

Amy Johnson

From: Susann Kaltwasser <susann@kaltwasser.com>
Sent: Monday, January 27, 2020 8:21 AM
To: CityRecorder
Subject: Testimony from ELNA on Multifamily code amendments
Attachments: ELNA comments on Multifamily design standardsCouncil 12720.pdf

Please enter into the record the attached comments from the East Lancaster Neighborhood Association regarding public hearing 4.c on tonight's agenda

Salem Revised Code updates to multifamily housing design standards and regulations.

Susann Kaltwasser

Co-president

ELNA



EAST LANCASTER NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION (ELNA)

January 27, 2020

To: Salem City Council and Mayor Bennett
From: Susann Kaltwasser, co-president, East Lancaster Neighborhood Association
RE: Salem Revised Code updates to multifamily housing design standards and regulations. Agenda item 4.c.

On November 7, the East Lancaster Neighborhood Association heard a presentation by Norm Wright of the Salem Community Development Department about the proposed design code changes. The members voted unanimously to authorize me to submit these comments.

TOPIC

3-and 4-unit Development:

Must generally meet the same standards as single-family homes (e.g., maximum height of 35 ft, rear setback of 14 ft or 20 ft in the multiple family zones)

The ELNA members are concerned about the possible requirement of only 14 feet for a 3-story building (35 ft maximum). This would put a house in a single family zone which normally only has 2-story houses right next to a single family house. And in that case the taller house would loom over the yard of their neighbors creating not only privacy and aesthetic issues, it would potentially hamper someone's ability to have solar panels on their house.

TOPIC

Parking:

- 3-12 units: 1 space per unit
 - 13+ units: Based on bedroom size of unit

 - Studio or 1-bedroom: 1 space per unit - 2+ bedrooms: 1.5 spaces per unit
 - Allow up to 25% parking reduction for transit access, on-site car share, or more covered bike parking
 - Allow parking reduction for affordable housing
-

The ELNA neighbors have significant concerns about any reduction in parking requirements.

- 1) When a 3 or 4-unit structure is being built in a single family subdivision they believe that parking requirements should not encourage more on-street parking, because in most neighborhoods there are already problems with people parking on both sides of the street and cars have difficulty passing each other.
- 2) Salem street-widths are not standard, and therefore there should be an on-street parking standard that is taken into account in developing the codes for parking that is linked to the proposed development.
- 3) There should be no large apartment complexes that would encourage on-street parking along streets that have bike lanes. Too often people park in those lanes and the police do not enforce the laws consistently.
- 4) How would a developer determine that the renters in their complex would have reduced number of vehicles just because the rents are 'affordable?' What is affordable? Is this proposal based on a wish for more use of mass transit, or based on an actual study here in Salem? We don't see a correlations between "affordable" housing in most apartment complexes in our area. We do see a possible correlation in HUD or 100% section-8 housing
- 5) Would on-street parking be managed by permits? Many property owners believe that the space in front of their house is theirs and do not like others parking in 'their spaces.' It currently causes arguments in our neighborhoods.

TOPIC

Review Process:

- Project meets all standards: Staff review with no public notice (proposed to remain) •

Project cannot meet all standards: Public hearing with public notice

The ELNA neighbors have strong objection to this proposal as it may apply to a small development.

When you have a duplex in a single family neighborhood there is not much of an impact on parking or on appearance. Many neighborhoods already have them. However, when you add a 3 or 4-unit structures to a single lot it is more likely to change the character of the neighborhood. Even when a structure might meet all the design code requirements, it is going to be significantly different. The neighbors feel that this difference will likely impact the not just the appearance, but the quality of life in their street. They want to be able to know that a major change is happening next door that will impact them. They want to be notified, to have the neighborhood association to be notified and to have the developer come to the neighborhood association, so that they can have an opportunity for input.

Some wanted to be able to have a hearing, while a few thought that being able to raise issues to staff might be enough. But they would want to have the right to appeal in all cases.

General comment:

- 1) The neighbors feel that some of the proposals are radically different from current codes and that the awareness in the general public is very low. People are going to be upset if this is implemented as proposed, because it is quite possible that someone could wake up one morning and see the house next door being torn down and a 4-plex being put up. They would have had no notice and no opportunity to comment.

- 2) The neighbors feel that there needs to be much more community outreach prior to moving any changes in the code to the City Council.
- 3) ELNA neighbors are bothered by the fact that our area seems to be getting higher density development compared to other parts of Salem. A 2016 housing study found that we have room for growth within the Urbani Growth Boundary for the next 20 years. If there are projected to be 60,000 new people in the next 30 years (or prorated 40, in the next 20 years) why must the higher density not be well distributed around town. Currently ELNA is 50% multifamily and more is being permitted in recent land use actions. Other parts of Salem are only 30-35% multifamily or high density. At what point do we get to say that this area has fulfilled its obligation to accept more density and more people?
- 4) Neighbors want setbacks in the front of any structures should be within 20% of all the other houses on the block. They do not want to see more than a couple of feet difference between how houses are placed on the lot and facing the street.

Amy Johnson

From: Nancy McDaniel <nanmcdann@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, January 24, 2020 4:01 PM
To: CityRecorder
Cc: Irma Dowd
Subject: NEN testimony on CA19-05
Attachments: NEN comments CA19-05.pdf

Attached please find NEN's testimony on Code Amendment Case No 19-05 (Ordinance 1-20) for the Council hearing on January 27. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks,
Nancy McDaniel
NEN Land Use Co-Chair



NEN

NORTHEAST NEIGHBORS
555 Liberty Street SE, Rm 305
Salem, OREGON 97301

(503) 588-6207
www.salemnen.org

January 24, 2020

To the Members of the Salem City Council,

At our meeting on January 21, the Northeast Neighbors Executive Board voted to support Ordinance No. 1-20 (CA19-05) amending the multifamily housing code, with two proposed changes.

The amendments make sense for a number of reasons: they create different requirements based on the size of the development; reduce parking minimums; require useable open space; and create basic design standards specifically for smaller developments (less than 13 units).

In addition, we voted to specifically support the staff recommendation to prohibit parking areas between the street and building for five to 12-unit multifamily projects. This provision is crucial for integrating smaller infill developments into residential neighborhoods.

We propose two changes to the amendments. One is to delete a provision that would allow an open space with benches and picnic tables to be double-counted toward meeting the open space requirements. The other improvements that can be double-counted are facilities such as a swimming pool or basketball court, which are a permanent investment; picnic tables are not. Second, we would like to see a requirement for secure, sheltered bike parking in large developments (13 or more units). The ordinance only requires only bike racks, which are not secure and so not suitable for residents to store their bikes.

The NEN neighborhood is an excellent example of how multifamily housing can be integrated into residential neighborhoods. We hope this ordinance will result in more housing in Salem that is compatible with our neighborhoods.

Thank you for your consideration of our testimony,

Nancy McDaniel
NEN Land Use Co-Chair



1/24/2020

Multifamily Housing Design Project

RE: Letter of Support

City Council and Members of the Community,

Salem Housing Authority would like to offer a letter of support with regard to the adjustment of design standards in Multifamily Housing. The item of most importance to our agency is the element of parking.

One of the most difficult aspects of building to current density is accommodating the required parking spaces. The current requirement for a project with four or more units is 1.5 spaces. This requirement does not take into account that a 3-bedroom household would have more vehicles than say, a studio household.

Currently, Salem is facing a shortage of affordable housing. The Studio and 1-Bedroom units represent a higher amount of need at this time. If we were to build to the need and have a higher saturation of smaller units, the current parking requirement would provide for potentially more parking spaces than actual units and/or individuals that live at the community.

My best example is our current project, Redwood Crossings. This building holds 36 Single Room Occupancy units and 1- 1 Bedroom unit. We anticipate that there may be 20 or less cars for the entire community. However, the parking requirement is 54 spaces. There is a potential that we could have used half of the parking lot for additional units, rather than spaces that most likely will not be used.

Our goal at the Housing Authority is to add additional affordable housing units to the Salem Community. We believe this design project has several elements which will remove barriers for us to do so more effectively.

We appreciate the time and attention Eunice Kim and her team have put into this project as well as the effort to incorporate as many of the other housing developers comments and suggestions. This proposal is well thought out and researched and we are in full support.

Thank you for your time and consideration,



Jessica Blakely
Salem Housing Authority – Asset Manager



555 Liberty St SE Room 305
Salem OR, 97301

10-17-2020

To: Mayor Chuck Bennett and Members of the Salem City Council

Re: Proposed Design Standard Changes for Salem Multifamily Design Project CA-19-05

From: Southwest Association of Neighbors

Members of the Southwest Association of Neighbors would like to commend City of Salem Staff for their work to update design standards for Multifamily Design. In particular, the board has voted and we would like to support the current topic change to 13+ unit developments in regards to setbacks and compatibility dealing with balconies facing properties zoned single family.

The original proposed change to the Multifamily Design Project regarding balconies from city planning staff provided a prohibition on balconies abutting RS properties. The Planning Commission amended and removed this original recommendation on prohibition of balconies abutting RS property.

SWAN strongly supports the new modification of the original balcony prohibition and current proposed change regarding balconies in 13+ unit developments. The proposed change is that "no" balconies be allowed "facing" properties zoned single family if the building façade is within 50 feet of those properties. We believe this change will provide a positive design standard for both builders and those RS properties impacted by new construction. This proposed design change will help assure privacy for current RS property holders and possibly limit project appeals concerning construction of balconies overlooking private property.

Current design standards require landscaping between 13+unit developments and RS property. We believe this newer proposed standard along with the landscaping design requirement is a much better solution for a contentious issue.

Thank you for your consideration.

Ted Burney

Land Use Chair

Southwest Association of Neighbors

www.salemswan.org



555 Liberty St SE Room 305
Salem OR, 97301