

From: Kermit-Donna
To: lisa.howard@state.or.us
Cc: kermit-donna@peoplepc.com
Subject: Comments to LCDC re: Central Or. and resorts
Date: Thursday, April 08, 2010 6:06:55 PM

Dear Lisa Howard:

April 8, 2010

Comments to LCDC re: Central Oregon and destination resorts

I was unable to attend the March 18 meeting in Bend with LCDC and the Deschutes Co. Planning Commission concerning destination resort remapping for Deschutes Co. Please accept these comments about how I feel as a citizen regarding this land issue for Central Oregon. The following letter is one that I presented at a prior meeting about the remapping.

To the Deschutes Co. Commission and Planning Commission re: public input regarding a new destination resort map:

I have been a resident of Oregon for over 35 yrs and have owned farm and ranch land in the past. I have already sent over ten letters in the past year to the Planning Commission, my State Representative and Senator, our Governor, Oregon Fish and Wildlife, Oregon Water Resources, Central Oregon Landwatch, the DLCD, and other State of Oregon public officials, regarding my opinion on destination resorts, which is : "enough already!".

I am a strong believer in preserving scenic values, wildlife corridors and habitat, farm and ranch land, and our natural resources like groundwater and forests. I want to take a stand against approving more destination resorts until there can be adequate scientific and economic studies conducted on the hidden negative impacts of destination resorts, and research on appropriate mitigation requirements for developing them. These impacts include increased demands for public services, demands on natural resources (groundwater, wildlife, and forests), and transportation demands with increased traffic on roads designed for rural use only. As I understand, system development charges aren't collected from destination resorts to cover costs of expanding services to them; yet, according to Hillary Borrud's article in the Bend Bulletin a short time ago, she revealed that destination resorts can obviously still have significant impacts on roads, sewers and parks for a nearby city.

Many residents, county and statewide, feel that destination resort land is being primarily developed to create high-end primary and secondary homes communities all with their own private golf courses rather than a development whose main objective was supposed to attract and serve tourists and visitors. I strongly agree with DCLD's opinion that destination resorts are more resembling residential subdivisions rather than unique developments for tourists. Already there has been public disclosure that several exclusive "resorts" in Deschutes Co. have circumvented state/county laws by continually delaying their requirement to provide in a timely manner a certain ratio of hotel/rental rooms per number of residential properties developed. Clearly these destination resorts are taking advantage of state/county rules and restrictions placed on destination resort development that aren't being enforced. It also seems like our Deschutes Co. Commission and Planning Commission are ignoring state laws and/or trying to circumvent them by possibly allowing ineligible land for destination resort development to become eligible by letting them combine acreage with a neighbor to qualify for the 160 acre minimum for destination resorts, or allowing ineligible lands to remain in the new destination resort map by grandfathering them in so they don't need to meet state requirements (i.e., allowing subdivisions to upgrade to enter the new destination resort map). I don't think the purpose of creating a new destination resort map is to ignore state laws and fiddle around with ineligible land to make them eligible. This issue is not about property rights - it's about upgrading an inaccurate map to conform to state laws and listening to and not ignoring a large number of citizens' opinions on resort remapping.

By the way, is it not considered unethical and an outright conflict of interest that Keith Cyrus, the Planning Commission Chair, whose family happens to own Aspen Lakes Golf Estates which had applied for destination resort status, may be using his position to advocate for his family's development interests? An article in the Bend Bulletin recently stated that Cyrus has acknowledged having spoken to

other planning commissioners about Aspen Lakes outside of public meetings even though he has recused himself from decisions on the destination resort zoning,

Sincerely,

Donna M. Harris
Deschutes Co. resident

PeoplePC Online
A better way to Internet
<http://www.peoplepc.com>