

## Amy Johnson

---

**From:** Dan Atchison  
**Sent:** Monday, February 25, 2019 2:31 PM  
**To:** Aaron Panko; Amy Johnson  
**Subject:** Fwd: THIS EVENING'S COUNCIL AGENDA: ITEM 4.A) RE. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT at WILSEY/CANDY FLOWER COURT

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Matthew Ausec <[MAUSEC@cityofsalem.net](mailto:MAUSEC@cityofsalem.net)>  
**Date:** February 25, 2019 at 2:09:16 PM PST  
**To:** Dan Atchison <[DAtchison@cityofsalem.net](mailto:DAtchison@cityofsalem.net)>  
**Subject:** FW: THIS EVENING'S COUNCIL AGENDA: ITEM 4.A) RE. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT at WILSEY/CANDY FLOWER COURT

---

**From:** [daltfam@comcast.net](mailto:daltfam@comcast.net)  
**Sent:** Monday, February 25, 2019 2:09:09 PM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada)  
**To:** Tom Andersen; [jleung@cityofsalem.net](mailto:jleung@cityofsalem.net)  
**Cc:** Chris Hoy; Cara Kaser; Sally Cook; Matthew Ausec  
**Subject:** THIS EVENING'S COUNCIL AGENDA: ITEM 4.A) RE. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT at WILSEY/CANDY FLOWER COURT

Dear Jackie, Tom and Colleagues.

Hi.

I cannot find any notice to the contrary, so I'm assuming Council will meet as planned this evening (i.e., even though apparently roads may get a bit 'dicey' as the evening progresses...)?

I am writing with concern regarding the above noted item on tonight's Agenda.

And my first question is regarding ***whether Public input will be allowed /Would I be allowed to testify??***

[I have just recently reviewed the Agenda and the background regarding this Development-related item; since I don't live in the immediate/adjacent 'neighborhood,' I was unaware earlier and so have not submitted any previous "objection"....].

Even if I cannot testify, I would like you and your fellow Councilors to be aware of my concerns:

.. First, I want to note that there appear to be a number of positive aspects to the proposal: more multi-family housing, plans to include open/common space, provisions for children's play equipment, ... .

.. That said, I found myself amazed and appalled at the apparent cavalier approach – and the Planning Commission's apparent acquiescence—to the

***elimination/removal of 320 of the 321 noted trees on the property (including 4-out-of-5 of the Heritage-eligible white oaks)!!***

{{ I visited the property this past weekend (even took some photos...).

There are literally stands of magnificent (70-100 year old??) conifers lining three sides of the property (including two lines of stately

trees bordering both side of the dirt lane along the north boundary...).

Happily, there is a large, largely open space in the middle of the property, which appears ready-made for the development being proposed.}}

So my questions are:

1. ***Are any – and if so, How many—of these magnificent conifers proposed for “removal??***
2. ***If ‘many’, especially along the “borders” of the development – Why??***

I continue to observe that many (most...) developments here in South Salem proceed with literally NO regard for large trees.

[Very recently, a literal forest was completely removed from the area west of S. Commercial/north of Waln, just east of the new

Battlecreek Elementary School. There now stand hundreds of new apartments and a being-built senior retirement facility:

Lots of room both along the borders, and in the few open areas-- just begging for some beauty and shade and carbon sequestration.

Instead we have a number of scrawny ‘plantings’ (which likely reaped Planning Commission praise...). ]

So (as with the Planning Commission’s approval of a Costco on our Kuebler ‘Parkway’/near the major S. Salem Freeway interchange/

in the midst of a largely- residential neighborhood/on the site approved for a ‘neighborhood shopping center’...) WHAT AM I MISSING??

There must be some reason that developers – encouraged by our City’s Planning (?) Commission – so blatantly ignore the possibilities of

actually protecting and utilizing what nature has gifted to Salem these past many years, include free enhancement for their new properties.

There has to be some good excuse for ignoring Salem’s status as a nationally-recognized “*Tree City*.”

There must be a solid rationale for destroying the mature vegetation cover that remains one of our last bastions for a threatened atmosphere.

But what if there isn’t?

What if it’s just for convenience – for ease of construction – for a few extra dollars in profit – or just because no one (including the City itself...)

thinks to raise (much less recognize/appreciate/reward) some additional sensitivity to what Nature has to gift Salem’s citizens.

We are so fortunate to have a Council that now has a majority of aware, sensitive, and caring Councilors. So please (continue to...) ask these questions, raise these concerns –

And maybe even address WHY the City’s taxpayer-paid Staff continue to ignore the best, broader interests of us taxpayers/citizens.

I will look forward to testifying as per the above tonight if possible.

And if not possible, maybe this note can be included in the record.

And if not, at least YOU are aware that someone else out here cares and will be there supporting you and your decisions.

Warmly,

*William (Bill) Dalton, Ph.D.*  
6619 Huntington Circle SE  
Salem 97306  
(503) 371-4174  
[daltfam@comcast.net](mailto:daltfam@comcast.net)