

November 30, 2015

RECEIVED

In regard to Conditional Use Permit 20-15-06 at Calhoun Trail

DEC 1 - 2015

To Whom it May Concern;

CITY OF HOMER

My name is Debra Williams, My husband Danny and I bought the home at 196 E. Danview Ave and have lived in it for 28 years. This is our family home where we raised our children and now enjoy our grandchildren's visits. Prior to buying the home on Danview we had built a home in a subdivision out East Road that had been zoned for single family dwellings but quite to the contrary, several triplexes were built in the neighborhood, three of them next to our little family home. The turnover of renters with no vested interest in the upkeep and safety of the neighborhood made our life less than peaceful, as a matter of fact, our neighborhood became often referred to by the nickname "Ghettowood".

I would like to go on record in opposition of the building of anything but single family dwellings on the properties off Calhoun Trail, a trail that runs directly past the east side of our family home. There are many and varied reasons for my concern, one of course being past experiences with multifamily rentals. A few of my other concerns are as follows.

1) DRAINAGE

When we bought this home we were warned by the previous owners that this subdivision is somewhat marshy and that we would need to make sure the ditches around our home were kept flowing to keep drainage from negatively impacting our property and home. I have worked very hard shoveling these ditches each year.

At the time we purchased the property there was a road that separated Danview from Svedlund and drainage moved under the road away from our home on the east side. When Danview was straightened, upgraded, and incorporated the small road that connected to Svedlund, drainage was rerouted from across the road to across the front of our property. Since then we have dealt with flooding of that front ditch frequently with the freeze and thaw throughout the winters. The flooding has impacted other homes along the lower side of Danview as well at times.

In order to build on this very wet property will the property not have to be built up, making it higher than the properties below? How will the issue of drainage be addressed? Will the drainage of 8 additional families flow across our property?

2) Toxic Oil Spill

A few years back one of the properties up the hill from us had a very serious oil spill resulting in rainbow colored stinky oil slick flowing across the east and front of our property for years. I never saw any clean up efforts made in the wooded areas along Calhoun Trail. What is being done to assure that the process of putting in a road and digging up the properties along the impacted area will not release more pollutants across our property? (Which again brings us back to the drainage and safety issue involving 8 rentals)

RECEIVED

Ľ

3) Who pays for the road to access the property?

When Danview was improved the property owners paid a goodly sum for the improvement which was fine as it did indeed improve our properties to some degree. How will this new road impact the pocketbooks of those of us who don't even want the road?

4) How will the increased volume of residents, (families and pets) impact the noise, traffic and safety level of our quiet little neighborhood?

5) Wild life, both plant and animal

Our children grew up watching the newly dropped moose calves gain their strength and roam with their moms. We have also seen groups of dogs chasing these wee ones when they stray out of the protected wooded area. one wee one wandered too far from mom and into an area with many pet dogs with a horrible loud ruckus. The next time we saw him one of his little ears was ripped off. We also have a favorite tree on our property that we have photographed in all it's glory throughout the seasons. We would hate to see that tree's roots damaged and the tree die due to changes along Calhoun Trail. **More families equal more pets and less wild life.**

I have the greatest respect for Judge/Mayor/Mr. Hornaday and I understand his wanting to get the most money for his property. I don't blame him but I was asked for my opinion on the proposed use of this land and this is in truth how I feel personally impacted.

Sincerely

Uli Mianos

Debra Williams 196 E. Danview Ave Homer, Ak. 99603



DEC 1 - 2015

11-26-2015

I Danny F Williams oppose giving a special permit to developers of the the property at 4242 calhoun street. When I purchased my property at 196 E Danview Ave I was informed that the properties surrounding my property are zoned only for single Family dwellings NOT duplexes. Additionally I did not receive a notice but was informed by my neighbors of the developers request. Please do not allow construction of these duplates. Thank you. Danny F Williame RECEIVED 196 EDanview Ave DEC 1 - 2015 CITY OF HOMER Homer AK

PLANNING/ZONING

From:	Adele Person <adele@bunnellarts.org></adele@bunnellarts.org>	
Sent:	Tuesday, December 01, 2015 10:28 AM	
То:	Department Planning	
Cc:	Dotti Harness	
Subject:	4242 Calhoun CUP	

Good Morning Planning Commission,

Two pieces of property are in the process of development on the Calhoun Trail. It is my understanding that the properties are putting in a gravel stub from Danview for access.

The Calhoun Trail is part of a North-South trail corridor that extends from the bench to the beach. Work is being done to strengthen this corridor that begins at Calhoun, goes past the Senior Center, Poopdeck and I&O trails to Bishops Beach. Trails are an asset that increase property values in neighborhoods.

I am an immediate neighbor of the properties on the Calhoun Trail. There are good reasons to develop the properties owned by Burgess and Hornaday / Fisher. As a neighbor and a committed member of the Homer Community, I would like to see careful attention paid to keeping a pedestrian / bike space along Calhoun.

The new occupants of the four duplexes and the rest of the neighborhood would benefit from keeping transportation options healthy and strong. It keeps community strong. Careful consideration must be given to *where will people walk?* How will they get to town safely and have options available to them? The new residents and the larger neighborhood want access that is easy, safe and healthy. People want to walk dogs, push strollers, bike to school, walk to the coffee shop.

Some solutions might be:

- to block off the north side of the stub with boulders

- to separate foot path and vehicle way

- to design the stub such that vehicles move slowly and yield to people on foot, bike, playing, etc (narrow lanes, gravel, boulders in the middle.. Parts of the right-of-way on Fairview act this way where local cars get to their driveway and it is still safe for people on foot and bike,)

Eight housing units is quite number. I hope that this development becomes a strong asset to the community, with greenspace and sunlight and good drainage and considerate access. Are these units well-built and easy to maintain? Will they be good spaces and attract good residents? I hope so and look forward to new neighbors.

Thank you,

Adele Person Bayview Ct resident

RECEIVED

DEC 2 - 2015

From:	Deborah Curtis <dcurtis@kpbsd.k12.ak.us></dcurtis@kpbsd.k12.ak.us>
Sent:	Wednesday, December 02, 2015 1:04 PM
То:	Department Planning
Cc:	debdcox@mac.com
Subject:	Request for CUP 2015-06 at 4242 Calhoun Street

To Planning Commission Members,

I live at 4225 Gavin Court, Homer, Alaska. It has been my family, and my, primary residence since 2006. My husband and I have two children, currently ages 6 and 8.

I am writing in response to the Conditional Use Permit 15-06 at 4242 Calhoun Street. I want to express my concern for the potential loss of the Calhoun trail between Bayview and Danview. It is a fantastic trail, and many people use it daily. It is an integral part of keeping Homer a pedestrian friendly town, and keeping people safe. It is also a fabulous bit of "nature" in the middle of town. This trail is used by children, families, pets on a daily basis (and frequently by moose). It also hooks into the lower portion of the Calhoun trail that heads down toward town, enabling people to walk safely and peacefully toward the town center.

On the CUP, I do not see specifics about access to the potential new development. I am hoping that if this CUP is granted, a trail can be retained. If this is already being considered, thank you.

In addition, I was not sent a letter regarding this CUP, and I live very close to the trail. A neighbor stopped by to tell me about this potential development. Therefore, would it be possible to be put on a mailing list for any further developments regarding this proposed project? I would just like to stay informed of any potential public input opportunities.

Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter. And thank you to the Commission Members for all of your hard work!

Sincerely,

Deb (Cox) Curtis PO Box 244 4225 Gavin Court Homer, AK 99603 (907)299-1516 debdcox@mac.com

RECEIVED

DEC 2 - 2015

RECEIVED

City of Homer Planning 491 East Pioneer Ave. Homer, AK 99603 DEC 2 - 2015

CITY OF HOMER PLANNING/ZONING

TO: Homer Advisory Planning Commission

I am writing to express my concerns regarding the proposed Conditional Use Permit (CUP) 2015-06 at 4242 Calhoun St. The request to build a total of eight dwelling units on this property will have an adverse effect on the surrounding single-family homes and the quality of life for the residents. The following issues should be considered:

Neighborhood Character

- The proposed multi-family housing development is in the middle of a neighborhood of single-family homes and is not in harmony with the existing neighborhood character. The majority of these homes are owner-occupied. The introduction of multiple buildings for rental purposes does not fit with the low-density, owner-occupied neighborhood and will have a profound adverse influence on the character of this community of homes.
- It is widely understood that homeownership leads to neighborhood stability. It is important that Homer maintains single-family home neighborhoods with less residential mobility and greater property values. Unlike renters, homeowners have economic interests in their property and a stronger attachment to the community.
- The staff report PL 15-78 finds that the proposed housing development is not expected to negatively impact the adjoining properties greater than other permitted or conditional uses "such as a hospital, or railroad". This finding is a bit nonsensical. The development project in question should be compared to housing in the immediate area to determine the impact (not railroads/hospitals).

Increased Traffic

- Currently E. Danview Ave. is a residential street with 11 single-family homes. Gavin Court has 6 single-family homes. The traffic flow from the proposed multi-family units onto E. Danview Ave. will have a significant impact on this quiet street and the character of the neighborhood.
- It is likely we will see an increase of 16 vehicles from the development as proposed for this one lot. This will create an intensity of use and generate a volume of traffic that will be harmful to the neighborhood.

Drainage and Flooding

• As a resident of this neighborhood, I have observed yearly flooding and significant water flow on Calhoun trail and the adjacent property. Drainage is a major issue for the property. Removing vegetation and soil, grading the

land surface, and constructing drainage networks increase runoff to streams from rainfall and snowmelt. A complete and thorough review of the hydrological effects of the housing development is needed to avoid adversely affecting the downstream properties or current drainage channels.

Open space

- The development plan proposes erecting four buildings, eight dwelling units, some within 30 feet of existing properties and will change the neighborhood from low-density to medium-density. There are presently 7 homes bordering the property so the proposed housing development in effect will double the units and potentially the number of residents in the immediate area.
- The majority of the single-family homes in the vicinity are on large lots or two lots for one home. The ratio of homes to residents to open space is very low and the additional 4 buildings, 8 units will increase that ratio by a minimum of 50%.

Safety Review

- The email from Timothy W. Fisher indicates a Plan review is unnecessary because they are "less than 4 dwelling units". (In the interest of transparency, it should be noted in the records if Mr. Timothy Fisher is any relation to Mr. Josiah Fisher).
- On the application, the developer and property owner have responded "No" to the question -- Are you building a multifamily building with more than 3 apartments?
- Both of these are misleading, the plan includes 4 buildings and 8 dwelling units with a single access road. The homes are located within 30 feet of neighboring property. A thorough safety review including a Fire Marshall certification is warranted.

I sadly accept that we will be losing our beloved Calhoun trail but I take issue with the number of buildings proposed for this lot. I request more forethought to address the issues that will arise from numerous multi-family dwellings in a singlefamily neighborhood as well as the environmental impact of such development. Your consideration of the needs and concerns of the people living in this neighborhood is most appreciated.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Susan Johnson 231 E. Danview Ave. sjohnson907@gmail.com

Letter of Concern CUP 15-06 4242 Calhoun St.

Patrick J. Church P.O. Box 2080 4321 Calhoun Court Homer, Alaska 99603 907-235-7388

December 02, 2015

City of Homer Homer Advisory Planning Commission Homer, Alaska 99603

Members of the Homer Advisory Planning Commission:

In the matter of the Conditional Use Permit for the proposed construction of a four duplex complex (eight dwelling units), and the impact on the immediate neighborhood please consider the following conditions regarding items 5 and 6 of Analysis page 13 of the Application:

- 1. That the Conditional Use Permit presupposes that the permit is conditional as the name implies.
- 2. That the proposed 20' driveway be constructed at the east side of the 60' ROW to minimize any conflict with existing trail.
- 3. That provisions are adopted to provide for Calhoun Trail to be suitably re-located west if Calhoun Trail is effected by the driveway placement and snow removal/berms.
- That being Calhoun St. is not a through street a 10 mph speed limit be placed on its vehicular traffic.
- 5. That planning is necessary to determine that the Project needs further study regarding due consideration given to the preservation of access and current usage of Calhoun Trail without vehicular interference or contact with pedestrians before the CUP is granted.

As a concerned citizen, living within 300' of the project, I ask that these <u>conditions</u> be considered and <u>Approved</u>.

By adopting these few conditions there will be much less impact to the Community.

Thank you for your courteous attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Patrick of . Church

RECEIVED

DEC 2 - 2015 CITY OF HOMER PLANNING/ZONING

From: Sent: To: Subject: Holly Brennan <hollyfromhomer@gmail.com> Tuesday, December 01, 2015 7:17 PM Department Planning comments for Dec 2 meeting

Homer Planning Commission and City of Homer Planning Department -

Thank you for your thoughtful considerations when drafting the Zoning for Marijuana documents. I found the outcome to be surprisingly reasonable.

As more information begins to reach the general public, I have noticed an increase in the number of comments expressing concern about cannabis zoning in Homer. It is not surprising to me that the majority of these comments are seemingly misguided, such as most made during the Nov 4, 2015 meeting.

I just wanted to reiterate my previous suggestion to take these comments opposing "marijuana" and replace with the phrase "cannabis businesses," since this is what the zoning regulations are addressing. Regulating the zoning for cannabis businesses does nothing to stop individuals from possessing it, which is something many people just do not seem to get. Many seem to think that if you change the zoning requirements they'll be able to create a personal buffer around themselves and prevent all use/possession, but of course this isn't true.

Thank you for creating zoning regulations for cannabis that are reasonable for residential, business, and commercial areas - especially business. It's my hope that one outcome of the legalization of cannabis is that Homer is able to take advantage of the potential revenue from sales, and this can't be done without ideal places to set up legitimate businesses (such as the spit).

Keep up the good work.

-Holly Brennan

City of Homer resident

RECEIVED

DEC 2 - 2015

From:	Crisi Matthews <broker@cmreagent.com></broker@cmreagent.com>	
Sent:	Wednesday, December 02, 2015 3:28 PM	
То:	Department Planning	
Subject:	Public Comment for Planning Commission Meeting Tonight	

I find it rather disappointing that members of the community came forward in support of limiting cannabis sales here in Homer from recreational areas such as the Spit and resulted in such minute support from the Commission. This conversation is not about alcohol on the Spit as was Council's statement in opposition of our request for restrictions to sales on the Spit. As a governing body, one member went on to read the definition of the City Code for recreation and it's facilities as they exist in Homer. In addition, the General Plan also designates OSR zones on Homer Spit and therefore it seems natural that RECREATION as defined by your code should have the same buffer zone as the 'Park' does. Children congregate in these zones while visiting Homer more than any other Zone in our City. I'm still not clear how the Council who has defined Recreation and it's Zones so clearly isn't placing any protection on them now. Buffer Zones for the zones of OSR need to be identified also as there won't be specific designations addressed in the state code such as these nor on marine OSR zones as this designation pertains to Homer not the state at large. The code limits construction so as to preserve them and their use a buffer zone here seems only logical.

To date, the state committee is still answering public questions on these same texts and they haven't completed the adoption of their guidelines as they apply to Alaska. It also states at this time that the local jurisdiction must approve a license request before the state will issue it once these guidelines are in place, so I'm not sure why there is such haste in generating Homer's guidelines ahead of the state. If ANYTHING it would seem prudent to allow them to lead not to supersede local recommendations ahead of theirs. The idea that we need to have our doors open first is extremely liberal and not reflective of the overall populous of Homer. As shown in the last public hearing the opponents far outweighed those in support and none from the Cannabis committee even attended.

According to the 2010 Census nearly 25% of Homer's population is under 19. In addition, a call to the Chamber of Commerce identified that 11,600+ visitors came into the Chamber not including the City of Homer in general from May 1 to August 31 and 9 cruise ships distributing 4500 visitor guides to these. Big draws like the Birding Week and Salmon Derby are big draws here also. It seems pretty obvious to me, a business owner in town and to the others that spoke last month requesting your expressed protection of the Spit that the Planning Commission HAS the authority and the obligation to protect the OSR Zones they've created for outdoor use. The families that live here came for all that is Homer; a safe community to raise healthy families. The residents and the visitors came for every reason OTHER than access to Cannabis Sales. Tourism is the heart of Homer's summer revenue as a City and for small time business owners that depend on the summer commerce, not a hope for retail tax from these proposed businesses.

We ask that you revisit the OSR and place a buffer zone on the	em just the same as you have identified for the
Hornaday Park.	RECEIVED
	NEVENCED

Loyally, Crisi Matthews, Broker c: 907-299-8700 f: 888-552-2805 www.CMREagent.com

DEC 2 - 2015 CITY OF HOMER PLANNING/ZONING

Subject:

FW: Comments for public hearing December 2nd planning commission

From: Chad Matthews <info@ofishial.com> Date: December 2, 2015 at 3:59:47 PM AKST To: planning@ci.homer.ak.us

DEC 2 - 2015

RECEIVED

CITY OF HOMER Subject: Comments for public hearing December 2nd planning edministion G/ZONING

I apologize ahead of time for being a terrible pubic speaker and my wife and tean't be there tonight but ask that you be patient for a couple of serious points not only on the Cannabis subject but how I have witnessed it address by this board. Neither point will mean anything unless you know my background. So please humor me for a minute down a quick blink of my life which I promise is all relevant to this town that I/We call home. I was born and raised in San Jose California more specifically the East side "the wrong side of town". It was ridden by drugs and gangs and my father and I were only there to grant my grandmother's dying wish to live out her years in the house that my grandfather built. As much as I loved my grandmother we said every year that this would be grandma's last Christmas living in what became one of the top rated ghettos in the lower 48. My grandfather's hand built home was built in the middle of an almond orchard that in 40 years became the festering grounds for gang activity, drug trafficking and violence. There I both witnessed and was a victim of violence based on drug trade both from gang selling and at the hands of the childhood product of druged out parenting. I went to school everyday sick to my stomach about about what would happen before the day was out. To save you the long "opera' moment I have been beaten to an inch of the end of my life more than once. Many of these kids who were violent in the name of gang involvement began their drugged lives at the hand of marijuana. It was a gateway drug for them. My rear neighbors who were 5th graders had access to marijuana and sold it within the neighborhood. How is that related to the pot here, in Homer I am sure you ask as well as this is not a forum to discuss the legality legalizing it since that has already been done.

I offer further evidence of the effects of it and ask what basis anyone in this room has to offer to the affects on this town? The Cannabis of the 70s when pot was a fraction of the potency and was a part of a free loving era that was the platform of counter capitalism has evolved. Those who believe the legality is just are ignoring that it is a controlled substance and it has become a more potent, more marketed, more effectively and illegally grown product that has lead to continual growth and profitability of major gangs and cartels that have changed everything from those fun loving hippy days. My story does not end there, at 13; the year before my grandmother passed and I had an out to get out of the ghetto based on my parents' divorce. I moved with my mother to a small dairy town in the Central Valley of California. This is the town that shaped me but I've been told by the teachers there that we were the last good class to come through a long history of a good wholesome town. Even my younger brother was on the wrong path. He harmlessly thought smoking pot was a good idea in contrast to myself who saw the devastating effects as a kid in the ghetto. I have not spoken to him in 10 years. He now sells marijanua through California's medical marijuana laws, he has multiple convictions of driving under the influence and theft still living with our mother at nearly 30 years old. I watched his demise which started with pot.

As an adult man legally hunting pigs in the mountains of California, I've been shot at by those growing illegally on forestry land. The crime report we produced for this board a month ago regarding the effects of legalization in Colorado, who read it? Was it a priority to look at those unbiased statistics before making decisions on how it will be implemented here before THE STATE OF ALASKA has even completed it's editing process of this document to serve as our template here in Homer?

Back to this board their basis for addressing this issue. In the first meeting I addressed specific questions that were brought up but not addressed in discussion since they clearly did not conform to what apprearded to be personal agenda. Only one proponent without a logical presentation showed up

to the meeting to state 'it's already here' in our town yet the appeal by business owners who are the lifeline of the City's revenue was largely ignored. 44% of the City's Budgeted Revenue is generated by taxes; sales and property therefore, why would the Plannign Commission ignore that this is largely based on the series Homer currently offers; safety, community, clean wholesome family activities and tourism of this town? When only 2 of the board both Roberta and Shelia tried to address questions by the people they were shut down or it was likened to rot gut sales on the Spit which has nothing to do with this issue nor minimized in light of alcohol a legalized and VERY REGULATED industry. How is it that in representing the people, their comments are ignored? What experience (like mine in seeing direct result of loose oversight of controlled substances) does the rest of the board have in this matter? I'm not sure why in Homer there is the need to be the trendsetter with this legislation in rushing to approval ahead of the state? I don't see more advocates for looser restrictions appearing than the opposite asking for more restriction. I'm a staunch advocate of the exact draw there is for people to Homer-1. tourism, 2. family based community 3. small town and low crime rates

The mission statement of Homer is:

The City of Homer Community Recreation will promote community involvement and life-long learning through educational and recreational opportunities for people of all ages. This will be accomplished through maximizing usage of all community facilities and resources, while utilizing, expanding and uniting local business and school resources and expertise. Our program shall be designed to recognize cultural diversity and to address social and community concerns.

Is your direction to allow pot retail in nearly all parts of Homer a reflection of that? Do you see the need for liberal Cannabis legislation to be paramount to building our community and the families here? You've outlined Recreation should have a buffer and in the General Plan there are numerous OPEN SPACE RECREATION areas and you further defined those at the last meeting per the City Code yet no consideration is being given to a buffer zone for those even at the request of those who conduct business there. I'm a little frustrated as I have seen first hand the effects of liberalization and left behind all of that for a place to conduct a family-run business and a community like many here to raise our family.

O'Fish'ial Charters of Alaska Capt. Chad Matthews 907-299-6991 Homer, Alaska

Loyally, Crisi Matthews, Broker c: 907-299-8700 f: 888-552-2805 www.CMREagent.com www.HomerShores.com

AK DRE Li #19150 CA BRE Li #01894501 4025 Homer Spit Rd#7, Homer, AK 99603 affiliate: Luminary RE



Subject:

FW: CUP 15-07 public hearing input

From: Homer Head Start [mailto:Homer@ruralcap.com] Sent: Wednesday, December 02, 2015 9:44 AM To: Department Planning Subject: CUP 15-07 public hearing input

To: Homer Advisory Planning Commission From: Martha Wagele, Homer Head Start Subject: CUP 15-07 Date: 12/2/15

Homer Head Start is a federally funded preschool program that offers services to children aged 3-5 years, and their parents. The goal of our program is to provide an enriched educational experience for our students to help prepare them for kindergarten. We strive to have a physical environment that is clean, safe and inviting. Homer Head Start is the tenant of 1266 Ocean Drive, next to 1242 Ocean Drive which is being considered for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) 2015-07. Our staff and families park in the lot adjoining 1242 Ocean Drive. The "Quicky Mart" and the canopy with a building underneath are visible from our office and meeting room windows. The back, or north end, of 1242 Ocean Drive with storage and small buildings, is visible from our playground where the children play every day.

We are supportive of the following City Planner recommended conditions:

- 1. Meet code requirements for sanitation and fire safety
- 2. Water and sewer connection
- 3. Enclosed dumpster
- 5. Setback buildings on skids

6. Install a 70ft evergreen buffer from NE corner of the West ½ lot 32 traveling southward and including planting within the lawn area

In addition, we believe the following suggestions would be beneficial:

- 1. Ample, well designated parking to eliminate overflow parking onto neighboring lots.
- 2. Instate dumpster service as soon as possible to eliminate the use of neighboring dumpsters.

Sincerely, Martha Wagele Local Program Supervisor Homer Head Start 1266 Ocean Drive Homer, AK 99603

RECEIVED

DEC 2 - 2015

BERTH II, INC. P.O. Box 3147 Homer, Alaska 99603 (907) 235-8483

December 2, 2015

Homer Advisory Planning Commission 491 East Pioneer Avenue Homer, AK 99603

To Whom It May Concern,

It has come to our attention that the property owner of T 6S R 13W SEC 21 Seward Meridian HM 0000839 Bay View Sub Lot 33, located at 1242 Ocean Drive has requested a Conditional Use Permit (CUP). As property owners of the neighboring lots, T 6S R 13W SEC 21 Seward Meridian HM 0000839 Bay View Sub Lots 34, 35, 51 and 52 located at 1230 Ocean Drive, we have several concerns about the request.

The property at 1242 Ocean Drive has been an eyesore for many years relative to the close proximity to our property. Maintenance and landscaping has been minimal and when debris accumulates it can be an unsightly mess. The growth of a transient population, during the summer months especially, is a growing concern as the foot traffic across our property on a daily basis increases as well. We have found bags of trash and human waste amongst the trees on our property, due to the fact that the neighboring property has not activated its water and sewer connections, and we have witnessed men/women walking back and forth from the property next door to our treed lots. This brings up a potential issue for the safety and welfare of our tenants and employees as these people have no purpose for trespassing on our property for any reason.

We have no issue with someone starting and running a business and in fact encourage this. However, we have made every attempt to comply with the City of Homer codes and regulations and ask the City to enforce the codes and regulations equally. Should the CUP be granted, we ask the City of Homer to ensure the property is used in the correct manner thereby discouraging littering of the properties, discouraging trespassing, safeguarding our tenant's and employee's safety and welfare and keeping our property values stable.

Regards,

Bryon Vormetto Bryan Vermette by ANV

Bryan Vermette 67 Ph President RECEIVED

DEC 2 - 2015

From: Sent: To: Subject: Warren Miller <wht6mtn@gmail.com> Wednesday, December 02, 2015 1:48 PM Department Planning CUP 15-07 (old Quicky Mart building)

If the city has set back limits for a reason then they should be enforced. If a Conditional Use Permit is granted for this property then the same setback limits should be given to all the adjoining properties or else why have them. If proper procedure were followed (building permit, fire marshal, etc.) then this would be already decided by the planning commission before now.

Warren Miller (property owner)

RECEIVED

DEC 2 - 2015



