

**From:** G Wagenblast [mailto:gngw@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 03, 2007 5:59 PM  
**To:** KARP Gary  
**Subject:** Case #LRP 2006-00027 and ZON 2006-00054

To: Springfield Planning Commission  
Re: Public Hearing Testimony

I would like to address some concerns regarding the rezoning of the site on Marcola Road, formerly known as Pierce Property. I think it is important to address these concerns before making a recommendation to the city counsel.

First, and I think foremost, is the issue of the medium density residential zone. I recognize that in the original zoning, there was an area of medium density residential that was included in the Metro Plan. However, increasing this area would add approximately 200 more residences than were originally intended. This would have a significant effect on the local region. I have based these numbers off an average of 12.5 homes per acres with the nodal development. However, at the public hearing, the planner mentioned that the master plan could include up to 20 homes per acre. That would be catastrophic to the neighborhood. I would implore you to consider this when making your decision.

The first effect that this would have is the significant increase in traffic pattern. In an already busy region, adding an enormous amount of cars would put an undue strain on the road system that has been established. This is also a concern in the medium density residential, as the lot size is so small that children in this area will almost certainly need to walk somewhere to play. The increased traffic will be a risk for these children.

The second effect would also involve children. That would be the increase to the school system in that area. Although the Metro Plan did include some medium density residential, an additional amount of medium density residential would definitely overpopulate already crowded schools. The addition of 435 dwellings would certainly bring children to the area. Yolanda Elementary School has large class sizes now and Briggs Middle School has children doubled up in lockers currently. With this issue in mind, the planner also needs to be cognizant of the fact that the school yards should not be considered open spaces for the future medium density residential. I feel that either a new school, or outbuildings will have to be considered to handle the additional influx of students which would drastically change the school grounds.

The third thing that I would like the counsel to consider is the drainage issue. The land in question is currently a fairly major wetland. Although the planner has addressed changing the drainage ditch to a seasonal creek, that drainage ditch is already in existence and we still have flooding issues associated with that piece of property. I feel that the planner would have to be very aware of water runoff and the direction of runoff. The neighborhood behind the field is often affected by the rainwater and this results in boggy yards from winter to early summer.

Many of the aforementioned issues could be resolved by changing to a lower density residential instead of a medium density residential. This would decrease the influx of both people and cars to a much more manageable level. This would also address the need for children to have space to play. The development of extremely small lots just contributes to a stagnate society. We should be advocates for children to be outside instead of sitting in front of televisions. A larger lot size would make an aesthetically pleasing neighborhood that could be considered an asset rather than a hindrance

I appreciate your consideration in this issue.

Sincerely-

Greg Wagenblast

