

August 27, 2009  
Richard Fry  
Creekside Architectural Review Committee  
777 Sahalee Dr SE  
Salem, OR 97306

Dear Richard,

I find the ARC rejection letter (see attached) for my solar panel installation request brief and incomplete. Given our current national, state and world priorities for moving toward renewable energy, I find a simple NO on this kind of project completely inadequate. As a citizen concerned about the sustainability of the world our grandchildren will inherit I have a right to understand the rationale behind a community policy in 2009 that not only does not encourage use of renewable energy but denies citizens their solar rights and does not support the public benefit.

I would like a written update to the ARC disapproval letter that specifically addresses the following issues:

1. Disapproval because “the panels are not permitted by the Creekside CC&Rs” is too vague. **Which Sections(s) and specific references of the CC&R’s is the ARC basing disapproval on?**
2. The State of Oregon has a long standing history (since 1979) of supporting the public benefit with a legal guarantee of solar access in the form of ORS 105.880 (see attached copy). **Is the ARC committee unaware of ORS 105.880?** Does the ARC have legal advice that ORS 105.880 is unenforceable? If so, I request a copy of such advice.
3. **Does the Creekside ARC believe it is representing the current majority of Creekside home owners with a solar ban?** Communities that ban renewable energy are at serious risk of negatively impacting property values because in the last 18 months there has been a significant shift in public opinion towards renewable energy. I doesn’t take much analysis to see that renewable energy is a huge trend.

I recognize that the disapproval letter offers to schedule a meeting agenda item to verbally discuss the reasons for this disapproval. However, in this case disapproval deserves a written rationale and explanation of the policy being enforced.

Sincerely,

Larry Lohrman

cc: Warren Carkin