upon water table
- . Lack of green space
- . Failure to incorporate key elements of the Sisters Country Vision Plan--such as preserving the unique character and small-town feel of Sisters.

I will focus on just two important concerns:

1. Traffic, and
2. Preservation of qualities that make our town unique and livable.

Traffic:

The Woodlands project could add some 600 cars on to our streets.

The McKenzie Meadows project could add 300 to 400 more.

The apartments behind Dollar General could inject several hundred more.

None of this even takes into account the future developments planned by the airport.

Nor does it take into account ongoing efforts to increase tourism.

Add to these ongoing projects another 100- 200 or more vehicles associated with The Sunset Meadows project and we could end up far surpassing the carrying capacity of our roads, despite the city's proposed transportation plan. (Note that I use the word "could" rather than "would" throughout as there is the very real possibility that the supply of new housing would far exceed the demand, unless a great deal more truly affordable housing were included in those projects.)

Preservation of qualities that make our town unique and livable.

Sisters is a small town bordered by mountains, forest, rivers and offers scenic views. Part of the town's character is its size and western ambience. In gathering information for the Sisters Country Visioning process, we were told again and again by the community that preservation of these unique qualities should be given highest priority as Sisters prepare us for the future. The proposed Sunset Meadows project fails to consider these qualities and should not be allowed to go forward, at least not as it is now proposed.

Respectively submitted,
Bruce Mason
69425 Deer Ridge Rd
Sisters, Oregon

Matt Martin

From: Bob Johnson <bjohnson@conversant.com>
Sent: Monday, November 21, 2022 9:16 AM
To: mmartin@cisisters.or.us
Subject: Sunset Meadows concerns
Attachments: Sunset Meadows PMV Concerns 11.22.docx

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi Mr. Martin,

I am the President of the Pine Meadow Village Homeowners Association Board. Attached is a letter outlining concerns are homeowners have regarding the Sunset Meadows development. Thank you for your consideration.

Bob Johnson
President, Pine Meadow Village Homeowners Association Board



November 18, 2022

Matthew Martin
Principal Planner
City of Sisters
P.O Box 39
Sisters OR 97759

Dear Mr. Martin,

As President of the Pine Meadow Village Homeowners Association Board of Directors, I am writing to share concerns on behalf of our homeowners regarding the Sunset Meadows project on scenic Highway 242 between Hood Ave. and Brooks Camp Rd.

Our homeowners have expressed the following concerns for your consideration:

A significant concern is **traffic congestion**. This could be caused by a number of factors including:

- The proposed density of the Sunset Meadows project as well as the Woodlands project across Hwy. 20.
- The East Portal Mobility Hub concept development, which is adjacent to Sunset Meadows. It is unclear what impact the additional traffic will contribute to our community.
- The new elementary school is just down the road on Hwy. 242. With all three schools located in the same area, traffic will increase significantly.

Another significant concern is **infrastructure capacity** including:

- The impact of increased water usage with the many developments already being built in Sisters.
- The need for increased sewer capacity that will be required as a result of the many developments existing and being built in Sisters.

Additional concerns we would ask you consider are:

- Is the development being done in a responsible way that reflects small town lifestyle and maintains the character of our town?
- What will be the impact of automobiles cutting through Pine Meadow Village?
- What will be the impact of increased foot and dog traffic through Pine Meadow Village?

Thank you for considering the concerns of the Pine Meadow Village homeowners.

Bob Johnson
President, Board of Directors
Pine Meadow Village Homeowners Association
541-760-3542

Matt Martin

From: Jeff Seymour
Sent: Saturday, November 26, 2022 8:36 PM
To: Scott Woodford; Matt Martin
Subject: Fw: Sunset Meadows...Please read

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Sent to me specifically.

Jeff

From: cpruss52 <cpruss52@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 25, 2022 11:22 AM
To: Jeff Seymour <jseymour@ci.sisters.or.us>
Subject: Sunset Meadows...Please read

Change is inevitable but the proposed Sunset Meadows development is NOT a well thought out development. The proposal does not promote quality of life, mitigate the efforts of growth, or maintain the unique community character of Sisters. Four of the five key themes/priorities garnered through community input in the developing of Sisters Comprehensive Plan.

The proposal does not meet the following goals stated in the Comprehensive Plan:

Goal 3: “Encourage growth to strike a balance between urban scale development and preserving the history, natural beauty, and character of the community. **The proposal is an urban scale development. It does not belong at the beginning of a designated Scenic Highway. It does absolutely nothing to enhance or preserve the natural beauty of the area.**

Goal 4: “Maintain and enhance the livability of Sisters as a welcoming community with a high quality of life and a strong community identity”. **This proposal does not encourage community. There are no gathering areas for proposed community members.**

Policy 4.1.1: “The City shall recognize and conserve the environment and natural resources that enhance the community’s identity, including open spaces, natural landscaping, outdoor recreation areas, historic structures, and architectural styles, and public art”. **There are no open spaces within this proposal.**

Goal 5: “Meet the housing needs of current and future residents, as well as the regions private and public sector employers by creating opportunities for development of a wide range of housing for all ages and income levels, including housing that is safe and high quality and that includes design features and transitions that contribute to compatibility with existing neighborhoods”. According to data in the Comprehensive Plan, based on the 1,100 needed units, 66% single family detached, 10% single family attached, 11% duplex, triplex, and 11%

multifamily units will be needed. If we apply those percentages to the proposed Sunset Meadows as presented it will provide 13% single family detached, 28% single family attached, 0% duplex, triplex, and 59% multifamily units. This proposal does not meet the actual housing needs of the community.

Goal 6.1: “Protect, conserve, and enhance the quality of the City’s natural and scenic resources, maintain the quality of its air, land, and wildlife habitat, and improve community health”. **This project basically clear cuts 13 acres with a sparse buffer along Hwy. 242, a Scenic Highway and one of the best views of the icon of Sisters.**

Goal 7.1: “Plan, develop, maintain, and enhance recreation opportunities, scenic views, and open spaces to meet the needs of community members and enhance their physical and mental health”. **The need for parks has been identified in several city documents. There are no parks on the west side of town. This proposal dumps hundreds more people on the west side of town which is under served. Postage stamp parks do NOT meet the needs for families and individual seeking an outdoor experience.**

This proposal will have a negative impact on the community. Sometimes preserving a community is far more important than maximizing development.

Redesign this project to reflect the goals stated in the Comprehensive Plan.

Redesign it with respect and thoughtfulness to the natural beauty of the area and the citizens of Sisters.

Change is inevitable. Ugliness is not.

**Cathy Russell
Sisters, OR**

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows