

Feb. 16, 2022

Britany Randall, BRAND Land Use 12150 Jefferson Hwy 99E SE Jefferson, OR 97352 <u>britany@brandlanduse.com</u>

RE: Completeness Review for Class 3 Site Plan Review, Class 2 Adjustment, and Class 1 Design Review for Property Located at 701 Lockwood Ln S

A land use application was received for the subject property on Jan. 27, 2022. Prior to deeming the application complete, modifications and/or additional information must be provided to address the following item(s):

Item	Description
Signing Authority	Please provide evidence that Terence C. Blackburn has authority to sign the application on behalf of the property owner(s). For a member-managed LLC, any member may sign the application. The articles of organization available through the Oregon Secretary of State's website indicate one member of the LLC: Sean A. Blackburn.
Site Plan Features	 Pursuant to SRC 220.005(e)(1)(A), the submitted site plan is missing the following information: The proposed development is required to plant street trees along Lockwood Lane S to the maximum extent feasible pursuant to SRC 86.015. The proposed site plan shall be updated to include the location of proposed street trees pursuant to SRC 220.005(e)(1)(A)(ix).

The following items are identified deficiencies in your application and will need to be addressed. **Failure to address issues could result in denial of the application.**

• **Development Site:** The application materials should be revised to include the entirety of the development site, which includes both tax lots 900 and 3300. The calculations within the summary table and written statement do not account for tax lot 3300.



- Adjustment Findings: The proposed multiple family development is not subject to the pedestrian access standards set forth in SRC 800.065 (per the statement at the beginning of the section). Instead, the development is subject to the pedestrian access standards set forth in SRC 702.020(d)(4). As discussed at the pre-application conference, Staff would expect a pedestrian connection from the new building to the street—around the east side of the existing building was the option discussed at that time. The applicant would be able to use existing nonconforming pathways on this route, if necessary.
- **Setbacks:** The proposal does not appear to meet the following setback standard(s):
 - Per the RM-II zone, a 10-foot minimum setback with Type C landscaping and screening between the new building and the interior property line to the south. Type C landscaping and a 6-foot-tall sightobscuring fence or wall are required along the north side of the property line.
- **Multiple Family Design Standards:** The proposal does not appear to meet the following multiple family design review standard(s):
 - SRC 702.020(b) and 702.020(c)(4): Without landscape plans, it's not possible to determine if the proposal meets the standards of these sections. Adherence with these standards can be conditioned within the land use approval, if the applicant wishes.
 - SRC 702.020(c)(2): Lighting shall be provided that illuminates all exterior dwelling unit entrances, parking areas, and pedestrian paths within the development to enhance visibility and resident safety. This applies to the new building and to the pedestrian path to the street, if provided. The written statement calls out lighting on the provided elevations, but Staff was unable to locate lighting on sheets A2.01 or A2.02. Adherence with this standard can be conditioned within the land use approval, if the applicant wishes.
 - SRC 702.020(d)(4): To ensure safe pedestrian access to and throughout a development site, pedestrian pathways shall be provided that connect to and between buildings, common open space, and parking areas, and that connect the development to the public sidewalks. This standard will require a pedestrian connection from the proposed building to the street, the common open space, the parking lot, and the existing building. As discussed at the pre-application conference, Staff would expect a pedestrian connection from the new building to the street—around the east side of the existing building was the option discussed at that time. Staff understands the applicant intends to obtain an adjustment to eliminate the required pedestrian path to the street. To support such an



adjustment, we would need additional justification demonstrating why a connection to the street isn't feasible.

- SRC 702.020(e)(2): Where a development site abuts property zoned Residential Agricultural (RA) or Single Family Residential (RS), buildings shall be setback from the abutting RA or RS zoned property as set forth in Table 702-5 to provide appropriate transitions between new buildings and structures on site and existing buildings and structures on abutting sites. For buildings with two or more stories, the minimum setback to the property zoned RA or RS is one foot for each one foot of building height, but in no case less than 20 feet. The subject property abuts RS-zoned properties to the north and west. With an average height of 26 feet, the proposed building's minimum setback to these property lines is 26 feet, with a five-foot reduction allowed under subsection (A) if the height of the required fence in 702.020(b)(2)(B) is increased to eight feet tall. The proposal does not meet this standard to the north and west property lines.
- SRC 702.020(e)(6): A porch or architecturally defined entry area shall be provided for each ground level dwelling unit. Shared porches or entry areas shall be provided to not more than four dwelling units. Individual and common entryways shall be articulated with a differentiated roof, awning, stoop, forecourt, arcade or portico. The proposed building does not appear to contain a differentiated roof, awning, stoop, forecourt, arcade or portico for the shared entries.

Notes:

• **Trash Enclosure:** The proposed site plan indicates the existing trash enclosure will be updated under a separate permit. The applicant is advised that a separate site plan review application will be required at that time.

The application will be deemed complete upon receipt of one of the following:

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

You have 180 days from the date the application was submitted to respond in one of the three ways listed above, or the application will be deemed void.



Please submit the above requested materials and/or information to our office through the <u>PAC Portal</u> using the appropriate <u>naming convention</u>. If you have questions, please contact me at (503) 540-2326 or <u>bpike@cityofsalem.net</u>.

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

Sincerely,

Brandon Pike, Planner I