

Dear Neighbors,

Since our last update on the Paine Development project (Six Range Condominium) under review by the City, there has been some substantial activity.

First, the Board sent off a brief email to the City Planning department to STRONGLY OBJECT to the City's demand that Paine include a connection to Mill Creek Drive (which had NOT been included in Paine's Site Plan under review). The same day, we learned that Paine & the City had a long meeting about what the City regarded as deficiencies in the Paine proposal, and Paine reported that the City had reluctantly DROPPED the demand that Mill Creek be connected (we have not heard that officially from the City yet).

Second, in the same message from Paine, he asked for CT's feedback on several other issues:

- (1) Our permission to let his project use the stormwater retention pond at the corner of Hanley and Babcock, as part of the stormwater plan for his project. Our answer was a firm NO, because that pond is needed to meet the stormwater needs of CT Condominium (for which it was designed).
- (2) As part of the normal requirements for a new development, Paine will be required to install a sidewalk on the western edge of his property, connecting our walking path to Babcock. Paine asked if we would prefer that the sidewalk be installed on the eastern edge of Hanley (on CT property), for the "convenience" of CT residents walking to Babcock. Again, our answer was NO, because installation of the sidewalk on our property would become CT's maintenance & liability responsibility.
- (3) Although Paine did not raise the subject of the access from his property to Hanley, we informed him we believe that he has no easement from his property to Hanley, and CT will not grant an easement.
- (4) Paine has also "volunteered" to install an earth (landscaped) berm between his property and our pathway, in order to protect adjacent CT units from headlights (and potentially some sound). In his message, Paine asked us the height we would prefer. Because he has not given us any specifics at this point, and installing a fence (or wall) rather than a berm is an alternate solution to sound & light blocking, the Board told him that the height should be whatever is necessary to block all vehicle headlights. In order to decide whether we prefer a berm, fence, or wall, we asked Paine to tell us specifically what he proposes for each one.
- (5) Finally, in light of the deletion of the Mill Creek street connection, Paine asked whether building a pathway for pedestrians and cyclists connecting the CT community to his project would be something we would be interested in. Because the size and location of this pathway was not spelled out by Paine, we asked him to be more specific, while telling him that we would not be interested in a pathway connecting directly to the Mill Creek stub, but that we would consider one connecting to the current pathway between Ferguson and the units on the east side of Mill Creek (after getting feedback from CT owners).

If any owner has any serious concern or questions about anything discussed above, please let the Board hear from you right away. We have already communicated all of this to Paine, because we wanted him to be clear on where we stand on ## 1-3 before he makes a revised project submittal to the City. Of course, individual owners can also email your views directly to the City, but we want to speak with one voice, as much as possible, on these critical issues that directly impact CT's property and property rights.

CT Condominium Board of Directors