

## Aaron Panko

---

**From:** hansenlindar@gmail.com  
**Sent:** Monday, May 27, 2024 8:17 PM  
**To:** Aaron Panko  
**Subject:** Subdivision Tentative Plan/Class 2 Adjustment Case No. SUB-ADJ24-04  
**Attachments:** 2024.05.27 Comments on proposed subdivision.docx

Hello Aaron,

Please see my attached comments regarding the proposed subdivision on Park Ave NE. When do you expect a decision to be made by the hearings officer?

Thanks,

Linda

Hello,

I have reviewed the proposal for the subdivision on Park Ave NE and have the following comments:

We understand the developer not wanting to create a new mid-block east-west street connection and are in support of not having a new connector street. However, we feel that the adjustment request is far greater than is warranted. Understandably, a small subdivision will need some sort of an adjustment to the 15% allowance of flag lots from the SRC and we would like to propose a compromise of 33%, more than double what the code allows, yet not the full requested 66% adjustment which seems unbelievably huge, basically ignoring the intent of the city's code, and onerous to the neighborhood. An adjustment of 33% would allow for building a home on a flag lot while still preserving the livability of the neighborhood, alleviating some of the parking, traffic and safety concerns and also reducing the amount of stormwater to deal with as there will be fewer impervious surfaces.

The proposal that we're seeing only has a 25' wide driveway and with the heavy density and small lots proposed, very out of character for this part of town, this also presents both a parking and public safety problem. The drawings aren't showing the size of the proposed driveways for the homes, just a 20' vehicle access setback. We have a set of 3 habitat for humanity homes on Evergreen across from us and the residents don't have enough parking and regularly need to park in front of our property and this is just the residents, not the guests. It would appear that this proposal offers even less parking space for the homeowners, and this will block up the driveway or have people parking on the bike path on Park, which is already happening and the city doesn't have the resources to enforce no parking on bike lanes in the residential neighborhood. The developers make their money and leave while the long-term residents are forced to endure the negative impacts.

In looking at the 214' long proposed driveway into the flag lots, we're not seeing the location of a fire hydrant on the utility plan. We would be interested in seeing the comments from the fire marshal on the proposed subdivision, length and narrow width of the driveway in and ability to handle a fire on one of the proposed homes on the flag lot. The greater the density of the homes the more risk there is of a fire traveling to other properties and going in 214 feet without the ability to bring in a fire truck or paramedic unit seems to be unsafe. There is no turnaround or cul-de-sac proposed for this subdivision.

We're also concerned about the tree plan. The developer has already removed many trees and when I called the City about the tree removal, I was told because it was two separate lots, not one lot, that he had the right to remove the trees according to code. If the lots had been one lot, the removal of all of the trees wouldn't have been allowed. Yet, one subdivision is being proposed so it appears to us that the developer is allowed to play games with the city code to suit his purposes. There are many offsite trees which will likely be disturbed by the construction process, causing them to die off. I appreciate the plan to erect fencing around existing trees yet I can't help but be skeptical that those fences will be respected by the contractors and that the trees will survive the planned development. I'm not seeing a plan to plant any trees or replace even a fraction of the ones that the developer has removed.

Our other comments are relative to the proposed stormwater plan. The proposed retention basin aka "rain garden" at the back of the property seems inadequate for the number of houses being proposed and I don't think that this topic has been adequately addressed to satisfy the criteria in the code. The water table back there is very high. With the addition of a huge amount of impervious surfaces to the lot with the proposed addition of 5 homes and all of the stormwater being directed to the back of the lot, any overflow will affect the existing property owners and affect their future ability to develop their lots. We're quite concerned about the maintenance taking place back there so it doesn't become a weed infested swampy mosquito breeding ground. While it won't be visible from the street, we will be forced to view it and experience its impacts day in and day out. The city has seemed unable or unwilling to enforce the intent of the existing codes on the developer to this point. The developer has also stated that he is NOT planning to build fences as part of the subdivision, which might give us a bit of a barrier from the impacts of the retention basin. We've also been told that there isn't an overflow to the retention basin to cause any excess water to go into a city storm facility. Instead, it will flood the neighboring properties when it isn't adequate for the high water table and heavy rains that do come from time to time. It seems to me that it would be a better plan to build the rain garden at the front of the property and then have the overflow directed to the nearest city stormwater facility instead of impacting the existing neighbors and their opportunity to potentially develop their lots in the future.

I thank you for the opportunity to comment and strongly urge you to give the developer an adjustment, but a scaled down percentage of 33%. That should help to alleviate many of the other concerns mentioned above.

Thank you,

Linda Hansen, Trustee  
John E Hansen IRR TR  
Helen M Hansen RLT  
1904 Evergreen Ave NE  
Salem, OR 97301  
hansenlindar@gmail.com  
503-302-6760