

From: ggordonent@att.net

Date: 16 Aug

Dear Jimmy,

In early July I sent you a memo outlining certain steps that should be considered by the Plywood mill land owners you represent as well as the owners of the two adjoining properties, if, in fact, the three parcels are to become part of a future development. (See attached correspondence)

On August the 15th I met with a city land use attorney who is familiar with your site and the politics surrounding the use of that site. The purpose for the meeting was to discuss a newly discovered City Ordinance that has been on the books for several years. This ordinance, 33.262 sections .01 thru .100, specifically provides the clout that all of us in the community thought was not possible, wherein we might have something to say about the actual use of the site and its impact on the neighborhood. Interestingly enough, none of the city planning staff or members of the City Council bothered to make it known that this Ordinance existed. Of course it suited the purpose of the biased Council members, led by the Mayor, to make us think that there could be no input from the neighborhood. As a member of the community that consistently pleaded for the Council to require a design review process or conditional use examination before the site could be used, I felt a significant loss when that issue was ignored. It was after that hearing that I wrote the correspondence called the "*tip of the iceberg*" referring to the fact that the real damage by the Council's decision was that heavy industrial use developers could do what they wanted with out restrictions and developers that proposed a mix use containing section of residential housing clearly understood that the city would veto any such use.

Jimmy, low and behold, Ordinance, 33.262 provides the club the community thought was lost. The intent of the Ordinance speaks to certain objectionable offsite impacts associated with non-residential uses that include noise, vibration, odors and glare. Standards in this Ordinance clearly are intended to insure that off site uses near existing communities provide adequate control measures protecting the community from health hazards and nuisances etc...

According to our Attorney, who will now represent a newly organized official Linnton awareness committee being formed by August 24, 2007 , the community will in fact be able to have an impact on the uses for the land in question, should there be a conflict with issues covered in this Ordinance. As you can imagine, the issues of nuisance and health hazards remain high in the interest of the community.

The attached July letter suggests some possible steps that might be considered before the property is actually sold. In addition, I personally offer to be a community representative that can act as a liaison between members of the neighborhood and the purchaser. I also volunteer to meet with you and the two neighboring property owners to see if we can get the three sites in agreement relative to selling conditions and prices. Just maybe we can finally get the horse in

front of the cart with our quest to find an acceptable land use designation.

I do believe the Ordinance very clearly provides the authority to allow effective community involvement. Certainly, there can be no doubt that it gives our attorney the ammunition to take what ever legal steps necessary to stop flagrant misuse of the site protected by 33.262. I also know that we will fund what ever it takes to litigate at the highest rung on the ladder to protect our community. The community will not give up with its demand for a compatible neighbor.

Finally, I can tell you that the City Council will be made fully aware of their responsibility to see to it that no building permits or site grading permits are issued for improvements of any kind to the site if they do in fact show to be conflict with this Ordinance 33.262.

Respectfully submitted,

Glen Gordon