

From: [James Baker](#)
To: [HWREC Exhibits](#)
Subject: Holiday Farm Fire
Date: Thursday, February 18, 2021 3:50:24 PM

Rf: Special Committee on Wildfire Recovery, Holiday Farm Fire

James Baker
51013 McKenzie
Vida OR. 97488. Cell 541 543 9048

Mailing Address
29112 N W 41 AVE
Ridgefield WA. 98642 Cell 541 543 9048

Committee members

My home was destroyed in the Holiday Farm fire also much of my 60 acres of timber zoned F2, my shop and our water system. One of 2 rentals was destroyed and the other damaged. Neither rental was insured.

With the help of my two daughters we are diligently trying to replace one of the rentals. This will allow our tenants a young couple with a 9-month-old baby to return to our property and be caretakers for it. Their cabin was located right next to the creek in the riparian zone, because of the lot layout we are unable to relocate it on the lot out of the riparian zone (we strongly feel we need to be farther away from the creek both for water quality and safety purposes) and still meet the criteria for replacement. Because of this we want to place a new mobile home for them on the adjacent lot zoned RR5. The lot in question was purchased from the Oregon Department of Transportation in 1967 for cash. The lot has been taxed by Lane County for all those years as a developable lot.

Now the county demands that we prove it is a legal lot all over again, saying that it is only a preliminary lot. In 1993 PA: 2398-93 the county confirmed it was a legal lot. They insist we pay \$1,005.00 and give us 150 days to basically provide them with the exact paperwork they provided us in 1993 to again, prove it's a legal lot. We submitted the cash and paperwork January,5,2021. I absolutely do not agree that even with some code changes that this should not have been accepted as a legal lot. Nothing has changed otherwise so why would a legal lot revert to a preliminary legal lot. Someday maybe this year Lane County will let baby Ezmay have a home out of the rain, just maybe.

I have not started on replacing my home yet, I just hope to live long enough to return. With Lane county planning a 91-year-old does not have much of a chance. The application to rebuild my home in F2 zoning is 12 pages and seems no less complicated or streamlined than their previous forms. One requirement is [A written statement indicating whether a railroad-highway crossing provides or will provide the only access to land that is the subject of an application] there is NO railroad within 30

miles. How in the world can they not know this? It's an example of excessive burden. [Applicant's Burden. It is the applicant's responsibility to provide evidence demonstrating that the application complies with all applicable standards and criteria.] this for a 70-year-old legal Home that burned.

This is not grandfathering the rebuild, it is a money making con and a waste of everyone's time.

I have been involved with Land Use planning in Lane County from the beginning. Mostly as an adversary of unwise applications. What started out as a good thing has deteriorated into a horrible money-making bureaucratic mess.

Respectfully your
James Baker