

Collected public comments for the Florida Mixed Housing Project

Mark,

Thank you for the notification. We intend on attending the meeting and as a note to the other Ryler Park neighbors, we hope you do as well.

The concerns about traffic congestion combined with narrow streets through Ryler and Miller Drive and connecting to Colorado Ave are apparent on a daily basis (pre-covid) and especially during the school season and winter. It is important for us as a group to understand the potential impact of additional cars that a development of 35+ homes will make using the existing access via these same streets that are congested with high traffic volume already. It would be in our best interest to follow the progression of various studies and so forth to best insure that the problems don't become much worse and are addressed responsibly.

I hope to see you at the meeting.

Julie Stone

2531 Colorado Ave.

Mark,

My name is Druan Vogel. My husband and I live at 82 Folsom Place and are very interested in the proceedings regarding this parcel. Please email us the link to participate in the virtual meeting. If you could also email a copy of the plans, we would appreciate it. There are definitely concerns over sewer and storm drains.

My email address is: fugate9433@msn.com

Thank you in advance,

Druan Vogel

Mark,

I live at 98 Folsom Place just behind the proposed Cummins Property development. I have a few concerns, chief being the height of the current land and potential height of the housing development. I have a letter I received from the prior home owner of 98 Folsom Place, Paul Hertz. We are lot 23, if that is helpful. The property accepted fill from the Florida Road project, as well as the Riverhouse Children's Center which raised the grade of the parcel. Per the notice from the City, development will be from the previous grade prior to the addition of any fill.

The complaint filed at the time of the addition of the fill is 566521200091. I would like to see this addressed at the future meetings. I am concerned the current proposal would cause the homes to tower over our single story homes and affect our views and sunlight immensely.

I also have concern regarding the number of homes the development proposes to put abutting the folsom place neighborhood. There are 5 lots affected, 1 of which will have open space behind it. The proposal then suggests they will abut 5 homes/lots behind the 4 remaining lots. I feel the distribution of lots needs to be consistent with current neighbors, I would propose no more than 4 lots be developed behind the 4 existing lots on folsom place.

I would like to maintain the feel of the neighborhood and cramming in extra homes will increase traffic, congestion and affect the current quiet neighborhoods both on Folsom and Ryler Park. There is a place for high density housing and I don't believe this development fits.

Thanks

Michael and Stacey Cavanaugh

The proposed community development on Florida (#20-00096) should be self-contained with access on and off Florida, not through our Ryler Park neighborhood. If the plan goes through as is, it will have an enormous negative impact on the residents on Miller Drive, Ryler Drive, and Colorado Ave.

Miller Drive and Ryler Drive are small, narrow neighborhood streets with children, bicycles and pets running around. They are barely two-way now. They simply cannot be turned into a thoroughfare for an additional 75 or more additional vehicles. In addition, Colorado Ave already has a driveway to the office complex, further complicating access in both directions in an already congested intersection (Colorado & Florida) with school buses, which is worse in snowy conditions. This is not good for traffic flow for anyone. All other communities on Florida use Florida as the in/out access points. Why is this one being treated differently?

The city should require the development to provide access drives in and out off of Florida and not direct traffic through our small neighborhood streets. There should be no vehicle access through our neighborhood, including construction trucks while the development is being built. They need to go in and out on Florida while building the community and the residents of the development should only be allowed access to Florida.

Please confirm receipt of this comment as it has been submitted before May 26 and should be included in the packet.

Thank you.

Martie Dickman
27 Miller Drive

It is with great concern the access passageway though Ryler Park with the proposed subdivision Florida Road Mixed Housing Annexation.

Our neighborhood is quiet and the impact of through traffic will place a substantial burden on the homes in Ryler Park. The sheer number of units will create an extraordinary amount of traffic, noise, pollution and safety issues for our neighborhood. Our neighborhood cannot take this burden. We are a quiet neighborhood with children and pet; families walking in relative ease.

There is no reasonable consideration to placing the traffic burden on Ryler Park. Access in and out of the development needs to be from Florida Road. Perhaps a round a bout will ease the traffic.

When school is in session there is substantial traffic headed to Riverview Elementary. There are buses, kids and families on bikes, and walkers on Colorado Avenue. The business on Colorado and Florida park their employees on Colorado creating a narrow throughway causing field of vision issues and safety issues. In addition when the snow falls the parking and plowing create an even narrower Colorado Ave. with snow and ice piling up along the edges and cars parked in all types of odd and crazy configurations.

Again, we are a quiet neighborhood and petition to keep it that way. The precedent has been set and we are providing examples of access being blocked for through traffic. You will find that in surrounding neighborhoods like the junction of Colorado Ave. and Jameson Dr. as well as the corner of Spruce and Cedar. We also see a emergency access only for the condos that are south and across the street from Colorado Ave. and Florida Ave.

Those neighborhoods have been protected from unnecessary traffic and their integrity and peace has been maintained. It is important for Ryler Park to have the same safeguards.

Please submit our Comments in this email for the review period and the petition attached.

Regards,
Christine and Nathan Trout
34 Miller Dr.
Durango, CO 81147

I have a couple of comments/concerns regarding the proposed development of the Cummins property on Florida road.

- The proposed zoning (RM), at 8.85 units/acre allowing 37 homes/townhomes is very high density considering this location. This could bring a potential of 50-60 additional vehicles (potentially 2 cars per household) accessing Florida Road. Already, the Colorado Ave access point to Florida road is very congested. Additionally, Folsom Place residents and Folsom Park visitors are often challenged when attempting accessing Florida road because of heavy traffic. I would suggest that one size does not fit all when it comes to zoning/density and the density for this project is too high.

- There is also a concern regarding the drainage on this parcel and the potential negative impact it could have on both Folsom and Ryler residents.

- The Cummins property owners allowed the Florida Road improvement project to dump large amount of fill gravel on the property when they were finished. This increased the grade of the Cummins property considerably. I notified City Planning at the time and they visited the site to document this increased grade which apparently was allowed because it is county property. My understanding is that the city would not have allowed this as it effects all of the adjacent property owners with regard to both potential drainage issues as well as negatively impacting site lines. This grade should be returned to its original state to be more compatible with the adjacent properties.

- The comment period is much too short given the circumstances regarding the Covid situation as well as the size of the project and the number of residents it will affect. This will affect many more residents than just adjacent property owners.

Please email me the link for the virtual meeting.

Thank you.
George Curtis
94 Folsom Place
Durango
Mark,

My name is Denise Danilov, I am a real estate broker and live at 105 Ryler Drive. This email is in response to the new proposed development on the Cummins property located along Florida Road. First of all - I just want to let you know I have petitioned Ryler Park Subdivision to stop access to Ryler Drive for this development. I have talked with 35 residents in our neighborhood and know one is in favor of having access to Ryler Drive. Also, out of the 35 residents, almost all homeowners and a few renters have not received notice of the planned development. Only 4 people received a notice from the City of Durango in the Ryler Park Subdivision. It is my understanding that ALL residents should have been mailed a proper notice. I believe the City of Durango is in violation of protocol to the homeowners of Ryler Park Subdivision. I was able to make a copy of that notice and distribute to all the residents. My home is located on Lot 13 and one house down from the proposed road opening of Ryler Drive. I should have received a notice! I have owned my home here for over 20 years. I bought this home in 1995 for the reason that the main road in the subdivision was a horseshoe without a lot of direct traffic. This neighborhood is very safe and quiet. Many of the neighbors have children and pets and with the opening of Ryler Drive, the values of our homes would decrease and change the face of the subdivision in a very negative way.

The current plan for the development is to build 37 residential units. That would be approximately 100 cars a day going by our homes, not to mention the nightmare of living with construction on our road for two years. The City of Durango needs to do a traffic study of the roads in this area. They would find that Ryler Drive and Colorado Avenue would be burdened heavily and are already congested. The Ryler Park Subdivision could not handle 100 cars a day. It is a small residential road. It is the problem of the developer to find the RIGHT access and egress to the planned development. He cannot dump this problem on us. The developer has other options but does not want the expense of road building onto Florida Road.

We neighborhoods as a whole entity, are prepared to seek legal counsel if necessary to stop this. You cannot destroy our quality of life and we do not want the traffic and crime that the new development will bring to our peaceful neighborhood.

Best,
Denise Danilov
105 Ryler Drive
Durango, Colorado 81301
970 769 9642

Hi Mark,

Would you please email me a link to participate in the June 1 Durango Planning Commission meeting? My home is on Ryler Dr and I strongly oppose the proposal to connect Ryler Dr to the new development on Florida Rd proposed by Stuart Wright & Tracy Reynolds. Our street is a quiet one where neighborhood kids play in the street daily. The additional traffic from this development connecting to our neighborhood would dramatically increase traffic on our roads, making it unsafe for the children and increasing noise for homeowners and residents. This would adversely impact our property values.

I am not opposed to the development of the 4 acre lot, but feel very strongly (along with many of my neighbors) that for the safety of our children and the preservation of home values of our quiet neighborhood, the entrance and exit to the new community should be on Florida Road, NOT Ryler Dr.

I look forward to the meeting on June 1.

Very Sincerely,
Meredith M. Woods, CFP

First and foremost we all knew that the Cummins parcel has been for sale and would eventually sell.

However the development that is being proposed is excessive on many levels. The density of the proposed build out is excessive and will have a direct impact on the surrounding neighborhoods. First, having this development exit onto Ryler Dr. and Miller Dr. will destroy the tranquility that we have now. There are several residences that have children and these children use these streets as safe play grounds, dumping all the traffic into this neighborhood will alter this area for children to play therefore being lost forever. Secondly Ryler Dr. and Miller Dr. were not built for this kind of traffic, two cars can barely pass each other now with vehicles parked on both sides of the street. Third, dumping all of the cars eventually out onto Colorado Ave will cause even more traffic congestion than already exists. The businesses that are located at the corner of Florida Rd and Colorado Ave. often have to use Colorado Ave, as overflow parking now. There are many egress issues with all of the traffic routes leading to Florida Rd in the way the way this development is being proposed.

This development needs to both enter and exit onto Florida Rd like all other new development that have taken place along Florida Rd. A reduction in density is also needed to help lessen the impact to all surrounding neighborhoods.

John Perry & Caryl Goode

Hello Mark,

I write in regard to the Cummins property at the intersection of Florida Road and Colorado Avenue. I am a Landscape Architect and a neighbor. I do not support the density or the EN designation of this development given the EN5 designation of the surrounding watershed, I am additionally concerned about privacy, safety, heat island reflectivity, scarce space for vegetable gardens, and developing a cookie cutter congregant setting in a pandemic and climate disaster era. Please see my attached comments on AS-101 & AS103. (forgive me, my yahoo mail is messing with my formatting)

The EN-5 Riverview Established Neighborhood district has an island of PUD shoved in it which will be enlarged by this Cummins proposal. The PUD model inserts a different character, density, and regulations from its watershed and surrounding landscape architecture. This high-density urban infill, thought popular by urban planners for many reasons, seems inappropriate given the site's slope & current drainage absorption functions, the urban wildlife migratory patterns, and the "congregant" design (conducive to virus-spreading).

The density of the proposed development is not felt only onsite. Their increased car, light, and noise pollution spills downhill into Folsom Place and Folsom Park. The resulting level of urbanity does not align with the Folsom Place's "established" character. As such, there is a degrading of neighborhood definitions and delineations. For example, why can't Folsom Place rent out to Airbnb while the Cummins neighborhood could? How is Folsom Place, adjacent to the development, different in

character when we share their dense sounds, smells, light, pollution, and runoff? If you want to maintain the character, then follow the established development guidelines:

- Lot width at the street edge varies. Many are approximately 75 feet in width.
- There are no alleys.
- Views occur through properties, especially along side yards.
- Rear yards of some properties drop off steeply.
- Garages are often attached to the primary structure. Some are set back from the front of the house, while others are in line with it. Typically, the garage door is visually subordinate to the overall building front, usually no more than 20% of the building face.
- Traditional houses are one and two stories in height.
- Houses vary in style and form.
- Traditionally, views were available, through properties along their side yard setbacks.
- Most houses face the street.
- Building fronts are uniformly set back from the street; this line of buildings reflects the curvature of the street.
- Most houses have one-story porches that face onto the street.
- Most houses have primary front walls that are 40 feet or less in width.
- Attached sidewalks are typical. Established development patterns in the Riverview District: Variety of lot sizes, lots typically along the ridges are deeper than those with less topography. Parking is typically accessed from the street.

Existing conditions in Riverview Residential District: Primary structures appear similar in height and form, even though some variation in heights exists, these are mostly a result of newer infill projects. The primary roof ridge typically runs parallel to the street.

Design Objectives for the the EN-5, Riverview Neighborhood:

- Maintain the line of building fronts along the street.
- Promote views through properties along side yard setbacks.
- Keep the visual effects of garage in proportion with those seen traditionally.
- New buildings should convey a scale similar to those seen traditionally by dividing larger buildings into modules that reflect traditional building sizes.
- Maintain a sense of green in the front setback by minimizing the amount of paving there.

During this great "Pause" is timely to ask Reynolds and Associates to design affordable communities, respond to anticipated environmental challenges. and fit into the surrounding context. If the EN-5 issue is a non-issue for you all, because you've already decided as much, then the PUD should make sure the trolley stops there, that urban runoff is used to water shade trees, that the Open Space be useable, not just sidewalk trips, unusable slopes and back corners for stormwater, that humans can have privacy and outdoor space isolated from neighbors, that streetlights are not obnoxious, that dwellers can garden and there are fruit trees. Business /Design, as Usual, is insufficient. Either make something truly valuable of the inserted PUD EN designation or revert to the character of the neighborhood and decrease density.

Kindly,
Mary

Dear Mr. Williams :

Please send me a link so I may attend the virtual meeting on June 1 at 6:00 pm.

My comments on the proposed project are concerned with safety and traffic. I am opposed to connecting Ryler Drive for internal access. Instead, Ryler should be gated emergency egress as are Jameson Drive and the newer Silverview Townhomes across Florida. The Cummins property conceptual plan shows a parking lot that backs up to Florida. That should be the main access to the entire housing development. There is another entrance planned off Colorado Avenue that should be used for additional access. For example, during reconstruction of Florida Road and during construction of the Children's House the Cummings property was used for staging and there was access from Florida Road.

It can be anticipated 37 residential units will generate at least 40+ additional cars. If there is no way to block Ryler Drive from becoming a main everyday access to the housing development, it is essential to require installation of at least one or two speed humps on Ryler Drive. Good planning will protect the safety of the many children who live and play here.

My last comment involves parking and city code enforcement. During business hours Colorado Avenue is parked full with employees of nearby businesses. The proposed new housing development will increase traffic and intensify conflict on the narrowing road when it is parked full. I urge parking on Colorado Avenue be limited to one side of the street to aid in accommodating the new housing development access and its associated increase in traffic. Currently the surrounding neighborhoods use Colorado Avenue to park a variety of work trailers, personal vehicles, boats, etcetera. More housing can only will increase the pressure on Colorado Avenue and cause safety issues. Please require the builder to submit a traffic study including proposed mitigation for the anticipated traffic increases.

Thank-you,
Catherine S. Jones
139 Ryler Dr.
970-247-4648

May 26, 2020

Dear Mr. Williams and Members of the Durango Planning Commission:

Thank you for the opportunity to make these public comments in regard to the Initial Zoning and Conceptual Development Plan for Project #20-00096, the 4.2 acre Cummins Property at Florida Road and Colorado Avenue. As a homeowner of 86 Folsom, which adjoins the Project, I have questions, concerns, and suggestions for pre-construction, construction and post construction phases of the proposed development.

Covid 19 has taught us the deep value of community connections in healthy spaces. I appreciate the character and quality of life on Folsom, and I believe that others should be allowed to enjoy the Durango lifestyle as well. Ideally, development on the Cummins property would allow a blending and enhancement of our Florida neighborhood community, and result in great benefits to everyone involved. The Folsom neighbors of this proposed development are literally and figuratively downstream, downhill, and downwind of the Cummins property. As a neighborhood of working-class families, we are also "economically below" the property developer. My overarching concern is that Folsom Residents will bear the burden of this development, and that the Developing Corporation and future Cummins Residents will receive the greatest benefit.

I ask the Planning Commission to work to balance the impacts and advantages of this development to the greater good of the entire community - current and future residents alike.

Thank you for including the following list of questions, concerns, and suggestions in the Project's packet for the Planning Commission.

Sincerely,
Leigh Gillette, Homeowner
86 Folsom Place, Durango, CO 81301

Project # 20-00096 Questions, Concerns, and Suggestions

Electrical utilities access: current electrical powerline access is via easement on the Cummins Property behind Folsom fence lines. The utility poles are in Folsom yards, and trucks currently access poles via Cummins property. What is the plan to deal with utility service access? We suggest an alley or open space corridor to allow utility access, share the maintenance burden, and benefit Folsom and Cummins residents alike.

Sewer and Water Lines: Where does the development plan to tie-in to sewer and water? Folsom's infrastructure seems outdated to handle this increase, especially the density of the increase proposed. Durango Fire Protection District Exclusion Request: Why is the developer not contributing to local fire protection and requesting a waiver from the mill levy? This tactic seems neither community-minded nor responsible.

Property Adjacency : Current Plans show proposed Cummins private residences sharing backyard fence with existing Folsom residences. As currently proposed, Folsom residents lose privacy as new homes loom uphill. Again, we suggest incorporating an alley or open space to allow for utility access and increase setback.

Construction impacts: Folsom and Ryler residents will be subject to ongoing impacts during construction. What efforts will be made to minimize/mitigate these impacts? As demonstrated when the Cummins property hosted the Florida Road Improvement Project, Folsom and Ryler residents will again face impacts on:

- Air Quality: morning airflow is downhill, and heavy equipment exhaust filled Folsom residences most summer mornings.
- Storm water and Dust control: What is the plan to mitigate these impacts?
- Sound pollution: overwhelming and constant sound of heavy equipment, especially "reverse/backing up" alarms (beep-beep beep).

Open Space access: As currently designed, the Cummins property development includes open space accessible to Ryler Park and Cummins residents, but Folsom residents are locked out. As a gesture of community goodwill and connection (and perhaps as remediation for impacts), Cummins development plans could be adjusted to connect Folsom residents to the planned open space via alley/utility connector/open space along Cummins/Folsom property boundary.

Community Paths/Safe Routes to School : Folsom and Cummins residents and communities could benefit from trail connectors to Riverview Elementary and Open Spaces via alley/utility connector/open space along Cummins/Folsom property boundary.

Light pollution: With Cummins residences currently proposed immediately adjacent and uphill of Folsom residences, light pollution should be considered and Dark Skies guidelines adjusted to shield Folsom residences from new, uphill light sources in the Cummins property.

Fireplace impact on air quality: Evening airflow in winter causes Folsom Place to be filled with smoke from nearby wood burning fireplaces. Will Cummins residences be adding to Folsom winter air pollution?

Ed and Marcy Waddell
102 Folsom Place
Durango, CO 81301

May 25, 2020

Comments on Project 20-00096:

The proposed community development of 37 residences is far too dense, it is not consistent with the residential Folsom neighborhood, it has a false elevation, and it is likely to stress the current sewer and storm drain infrastructure.

The west side of the Cummins property should match what currently exists on the shared property line with the Folsom Place residences (Zoning EN-5). The five Folsom Place lots (lots 20-24) are 7200 square feet or larger. The Folsom houses are single-story. I have a 25 foot set-back and believe the other lots do as well. Three of the Folsom properties have 55-60 feet between the property line and the house. The proposed 5 houses on the west side of Cummins property shows lot sizes of 3200 to 4000 square feet; half the size of their Folsom neighbors. In addition, the plans suggest that the Cummins houses would be a mere 20 feet from the Folsom property lines; is that the minimum set-back? The plans neglect to state whether the single-family homes are one, two or two and a half stories.

In addition, it is my understanding that the elevation of the property has risen significantly since the widening of Florida Road (2009) and the development of the Riverhouse Childrens Center (2012) and that complaints as well as photographs have been filed. I ask that the Planning Department addresses these complaints and resolutions (if any) with the current Folsom property owners as well as the buyer/developer.

With the higher elevation, a small lot size and such close proximity to the west property line the new houses will tower over the existing Folsom properties leaving us without any privacy. The homes that share the property line with the Folsom residents should be consistent with what's already established and therefore no more than 3 single-story houses, each with at least 40 feet of back yard from the property line to the house should be built on this side of the Cummins property. Furthermore, this area is more dense than the RM (medium density) standards sited in the narrative offered by the developer which states 8 units per acre. The 5 proposed houses sit on a total of 20,000 square feet (only half of an acre). The current development plan for the Cummins property is not acceptable; it is too dense and does not honor the Folsom Place zoning standards.

As a Folsom Place resident, one of my greatest concerns is the sewer system and storm drain capacity. It is well known on our street that over the years residences have experienced sewer back-ups. It looks as though the existing sewer line for the Ryler subdivision as well as the 14 units at Silverview Townhomes (798 Florida Rd, built in 2015) feed into Folsom's sewer line. Can the 12" sewer line accommodate an additional 70-100 people? I have even more concern when the site plan (page AS-102) key notes states: "7. Capacity of existing sewer main to be confirmed." Is Florida Road absent of sewer

lines that this development can utilize? On two sides of my property I have sewer and storm drain easements. How is the sewer line tied into the existing line? What impact will I have on my property? It appears that there is only one storm drain for the entire Cummins property. Is that adequate for a 4 acre parcel? The Folsom neighborhood has four, and the slope is much less. Also, I would like an explanation of what "storm water quality detention" means; is it an above or below ground area that collects run-off prior to going into a storm drain? Will we have an increase in mosquitoes? We already have a mosquito problem with the poor drainage at Folsom Park and Animas Mesquito Control regularly visits our area.

As for cars and roadways, why isn't the access on and off of Florida Road? Why impact the small, quiet neighborhoods that already have to accommodate 9 months of elementary school traffic? An additional 70 cars a day seems problematic.

Finally, I need to express my concern about the exclusion of the Durango Fire Department. I hope I have read this document incorrectly as it leads me to believe that the property isn't paying for fire protection. How is that possible? What other options are there? Isn't that exclusion putting my property and family at greater risk?

Ed and Marcy Waddell
102 Folsom Place

Dear Mr. Williams:

I understand that comments are required by today for inclusion in the Planning Commission packet. As a resident of 131 Ryler Drive, I'm an interested party in the above matter, and, as such, submit the following comment:

Ryler Park was designed as a self-contained community consisting of a loop, each end of which linked with Colorado Avenue, an arrangement contemplating no traffic other than that serving the residences within the Park and establishing a residential-friendly, very lightly trafficked enclave. One side of this loop was designated as Miller Drive and the other side as Ryler Drive. The containment of traffic to that serving residents of Ryler Park was of the essence in the concept of Ryler Park's design and integral to the value of the residences within it.

Stuart Wright, the Developer, proposes a somewhat similar community, which for want of a better label I'll refer to as the "FRP" (for Florida Road Project), which would abut Miller Drive, but instead of proposing that it be a cul de sac, with one entrance, which could be off Colorado Avenue or off Florida Avenue, or, in the manner of Ryler Park, a loop with one entrance off Colorado Avenue and another off Florida Avenue, the Developer wishes to have a single entrance off Colorado Avenue and to appropriate Ryler Drive as a means of funneling traffic serving the FRP back to Colorado Avenue.

Because of saving of costs in road construction and the increase in space available for housing units, allowing the FRP to proceed in this fashion would result in FRP's total value being increased significantly over what it would be if, like Ryler Park, it were designed either as a cul de sac or as a self-contained loop. It would also have the effect of greatly increasing traffic and congestion in Ryler Park, grossly compromising its character, and significantly reducing the property value of every Ryler Park residence. It would thereby amount to a taking of what belongs to residents of one community to enrich the developer of a neighboring new community. I don't know what legal principles obtain in this situation,

but I submit to you that acceding to the Developer's request would would contravene basic principles of equity and good neighborliness.

I'll only add that, in drafting his plan, the developer did at least show some sensitivity to the character of Ryler Park: He presumed to change the name of our street from Ryler Drive to Ryler Road, a more fitting designation if it were to be rededicated to serving a great deal more traffic.

For the foregoing reasons, I respectfully request that this application be denied in its present form and that the developer be required to redesign his plan in a way that admits of no intrusion on Ryler Park.

Edward Packard
131 Ryler Drive
Durango CO 81301
cell: 561 234-0282

Dear Mark,

First I would like to participate in the virtual meeting planned for June 1 at 6pm.

I would appreciate that my comments be included in the Planning Commission packet.

I have lived and worked in Durango for over 40 years. In 1994 I was the first person to purchase a home in the newly developed Ryler Park subdivision. My home is 139 Ryler Dr. This was the first house built. One aspect of that development was the completion of Colorado Av. Durango at that time was in need of the cross town assess that Colorado provided from Florida to the 32nd street bridge. Then Hummingbird cul de sac and Jamison where created with Jamison not a through street. Colorado can be a busy street because of the limit cross town access. When Colorado was first completed it was also designated a snow route. For some reason the city took that designation away? The Ryler Dr. and Miller street makes a nice circle system. I know that the end of Ryler just deadends at the property now under consideration for development.

The redesign of Florida road a few years ago egress was added at the intersection with Colorado to handle the increased amount of traffic at that intersection. I can attest that for a number of reasons turning right and particularly left from Colorado has become more difficult. Up stream development in the city and county and the increased population has it appears doubled the traffic load. That and the way the city manages Colorado. There is often so many cars parked on Colorado right up to the intersection from employees at the offices near the intersection it feels like a one lane road. And turning makes it hard to fit two cars through at once. In addition trucks, cars and trailers are stored on Colorado. Every now and then the code enforcement tags some of them and the owners play the game and move them a little. When it snows Colorado turns into a one lane road.

On Jamison the developers tried to put in 12 units on a small lot. Only have has been built out and not all those have been sold. Thankfully Jamison is not a through street as the home owners can attest. Much of the other development along Florida condos, townhomes have their own access to Florida.

I don't want this new development proposed by Mr. Stuart on the Cummins property connected to Ryler Park road system. Thirty-seven units at least 2 cars per unit coming and going would overwhelm our

street. It could take years to built and construction traffic would be to much. The development should have it own access to Florida. And Colorado should be designated no parking. The city needs to strictly enforce the current parking ordinances. Colorado must be a snow route, no parking especially near the intersection with Florida. At the end of Ryler drive where it meets the new development should be a gate that is locked accept for emergencies just as was done on Jamison. Do not allow traffic through Ryler Park.

To the south of the Cummins property is two other lots, one with businesses and the other also a vacate lot. For sure someday some one will want to build those out. Those properties should be thought of in this process as contributing to access. So please require this new proposal to have its own access to Florida and knowing that the other properties some day could fit into the scenario.

From Ryler Park there was originally planned a foot path to Folsom park so that children from Riverview could go to the park with out walking on Florida. That should be included in this proposal as well to gain access to Folsom Park internally.

Thank You for the opportunity to comment.

Gary and Cathy Jones
139 Ryler Dr

I am a home owner at 129 Ryler Drive and would like to participate in the virtual meeting to be held on June 1st.

The proposed number of homes going into that lot is quite concerning, along with the street access to Ryler Drive. We have children who play in the street and this proposes a safety issue due to the curve of the street. Cars cannot always see the children due to the curve.

In addition, access to Colorado Ave from Ryler and Miller Drives can be a burden in the morning during the school year as many cars utilize Colorado Ave from the homes above Ryler Drive.

Employees from the medical office buildings and the Riverhouse Children's Center park along Colorado Ave creating limited road space and line of sight from Ryler/Miller Dr to Florida Road. In addition to all the other vehicles (Trailers, other recreational vehicles, work vehicles, etc.) parked along there from people who do not live on Colorado Ave, some from the Riverview Drive area.

In the winter, buildup of snow along the curbs on Colorado Ave (and in the Ryler Park neighborhood) create more of a one lane street - I have seen a school bus wait until all cars have left Colorado Ave before it could turn onto Colorado Ave from Florida Road due to the 4+ feet of snow on each side of the road and cars parked next to that on each side of the road.

Adding some 70+ vehicles to the mix will create a great deal of congestion in an already overloaded neighborhood.

Thank you,
Kim Nemecek

Good Morning Mark,

I have a question about one of the documents that are available on the projects website for Florida mixed housing project. It appears the Ryler Park plat is not the correct plat. It does not include Miller drive and is not the as built plans for the subdivision. This is problematic for several reasons. Is there a correct plat of the Ryler Park subdivision that should have been included in the packet material for review? Maybe this is the correct plat, for some reason that I am not aware of? Just thought it needs to be checked before the meeting at the end of next month so that we all have the correct information to go on.

I will be interested to know if I have missed something in looking at this plat.
Thank you,
Julie Stone

I would like to make a comment regarding the project #20-00096 which is for the Florida Road Mixed Housing Annexation project.

I do not want the road from this housing project to connect with Ryler Drive. If it connects with Ryler Drive it also connects with Miller Drive. Both Ryler Drive and Miller Drive are quiet streets with lots of kids. We do not need heavy traffic added to these streets.

Thank you.
Trish Gyland
email: trishgyland@gmail.com

My name is Sue Dickinson, and I am a resident on Folsom Place. I want to express my concerns about the project planned at the intersection of Colorado and Florida Rd.

Several of the residents on Folsom Place have had issues with sewer backups in their basements. Though we do not have a basement, we are still downstream from this proposed project. I feel that the current sewer main would be impacted with so many more residences. I think the rights of way and the sewer volume need to be addressed.

I would like to be given a link for the public hearing. skjkdickinson@gmail.com

Thank you for your addressing this issue.

Sue Dickinson

City of Durango Planning Commission

6-6-2020

Ref: Concerning the proposed Florida Road mixed housing annexation
Cummins Property

I am one of the original residents of Ryler Park, having rented a house on Miller Drive in 1994 for a year, then I purchased my current home on Ryler Drive in '95.

My house is one of the last houses on Ryler Drive, at the dead end. My property abuts the property of discussion.

I lived at this house throughout the Florida Road re-construction project that lasted around 2 years, and later, when the hillside construction, opposite this property, was developed into a preschool. There was a multi week procession of dump trucks thickly covering the entire field with the excavated soil from the preschool site. This has also changed the lots topography. One of the immediate effects was sending water in such volume towards my house that it flooded the crawl space, destroying items I had stored there and creating mold which had to be abated. In addition this topography change could possibly lead to any new construction being higher than the original lot would have allowed based on city height restrictions. Also, none of this dumped dirt was compacted.

Both projects were invasive by nature and disruptive to live next to. Constant noise, dirt and added traffic. It turned a peaceful community into one with strangers.

For 26 years we have considered the Ryler Park neighborhood a very safe and connected community, one where there is always an assortment of kids and pets active and playing in the streets and sidewalks. Safe because of very little traffic from within the neighborhood and virtually none from the outside driving through. That aspect was and is a factor in all of us feeling good about having bought into our community and for those now buying in. This new development with access from Ryler Drive will destroy that and consequently devalue all of our homes in Ryler Park.

Therefore, I do not endorse the proposed access through Ryler Drive, I would like to be assured for the safety of our neighborhood and kids that development access would not be allowed through Ryler drive to the lot. i.e. NO construction vehicles or crews through Ryler.

In addition, if the project receives an approval it should require them to build a permanent wall of some kind to separate the two communities. This should be done at the beginning of construction to assure the safety of our children along with keeping construction noise and disruption to a minimum. As my home is located directly adjacent to the Cummings project as well as being located as the last house on Ryler Drive at the dead end, my personal experiences have been annoying at best. Since asphalt paving was never completed along the front of my house, 3" to 6" cobblestone was dumped on the dirt so heavy construction vehicles could run through our neighborhood when the Florida road reconstruction project was going on. Multiple times construction vehicle tires kicked up large rocks that hit my vehicles which were parked in front of my house.

Thank you,
Doe Youtz
101 Ryler Drive
Durango, Colorado 81301

I'm writing to comment on the proposed Florida Road Mixed Housing Annexation, Initial Zoning and Conceptual Development Plan (6/29).

I live at Florida Road and Colorado Ave, across the street from this proposed development. My primary concerns about this development are the impact it will have on Florida Road traffic and the safety of pedestrians in the area. City officials should consider lowering the speed limit on Florida Road prior to this development beginning and enforcing the speed limit as well as crosswalks.

1) Cars routinely speed along the stretch of Florida Road between the 3rd Avenue turn and County Road 250. I am regularly tailed simply for driving the posted speed limit. I ask city officials to lower the speed limit and enforce the limit with flashing signs like what you see on 32nd Street. With the additional traffic that would be added to the road due to this development, the time is now to make this change.

2) I'm concerned with the impact that the increase in traffic from this development will have on pedestrian safety. I have lived in my home for over four years and can count on one hand the number of times cars have actually followed the law and stopped for me to safely cross the painted crosswalk at Colorado Ave and Florida. Prior to approving this development, I suggest the city examine how to keep pedestrians safe with this increase in traffic to Florida. I know adults and children at the Riverhouse Childrens' Center day care center (directly across the street from the proposed development) routinely cross this street as well, and I'm concerned for their safety. Perhaps the city could consider installing a blinking pedestrian signal at this crosswalk to improve our ability to safely cross this increasingly dangerous road.

Thank you.
Brannon Addison

Hi Mark,

My name is Mary Lerner, and I live at 70 Folsom Place.

I have actually found the Cummins project plans on the city website.

Neighbors on Folsom Place have expressed concerns about the capacity of the current sewer system here to support such a big project. As far as any of us knows, the sewer line on Folsom Place has not been updated or expanded since the 1950s. Over the 26 years that I have lived on Folsom Place, I know that there has been a repeated sewer blockage/backup problem especially at the south end of the block where apparently the sewer line goes uphill somewhat to meet the line coming down Florida Road. With 37 or more new toilets, sinks, tubs and showers emptying into the current sewer line, this problem could definitely be magnified.

Also with less ground space for rain and snow melt to soak into, there is concern about adequate drainage, since Folsom Place and Folsom Park are the low point of this area, and once used to be a local skating pond.

Many of the neighbors on the west side of Folsom Place have basements and are concerned about sewer backups and overflows into these spaces without updated and expanded sewer capacity on Folsom Place.

I do see on the plans that an assessment of the current sewer line's capacity is to be looked into. So, does that mean that the project will then include sewer upgrading and expanding on Folsom Place that seems likely to be needed?

Also, if private contractors will be involved if lots are sold separately from the entire project, will there be universal requirements in regards to distance from and height limitations in consideration of current properties? I know some neighbors are concerned about privacy issues if new building is very close to their current backyards. Most of the homes on the east side of Folsom Place are low one story single family homes, and neighbors are concerned about two story or higher buildings overlooking their backyards and into their back windows.

The current utility access road/space does not seem indicated on the plans, so does the 20 foot space on the west side of the project from anticipated building to property line include that space or not include that space?

Thank you,
Mary Lerner

Mr Williams:

I am a resident in the Ryler Park Neighborhood, living at 30 Miller Drive for the past seven years. I have a number of concerns regarding the proposed development on Florida Road. That property is directly behind my home,

1. Safety Concerns

There are numerous concerns regarding the proposed plan:

A huge increase in traffic merging onto both Miller and Ryler Drive which will increase the danger to children, residents and bikers at the same time of day as residents of the Florida Development go to work or return.

**Environmental concerns with increase in pollution and noise in the neighborhood.
The construction process will greatly increase this problem.**

Dangerous merging onto Colorado Avenue in either direction due to the downhill from Colorado Avenue to Ryler Dr.

Snow removal will be greatly impeded more than it is already, narrowing Miller and Ryler to one lane.

2. Failure of Notification.

On two occasions I was not informed of the proposed notice of the Development by the City of Durango Planning Commission . Had my neighbors not given me the information I would have been totally uninformed. I live within 300 ft of the proposed Development.

3. Our Folsom St area neighbors have concerns about the existing Sewer system which may already be compromised.

4.The property related to the Development has never been compacted, raising the level of the lot by many feet, the slope of the property increased the threat of flooding and mud run off onto the Miller Drive , Ryler and Folsom residences .

5. Fire Protection: The petition for exclusion from the Durango Fire protection District submitted on 05/05/2020 excluded the Mixed Housing Development from paying proper and expect taxes leaving

the burden of that to other residents and allowing the Proposed Development to avoid paying their fair share.

6. The proposed Development offers no actual benefits to the Ryler Park Neighborhood and only presents serious concerns for safety and quality of life to this neighborhood.

Please add my name to the Zoom Meeting on June 29th at 6 PM.

WE are asking that you take our concerns regarding the proposed development quite seriously being that it affects many aspects of our quality of living including health, safety and property values.

**with appreciation
Sandra Eisemann Ph.D. R.N.
30 Miller Drive
Durango Colorado
June 22, 2020**

Mr Williams

I live at 117 Ryler Drive I would like to see Ryler Drive not continued to the new housing. It would put a lot off extra traffic on to Ryler Drive. I was also told that if the road goes through that Ryler Park would have to go to a cluster mail box. I do not what to see the name of Ryler Drive changed to Ryler road. On the concept plans it also shows the the road would continue on south at a later time that would being more traffic to Ryler Drive. Could I get a link to participate in the virtual meeting.

Thanks Harvey McCune

Hhmcune@gmail.com

Sent from my iPad

Mr. Williams,

Respectfully, I request a reply to this email and that this email be included in the public comments concerning this proposed Development.

My name is Nathan Trout and my home is at 34 Miller Drive, Durango, CO 81301, and is adjacent to the north of the proposed Florida Road Mixed Housing Development in Ryler Park.

I, and my neighbors, have many concerns regarding this proposed Development including:

- an access road from the proposed Development into Ryler Park via Ryler Drive will fundamentally and negatively affect the quality of life of the residents of Ryler Park, and will create major safety concerns for our neighborhoods' many children, walkers, bikers and our pets
- Ryler Park is a densely housed neighborhood that already has significant traffic

- Ryler Drive was originally designed to be a cul-de-sac, and early buyers of homes along Ryler Dr, at least four of which still live here, were sold homes with that intention and promise in mind
- construction spoils on the Cummins property were never compacted, setting up height issues regarding new development, and dangerous and costly runoff issues including flooding of homes on Ryler Dr, Miller Dr, and Folsom St
- there are already existing sewage backup issues with the City's sewage system in the Folsom St area and this proposed Development is likely to exacerbate this infrastructure problem
- the City of Durango has not fully complied with its own requirement to notify ALL residents who live within 300 ft of this proposed Development by mail of the upcoming public hearing
- the Florida Road Mixed Housing Development has put in a Petition for Exclusion from Durango Fire Protection District, and if this exclusion is granted, they will then not pay their fair share of the tax burden we must all contribute towards for public safety
- access to and from this proposed Development from Florida Rd is the safest and most common sense approach to the development of the Cummins property to assure safety of our children, residents, pets and quality of life

Thank you for your time and attention to these important issues,

Nathan Trout

June 22, 2020

Dear Mr. Williams

I reside at 131 Ryler Drive and have this comment concerning the proposed plan:

It would be best if both the new development and Ryler Park could each be and remain quiet enclaves with no through traffic, which is the way Ryler Park has been since its inception. This can readily be achieved by fashioning the new development so it's either a cul de sac with one entrance / exit on either Florida or Colorado, or a loop with one entrance /exit on Florida and one on Colorado.

The present existence on Florida of a third lane to facilitate turns is a good reason to have both the entrance and exit to the new development off Florida. Against this proposition, it may be argued, "That would increase traffic on Florida." But anyway you look at it, the new development will increase traffic on Florida. That's a negative we have to live with, but not a reason to change the character of Ryler Park for the worse to please the developer or to maximize revenues for the City of Durango.

In addition to materially degrading the quality of life in Ryler Park, subjecting either Ryler Drive or Miller Drive to traffic entering or exiting the new development would materially lower the value of properties impacted by added traffic. For the Planning Board to approve a plan that allows this in order to increase

density and hence market value of the new development would amount to unjust enrichment of the developer at the expense of Ryler Park residents. It would be grossly inequitable.

When I was in the Navy, one of the rules of the road we learned to follow was, "Overtaking vessels shall keep clear." The new development is akin to an overtaking vessel. It's moving in, and has a right to do so. But it should not be allowed to degrade Ryler Park in the process.

Thank you.
Edward Packard

P.S. Please include me and my wife in the Zoom meeting June 29 at 6 p.m.

Edward Packard Sara Compton
edpack@gmail.com compton.sara@gmail.com

Dear Mr. Williams,

When I learned of the plans to develop the Cummings parcel my first reaction was surprise and alarm at the plan to hijack Ryler Drive, rename it Ryler Road, and link it to the parcel. The idea of new traffic, not to mention years of noise, pollution, congestion and danger involving access during construction, was appalling.

Since then, new concerns have emerged that are equally alarming. These involve existing problems with drainage, sewage backups, and the pileup of construction spoils that were never mitigated after the property was used as a "staging ground" for construction of Florida and a day care center.

I urge you to address these concerns in moving forward with development and ask that you keep residents of Ryler Park and Folsom informed as the process unfolds.

Respectfully,
Sara Compton
131 Ryler Drive

Dear Planning Commission:

There are several issues that should be addressed before allowing this development to proceed.

- 1) Traffic and safety for the existing Ryler Park neighborhood residents will be negatively impacted. Ryler Park is a small neighborhood with two small streets. Children play and ride their bikes in the street, people walk their dogs and roll their baby strollers up and down the streets. The potential of someone being hurt or worse is very high if there is going to be 75+ more vehicles traveling up Miller Drive or Ryler Drive, especially just to get to Florida, where they should have access from their own development. Our streets are narrow and quiet. I can't imagine what will happen when the residents of the new development are forced to use our street(s) to get in and out of their own community.
- 2) Traffic and safety on Colorado would severely be affected as well, if an ingress or egress is placed near the stop sign, across from the businesses on the other side of Colorado. As it is, cars are lined up to turn on to Florida and the sheer steepness of the street already creates problems especially in snowy conditions.
- 3) The grading of the property in question has been raised due to the dirt dump resulting from the Day Care project. The height restriction needs to be from where the grade used to stand.

4) It has come to our attention the sewer lines are not adequate to handle the density being proposed. There has already been sewer backup in the Folsom neighborhood, even without the new development.

5) The development needs to have ingress/egress on Florida and not through the Ryler Neighborhood. All other developments on Florida provide access for their residents directly on and off Florida. This development should be no different.

Thank you.
Howard Dickman
27 Miller

Hi Mark,

My name is Caryl Goode; my home is at 22 Miller Drive which is backed up to the field and will be directly impacted by the proposed dense development.

Obviously, I am not happy with the proposition, but I have included talking points which were recorded at our neighborhood meeting last night.

Aside from a normal sense of loss of habitat, I do not feel that our neighborhood should be involved in helping a developer make a bigger profit at the risk of devaluing properties by lowering the quality of our environment.

We may already be on the upcoming Zoom meeting list, but please include John Perry, eweherd@frontier.net and myself on the 6/29 invitation.

Sincerely,
Caryl Goode

Hello Mark,

I appreciate you including this email as one of several correspondence that you have received from the residents in Ryler Park and on Folsom Drive.

I would like to be on record for my opposition of using Ryler Dr and Colorado as access points for the new Cummins development. The street is narrow with cars often parked on both sides. My 6 year old son is often playing in the neighborhood with other neighborhood children. I feel that increased traffic would be a huge safety concern seeing that the volume of second and third cars occupants seem to have these days have clogged the streets even more than in the past. I believe increased traffic is a disaster waiting to happen and would hate to see the safety of the kids negatively impacted.

I also understand the development is calling for denser housing than both Ryler Park and Folsom that border it. I would like to see something closer to the existing footprint as far as lot size, setback, etc...

I know this lot is going to be developed and I'm happy to have it brought into the City but would like to make sure it is done as safely as possible.

Thank you for including this, I appreciate your time.

Could you also send me a link to the Zoom meeting. I was on the list last time and want to make sure I am on again for this round.

Sincerely,
Todd Wells

Mr Williams: I am adding to my above list of concerns another of major importance:

The position of the Developers regarding the Fire Protection exclusion.

After giving this more thought I was utterly appalled and angry about the lack of moral and ethical positions regarding fire protection. We live in a high risk area and all of us are vulnerable to fire.

To think that the Developers do not want to share the responsibility of tax payment for Fire protection is hard to believe.

I would imagine that if it were **their** homes that were subject to another development not paying their fair share the developers might have another attitude about it.

I am registering a very strong objection to this position on the part of the Developers.

Please add this to my prior statement above.
Thank you
Sandra Eisemann

Mr Williams:

We have been homeowners on Ryler Drive since the original development. We share many of the concerns our fellow Ryler Park residents and owners have expressed. In particular, we are extremely displeased to hear of potential plans to open Ryler Drive to through traffic. We specifically purchased here because of the pleasant community with a street that was free from through traffic. Opening Ryler Drive creates a safety hazard for residents and devalues our property.

We are strongly opposed to through traffic on Ryler Dr.
Thank you,

Ron and Melinda Heard
(Owners 110, 118 and 122 Ryler Drive.)
PO 478
Clio, CA 96106

Hello Mark,

Attached you will find my comments regarding the development of the Cummins property (file 20-00096) to be included in the Planning Commission packet. I sent it several weeks ago but due to the rescheduling of the Planning Commission's public hearing, I thought it best to resend it (due tomorrow June 23).

In addition, please include me for the Public Hearing next Monday, June 29th.

Please respond acknowledging you have received my comments.

Thank you,
Marcy

Monday, June 22, 2020

Dear Mark Williams,

We are Robyn Kellogg and Merran Owen and we live in the Ryler Park neighborhood. Robyn has owned 125 Ryler Dr for 16 years, and we love the quiet and calm of our neighborhood. We are writing in regards to the proposed development on the Cummins property south of Ryler Park. We do not want this new neighborhood to be accessed via Ryler Drive or Colorado Drive, and have detailed our concerns below. Please include our comments in the city records.

The Ryler Park Development was never completed: our neighborhood was meant to have a cul-de-sac at the Ryler/Miller intersection

Our understanding is that there was never any intention for this neighborhood to connect to future developments. These roads were not constructed with larger traffic loads in mind.

Traffic and parking are already at capacity in the Ryler Park neighborhood

Our road is narrow with vehicles routinely parked along both sides. It is not wide enough to function as a two-lane street with the current traffic load. In general, cars must wait at a wider spot to pass each other or maneuver carefully and slowly. This problem is exacerbated in winter when plowing width is limited by cars parked along the street. Typically the snow plow makes a single pass down the middle of the road and does not return for several days. Parking and navigation of the street during that time is very difficult.

The lack of neighborhood covenants allows people to park RV's, larger trailers, etc., along the street. Our neighborhood does not have covenants restricting what people can park in the street, but we assume that the new development will. We are concerned that homeowners and renters in the new neighborhood will take advantage of this to park their larger vehicles in Ryler Park.

There is no traffic guidance such a stop sign at the intersection of Ryler and Miller, the proposed access point. From this corner there is a blind curve along Ryler, making it difficult to see children and pets in the street. Because a homeowner's association was never established, our neighborhood park is a small city park that has ended up neglected. Given that most homes in Ryler Park have small yards, children have few alternatives to playing in the street. We know these kids and are aware of them when driving, but it already feels unsafe. No park or designated place for children is indicated in drafts of the new development, despite the even smaller yards and homes. Without providing a better alternative for the kids, they will be in the street.

It is reasonable to assume that increased traffic would worsen the situation. Given the above issues, people who live in Ryler Park tend to drive slowly through the neighborhood, but we predict that drivers passing through on their way to the new development would drive at higher speeds. We fear the safety issues this would cause.

Congestion and parking issues already exist at the Colorado Drive/Florida Road intersection

This is a busy intersection. Our neighborhood accesses Florida Road via Colorado Drive, as does the commercial development to the north, which has three access points onto Colorado. There is now a new

development, Silverview, across the street from the Colorado Drive/Florida Road intersection, affecting the turning times onto Florida. Adding another road to the already short space between Miller and Colorado would create a bottleneck.

During the workday, Colorado Drive generally has vehicles parked along both sides of the street up to the intersection with Florida, narrowing the width of the street and affecting visibility. Just like in Ryler Park, congestion and visibility become worse in the winter when the parked cars prevent thorough plowing. Congestion coupled with the slope of the hill in icy weather has created accidents.

It is not uncommon for school busses to be unable to turn from Florida on to Colorado due to traffic at that intersection, especially in winter. This road needs to be a safe route to school. It is concerning to imagine the delays and difficulties an emergency vehicle might encounter trying to access our neighborhood, especially during construction or on a snowy day.

Construction projects have been known to affect our garbage and recycling pickup

We are concerned that the construction access will be through Ryler Park, greatly increasing traffic and parking congestion for months. Recent construction projects in the neighborhood caused such an increase in vehicles parked near our house that the city was prevented from reaching our trash can on trash day, though it was placed at the end of our driveway. Increased parking results in missed trash pickups, and we cannot have this become a frequent occurrence for us and our neighbors. Sanitation is a safety issue.

The city allowed construction access during Florida road construction and Rivergate Preschool construction, so that fill dirt could be dumped into the lot currently proposed for development. The process was noisy and dusty and resulted in dangerous situations, congestion and damage to Miller and Ryler Drive. Ultimately, the city did agree to reroute traffic to the dump site via Florida instead of Ryler Park. We do not want to confront this situation again -- construction needs to access the lot from Florida. Our houses are 26 years old at this point, and it's likely that there will be construction projects in our own neighborhood during this time.

There are drainage and sewage issues in the lot proposed for development

It has come to our attention that there is raw sewage in the lot proposed for development, and that it intermittently rises to the soil surface. The unregulated and unmitigated change in topography from the dumping of fill dirt may have impacted the drainage and sewage lines in the area. We have heard that water has flooded the crawl space of a house at the Ryler Drive/Miller Drive intersection as a result of the piled fill dirt. This demonstrated lack of responsibility from the city and developers causes us great concern going into this new project.

As this development proposal goes forward, information needs to be shared with **all** residents of Ryler Park, not just those who live within 300 feet. We all live within 300 feet of the roads that will be affected. We would like to be kept apprised of how construction will proceed and the steps that will be taken to minimize impact to the neighborhoods in regards to traffic, dust, utilities, drainage, noise, trash and emergencies before and during construction. We plan to be actively engaged and ensure that our concerns are heard. We also feel that the city needs to improve the city park in Ryler Park or require the new development to include a safe space for children to play.

Thank You,
Robyn Kellogg and Merran Owen

