

31 March 2023

Bryce Bishop Planner III Community Development City of Salem

RE: 23-101404-PLN 1341 Waller Street SE

item	Description	
Proof of	The subject property is currently owned by MAPP, LLC, and the	
Application	application form has been signed by Brandon Fahlman. Because the	
Signature	property is currently owned by MAPP, LLC, proof of signature authority is	
Authority	needed identifying Brandon Fahlman as being authorized to sign the	
	application on behalf of the property owner.	
Response: previously submitted see attached		
List of LLC	SRC 300.210(a)(3) requires the submittal of any information that would	
Member	give rise to an actual or potential conflict of interest under state or local	
	ethics laws for any member of a Review Authority that will or could make a	
	decision on the application.	
	In order to implement this submittal requirement for applicants and/or property owners who are companies or LLCs, we require applicants to submit a list of the names of all of the members of the company or LLC. This allows the members of any potential Review Authority at the City who may end up reviewing the application to be able to identify whether any potential conflict of interest exists with the applicant and/or property owner.	
	Because the applicant for the proposal is MAPP, LLC, a list of members of MAPP LLC is required to be submitted.	
Response:	Response: previously submitted see attached	
Class 1	Per SRC 521.015(a), within the CO zone multiple family development	
Design	requires design review. As such, in addition to the Class 3 Site Plan	
Review	Review application already submitted, an application for Class 1 Design	

Application Required	Review is also required for the proposed development.
'	The application fee for Class 1 Design Review is: \$671.00.
Response:	We have paid everything you have billed us.
Class 2 Adjustment Application Required	As identified in the comments included on the attached plans, a Class 2 Adjustment will be required in conjunction with the proposed development to eliminate the minimum required 10-foot parking setback abutting the alley to the north.
	The application fee for a Class 2 Adjustment is: \$1,807.00.
Response:	We have eliminated parking along the north alley
Existing Significant Trees on Property	There are two significant Oregon White Oaks located on the subject property. A report from an ISA certified arborist was submitted with the application indicating that of the two significant oaks on the property, the30-inch oak located in the northwest portion of the site is declining in health, is in poor condition, and presents both a hazard and danger to persons and/or property that cannot be alleviated by treatment or pruning.  The other significant tree on the property, the 32-inch Oregon white oak, is not identified as a hazardous tree and the arborist repot explains that they are confident that the proposed development can occur on the site while encroaching approx. 26 percent into the CRZ of the tree if the recommendations of the report are followed and 74 percent of the CRZ of the tree is protected with fencing.
	Because it appears that the amount of disturbance within the critical root zone of the 30-inch Oregon white oak located in the northwest corner of the site will exceed the maximum allowed 30 percent with an arborist report, either:
	1) An adjustment to allow more than 30 percent of the critical root zone of the tree to be disturbed together with an arborist report demonstrating that the tree will be able to be preserved with the development; or 2) An application for a Tree Removal Permit or Tree Variance will be required in order to remove the tree. In order for a Tree Removal Permit or a Tree Variance to be approved the applicable approval criteria under either SRC 808.030(d) (for Tree Removal Permits) or SRC 808.045(d) (for Tree Variances) must be found to be me
•	We will be removing the tree in due course according to the arborist
the Oak in the NW corner is not well and is not long for this world. We would like to nurse it along. If we must remove	
Additional Comments on Plans	Please see the attached plans for additional comments.
	Responces to annotated sheets:
	Elevations-Annotations Reply.pdf
<u> </u>	

SPR-2 Annotations Reply.pdf, SPR-6 Annotations Reply.pdf
Revised SPR sheets: SPR-2, SPR-5, SPR-5B, SPR-6
Additional Floor Plan and Elevation sheets for building "A" and building "B"
Floor Plans: A2.1-A2.3
Elevations: A3.4,A3.5

Sincerely.

Ronald James Ped Architect, PC