

Good evening!

I am Audrey Keller a resident of Rancharrah and the Appellant. Since the May 1st Planning Commission and my Appeal I have met with Rancharrah's GM/HOA President Robert Cuillard and Andy Durling, Wood Rogers June 11th.

At this meeting I was told that YOU the council would deny my appeal 6-0 or 7-0.

IS THIS TRUE?

At a meeting with myself and a room with 40 homeowners on July 10th, we were told by Mr. Cuillard (he works for the developer), that we should be grateful- lucky that the builder is not building 310 condos instead of 59 homes as a threat because we have dared to Appeal their plan.

The builder has not tried to work with the homeowners or made any compromises after hearing our concerns. After meeting with Andy Durling, I asked him in writing for feedback on what the builder will modify with our requests.

No reply from Andy.

Play recording 1 – Planning Commission Meeting Commissioner Rohymeyer and Andy Durling.

Play recording 2 And now let's hear from the Planning Commissioner Drakulich.

Let's stop this threat of 310 homes, and focus on getting a better community result.

As you just heard the developer/builder never intended on building 310 units. Their plan is to tie up the residents with excessive PUD housing counts, 700+ units never to be built, ultimately to control our Community Assns. MONEY.

The builders plan carefully avoided all discussion of the adjacent Parcel A-2 - the Sales Pavilion and two parking lot(s) north and south, which were split off from Village 7 in 2019.

Today homeowners want to buy the beautiful Sales Pavilion, and the north parking lot from the developer/builder. Why, because the PUD suggests such 'use' as a community center. It seems like all parties may want to make this happen at a fair price, but this tentative plan stands in the way of making this deal.

Now the highlights of the Appeal.

Condition #1 City codes in effect at the time of application shall prevail.

The PUD document clearly states in event of conflict between design standards and City Code, these PUD standards shall govern development. The developer and Wood Rogers created the PUD over 10 years ago. City Council approved the PUD & all amendments.

My APPEAL ASK: Council to rule that builder to follow All PUD standards.

Condition #8 Final map shall demonstrate each driveway to meet the minimum length.

Code says driveways to meet minimum length of 3 feet.

PUD standards state driveway length = 19ft minimum.

PUD shall govern. (A three feet minimum is in this current plan. Our friend Roger could not get his golf cart parked in front of his garage in 3 feet).

MY APPEAL ASK: Builder to follow All PUD standards. A 3 foot “driveway” is unacceptable for Rancharrah.

Condition #10 – Hours of Construction.

MY APPEAL ASK: Construction hours to follow City Halls work hours. No Work Saturdays, No Work Sundays and No Work Holidays.

My Appeal Comments on the STAFF FINDINGS

Finding #1 Compliance with Title 18 & PUD. In conflicts between the PUD and CODE, the PUD Standards shall Govern.

PUD Infrastructure ACCESS states clearly:
Additional access locations between land use categories shall be determined during review of a tentative map.

I will show you now the map from the PUD regarding the planned access on Sierra Rose Drive.

MY APPEAL ASK: Follow the PUD – Builder to build Sierra Rose access gate for Village 7.

Finding #4 Provide safe environment.

Build walkable, bikeable pathways to connect existing Sales Pavilion. Zoning Code: 18.04.903
Provide opportunities for pedestrian and bicycle connectivity.

MY APPEAL ASK: Builder to build additional safe pathways. Remove all barriers that hinder connectivity to the Sales Pavilion and Talbot Lane Gate.

Finding #5 Tentative Map doesn't comply to the PUD. The builder failed to embrace the clear description or goals of the 'ranch esthetic' and they failed to remain sensitive to rural character as clearly described in the PUD. This PUD mandate is about how Village 7 "feels".

Shared driveways and red curbs don't promote rural character.

The builders failed to meld their architectural style with existing buildings, like the Sales Pavilion and Talbot gate house, which are directly adjacent to Village 7. Even the Rancharrah Village shops follows the PUD better than this plan.

MY APPEAL ASK: Builder to follow PUD 'build & design upon the existing features of the ranch'.

FINDING #6: The development for Village 7 is NOT compatible with the neighborhoods in which it is proposed to be established.

The central street inside Village 7 is 100% red curbed. The shared driveways force homeowners or guests to park outside Village 7, forcing cars into other adjacent neighborhoods.

City zoning code 18.04.903 Zero Lot Line Homes - Clustering proposal will have no adverse impact on adjacent properties or development.

MY APPEAL ASK: 1) This plan causes adverse impact in the development. Reject this tentative plan. And...

2) Advise the prospective buyers of new Village 7 homes, in sales material and closing documents (require disclosures) that these homes come with extreme parking limitations.

FINDING #10e: The development for Village 7 is not a significantly higher quality development, nor does it propose a unified design concept.

Village 7, sales pricing is slated for over one million dollars – has narrow access streets, (1/3 the width of my neighborhood) no parking in front of your own home, 3-19 foot, un-parkable and mostly shared driveways represent a real destruction of home values. This is supposed to be a significantly higher quality development. It is not.

MY APPEAL ASK: Widen the central street to allow for parking on at least one side of the street in Village 7.

Tentative Map: Item #9 –

Bit by bit the developer has eroded homeowner property values like the destruction of the Rancharrah Equestrian Center last month. It was The Ranches perfect example of ‘ranch aesthetic’.

What's next on the demo list? The builder submitted a plan to demolish the Talbot entry curved monument and 230 feet of ranch style fence line, which is HOA property.

MY APPEAL ASK:

- 1) City to monitor grading to ensure builders cannot destroy any mature trees surrounding the beautiful Sales Pavilion or the north parking lot.
- 2) The builder must plan for additional setbacks and build solid masonry 10ft + walls consistent with the Talbot Gate entry's west side, (built by Toll Brothers) to benefit and secure Village 7 homeowners.
- 3) The builder must include ADA access for parking and sidewalk access to the front entry of the Sales Pavilion. Currently the plan shows ZERO access to the front entry of the Sales Pavilion.

I thank you for hearing this complicated and important Appeal for the homeowners of Rancharra.

Good evening!

I am Audrey Keller a resident of Rancharrah and the Appellant. Since the May 1st Planning Commission and my Appeal I have met with Rancharrah's GM/HOA President Robert Cuillard and Andy Durling, Wood Rogers June 11th.

At this meeting I was told that YOU the council would deny my appeal 6-0 or 7-0.

IS THIS TRUE?

At a meeting with myself and a room with 40 homeowners on July 10th, we were told by Mr. Cuillard (he works for the developer), that we should be grateful- lucky that the builder is not building 310 condos instead of 59 homes as a threat because we have dared to Appeal their plan.

The builder has not tried to work with the homeowners or made any compromises after hearing our concerns. After meeting with Andy Durling, I asked him in writing for feedback on what the builder will modify with our requests.

No reply from Andy.

Play recording 1 – Planning Commission Meeting Commissioner Rohymeyer and Andy Durling.

Play recording 2 And now let's hear from the Planning Commissioner Drakulich.

Let's stop this threat of 310 homes, and focus on getting a better community result.

As you just heard the developer/builder never intended on building 310 units. Their plan is to tie up the residents with excessive PUD housing counts, 700+ units never to be built, ultimately to control our Community Assns. MONEY.

The builders plan carefully avoided all discussion of the adjacent Parcel A-2 - the Sales Pavilion and two parking lot(s) north and south, which were split off from Village 7 in 2019.

Today homeowners want to buy the beautiful Sales Pavilion, and the north parking lot from the developer/builder. Why, because the PUD suggests such 'use' as a community center. It seems like all parties may want to make this happen at a fair price, but this tentative plan stands in the way of making this deal.

Now the highlights of the Appeal.

Condition #1 City codes in effect at the time of application shall prevail.

The PUD document clearly states in event of conflict between design standards and City Code, these PUD standards shall govern development. The developer and Wood Rogers created the PUD over 10 years ago. City Council approved the PUD & all amendments.

My APPEAL ASK: Council to rule that builder to follow All PUD standards.

Condition #8 Final map shall demonstrate each driveway to meet the minimum length.

Code says driveways to meet minimum length of 3 feet.

PUD standards state driveway length = 19ft minimum.

PUD shall govern. (A three feet minimum is in this current plan. Our friend Roger could not get his golf cart parked in front of his garage in 3 feet).

MY APPEAL ASK: Builder to follow All PUD standards. A 3 foot “driveway” is unacceptable for Rancharrah.

Condition #10 – Hours of Construction.

MY APPEAL ASK: Construction hours to follow City Halls work hours. No Work Saturdays, No Work Sundays and No Work Holidays.

My Appeal Comments on the STAFF FINDINGS

Finding #1 Compliance with Title 18 & PUD. In conflicts between the PUD and CODE, the PUD Standards shall Govern.

PUD Infrastructure ACCESS states clearly:
Additional access locations between land use categories shall be determined during review of a tentative map.

I will show you now the map from the PUD regarding the planned access on Sierra Rose Drive.

MY APPEAL ASK: Follow the PUD – Builder to build Sierra Rose access gate for Village 7.

Finding #4 Provide safe environment.

Build walkable, bikeable pathways to connect existing Sales Pavilion. Zoning Code: 18.04.903
Provide opportunities for pedestrian and bicycle connectivity.

MY APPEAL ASK: Builder to build additional safe pathways. Remove all barriers that hinder connectivity to the Sales Pavilion and Talbot Lane Gate.

Finding #5 Tentative Map doesn't comply to the PUD. The builder failed to embrace the clear description or goals of the 'ranch esthetic' and they failed to remain sensitive to rural character as clearly described in the PUD. This PUD mandate is about how Village 7 "feels".

Shared driveways and red curbs don't promote rural character.

The builders failed to meld their architectural style with existing buildings, like the Sales Pavilion and Talbot gate house, which are directly adjacent to Village 7. Even the Rancharrah Village shops follows the PUD better than this plan.

MY APPEAL ASK: Builder to follow PUD 'build & design upon the existing features of the ranch'.

FINDING #6: The development for Village 7 is NOT compatible with the neighborhoods in which it is proposed to be established.

The central street inside Village 7 is 100% red curbed. The shared driveways force homeowners or guests to park outside Village 7, forcing cars into other adjacent neighborhoods.

City zoning code 18.04.903 Zero Lot Line Homes - Clustering proposal will have no adverse impact on adjacent properties or development.

MY APPEAL ASK: 1) This plan causes adverse impact in the development. Reject this tentative plan. And...

2) Advise the prospective buyers of new Village 7 homes, in sales material and closing documents (require disclosures) that these homes come with extreme parking limitations.

FINDING #10e: The development for Village 7 is not a significantly higher quality development, nor does it propose a unified design concept.

Village 7, sales pricing is slated for over one million dollars – has narrow access streets, (1/3 the width of my neighborhood) no parking in front of your own home, 3-19 foot, un-parkable and mostly shared driveways represent a real destruction of home values. This is supposed to be a significantly higher quality development. It is not.

MY APPEAL ASK: Widen the central street to allow for parking on at least one side of the street in Village 7.

Tentative Map: Item #9 –

Bit by bit the developer has eroded homeowner property values like the destruction of the Rancharrah Equestrian Center last month. It was The Ranches perfect example of ‘ranch aesthetic’.

What's next on the demo list? The builder submitted a plan to demolish the Talbot entry curved monument and 230 feet of ranch style fence line, which is HOA property.

MY APPEAL ASK:

- 1) City to monitor grading to ensure builders cannot destroy any mature trees surrounding the beautiful Sales Pavilion or the north parking lot.
- 2) The builder must plan for additional setbacks and build solid masonry 10ft + walls consistent with the Talbot Gate entry's west side, (built by Toll Brothers) to benefit and secure Village 7 homeowners.
- 3) The builder must include ADA access for parking and sidewalk access to the front entry of the Sales Pavilion. Currently the plan shows ZERO access to the front entry of the Sales Pavilion.

I thank you for hearing this complicated and important Appeal for the homeowners of Rancharra.

Good evening!

I am Audrey Keller a resident of Rancharra and the Appellant. Since the May 1st Planning Commission and my Appeal I have met with Rancharra's GM/HOA President Robert Cuillard and Andy Durling, Wood Rogers June 11th.

At this meeting I was told that YOU the council would deny my appeal 6-0 or 7-0.

IS THIS TRUE?

At a meeting with myself and a room with 40 homeowners on July 10th, we were told by Mr. Cuillard (he works for the developer), that we should be grateful- lucky that the builder is not building 310 condos instead of 59 homes as a threat because we have dared to Appeal their plan.

The builder has not tried to work with the homeowners or made any compromises after hearing our concerns. After meeting with Andy Durling, I asked him in writing for feedback on what the builder will modify with our requests.

No reply from Andy.

Play recording 1 – Planning Commission Meeting Commissioner Rohmeyer and Andy Durling.

Play recording 2 And now let's hear from the Planning Commissioner Drakulich.

Let's stop this threat of 310 homes, and focus on getting a better community result.

As you just heard the developer/builder never intended on building 310 units. Their plan is to tie up the residents with excessive PUD housing counts, 700+ units never to be built, ultimately to control our Community Assns. MONEY.

The builders plan carefully avoided all discussion of the adjacent Parcel A-2 - the Sales Pavilion and two parking lot(s) north and south, which were split off from Village 7 in 2019.

Today homeowners want to buy the beautiful Sales Pavilion, and the north parking lot from the developer/builder. Why, because the PUD suggests such 'use' as a community center. It seems like all parties may want to make this happen at a fair price, but this tentative plan stands in the way of making this deal.

Now the highlights of the Appeal.

Condition #1 City codes in effect at the time of application shall prevail.

The PUD document clearly states in event of conflict between design standards and City Code, these PUD standards shall govern development. The developer and Wood Rogers created the PUD over 10 years ago. City Council approved the PUD & all amendments.

My APPEAL ASK: Council to rule that builder to follow All PUD standards.

Condition #8 Final map shall demonstrate each driveway to meet the minimum length.

Code says driveways to meet minimum length of 3 feet.

PUD standards state driveway length = 19ft minimum.

PUD shall govern. (A three feet minimum is in this current plan. Our friend Roger could not get his golf cart parked in front of his garage in 3 feet).

MY APPEAL ASK: Builder to follow All PUD standards. A 3 foot “driveway” is unacceptable for Rancharrah.

Condition #10 – Hours of Construction.

MY APPEAL ASK: Construction hours to follow City Halls work hours. No Work Saturdays, No Work Sundays and No Work Holidays.

My Appeal Comments on the STAFF FINDINGS

Finding #1 Compliance with Title 18 & PUD. In conflicts between the PUD and CODE, the PUD Standards shall Govern.

PUD Infrastructure ACCESS states clearly:
Additional access locations between land use categories shall be determined during review of a tentative map.

I will show you now the map from the PUD regarding the planned access on Sierra Rose Drive.

MY APPEAL ASK: Follow the PUD – Builder to build Sierra Rose access gate for Village 7.

Finding #4 Provide safe environment.

Build walkable, bikeable pathways to connect existing Sales Pavilion. Zoning Code: 18.04.903
Provide opportunities for pedestrian and bicycle connectivity.

MY APPEAL ASK: Builder to build additional safe pathways. Remove all barriers that hinder connectivity to the Sales Pavilion and Talbot Lane Gate.

Finding #5 Tentative Map doesn't comply to the PUD. The builder failed to embrace the clear description or goals of the 'ranch esthetic' and they failed to remain sensitive to rural character as clearly described in the PUD. This PUD mandate is about how Village 7 "feels".

Shared driveways and red curbs don't promote rural character.

The builders failed to meld their architectural style with existing buildings, like the Sales Pavilion and Talbot gate house, which are directly adjacent to Village 7. Even the Rancharrah Village shops follows the PUD better than this plan.

MY APPEAL ASK: Builder to follow PUD 'build & design upon the existing features of the ranch'.

FINDING #6: The development for Village 7 is NOT compatible with the neighborhoods in which it is proposed to be established.

The central street inside Village 7 is 100% red curbed. The shared driveways force homeowners or guests to park outside Village 7, forcing cars into other adjacent neighborhoods.

City zoning code 18.04.903 Zero Lot Line Homes - Clustering proposal will have no adverse impact on adjacent properties or development.

MY APPEAL ASK: 1) This plan causes adverse impact in the development. Reject this tentative plan. And...

2) Advise the prospective buyers of new Village 7 homes, in sales material and closing documents (require disclosures) that these homes come with extreme parking limitations.

FINDING #10e: The development for Village 7 is not a significantly higher quality development, nor does it propose a unified design concept.

Village 7, sales pricing is slated for over one million dollars – has narrow access streets, (1/3 the width of my neighborhood) no parking in front of your own home, 3-19 foot, un-parkable and mostly shared driveways represent a real destruction of home values. This is supposed to be a significantly higher quality development. It is not.

MY APPEAL ASK: Widen the central street to allow for parking on at least one side of the street in Village 7.

Tentative Map: Item #9 –

Bit by bit the developer has eroded homeowner property values like the destruction of the Rancharrah Equestrian Center last month. It was The Ranches perfect example of ‘ranch aesthetic’.

What's next on the demo list? The builder submitted a plan to demolish the Talbot entry curved monument and 230 feet of ranch style fence line, which is HOA property.

MY APPEAL ASK:

- 1) City to monitor grading to ensure builders cannot destroy any mature trees surrounding the beautiful Sales Pavilion or the north parking lot.
- 2) The builder must plan for additional setbacks and build solid masonry 10ft + walls consistent with the Talbot Gate entry's west side, (built by Toll Brothers) to benefit and secure Village 7 homeowners.
- 3) The builder must include ADA access for parking and sidewalk access to the front entry of the Sales Pavilion. Currently the plan shows ZERO access to the front entry of the Sales Pavilion.

I thank you for hearing this complicated and important Appeal for the homeowners of Rancharra.

Good evening!

I am Audrey Keller a resident of Rancharrah and the Appellant. Since the May 1st Planning Commission and my Appeal I have met with Rancharrah's GM/HOA President Robert Cuillard and Andy Durling, Wood Rogers June 11th.

At this meeting I was told that YOU the council would deny my appeal 6-0 or 7-0.

IS THIS TRUE?

At a meeting with myself and a room with 40 homeowners on July 10th, we were told by Mr. Cuillard (he works for the developer), that we should be grateful- lucky that the builder is not building 310 condos instead of 59 homes as a threat because we have dared to Appeal their plan.

The builder has not tried to work with the homeowners or made any compromises after hearing our concerns. After meeting with Andy Durling, I asked him in writing for feedback on what the builder will modify with our requests.

No reply from Andy.

Play recording 1 – Planning Commission Meeting Commissioner Rohymeyer and Andy Durling.

Play recording 2 And now let's hear from the Planning Commissioner Drakulich.

Let's stop this threat of 310 homes, and focus on getting a better community result.

As you just heard the developer/builder never intended on building 310 units. Their plan is to tie up the residents with excessive PUD housing counts, 700+ units never to be built, ultimately to control our Community Assns. MONEY.

The builders plan carefully avoided all discussion of the adjacent Parcel A-2 - the Sales Pavilion and two parking lot(s) north and south, which were split off from Village 7 in 2019.

Today homeowners want to buy the beautiful Sales Pavilion, and the north parking lot from the developer/builder. Why, because the PUD suggests such 'use' as a community center. It seems like all parties may want to make this happen at a fair price, but this tentative plan stands in the way of making this deal.

Now the highlights of the Appeal.

Condition #1 City codes in effect at the time of application shall prevail.

The PUD document clearly states in event of conflict between design standards and City Code, these PUD standards shall govern development. The developer and Wood Rogers created the PUD over 10 years ago. City Council approved the PUD & all amendments.

My APPEAL ASK: Council to rule that builder to follow All PUD standards.

Condition #8 Final map shall demonstrate each driveway to meet the minimum length.

Code says driveways to meet minimum length of 3 feet.

PUD standards state driveway length = 19ft minimum.

PUD shall govern. (A three feet minimum is in this current plan. Our friend Roger could not get his golf cart parked in front of his garage in 3 feet).

MY APPEAL ASK: Builder to follow All PUD standards. A 3 foot “driveway” is unacceptable for Rancharra.

Condition #10 – Hours of Construction.

MY APPEAL ASK: Construction hours to follow City Halls work hours. No Work Saturdays, No Work Sundays and No Work Holidays.

My Appeal Comments on the STAFF FINDINGS

Finding #1 Compliance with Title 18 & PUD. In conflicts between the PUD and CODE, the PUD Standards shall Govern.

PUD Infrastructure ACCESS states clearly:
Additional access locations between land use categories shall be determined during review of a tentative map.

I will show you now the map from the PUD regarding the planned access on Sierra Rose Drive.

MY APPEAL ASK: Follow the PUD – Builder to build Sierra Rose access gate for Village 7.

Finding #4 Provide safe environment.

Build walkable, bikeable pathways to connect existing Sales Pavilion. Zoning Code: 18.04.903
Provide opportunities for pedestrian and bicycle connectivity.

MY APPEAL ASK: Builder to build additional safe pathways. Remove all barriers that hinder connectivity to the Sales Pavilion and Talbot Lane Gate.

Finding #5 Tentative Map doesn't comply to the PUD. The builder failed to embrace the clear description or goals of the 'ranch esthetic' and they failed to remain sensitive to rural character as clearly described in the PUD. This PUD mandate is about how Village 7 "feels".

Shared driveways and red curbs don't promote rural character.

The builders failed to meld their architectural style with existing buildings, like the Sales Pavilion and Talbot gate house, which are directly adjacent to Village 7. Even the Rancharrah Village shops follows the PUD better than this plan.

MY APPEAL ASK: Builder to follow PUD 'build & design upon the existing features of the ranch'.

FINDING #6: The development for Village 7 is NOT compatible with the neighborhoods in which it is proposed to be established.

The central street inside Village 7 is 100% red curbed. The shared driveways force homeowners or guests to park outside Village 7, forcing cars into other adjacent neighborhoods.

City zoning code 18.04.903 Zero Lot Line Homes - Clustering proposal will have no adverse impact on adjacent properties or development.

MY APPEAL ASK: 1) This plan causes adverse impact in the development. Reject this tentative plan. And...

2) Advise the prospective buyers of new Village 7 homes, in sales material and closing documents (require disclosures) that these homes come with extreme parking limitations.

FINDING #10e: The development for Village 7 is not a significantly higher quality development, nor does it propose a unified design concept.

Village 7, sales pricing is slated for over one million dollars – has narrow access streets, (1/3 the width of my neighborhood) no parking in front of your own home, 3-19 foot, un-parkable and mostly shared driveways represent a real destruction of home values. This is supposed to be a significantly higher quality development. It is not.

MY APPEAL ASK: Widen the central street to allow for parking on at least one side of the street in Village 7.

Tentative Map: Item #9 –

Bit by bit the developer has eroded homeowner property values like the destruction of the Rancharrah Equestrian Center last month. It was The Ranches perfect example of ‘ranch aesthetic’.

What's next on the demo list? The builder submitted a plan to demolish the Talbot entry curved monument and 230 feet of ranch style fence line, which is HOA property.

MY APPEAL ASK:

- 1) City to monitor grading to ensure builders cannot destroy any mature trees surrounding the beautiful Sales Pavilion or the north parking lot.
- 2) The builder must plan for additional setbacks and build solid masonry 10ft + walls consistent with the Talbot Gate entry's west side, (built by Toll Brothers) to benefit and secure Village 7 homeowners.
- 3) The builder must include ADA access for parking and sidewalk access to the front entry of the Sales Pavilion. Currently the plan shows ZERO access to the front entry of the Sales Pavilion.

I thank you for hearing this complicated and important Appeal for the homeowners of Rancharra.

Good evening!

I am Audrey Keller a resident of Rancharrah and the Appellant. Since the May 1st Planning Commission and my Appeal I have met with Rancharrah's GM/HOA President Robert Cuillard and Andy Durling, Wood Rogers June 11th.

At this meeting I was told that YOU the council would deny my appeal 6-0 or 7-0.

IS THIS TRUE?

At a meeting with myself and a room with 40 homeowners on July 10th, we were told by Mr. Cuillard (he works for the developer), that we should be grateful- lucky that the builder is not building 310 condos instead of 59 homes as a threat because we have dared to Appeal their plan.

The builder has not tried to work with the homeowners or made any compromises after hearing our concerns. After meeting with Andy Durling, I asked him in writing for feedback on what the builder will modify with our requests.

No reply from Andy.

Play recording 1 – Planning Commission Meeting Commissioner Rohymeyer and Andy Durling.

Play recording 2 And now let's hear from the Planning Commissioner Drakulich.

Let's stop this threat of 310 homes, and focus on getting a better community result.

As you just heard the developer/builder never intended on building 310 units. Their plan is to tie up the residents with excessive PUD housing counts, 700+ units never to be built, ultimately to control our Community Assns. MONEY.

The builders plan carefully avoided all discussion of the adjacent Parcel A-2 - the Sales Pavilion and two parking lot(s) north and south, which were split off from Village 7 in 2019.

Today homeowners want to buy the beautiful Sales Pavilion, and the north parking lot from the developer/builder. Why, because the PUD suggests such 'use' as a community center. It seems like all parties may want to make this happen at a fair price, but this tentative plan stands in the way of making this deal.

Now the highlights of the Appeal.

Condition #1 City codes in effect at the time of application shall prevail.

The PUD document clearly states in event of conflict between design standards and City Code, these PUD standards shall govern development. The developer and Wood Rogers created the PUD over 10 years ago. City Council approved the PUD & all amendments.

My APPEAL ASK: Council to rule that builder to follow All PUD standards.

Condition #8 Final map shall demonstrate each driveway to meet the minimum length.

Code says driveways to meet minimum length of 3 feet.

PUD standards state driveway length = 19ft minimum.

PUD shall govern. (A three feet minimum is in this current plan. Our friend Roger could not get his golf cart parked in front of his garage in 3 feet).

MY APPEAL ASK: Builder to follow All PUD standards. A 3 foot “driveway” is unacceptable for Rancharrah.

Condition #10 – Hours of Construction.

MY APPEAL ASK: Construction hours to follow City Halls work hours. No Work Saturdays, No Work Sundays and No Work Holidays.

My Appeal Comments on the STAFF FINDINGS

Finding #1 Compliance with Title 18 & PUD. In conflicts between the PUD and CODE, the PUD Standards shall Govern.

PUD Infrastructure ACCESS states clearly:
Additional access locations between land use categories shall be determined during review of a tentative map.

I will show you now the map from the PUD regarding the planned access on Sierra Rose Drive.

MY APPEAL ASK: Follow the PUD – Builder to build Sierra Rose access gate for Village 7.

Finding #4 Provide safe environment.

Build walkable, bikeable pathways to connect existing Sales Pavilion. Zoning Code: 18.04.903
Provide opportunities for pedestrian and bicycle connectivity.

MY APPEAL ASK: Builder to build additional safe pathways. Remove all barriers that hinder connectivity to the Sales Pavilion and Talbot Lane Gate.

Finding #5 Tentative Map doesn't comply to the PUD. The builder failed to embrace the clear description or goals of the 'ranch esthetic' and they failed to remain sensitive to rural character as clearly described in the PUD. This PUD mandate is about how Village 7 "feels".

Shared driveways and red curbs don't promote rural character.

The builders failed to meld their architectural style with existing buildings, like the Sales Pavilion and Talbot gate house, which are directly adjacent to Village 7. Even the Rancharrah Village shops follows the PUD better than this plan.

MY APPEAL ASK: Builder to follow PUD 'build & design upon the existing features of the ranch'.

FINDING #6: The development for Village 7 is NOT compatible with the neighborhoods in which it is proposed to be established.

The central street inside Village 7 is 100% red curbed. The shared driveways force homeowners or guests to park outside Village 7, forcing cars into other adjacent neighborhoods.

City zoning code 18.04.903 Zero Lot Line Homes - Clustering proposal will have no adverse impact on adjacent properties or development.

MY APPEAL ASK: 1) This plan causes adverse impact in the development. Reject this tentative plan. And...

2) Advise the prospective buyers of new Village 7 homes, in sales material and closing documents (require disclosures) that these homes come with extreme parking limitations.

FINDING #10e: The development for Village 7 is not a significantly higher quality development, nor does it propose a unified design concept.

Village 7, sales pricing is slated for over one million dollars – has narrow access streets, (1/3 the width of my neighborhood) no parking in front of your own home, 3-19 foot, un-parkable and mostly shared driveways represent a real destruction of home values. This is supposed to be a significantly higher quality development. It is not.

MY APPEAL ASK: Widen the central street to allow for parking on at least one side of the street in Village 7.

Tentative Map: Item #9 –

Bit by bit the developer has eroded homeowner property values like the destruction of the Rancharrah Equestrian Center last month. It was The Ranches perfect example of ‘ranch aesthetic’.

What's next on the demo list? The builder submitted a plan to demolish the Talbot entry curved monument and 230 feet of ranch style fence line, which is HOA property.

MY APPEAL ASK:

- 1) City to monitor grading to ensure builders cannot destroy any mature trees surrounding the beautiful Sales Pavilion or the north parking lot.
- 2) The builder must plan for additional setbacks and build solid masonry 10ft + walls consistent with the Talbot Gate entry's west side, (built by Toll Brothers) to benefit and secure Village 7 homeowners.
- 3) The builder must include ADA access for parking and sidewalk access to the front entry of the Sales Pavilion. Currently the plan shows ZERO access to the front entry of the Sales Pavilion.

I thank you for hearing this complicated and important Appeal for the homeowners of Rancharra.

Good evening!

I am Audrey Keller a resident of Rancharrah and the Appellant. Since the May 1st Planning Commission and my Appeal I have met with Rancharrah's GM/HOA President Robert Cuillard and Andy Durling, Wood Rogers June 11th.

At this meeting I was told that YOU the council would deny my appeal 6-0 or 7-0.

IS THIS TRUE?

At a meeting with myself and a room with 40 homeowners on July 10th, we were told by Mr. Cuillard (he works for the developer), that we should be grateful- lucky that the builder is not building 310 condos instead of 59 homes as a threat because we have dared to Appeal their plan.

The builder has not tried to work with the homeowners or made any compromises after hearing our concerns. After meeting with Andy Durling, I asked him in writing for feedback on what the builder will modify with our requests.

No reply from Andy.

Play recording 1 – Planning Commission Meeting Commissioner Rohymeyer and Andy Durling.

Play recording 2 And now let's hear from the Planning Commissioner Drakulich.

Let's stop this threat of 310 homes, and focus on getting a better community result.

As you just heard the developer/builder never intended on building 310 units. Their plan is to tie up the residents with excessive PUD housing counts, 700+ units never to be built, ultimately to control our Community Assns. MONEY.

The builders plan carefully avoided all discussion of the adjacent Parcel A-2 - the Sales Pavilion and two parking lot(s) north and south, which were split off from Village 7 in 2019.

Today homeowners want to buy the beautiful Sales Pavilion, and the north parking lot from the developer/builder. Why, because the PUD suggests such 'use' as a community center. It seems like all parties may want to make this happen at a fair price, but this tentative plan stands in the way of making this deal.

Now the highlights of the Appeal.

Condition #1 City codes in effect at the time of application shall prevail.

The PUD document clearly states in event of conflict between design standards and City Code, these PUD standards shall govern development. The developer and Wood Rogers created the PUD over 10 years ago. City Council approved the PUD & all amendments.

My APPEAL ASK: Council to rule that builder to follow All PUD standards.

Condition #8 Final map shall demonstrate each driveway to meet the minimum length.

Code says driveways to meet minimum length of 3 feet.

PUD standards state driveway length = 19ft minimum.

PUD shall govern. (A three feet minimum is in this current plan. Our friend Roger could not get his golf cart parked in front of his garage in 3 feet).

MY APPEAL ASK: Builder to follow All PUD standards. A 3 foot “driveway” is unacceptable for Rancharrah.

Condition #10 – Hours of Construction.

MY APPEAL ASK: Construction hours to follow City Halls work hours. No Work Saturdays, No Work Sundays and No Work Holidays.

My Appeal Comments on the STAFF FINDINGS

Finding #1 Compliance with Title 18 & PUD. In conflicts between the PUD and CODE, the PUD Standards shall Govern.

PUD Infrastructure ACCESS states clearly:
Additional access locations between land use categories shall be determined during review of a tentative map.

I will show you now the map from the PUD regarding the planned access on Sierra Rose Drive.

MY APPEAL ASK: Follow the PUD – Builder to build Sierra Rose access gate for Village 7.

Finding #4 Provide safe environment.

Build walkable, bikeable pathways to connect existing Sales Pavilion. Zoning Code: 18.04.903
Provide opportunities for pedestrian and bicycle connectivity.

MY APPEAL ASK: Builder to build additional safe pathways. Remove all barriers that hinder connectivity to the Sales Pavilion and Talbot Lane Gate.

Finding #5 Tentative Map doesn't comply to the PUD. The builder failed to embrace the clear description or goals of the 'ranch esthetic' and they failed to remain sensitive to rural character as clearly described in the PUD. This PUD mandate is about how Village 7 "feels".

Shared driveways and red curbs don't promote rural character.

The builders failed to meld their architectural style with existing buildings, like the Sales Pavilion and Talbot gate house, which are directly adjacent to Village 7. Even the Rancharrah Village shops follows the PUD better than this plan.

MY APPEAL ASK: Builder to follow PUD 'build & design upon the existing features of the ranch'.

FINDING #6: The development for Village 7 is NOT compatible with the neighborhoods in which it is proposed to be established.

The central street inside Village 7 is 100% red curbed. The shared driveways force homeowners or guests to park outside Village 7, forcing cars into other adjacent neighborhoods.

City zoning code 18.04.903 Zero Lot Line Homes - Clustering proposal will have no adverse impact on adjacent properties or development.

MY APPEAL ASK: 1) This plan causes adverse impact in the development. Reject this tentative plan. And...

2) Advise the prospective buyers of new Village 7 homes, in sales material and closing documents (require disclosures) that these homes come with extreme parking limitations.

FINDING #10e: The development for Village 7 is not a significantly higher quality development, nor does it propose a unified design concept.

Village 7, sales pricing is slated for over one million dollars – has narrow access streets, (1/3 the width of my neighborhood) no parking in front of your own home, 3-19 foot, un-parkable and mostly shared driveways represent a real destruction of home values. This is supposed to be a significantly higher quality development. It is not.

MY APPEAL ASK: Widen the central street to allow for parking on at least one side of the street in Village 7.

Tentative Map: Item #9 –

Bit by bit the developer has eroded homeowner property values like the destruction of the Rancharrah Equestrian Center last month. It was The Ranches perfect example of ‘ranch aesthetic’.

What's next on the demo list? The builder submitted a plan to demolish the Talbot entry curved monument and 230 feet of ranch style fence line, which is HOA property.

MY APPEAL ASK:

- 1) City to monitor grading to ensure builders cannot destroy any mature trees surrounding the beautiful Sales Pavilion or the north parking lot.
- 2) The builder must plan for additional setbacks and build solid masonry 10ft + walls consistent with the Talbot Gate entry's west side, (built by Toll Brothers) to benefit and secure Village 7 homeowners.
- 3) The builder must include ADA access for parking and sidewalk access to the front entry of the Sales Pavilion. Currently the plan shows ZERO access to the front entry of the Sales Pavilion.

I thank you for hearing this complicated and important Appeal for the homeowners of Rancharrah.

Good evening!

I am Audrey Keller a resident of Rancharrah and the Appellant. Since the May 1st Planning Commission and my Appeal I have met with Rancharrah's GM/HOA President Robert Cuillard and Andy Durling, Wood Rogers June 11th.

At this meeting I was told that YOU the council would deny my appeal 6-0 or 7-0.

IS THIS TRUE?

At a meeting with myself and a room with 40 homeowners on July 10th, we were told by Mr. Cuillard (he works for the developer), that we should be grateful- lucky that the builder is not building 310 condos instead of 59 homes as a threat because we have dared to Appeal their plan.

The builder has not tried to work with the homeowners or made any compromises after hearing our concerns. After meeting with Andy Durling, I asked him in writing for feedback on what the builder will modify with our requests.

No reply from Andy.

Play recording 1 – Planning Commission Meeting Commissioner Rohmeyer and Andy Durling.

Play recording 2 And now let's hear from the Planning Commissioner Drakulich.

Let's stop this threat of 310 homes, and focus on getting a better community result.

As you just heard the developer/builder never intended on building 310 units. Their plan is to tie up the residents with excessive PUD housing counts, 700+ units never to be built, ultimately to control our Community Assns. MONEY.

The builders plan carefully avoided all discussion of the adjacent Parcel A-2 - the Sales Pavilion and two parking lot(s) north and south, which were split off from Village 7 in 2019.

Today homeowners want to buy the beautiful Sales Pavilion, and the north parking lot from the developer/builder. Why, because the PUD suggests such 'use' as a community center. It seems like all parties may want to make this happen at a fair price, but this tentative plan stands in the way of making this deal.

Now the highlights of the Appeal.

Condition #1 City codes in effect at the time of application shall prevail.

The PUD document clearly states in event of conflict between design standards and City Code, these PUD standards shall govern development. The developer and Wood Rogers created the PUD over 10 years ago. City Council approved the PUD & all amendments.

My APPEAL ASK: Council to rule that builder to follow All PUD standards.

Condition #8 Final map shall demonstrate each driveway to meet the minimum length.

Code says driveways to meet minimum length of 3 feet.

PUD standards state driveway length = 19ft minimum.

PUD shall govern. (A three feet minimum is in this current plan. Our friend Roger could not get his golf cart parked in front of his garage in 3 feet).

MY APPEAL ASK: Builder to follow All PUD standards. A 3 foot “driveway” is unacceptable for Rancharrah.

Condition #10 – Hours of Construction.

MY APPEAL ASK: Construction hours to follow City Halls work hours. No Work Saturdays, No Work Sundays and No Work Holidays.

My Appeal Comments on the STAFF FINDINGS

Finding #1 Compliance with Title 18 & PUD. In conflicts between the PUD and CODE, the PUD Standards shall Govern.

PUD Infrastructure ACCESS states clearly:
Additional access locations between land use categories shall be determined during review of a tentative map.

I will show you now the map from the PUD regarding the planned access on Sierra Rose Drive.

MY APPEAL ASK: Follow the PUD – Builder to build Sierra Rose access gate for Village 7.

Finding #4 Provide safe environment.

Build walkable, bikeable pathways to connect existing Sales Pavilion. Zoning Code: 18.04.903
Provide opportunities for pedestrian and bicycle connectivity.

MY APPEAL ASK: Builder to build additional safe pathways. Remove all barriers that hinder connectivity to the Sales Pavilion and Talbot Lane Gate.

Finding #5 Tentative Map doesn't comply to the PUD. The builder failed to embrace the clear description or goals of the 'ranch esthetic' and they failed to remain sensitive to rural character as clearly described in the PUD. This PUD mandate is about how Village 7 "feels".

Shared driveways and red curbs don't promote rural character.

The builders failed to meld their architectural style with existing buildings, like the Sales Pavilion and Talbot gate house, which are directly adjacent to Village 7. Even the Rancharrah Village shops follows the PUD better than this plan.

MY APPEAL ASK: Builder to follow PUD 'build & design upon the existing features of the ranch'.

FINDING #6: The development for Village 7 is NOT compatible with the neighborhoods in which it is proposed to be established.

The central street inside Village 7 is 100% red curbed. The shared driveways force homeowners or guests to park outside Village 7, forcing cars into other adjacent neighborhoods.

City zoning code 18.04.903 Zero Lot Line Homes - Clustering proposal will have no adverse impact on adjacent properties or development.

MY APPEAL ASK: 1) This plan causes adverse impact in the development. Reject this tentative plan. And...

2) Advise the prospective buyers of new Village 7 homes, in sales material and closing documents (require disclosures) that these homes come with extreme parking limitations.

FINDING #10e: The development for Village 7 is not a significantly higher quality development, nor does it propose a unified design concept.

Village 7, sales pricing is slated for over one million dollars – has narrow access streets, (1/3 the width of my neighborhood) no parking in front of your own home, 3-19 foot, un-parkable and mostly shared driveways represent a real destruction of home values. This is supposed to be a significantly higher quality development. It is not.

MY APPEAL ASK: Widen the central street to allow for parking on at least one side of the street in Village 7.

Tentative Map: Item #9 –

Bit by bit the developer has eroded homeowner property values like the destruction of the Rancharrah Equestrian Center last month. It was The Ranches perfect example of ‘ranch aesthetic’.

What's next on the demo list? The builder submitted a plan to demolish the Talbot entry curved monument and 230 feet of ranch style fence line, which is HOA property.

MY APPEAL ASK:

- 1) City to monitor grading to ensure builders cannot destroy any mature trees surrounding the beautiful Sales Pavilion or the north parking lot.
- 2) The builder must plan for additional setbacks and build solid masonry 10ft + walls consistent with the Talbot Gate entry's west side, (built by Toll Brothers) to benefit and secure Village 7 homeowners.
- 3) The builder must include ADA access for parking and sidewalk access to the front entry of the Sales Pavilion. Currently the plan shows ZERO access to the front entry of the Sales Pavilion.

I thank you for hearing this complicated and important Appeal for the homeowners of Rancharra.

Good evening!

I am Audrey Keller a resident of Rancharrah and the Appellant. Since the May 1st Planning Commission and my Appeal I have met with Rancharrah's GM/HOA President Robert Cuillard and Andy Durling, Wood Rogers June 11th.

At this meeting I was told that YOU the council would deny my appeal 6-0 or 7-0.

IS THIS TRUE?

At a meeting with myself and a room with 40 homeowners on July 10th, we were told by Mr. Cuillard (he works for the developer), that we should be grateful- lucky that the builder is not building 310 condos instead of 59 homes as a threat because we have dared to Appeal their plan.

The builder has not tried to work with the homeowners or made any compromises after hearing our concerns. After meeting with Andy Durling, I asked him in writing for feedback on what the builder will modify with our requests.

No reply from Andy.

Play recording 1 – Planning Commission Meeting Commissioner Rohymeyer and Andy Durling.

Play recording 2 And now let's hear from the Planning Commissioner Drakulich.

Let's stop this threat of 310 homes, and focus on getting a better community result.

As you just heard the developer/builder never intended on building 310 units. Their plan is to tie up the residents with excessive PUD housing counts, 700+ units never to be built, ultimately to control our Community Assns. MONEY.

The builders plan carefully avoided all discussion of the adjacent Parcel A-2 - the Sales Pavilion and two parking lot(s) north and south, which were split off from Village 7 in 2019.

Today homeowners want to buy the beautiful Sales Pavilion, and the north parking lot from the developer/builder. Why, because the PUD suggests such 'use' as a community center. It seems like all parties may want to make this happen at a fair price, but this tentative plan stands in the way of making this deal.

Now the highlights of the Appeal.

Condition #1 City codes in effect at the time of application shall prevail.

The PUD document clearly states in event of conflict between design standards and City Code, these PUD standards shall govern development. The developer and Wood Rogers created the PUD over 10 years ago. City Council approved the PUD & all amendments.

My APPEAL ASK: Council to rule that builder to follow All PUD standards.

Condition #8 Final map shall demonstrate each driveway to meet the minimum length.

Code says driveways to meet minimum length of 3 feet.

PUD standards state driveway length = 19ft minimum.

PUD shall govern. (A three feet minimum is in this current plan. Our friend Roger could not get his golf cart parked in front of his garage in 3 feet).

MY APPEAL ASK: Builder to follow All PUD standards. A 3 foot “driveway” is unacceptable for Rancharrah.

Condition #10 – Hours of Construction.

MY APPEAL ASK: Construction hours to follow City Halls work hours. No Work Saturdays, No Work Sundays and No Work Holidays.

My Appeal Comments on the STAFF FINDINGS

Finding #1 Compliance with Title 18 & PUD. In conflicts between the PUD and CODE, the PUD Standards shall Govern.

PUD Infrastructure ACCESS states clearly:
Additional access locations between land use categories shall be determined during review of a tentative map.

I will show you now the map from the PUD regarding the planned access on Sierra Rose Drive.

MY APPEAL ASK: Follow the PUD – Builder to build Sierra Rose access gate for Village 7.

Finding #4 Provide safe environment.

Build walkable, bikeable pathways to connect existing Sales Pavilion. Zoning Code: 18.04.903
Provide opportunities for pedestrian and bicycle connectivity.

MY APPEAL ASK: Builder to build additional safe pathways. Remove all barriers that hinder connectivity to the Sales Pavilion and Talbot Lane Gate.

Finding #5 Tentative Map doesn't comply to the PUD. The builder failed to embrace the clear description or goals of the 'ranch esthetic' and they failed to remain sensitive to rural character as clearly described in the PUD. This PUD mandate is about how Village 7 "feels".

Shared driveways and red curbs don't promote rural character.

The builders failed to meld their architectural style with existing buildings, like the Sales Pavilion and Talbot gate house, which are directly adjacent to Village 7. Even the Rancharra Village shops follows the PUD better than this plan.

MY APPEAL ASK: Builder to follow PUD 'build & design upon the existing features of the ranch'.

FINDING #6: The development for Village 7 is NOT compatible with the neighborhoods in which it is proposed to be established.

The central street inside Village 7 is 100% red curbed. The shared driveways force homeowners or guests to park outside Village 7, forcing cars into other adjacent neighborhoods.

City zoning code 18.04.903 Zero Lot Line Homes - Clustering proposal will have no adverse impact on adjacent properties or development.

MY APPEAL ASK: 1) This plan causes adverse impact in the development. Reject this tentative plan. And...

2) Advise the prospective buyers of new Village 7 homes, in sales material and closing documents (require disclosures) that these homes come with extreme parking limitations.

FINDING #10e: The development for Village 7 is not a significantly higher quality development, nor does it propose a unified design concept.

Village 7, sales pricing is slated for over one million dollars – has narrow access streets, (1/3 the width of my neighborhood) no parking in front of your own home, 3-19 foot, un-parkable and mostly shared driveways represent a real destruction of home values. This is supposed to be a significantly higher quality development. It is not.

MY APPEAL ASK: Widen the central street to allow for parking on at least one side of the street in Village 7.

Tentative Map: Item #9 –

Bit by bit the developer has eroded homeowner property values like the destruction of the Rancharrah Equestrian Center last month. It was The Ranches perfect example of ‘ranch aesthetic’.

What's next on the demo list? The builder submitted a plan to demolish the Talbot entry curved monument and 230 feet of ranch style fence line, which is HOA property.

MY APPEAL ASK:

- 1) City to monitor grading to ensure builders cannot destroy any mature trees surrounding the beautiful Sales Pavilion or the north parking lot.
- 2) The builder must plan for additional setbacks and build solid masonry 10ft + walls consistent with the Talbot Gate entry's west side, (built by Toll Brothers) to benefit and secure Village 7 homeowners.
- 3) The builder must include ADA access for parking and sidewalk access to the front entry of the Sales Pavilion. Currently the plan shows ZERO access to the front entry of the Sales Pavilion.

I thank you for hearing this complicated and important Appeal for the homeowners of Rancharrah.