

Olivia Glantz  
City of Salem Community Development Department  
Case Number: SUB-ADJ-J19-02

Dear Ms. Glantz,

My name is Alexandra Andeen. I live at 695 Salem Heights. My property is on the lane along the west side of the proposed development.

My comments are in response to the staff report dated July 15th.

As noted in Substantive Finding #5, public comments were received, categorized, and a staff response was provided for each category of comments. My comments here are in regard to bullet points A, B, C, and D.

- A. **Safety of Salem Heights Ave:** City staff acknowledged that Salem Heights (SH) is an under-improved collector street and does not meet city standards. Omitted from the staff report were comments submitted during the appropriate period describing the severity of safety concerns. Among these:
- A year ago a driver ran through six mailboxes, struck a telephone pole - hard enough that the pole had to be replaced, went through a large hedge, and finally came to a stop in the condos directly across from this proposed development. This is not the first time some of these mailboxes have been replaced due to careless drivers.
  - Children wait for *multiple* school buses along this street 192 days of the year. As the street runs east/west, there are many days when the rising sun partially blinds the view of drivers.
  - Each time I pass students waiting for their busses I am reminded of the student - I believe it was in Gresham - who, a few years ago, was waiting for his school bus on another street without sidewalks. The side view mirror of a pick-up truck which never left the road struck and killed the child. The television news reports indicated no one was at fault, it was simply a terribly unfortunate incident.
- B. **Traffic Impact Analysis:** Staff acknowledges that SH does not meet standard yet approved significant development plans. In fact, the appropriate course of action would be to either:
- Conduct a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA), or
  - Allow development to proceed only after the street is brought to standard.
- To do otherwise is irresponsible.
- C. **Impact of Increased Traffic on Adjacent Streets:** Since a TIA has not been done, it's not known if off-site mitigation is warranted. Given that the lane adjacent to this property

on the west is only a single lane, and given that the proposed plans for the easement at the end of this lane (indicated in attachment B) are nonsensical when one stands next to the 12' drop between properties, I suspect mitigation would be required if a TIA were conducted.

- D. **Street System In and Adjacent to Subdivision Is Not Compatible:** In the staff report the street connectivity that would result from the proposed development is described as beneficial. The report does not, however, include an analysis of the impact of that connectivity to traffic loads on SH. Though it's been estimated that the development itself would bring an additional 345 trips per day, there's no analysis as to the increase from trips beyond the development, as a result of increased connectivity.

There are concerns beyond traffic and safety, though I've limited my comments to these in an effort to succinctly make my point that the impact of this development has not been given full consideration. Thank you for receiving additional comments on this matter.

Warm regards,  
Alexandra Andeen  
695 Salem Heights Ave S  
503-930-6703