

Dear Andrew Reeves (Hearing examiner), John Coleman, Katherine Weir,

This email is an application for review of the hearing examiners recent findings on CUP # 2020-032, specifically, the Examiners Condition #4, under the Decision heading.

At the initial hearing, the Examiner requested additional information from the applicant regarding building heights, roof orientation, and positioning of the buildings. The Examiner also requested time for the city planners to review the applicants additional information, and make a final recommendations to the Examiner.

In response to the Examiners request, the applicant spoke with the city planners and timely made adjustments to the site plan that were accepted with full support by the Planning Department. This updated site plan and description are noted in Exhibit Q, "The City submitted a response to the Applicant's updated site plan and building description on September 16, 2020. The City noted that the updated site plan and building description would meet the intent of the step-back requirement allowing for 20 foot side setbacks and that it had no other concerns about the Applicants proposed revisions." Additionally, under the heading "Conclusions based on findings #2" it is further recognized the updated site plan is approved by the City. This updated site plan and building description reflect adjustments in height, and roof orientation, that were directly made in collaboration with the City Planners.

The Examiners Condition # 4, states: "Arrange the buildings on the construction site plan to have the shortest buildings on the perimeter to mitigate the storage facilities incompatibility with the surrounding uses".

During the initial Hearing, there was discussion regarding relative building heights, and roof slope in relation to each property boundary. The nature of the discussion led the Examiner to request additional information, an updated site plan, and recommendations from the City after reviewing the new site plan. In response, the applicant collaborated with the City Planners to make coordinated adjustments. The updated site plan reflects those changes, and has the full support of the City.

The applicants concern is that Condition #4 does not reflect the City endorsed changes to the site plan, and is restrictive to the point of negating the viability of this project. For example, the taller building on the west property was reduced in height, and the roof slope reoriented with the low eave west facing. This more creative and coordinated change is not reflected in the Examiners wording of Condition 4, and therefore restricted. Likewise the building on the North line, which has been lowered significantly, even though this is not a requirement on the North boundary. However, it is taller than an interior building, and would be restricted by Condition #4.

The applicant requests the Examiner change the wording of Condition #4 to reflect the most recent adjusted site plan, endorsed by the City Planners. The applicant suggests rewording

Condition #4 to read, “The arrangement of buildings on the adjusted site plan submitted September 11, 2020, which incorporated minor revisions in response to concerns raised at the open record hearing, mitigate the storage facilities incompatibility with the surrounding uses.”

Thank you for your consideration,

Respectfully,

Lance Campbell (applicant)

10/1/2020