From:	KASEY KUBOTA
To:	Planning Department
Subject:	Testimony in Opposition to Application AM-22-003 R2-22-002 McGrath
Date:	Friday, June 24, 2022 12:52:15 PM
Attachments:	Rezone App AM-22-003 R2-2-002 McGrath.pdf

This Message originated outside your organization.

Coos County Planning Department,

Attached please find written testimony in opposition to Application No. AM-22-003 R2-22-002 McGrath to rezone from forest to recreation.

Regards,

Doran Boctor
72183 Potlatch Road
Lakeside, OR 97449
(562) 338-0935

June 24, 2022

Coos County Planning Department
250 North Baxter
Coquille, OR 97423

Re: Amendment/Rezone Application No. AM-22-003 R2-22-002 McGrath

Dear Coos County Planning Department:

I take exception and object to the Ewing Family Trust's effort to rezone properties to the recreation designation. There are many reasons to object to this reclassification by the Coos County Planning Commission, the least of which is the selective presentation of information provided in the application and documentation.

I wish to emphasize the that whole sector of short-term vacation rentals is and remains problematic and harmful to neighborhoods and existing residents. This has become such an issue throughout the Oregon Coast that many communities have banned short-term vacation franchises, and where allowed, are heavily restricted to alleviate some of the problems created by allowing short-term vacation rentals to operate in the local communities. These rentals tend to be loud, rowdy, and detrimental in every possible way other than generating a small bit of revenue to the franchise holders. I recently sold my home of 6 years in Scottsburg, Oregon and moved to Potlatch Road in Lakeside, Oregon specifically because the short-term vacation rentals on my street in Scottsburg had such a negative impact to my quality of life and property.

The applicant's attempt to circumvent a traffic study is a real effort to hide the impacts from the proposed short-term vacation rentals. As referenced in the application, Potlatch Road is a narrow, private, dirt road that is not maintained by the County. This is nominally 18' wide, and the residents all contribute to its continuous maintenance. This is accessed from Nordloch Lane which is another narrow, private, dirt road that is maintained by the residents. These roads are so narrow that when residents meet oncoming traffic, one vehicle must find a place to pull over to allow the side-by-side passage of oncoming vehicle(s). This will not only be exacerbated by the addition of the vacation rentals, but we must also consider the nature of these rentals. These individuals are typically coming to access Tenmile Lake and the dunes. For both of these activities the guests will be bringing trailers for their dune vehicles and trailers for their boats. Trucks with trailers loaded with vehicles and boats will cause undue wear and tear on these privately maintained dirt roads, as well as cause traffic and hazards for residents on the narrow roads. The volume of rain softening the roadway and the wear and tear impacts from the proposed short-term rental properties puts an unfair burden on the rest of the residents who must maintain these roadways. Short-term vacationers constantly coming and going on the private roads to access local activities will cause frustration and headaches to the local residents. At a minimum, the applicant should be restricted from allowing any trailers or RVs. Additionally, the cost to widen and pave the roads should fall exclusively on the applicant

The statement that "the rezone will reduce the number of trips to the properties" is false. The applicant went on to indicate that according to a study, vacation rentals have lower traffic than permanent residences, but this is a case of selective extraction of a study that is not applicable to these conditions. The typical single family has 2.1 cars per family going in and out 2 to 6 times a day. The vacation rental will typically have 2 to 5 vehicles with trailers going in and out 6 to 12 times a day. Additionally, not taken into consideration or referenced in the study is the impact at this non-city venue of the trailers as the guests access the lake and dunes. Also omitted is the necessary cleaning crews that must come into the property before and after each rental and clean the property. Then the rental managers must come and assess any possible damage from the previous renters and verify the property is ready for the next renters and repeat the cycle on a continuous basis before and after each rental. Consider all of this, plus the noise and party environment created by the short-term rentals and you see that the data presented is disingenuous. The data extracted is not for a rural or forest area but extracted from a city environment. Consider how you would feel with this type of operation being allowed next door to your home.

The applicant's response to Goals 2, 11, 16, and 18 state they are not applicable to the request of this zoning change. While true in the literal sense, the responses are, again, a misdirection, and they need the zoning change to implement the further development of these properties. If approved, it is likely that the long-term plan is to expand the area, further split the newly zoned property into smaller individual lots to further develop and become a recreational multi-home development for which this zoning change is the first step. Again, the applicant's proposal to rezone from forest to recreation will not only impact the neighborhood and the wildlife, but it may be a first step to continued expansion of single-family residences for short-term vacation rentals. The application to rezone is a process of opening the door to completely eliminate the privacy and natural environment for which we residents purchased our homes and properties on Potlatch Road. While this is not the direct subject of this appeal, this is the first step in this developing disaster for the natural environment and the existing property owners which should not be ignored by the Planning Commission. Most of the residents on Nordloch Lane and Potlatch Road bought these properties specifically for the privacy, quiet and exclusion from the noise and impacts from a more crowded and active environment.

In Item 1C of 7.1.500, the applicant has to address parking standards. By indicating they will do this if approved, they effectively circumvent the study and compliance. While they say they will address it after the re-zone, the fact is they would likely not get approval if they perform these studies before the zoning change. This, again, is an effort to shift focus away from the magnitude of the impact they will create as they get this business enterprise approved. Also, noted at item 1e, the applicant is requesting to waive the traffic study which should be required including 100% of the cost to improve the road and purchasing the expansion of the easement from the property owners. The request to waive is, again, likely due to the likelihood if the study was completed before the zoning change, which is appropriate, the change in zoning would not be approved.

The applicant's response to items 1 g, h about not needing a bicycle lane is a misdirection as the renters would want the lane but this private dirt road is not suitable for vacation rentals in either traffic or in the accommodation of the expected boat trailers, UTV trailers, dune buggy trailers, ATV trailers, motorcycle trailers, bicyclists, etc. that are normal and expected with vacation rentals. 1 j,k,l,m is similar as they attempt to redirect attention away from their responsibility to improve the roads to accommodate changing this forested natural environment into a business area which emphasizes how unsuitable this area of rural Lakeside is for short-term vacation rentals. The applicant's statement that there are other vacation rentals "in the area" is vague. The reason for this vague statement is because a search utilizing the local services and internet search engines for any of the terms Airbnb, Vacasa, VRBO and even the terms vacation rental at Lakeside will show there are no current vacation rental properties on either Nordloch Lane or Potlatch Road.

This proposed change is not in compliance with:

- Goal 17 Shorelands to provide protection of soil, water and wildlife habitat which is currently supportable with the existing forest designation.
- The application shows where the applicant will construct a new road. The applicant has already installed a new road directly against the neighboring property with no property set-back as required. Then, without sharing the information or protecting the adjacent property, made a vertical cut in excess of 20 vertical feet. This creates a condition where the vertical cut directly against the adjacent property without any retaining walls or the proper benching and setbacks where the adjacent property owners property continuously erodes onto the new roadway at the much lower elevation. Then the applicant graded the collapsing soils from their property eating further into the neighboring property.
- The mixed-use overlay zone as shown in the applicant's package (in response to 660.006.0010) is presented in a manner that selectively supports the subject property while harming the neighboring properties currently zoned as forest. Again, select rezoning harms everyone on Potlatch Road except for the applicant.
- Rule 660.00.0040: Applicant is requesting the rezoning to recreation. Applicant goes on to note in their response that ***" there is no clear definition (regardless of intent of the rule) that the rezoning district is considered non resource lands."*** This is another example of loopholes and seeking support by the Commission to harm the residents, wildlife and peaceful way of life with this proposal for operating vacation rentals in an unsuitable area.
- Article 5.1.110 Who may Seek change. The applicant's response to this section quotes: ***"The applicant included ALL landowner signatures for lands being proposed to change from Forest to Recreation."*** The applicant submitted their signatures for the rezoning.

In summary, I strongly urge the Commission to consider the negative impact to the existing community from the noise, traffic and negative impact related to the roads and wildlife at this isolated area of Coos County. No one wants a vacation rental as their neighbor even when the existing infrastructure can accommodate the traffic and problems associated with these

operations. To allow such a change of an isolated property at the end of two dirt roads that are not maintained by Coos County and to allow this to potentially be further developed into multiple such properties will negatively impact residents. I hope and expect this application will be rejected and denied, as it should be

Sincerely,

Doran Boctor
72183 Potlatch Road
Lakeside, OR 97449
Mail: PO Box 512, Lakeside, OR 97449