



LAND USE APPEAL APPLICATION

FEB 23 2018

1. GENERAL DATA REQUIRED *[to be completed by the appellant]*

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Case No. CU-ZC 17-14

February 9, 2018

Case # Being Appealed

Decision Date

700-800 Blocks of Commercial Street NE, 97301

Address of Subject Property

David Glennie, 445 Myers Street SE, Salem, OR 97302

Appellants Mailing Address with zip code

dave@telosdevelopment.com

503-371-8014

Appellant's E-mail Address

Day-time Phone / Cell Phone

Appellant's Representative or Professional to be contacted regarding matters on this application, if other than appellant listed above:

Phillip E. Grillo, Davis Wright Tremaine LLP

1300 SW 5th Ave, Suite 2400, Portland, OR 97201

Name

Mailing Address with ZIP Code

philgrillo@dwt.com

503-778-5284

E-Mail Address

Day-time Phone / Cell Phone

2. SIGNATURES OF ALL APPELLANTS

Signature:

Date: 2/22/18

Printed Name:

David Glennie

Signature:

Date:

Printed Name:

3. REASON FOR APPEAL

Attach a letter, briefly summarizing the reason for the Appeal. Describe how the proposal does not meet the applicable criteria as well as verification establishing the appellants standing to appeal the decision as provided under SRC 300.1010

FOR STAFF USE ONLY

Received By:

AP

Date:

2/23/2018

Receipt No:

17-122248-20

Appeal Deadline:

FEB 27, 2018

Case Manager:

BRYCE BAXTER

February 22, 2018

Mayor Bennett and City Council
City of Salem
c/o Community Development Department
555 Liberty Street SE, Room 305
Salem, OR 97301

Re: Appeal of the Hearing Officer's February 9, 2018 decision in
Case No. CU-ZC 17-14 (Union Gospel Mission)

Dear Mayor Bennett and City Council Members:

I represent Mr. David Glennie in the above-captioned matter. Mr. Glennie has standing to appeal the hearing officer's decision in this case pursuant to SRC 300.1010, because he testified orally and in writing during the proceedings below.

As required in the Land Use Appeal Application (attached) I am providing a brief summary of the reasons for Mr. Glennie's appeal of the hearing officer's decision:

1. The hearing officer's decision violates SRC 240.005 (d)(1) because the proposed use is not allowed as a conditional use in the zone.
2. The hearing officer's decision violates SRC 240.005 (d)(2) because the reasonably likely adverse impacts of the proposed use on the immediate neighborhood cannot be minimized through the imposition of conditions.
3. The hearing officer's decision violates SRC 240.005 (d)(3) because the proposed use will not be reasonably compatible with and will not have minimal impacts on the livability or appropriate development of surrounding property.

Pursuant to the city's currently adopted fee schedule, a check in the amount of \$268.00 is included with this appeal. Please notify me when the appeal is scheduled with the City Council.

Respectfully Submitted,

Davis Wright Tremaine LLP


Phil Grillo

cc: David Glennie

4835-7050-3518v.1 0085607-000004