

**Voice, Jared**

---

**From:** Deb Kadas <debkadas@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 22, 2016 4:20 PM  
**To:** Voice, Jared  
**Subject:** Comment Regarding Case: LDO16-00003



Dear Jared Voice,

I own two properties to the east of 3255 NW Fillmore. I am opposed to the current application for a minor LDO request, LDO16-00003, to reduce the minimum rear yard setback from 15 feet to 5 feet.

I am opposed for the following reasons:

1. Setback requirements exist for a reason. Setbacks contribute to neighbors' privacy and personal space, allow sunlight to shine on neighboring properties, add a noise buffer, provide access, and enhance green space.
2. The systematic ignoring of codes and rules has been like a cancer to Corvallis' older neighborhoods. Enforcement of setbacks (and other codes) help neighborhoods maintain their character and livability.
3. A variance isn't necessary to accomplish the applicant's goals. The lot is large enough to accommodate a garage addition that meets the setback code.
4. The currently existing legal and illegal garages have a very large massing that competes with the articulated facade of the smaller, original 1952 home. If rebuilt to code, I believe a legal garage addition that steps forward 10 feet would actually enhance the street view of the property.
5. This property has a long history of occupancy and development code violations. It is time to break this cycle.
6. Due to basement improvements, this once small, single-family home is now a rental with 5 bedrooms. Considering past history, it is not unreasonable to assume this garage space has the potential to be illegally converted into additional bedrooms, or other illegal living spaces.
7. Finally, the compensating benefit #2 of the 6-ft cedar fence on the east property line should not be considered. That fence does not belong to the applicant and they have no say as to whether it will remain or not. I built and paid for that fence entirely myself, and it belongs to my property.

Despite opposition, it is usually appreciated by neighbors when an absentee landlord makes improvements to a rental property. I hope the city denies this variance, and the applicant reapplies with a plan that meets all city development and UNO codes.

Thank you kindly for your consideration. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Deb Kadas  
3105 NW Jackson Avenue  
541-754-6611