

August 5, 2021

UPDATED PLANNING REVIEW CHECKLIST

Subject Property: 2499, 2501, 2519, 2539, 2551 Wallace Rd NW

(Polk County Assessor Map and Tax Lot Number 073W09CD /

00900, 01000, 01101, 01300, 01301)

Ref#: 21-106129-RP, 21-106130-ZO

Applicant: Scott Martin

Scott Martin Construction LLC

PO Box 5850 Salem OR 97304

smconstruction@sendmemail.me

Contact: Sam Thomas

Lenity Architecture 3150 Kettle Court SE Salem OR 97301

Samt@lenityarchitecture.com

A consolidated Class 3 Site Plan Review and Class 2 Adjustment application was received March 25, 2021 and accepted for processing March 31, 2021 when fees were paid. A notice of incompleteness was sent April 29, 2021. Additional information was uploaded May 3, 2021 and July 21, 2021. Prior to deeming your applications complete, modifications and/or additional information must be provided to address the following item(s).

Item:	
Application Submittal Items	Deeds
	Some of your plans indicate that 2539 Wallace Road NW (located in the RD (Duplex Residential) zone and not developable with a multi-family use) is part of the project. The revised written statement indicates that this property is under separate ownership but under contract to purchase by 3030 Riverbend LLC. The Polk County Assessor indicates that the



latest Deed is Document 1999-1853 (Source ID 372-762) and
the property is owned by Julie F Mengucci-Foster, Agent. You
provided a letter written to Julie Foster stating that you intend to
purchase the property according to an executed sale
agreement. Julie Foster electronically signed the revised
application. Your response indicates that a deed has been
provided for 2539 Wallace, but it is not uploaded. Please
provide a copy of Document 1999-1853 (Source ID 372-762). A
copy of the executed sale agreement is optional.

Lawfully Established Units of Land / Legal Description Issues

The issues in this section also affect the existing conditions plan, site plan, and adjustments.

As staff noted in the pre-application conference summary, the City Surveyor's office has indicated that at least one of the parcels may be unlawfully created. Please provide previous deeds and legal descriptions (chain of title) to confirm when the existing interior property boundaries were created so that staff may evaluate whether these are lawfully established units of land. This area became subject to the city's land division regulations upon annexation in 1967.

City Surveyor's office staff in 2015 researched documents pertaining to the 20-foot-wide so-called R.O.W. shown on the Assessor map and found that it was not a public right-of-way. Staff recommended to Jeff Tross at that time that this was a private matter and the assistance of a title company and attorney may be needed to answer questions pertaining to chain of title, unrecorded documents, intent, and other potential issues. Staff determined that it was not the City's responsibility to conduct further research or resolve the issues.

You provided a June 2019 document indicating that the County Surveyor did not see any legal creation of an easement or right of way, public or private. That helps to confirm that the 20-foot-wide strip is not right-of-way, but it is not sufficient to confirm that the existing interior property boundaries were lawfully established or to show the location of lawful boundaries.

Lawfully established units of land / property lines must be determined before the application can be processed. The plans are still showing property lines on both sides of the 20-foot-widestrip as shown on the erroneous assessor map. The City has not received adequate documentation to determine lawfully established property lines, and the plans must show the lawfully established property lines.



Existing Conditions Plan

220.005(e)(1)(B) An existing conditions plan, of a size and form and in the number of copies meeting the standards established by the Planning Administrator, containing the following information:

- (i) The total site area, dimensions, and orientation relative to north;
- (ii) The location of existing structures and other improvements on the site, including accessory structures, fences, walls, and driveways, noting their distance from property lines; and
- (iii) The location of the 100-year floodplain [not applicable].

The existing conditions plan (C2.0) must include the boundaries and dimensions of each separate lawfully established parcel (interior property lines – see discussion above) and indicate distances from existing structures and improvements to those interior property lines.

Site Plan

220.005(e)(1)(A) A site plan, of a size and form and in the number of copies meeting the standards established by the Planning Administrator, containing the following information:

- (i) The total site area, dimensions, and orientation relative to north;
- (ii) The location of all proposed primary and accessory structures and other improvements, including fences, walls, and driveways, indicating distance from the structures and improvements to all property lines and adjacent on-site structures;
- (iii) Loading areas, if included in the proposed development;
- (iv) The size and location of solid waste and recyclables storage and collection areas, and amount of overhead clearance above such enclosures, if included in the proposed development;
- (v) An indication of future phases of development on the site, if applicable;
- (vi) All proposed landscape areas on the site, with an indication of square footage and their percentage of the total site area;



555 Liberty Street SE / Room 305 • Salem OR 97301-3503 • Phone 503-588-6213 • Fax 503-588-6025

555 Liberty Street SE / Room 305 • Salem OR 97301-3503 • Phone 503-588-6213 • Fax 503-588-6025 www.cityofsalem.net/planning • www.cityofsalem.net		
	(vii)The location, height, and material of fences, berms, walls, and other proposed screening as they relate to landscaping and screening required by SRC chapter 807;	
	(viii) The location of all trees and vegetation required to be protected pursuant to SRC chapter 808;	
	(ix) The location of all street trees, if applicable, or proposed location of street trees required to be planted at time of development pursuant to SRC chapter 86; and	
	(x) Identification of vehicle, pedestrian, and bicycle parking and circulation areas, including handicapped parking stalls, disembarking areas, accessible routes of travel, and proposed ramps.	
	Please revise all of the plans to show the required street connections as discussed below and the related reconfigurations of buildings, off-street parking, and other features.	
	The site plan and other plan sheets must include the boundaries and dimensions of each separate lawfully established parcel (interior property lines – see discussion above) to indicate distances from proposed structures and improvements to those interior property lines.	
	Please identify Trees 1, 2, and 3 from the arborist's statement on the site plan and indicate Tree 1 for removal, Tree 2 for preservation, and Tree 3 for removal.	
	Please provide a pedestrian connection to Phase 1 along the driveway parallel to Wallace Road NW.	
Connectivity	Previous comment - Staff addressed connectivity in the Pre- Application Conference 20-57 summary: The development is subject to infrastructure requirements, including SRC Chapter 803, Streets and Right-of-Way Improvements. Requirements include such improvements as finishing off a stub street, and leaving the stub of La Jolla Drive NW as-is is not acceptable. A boundary street is required for the construction or enlargement of any building or structure located on property abutting a boundary street and that requires a building permit under SRC chapter 56. Boundary street means an existing street that abuts a unit of land. The property abuts La Jolla Drive NW, and the development will need to provide a local street connection (SRC 803.035(a)). The street should be located where it would provide a logical connection to future streets to the northwest. A 60-foot	
	property (Polk County 073W09CD00811) between 1452 and 1492	

Brush College Road NW is expected to accommodate a future north-



south street; existing gravel driveways run from that property to the south across 073W09CD00801 (1482 Brush College Road NW) and 073W09CD00813, and east from 073W09CD00813 across 073W09CD00901 to the subject property. The code requires a street, but the applicant may propose an alternative. At the very least, Planning would accept pedestrian connections, but Planning would prefer the street.

Previous comment - The applicant provided a conceptual plan to Planning Commission for the comprehensive plan change / zone change CPC-ZC-ZC19-10 that indicated a cul-de-sac bulb at the end of La Jolla near the southwest corner of the property. The applicant's representative submitted a traffic circulation plan for the 2018 pre-application conference that showed the cul-de-sac bulb, as well as a shadow plat of property to the west indicating how lots could be developed along a future street extending south from Brush College Road NW and connecting to Winchester Street NW.

None of these previously discussed options for connectivity are shown on the site plan or civil plans. The only proposal for connectivity is a pedestrian connection to La Jolla. Multi-family development and mixed-use development are not exempt from connectivity. Streets through RS-zoned properties may serve multi-family and mixed-use development on adjacent properties. Streets can be constructed through multi-family complexes.

I have discussed the proposed pedestrian connection to La Jolla with the Planning Manager and Assistant City Traffic Engineer. This is not sufficient to meet connectivity, street spacing, and block length requirements (SRC 803.020 through 803.035). Staff's recommendation is a public or private local street (60 feet in width) to connect La Jolla with Wallace Road NW. The most logical location would be northward from La Jolla, then along the northwest and north property boundaries. This would separate the office / rec building / pool from the other buildings, and you may need to provide an ADA space and off-street loading space near that building or apply for an adjustment to that standard. You may provide an alternate alignment as long as it meets street spacing and block length requirements. The street would have on-street parallel parking, planter strips, and property-line sidewalks on both sides and would allow the development to meet the purpose of the MU-II zone to promote pedestrianoriented development in mixed-use districts. The local street



would be a secondary street according to MU-II definitions. The buildings could be placed 0 to 10 feet from the street, depending on pedestrian amenities and horizontal separation.

Please submit a revised plan with the required local street connection and reconfigured buildings and parking. You may propose other alternatives such as a public or private street reduced to 52 feet in width, but the alternatives must meet criteria for alternative street standards.

Previous comment - There is a significant tree north of the stub street. Staff addressed this in the Pre-Application Conference 20-57 summary:

Significant trees shall be protected and preserved to the greatest extent possible. For the proposed development, removal of a significant tree from property outside of street right-of-way would require a tree removal permit (see SRC 808.030) (if a tree meets criteria for a hazardous tree) or a variance (see SRC 808.045). Removal of a significant tree from future right-of-way may require a tree removal permit (see SRC 808.030) (if a tree meets criteria for a hazardous tree) or a variance (see SRC 808.045) and/or may require a Street Tree Removal Permit Under SRC Chapter 86. Staff is in discussion on the applicability of SRC 86 to future right-of-way. A Street Tree Removal Permit under SRC Chapter 86 would be required for removal of a significant tree or other tree from existing right-of-way.

Previous comment - If you wish to retain the tree, please provide documentation that the tree is healthy and propose an alternative that includes a pedestrian connection from La Jolla to the pedestrian network within the complex.

The arborist's report does not confirm that the tree is healthy. It states that the tree has a significant defect that requires immediate mitigation including pruning and a cabling system. SRC 808.005 definition - Hazardous tree means a tree that is cracked, split, leaning, has a dead top or a large dead limb high in the crown, or is otherwise physically damaged, to the degree that it is likely to fall and injure persons or property. The photos indicate that this tree is cracked. A tree removal permit for this tree would likely be approved. The cabling system is an extraordinary measure and would not guarantee that the tree can be saved.



Environmental Tro	Because this tree is to be removed for street construction, you would need to obtain a concurrent Street Tree Removal Permit or the land use decision would have a condition requiring a Street Tree Removal Permit prior to public construction. ee Preservation SRC 808 evious comment - As noted in the pre-application planning mmary: Trees: The City's tree preservation ordinance (SRC Chapter 808) protects Heritage Trees, Significant Trees (including Oregon White Oaks with diameter-at-breast-height of 24 inches or greater), trees and native vegetation in riparian corridors, and trees on lots and parcels greater than 20,000 square feet. The tree preservation ordinance defines "tree" as, "any living woody plant that grows to 15
Pro	evious comment - As noted in the pre-application planning mmary: **Trees:* The City's tree preservation ordinance (SRC Chapter 808) protects Heritage Trees, Significant Trees (including Oregon White Oaks with diameter-at-breast-height of 24 inches or greater), trees and native vegetation in riparian corridors, and trees on lots and parcels greater than 20,000 square feet. The tree preservation
	Trees: The City's tree preservation ordinance (SRC Chapter 808) protects Heritage Trees, Significant Trees (including Oregon White Oaks with diameter-at-breast-height of 24 inches or greater), trees and native vegetation in riparian corridors, and trees on lots and parcels greater than 20,000 square feet. The tree preservation
su	Trees: The City's tree preservation ordinance (SRC Chapter 808) protects Heritage Trees, Significant Trees (including Oregon White Oaks with diameter-at-breast-height of 24 inches or greater), trees and native vegetation in riparian corridors, and trees on lots and parcels greater than 20,000 square feet. The tree preservation
	protects Heritage Trees, Significant Trees (including Oregon White Oaks with diameter-at-breast-height of 24 inches or greater), trees and native vegetation in riparian corridors, and trees on lots and parcels greater than 20,000 square feet. The tree preservation
	feet or more in height, typically with one main stem called a trunk, which is 10 inches or more dbh, and possesses an upright arrangement of branches and leaves." The subject property contains significant trees. Significant trees shall be protected and preserved to the greatest extent possible. For the proposed development, removal of a significant tree from property outside of street right-of-way would require a tree removal permit (see SRC 808.030) (if a tree meets criteria for a hazardous tree) or a variance (see SRC 808.045). Removal of a significant tree from future right-of-way may require a tree removal permit (see SRC 808.030) (if a tree meets criteria for a hazardous tree) or a variance (see SRC 808.045) and/or may require a Street Tree Removal Permit Under SRC Chapter 86. Staff is in discussion on the applicability of SRC 86 to future right-of-way. A Street Tree Removal Permit under SRC Chapter 86 would be required for removal of a significant tree or other tree from existing right-of-way.
s	Due to the condition of the tree immediately north of the La Jolla stub (a significant defect) and the need for connectivity, removal of the tree is necessary for construction of the required street.
pro an ma inc or	evious comment - There are differences in the trees to be otected / trees to be removed on the architectural site plan A1.1 and the Civil existing conditions / demolition plan C2.0. Please take these plan sheets consistent, show all trees that are 10 ches or greater in diameter and all Oregon white oaks 24 inches greater in diameter, and indicate which are to be removed and nich are to be preserved.
	You have indicated to staff that you will provide updated plans with consistent tree information.
Adjustments Wi	ritten Statement.
Ple	ease provide a written statement demonstrating how each
pro	oposed adjustment meets the criteria:



	-
	250.005(d)(2) An application for a Class 2 adjustment shall be granted if all of the following criteria are met:
	(A) The purpose underlying the specific development standard proposed for adjustment is:
	(i) Clearly inapplicable to the proposed development; or
	(ii) Equally or better met by the proposed development.
	(B) [not applicable] If located within a residential zone, the proposed development will not detract from the livability or appearance of the residential area.
	(C) If more than one adjustment has been requested, the cumulative effect of all the adjustments result in a project which is still consistent with the overall purpose of the zone.
	Reconfiguration of the site due to street required for connectivity may change the adjustments you will need. Please update the written statement to reflect that.
	On the first page and elsewhere in the written document, the fifth adjustment should be stated as a request to reduce street (not building) frontage requirement from 16 feet to 0 feet.
	On the first page of the written statement and in the findings for the written statement, please add the sixth adjustment to reduce building frontage to less than 50 percent on Wallace Road.
	In the findings for Adjustment 3, you did not address the correct adjustment but copied the finding for Adjustment 2. Please revise.
	Reconfiguration of the site due to required street connectivity may change the adjustments you will need. Please update the written statement to reflect that.
Public Works Items	Public Works has completed a preliminary "Completeness"
	review of the application submitted for the above-mentioned
	project. The following items have been identified as required
	material to be provided by the applicant prior to accepting the
	application as "Complete":



- 1. The application does not provide sufficient details to identify how the site is compliant with SRC 71, specifically the requirements for Green Stormwater Infrastructure (GSI) pursuant to PWDS Appendix 4E. The applicant shall provide a storm drainage system that provides treatment and flow control as required by PWDS, by one of three means:
- a. Runoff from the new and replaced impervious surfaces flows into one or more locations that have been set aside for installation of Green Stormwater Infrastructure (GSI) and the locations have a total area of at least ten percent of the total new plus replaced impervious surface area; or

You responded that this is not applicable and referred to 1b.

b. GSI is used to mitigate the impacts of stormwater runoff from at least 80 percent, but less than 100 percent, of the total new plus replaced impervious surfaces; or

You responded that GSI will be used to mitigate 100% of the stormwater runoff and referred to the submitted Stormwater Report. Please be advised that 3030 Riverbend LLC must purchase 2539 Wallace Rd NW before any work can be done on the stormwater facility on that property to serve the multifamily development.

c. Under a design exception from the City Engineer, GSI is used to mitigate the impacts of stormwater runoff from less than 80 percent of the total new plus replaced impervious surfaces and the factor(s) limiting implementation (SRC 71.095).

You responded that this is not applicable and referred to 1b.

The following items are not listed in SRC as specific requirements for a complete application, however the applicant should be aware that the following have been identified as items that will be considered by the Public Works Department while recommending conditions for the proposed development.



1. The submitted plans show a 10-foot-wide sewer easement where a 20-foot-wide easement exists. Pursuant to PWDS Section 1.8, buildings, structures, etc. shall not encroach into pipeline easements. Public Works Engineering staff has indicated that the applicant should relocate the building so no part of the structure encroaches the easement.

You responded that Buildings have been adjusted to be outside of the 20-foot-wide sewer easement and sewer easement has been adjusted at SE (should this be NE?) corner to be within new proposed driveway connection to Wallace Rd (Sheet C4.0).

Public Works has not signed off on completeness of the application. For additional information, please contact Matt Olney at 503-588-6211 x 7226 or MOlney@cityofsalem.net.

Items of concern:

*Failure to address issues would result in denial of the application.

See "Lawfully Established Units of Land / Legal Description Issues" above

You have indicated that you intend to apply for a property boundary verification (PBV) to allow buildings to be constructed over property lines. The PBV process does not eliminate the interior property lines or allow the proposed development on unlawfully established units of land. Staff recommends property line adjustments or a partition to reconfigure lot lines and/or consolidate the parcels. Staff cannot determine which type(s) of land division applications can be processed until the boundaries of lawfully established units of land are determined.

See "Connectivity" above

The location and width of the required street connection will significantly affect the design of the development and must be resolved before you address the other remaining issues.

Your application, which is incomplete, will be deemed complete upon receipt of one of the following:

- (1) All of the missing information.
- (2) Some of the missing information and written notice from you (the applicant) that no other information will be provided.
- (3) Written notice from you (the applicant) that none of the missing information will be provided.



You have 180 days from the date the application was accepted (March 31, 2021) to respond in one of the three ways listed above, or the application will be deemed void.

For questions regarding the above requirements, feel free to contact me directly by calling (503) 540-2309 or via email at pcole@cityofsalem.net.

The Salem Revised Code may be accessed online at the following location: https://www.cityofsalem.net/Pages/salem-revised-code.aspx

Sincerely,

Pamela Cole, Planner II

and Ch

G:\CD\PLANNING\PamelaCole\Site Plan Review\Type II - Class 3\2499 Wallace\Incomplete Letter 2.docx