

## Exhibit M

**Date:** August 3, 2021  
**To:** City of Sandy  
**Attn:** Emily Meharg  
**RE:** 21-037 SUB/VAR/TREE

To whom it may concern,

An incomplete letter was received from the City of Sandy for File No. 21-037 SUB/VAR/TREE. This letter includes responses and additional information regarding the items mentioned in said letter. Included with this resubmittal for completeness check are: a revised plan set, revised Project Narrative (revised sections highlighted, revised to match the correct acreages), Partial Approval for a Design Modification from Clackamas County, Arborist Report Addendum, and the additional check requested.

- Additional information from the project arborist on the definition of “viable.” Are all viable trees healthy and likely to grow to maturity? Typically, an arborist’s tree health/condition evaluation assesses trees as being in very good, good, fair, poor, or dead/dying condition.

**RESPONSE:** Please refer to the addendum prepared by the arborist further explaining this.

- Additional information from the project arborist detailing why the standard critical root zone (CRZ) of 1 foot per 1 inch DBH is not being proposed.

**RESPONSE:** Please refer to the addendum prepared by the arborist further explaining this.

- Plan Set sheet that details building footprints, retention trees, and standard critical root zone (1 foot per 1 inch DBH) around all proposed retention trees.

**RESPONSE:** Building footprints have been added on the plans. Please refer to the revised plans.

- Revise Sheet 11, future street plan, to detail trail connections to the east.

**RESPONSE:** Detail trail connections have been added on the plans. Please refer to the revised plans.

- \$1,250 third party review fee for review of arborist report and tree retention plan. You submitted \$250; however, given the size of the project and proposed deviations from the industry standards, paying the full \$1,500 third party review fee is necessary.

**RESPONSE:** Check included with resubmittal.

- Clarification on the dashed lines and sidewalk proposal along Kelso Road detailed on Sheet 1. Are you proposing right-of-way dedication along Kelso Road? The sidewalk will need to extend to the furthest extent of the property.

**RESPONSE:** The applicant has collaborated extensively with Clackamas County on the desired sidewalk design. A design modification partial approval has been issued by Clackamas County and included with this resubmittal. Please refer to this document for more detail. The sidewalk design has been revised with the County’s guidance to stop the sidewalk 5’ short of each property line

and having a 2:1 graded slope within the ROW. This is only one panel short of the property line and will not be a significant burden should neighboring development occurs.

- Clarification on the proposed retaining wall along Tract K on Street A. The wall is located in the front yard along Street A so the maximum height is 4 feet. A 6 foot tall wall would require a variance or special variance. Is the wall at grade or sunken? Will it require a fence on top?

**RESPONSE:** The additional information on the retaining wall along Tract K on Street A has been included in the revised plan set. Please refer to the plan set for these additional details. Regarding the height of the wall, per the City’s definition for Front Yard refers to a building and there is no building on Tract K. This tract is reserved for open space, a perennial stream, wetland and buffers. Therefore the wall height does not apply as there is no building on this parcel.

- Clarification on the area of the tracts and the net site area calculation. Is Tract P in the table on page 1 of the narrative supposed to be Tract M? Are Tracts K and L labeled correctly in the table on page 1? The areas listed for the tracts in the table do not add up to the total tract area listed in the project narrative. Does the right-of-way dedication in the project narrative include a right-of-way dedication along Kelso Road?

**RESPONSE:** Please refer to the updated table below with the correct tract assignments and square footage. The ROW dedication to the City is 95,180 and County is 3,265. Total is 98,445.

Tract	Size (square feet)	Use
J	137,121	Open Space, Wetland & Buffer, Stormwater Easement
L	34,622	Public Storm Drain Facility
M	79,544	Open Space, Perennial Stream, Wetland & Buffer
N	5,306	Public Walkway and Sanitary Sewer Tract/Easement
O	20,205	Perennial Stream & Buffer
K	24,940	Open Space, Perennial Stream, Wetland, and Buffers