

**172nd Avenue: Sunnyside Road to Hwy 212 - Roundabout Alternatives**  
**May 22, 2007**  
**Property Owners Comments**

Alternative #1.	Alternative #2.	Alternative #3.	Alternative #4.	Alternative #5.	Other Feedback
Would preserve the trees in the riparian zone and not destroy my yard	Would partially take out my kids play area but not be as bad as #3.	I will be in big trouble - goes over my septic drainage and back-up septic. It also destroys my kids play area. It will also disrupt 2 homes, big trees/riparian area wildlife corridor. A tree more likely to fall on my house.	I got used to the idea of this one similar to the original intersection options.	I like this best. Intersection spacing is "adequate" and no homes removed.	Why are you locked in to the roundabout? An intersection would work better for Obrist truck access north & south. This last minute change is very disturbing to myself and other residents. Thank you.  We really don't want any of them. If we were to choose, we would do # 3 so we could get out of it.  We just moved there and we didn't know this was going to happen. We would have never moved there if we knew about it.
I do not like having the access road so close to our house and the wall in front.	We would like this one because we really like the way our house is right now and if changes we would not feel comfortable. The only concern is our son staying in this school district.	This is a really bad idea because you take part of the front and there is no sound wall. Our front yard would become very dangerous.	I think this is one of the best because you don't affect so many people.	This is the worst because we would have straight access to 172nd Avenue and that is <u>NOT</u> an option at all. It gets really complicated with our kids and the safety of our whole family.	
		Like the further away circle from our house.	Like 2nd best		We plan on getting OUT! Want to sell. Also want to have wood from trees in front for our fireplace. Don't want to be in between two freeways with all the noise. Septic tank - drainfield in jeopardy with all plans. Give US ALTERN ATIVES.
Works the best for us. Must have access road and sound wall!!	Removes us. We want to stay provided we have access road and sound wall!	Do not like. This puts traffic in front and back of us. Removes old growth timber and wild animal escapement.	Works ... with an access road on east side with sound wall.	Works but needs access road and sound wall!! We would find it to be incredibly hard to get out onto 172 (and dangerous). We feel this to be equal to #1.	We believe that its possible and will work with access road and sound wall in front (east) of us. WE DO NOT WANT TO STAY HERE WITHOUT THIS!!  We would also appreciate a decision soon on this amtter as it s very hard living in limbo.
No	No	1st choice with temporary left out/right out access for our truck traffic.	No	2nd choice.	
		We prefer this alternative: -gives good access both directions. -gives access in both directions for property north of Dave Obrist, or, in and out. -slows traffic on all hours -midway between other intersections.			I prefer a non landscaped median because of the high truck traffic in a heavy commercial area for the future. Turned medians would lend better access in all sides.
No Thanks	No Thanks	Would like to have #3 Alt all work good.Thanks	No Thanks	No Thanks	
<u>We do not like this alternative at all.</u> It destroys great property and upends a family of 6 (with 4 kids in pre-school to Elementary). In general, this alternative impacts us in many negative ways as we've come to love this land and its character. By removing all functioning outbuildings (2000 sq ft house w/basement), 900 sq ft Metal Shop, 700 sq ft Two Car Garage, 400 sq ft Guest House and 2000 sq ft Pole Barn outbuilding housing our business, the access road/roundabout would create both personal and business hardships. <u>Negatives:</u> 1. 5 functioning structures are removed that need to be relocated to another property 2. 2-Acre parcel is bisected in such a way as to seriously alter any future use for residential or potential commercial development (alternatives #2-5 leave a large portion of our property intact and do not separate it into 2 small separate parcels) 3. Resulting access road for properties south of our property will impact the front of the southern properties (taking away front yard and driveway leaving them too close to a major street) 4. Too much of our property is used for retaining walls, access road and buffer space by positioning the roundabout here 5. It will be fairly impossible to find like replacement property to live and work at the price point that we paid, or even the appraisal price arrived at 6. This type of property does not exist within a 4 mile proximity to 205 Happy Valley (with 5-outbuildings and farmhouse with wraparound porch); actual replacement costs would be well over \$1 million dollars in "new buildout dwellings" for like kind functionality (60x36 pole buildings; 2 car detached garage, 30x30 shop, 400 sq ft guest house, 2000 sq ft house w/800 sq ft daylight basement on two acres in Happy Valley?)  <u>Summary:</u> We would at least like to see this option happen as "Little Ranch Estates" was the founding property of the area and bisecting the property will render it useless for our current living and will also severely alter any		We are <u>fairly ambivalent</u> about this alternative and hope it does not win out. <u>Positives:</u> 1. Least impact (noise and roundabout location) 2. Minimiz right-of-way impact of our property <u>Negatives:</u> 1. Pole building (Business) relocation has to take place 2. High cost indicated for reasons of retaining walls (slope) 3. Impeded two southern neighbors front yards (access road) 4. No easy access to our property (for redevelopment) ~ roundabout too far away.	This is our <u>third choice</u> for an alternative. <u>Positives:</u> 1. Least impact on neighbors (one affected house to the south) 2. Leaves development potential for the buld of our property (which has great road frontage) <u>Negatives:</u> 1. Pole building (Business) relocation has to take place 2. Round about too close to our house (master bedroom, ground floor front of house) 3. Requires more of our southern property for right-of-way	This is the most sensible solution. <u>This is our first choice</u> for development of round-about. <u>Positives:</u> 1. Leaves our life on the property intact (no major, in-use outbuildings affected) 2. Provides concise and direct access for Timber Lane and northern neighbors onto 172nd 3. Impacts our property only on the northern area, for right-of-way 4. Does not require business move/relocation 5. Does not require personal move/relocation 6. Removes red-bar, which while intersting is in dis-repair and not in use 7. Seems like this is the lowest cost option, too 8. Neighbors to the south keep their house and life. <u>Negatives:</u> 1. Reduces linear road frontage of our property 2. Some issues of right-in, right-out for neighbors to the south <u>Summary:</u> The red barn and cedars are not much to sacrifice for progress and keeping the rest of our life intact. We like this option!	While we struggle with change, we appreciate the job that Clac kamas County and HHPR are doing with the community and taking our views and opinions into account.