

Aaron Panko

From: Kenn and Nancy Battaile <knbatt@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 27, 2021 11:05 AM
To: Aaron Panko
Cc: geoffreyjames@comcast.net
Subject: COMMENTS RE: SUB21-09
Attachments: SUBDIVISION2021.pdf

Thanks for the opportunity to comment on the Meyers Farm Subdivision.

If you have a chance, I would like to have confirmation that you received this email.

Kenn Battaile

COMMENTS BY: Kenn Battaile,
4055 Mandy Avenue SE
Salem, Oregon 97302
Telephone: 503 364 3128
Email - knbatt@hotmail.com

re: MEYERS FARM: SUBDIVISION CASE NO. SUB21-09

DENSITY:

Much of the purpose statements in the Draft Policies for the Comp Plan are directed toward increasing densities as one technique to reduce housing costs in the future. Depending upon how you calculate the land availability for development on the Meyers Farm - total site minus open spaces and land set aside for future development (area to remain) - and the proposed number of lots between 139 and 161 the site density ranges from 5.39 to 6.27 units per gross acre neither of which make a positive move toward increasing density - as directed by HB 2001 and 2003 in the 2021 Oregon Legislature - and thereby reducing housing cost. [Phase 1 and 2 density as shown is 5.39 units per gross acre which is inadequate to meet the requirements of state law to provide for additional housing needs within the city limits.] Development costs per residential unit for the Farm are going to place individual lot cost well over \$125,000 which does nothing for the reduction of housing cost.

Recommendation: The proposal should be denied in its present configuration and final densities should be increased to a minimum of 8.5 units per gross acre.

OPEN SPACE:

The three cited open space areas - (1) the open space/wetland in the northwest corner of the property, (2) the detention basin at the northeast corner of the property, and (3) the open space at the north end and abutting the "area to remain" are of limited use to the residents of the subdivision. On the other hand they are great places for young people to be mischievous. For example: #1 site is very steep and not visually open to abutting properties - a condition for nefarious activities by young people; #2 site is relatively small and less susceptible to nefarious activities but only if it is maintained and kept relatively clear of brush and grasses; #3 site is too small and lends itself to a trash situation because the abutting properties are very likely to fence it off so that it is hidden from community eyes, thus a potential problem - site #3 is only appropriate as an open space if it is expanded to the south to include the "large lot" that seemingly fronts on the cul-de-sac off Aldrich Street; such an increase in size would also increase the community eyes on the open space and result in less nefarious activities. In no case should the City assume ownership by dedication or failure to pay taxes on any of these open space properties

Recommendation: The developer should be required to establish a home owners association to pay the taxes and cost of maintenance of these on site open spaces.

PARK:

The Meyers Farm property is coterminous with an undeveloped park at the east end of the south property line. The undeveloped park will eventually provide an park/open space for the Meyers Farm subdivision and the surrounding residential areas, but the existing park is inadequate in size for the service area of the Farm subdivision and areas to the east, south, and west. Expansion of the park should also provide for better access by residents of the Farm subdivision without impacting the subdivision's "area to remain", which contains the farm house, etc.

Recommendation: Use the system development charges from the Meyers Farm to purchase more park property between the west property line of the park and the alley to the east of Chaparral.

HILFIKER STREET:

For the forty-five years of my residency in south Salem there has been a desire to have an east west street connection south of Madrona between Pringle/Battle Creek and Commercial Street to provide an alternative access for residents going between the residential/commercial/industrial areas of SE Salem. The proposed Hilfiker Street provides that long sought connection. The connection is more important with the greater development of both the McGilchrist and Fairview industrial areas and the residential development of the Fairview Hospital property as far east as Reed Road and even more so as development occurs east of Reed Road. Consequently, the proposed Hilfiker connection will be heavily traveled and the proposed direct and straight alignment of Hilfiker will encourage heavy and speedy traffic, which is unfortunate, especially when about 30 % of the houses in phase 1 and 2 of the Meyers Farm subdivision will abut Hilfiker. Some effort should be made to control this traffic by making the through access of Hilfiker a little more circuitous, i.e:

- A. The proposed location of Hilfiker in this subdivision should be rejected and revised as follows:
 - 1. Over the long haul Hilfiker traffic should go straight east from 12th Street to Hillrose along the south Meyers Farm property line then north on Hillrose to Pringle/Battle Creek;
 - 2. In the interim Hilfiker should turn 90 degrees to the north at Chaparral proceed north to an east-west street at about the north end of the "area to remain" which would terminate on the east at Hillrose. This circuitous route will give more traffic speed control and provide a Commercial Street/Pringle/Battle Creek connection without making Hilfiker a "higher speed" collector. At the same time this alignment would not negatively impact the future alignment cited in 1 above; and
 - 3. The reconfiguration cited in 1 and 2 will result in:
 - a. a better intersection with the driveway of Salem Mission Faith Ministries at the SE corner of Hillrose and Pringle/Battle Creek,
 - b. no need to increase the maximum grade of Hilfiker, and
 - c. street spacing and connectivity standards should not have to be exceeded.
- B. Under all circumstances where Hilfiker is connected from 12th Street and Pringle/Battle Creek the following requirements are appropriate:
 - 1. Hilfiker between 12th Street and Commercial will need considerable improvements and a major portion of the changes should be the responsibility of the Meyers Farm developer;
 - 2. At the intersection of Hilfiker and Pringle/Battle Creek the developer should be responsible for:
 - a. a right turn lane from south bound Pringle traffic onto Hilfiker, and
 - b. a left turn lane from north and west bound Battle Creek onto Hilfiker; and
 - 3. Over time signalization will be required at this intersection.

Recommendation: Meet the conditions cited in A and B above.

12TH STREET:

Recommendation:

- 1. Maintaining the grade of this street with the improvements proposed is appropriate.
- 2. The improvements along the east side of 12th Street are necessary. In addition, it would be appropriate to use the system development charges from the Meyers Farm to assist the abutting property owners with the cost of improvements on the west side of the street.

TREES:

It is not clear who hires and pays the project arborist. The City should have major input into the actions/directions of the arborist regarding the implementation of the plan to remove or retain trees. Because cut down mature trees cannot be replaced, how does the City guarantee that the arborist is following the plan for removal or retention of trees?

In most situations the removal of trees is appropriate; however, the removal of trees along rear and side property lines - outside the development envelopes - is excessive; greater efforts should be made to retain trees - particularly the oaks near property lines. For example: Sheet P3.1 Oak trees designated - numbers 4891, 4932, 4933, 4955, 4954, 4956 are to be removed; see also similar situations on Sheet P3.2, P3.3 and P3.4. More explanation and defense must be made to explain why these trees along property lines are slated for removal.

Recommendation:

1. Clarify how the city will guarantee participation and some control in the questions of removal and retention of on-site trees, and
2. The developer and arborist should provide more explanation and defense regarding the removal of trees near property lines before the trees are approved for removal.