From: Linda Nishioka
To: Amy Johnson
Subject: FW: Concerns regarding Overlay Zoning (Saginaw Street, Superior- Rural)
Date: Monday, June 26, 2023 8:30:34 AM

Amy,

Here is testimony that should be added for tonight's council meeting regarding the overlay zones 4.a 23-128.

Thank you,

Linda Nishioka (She/Her)
City Councilor - Ward 2
lnishioka@cityofsalem.net | 971-707-2112

From: Ashley Duenas <ashaduenas@gmail.com>
Date: Monday, June 26, 2023 at 7:50 AM
To: Linda Nishioka <LNishioka@cityofsalem.net>
Subject: Concerns regarding Overlay Zoning (Saginaw Street, Superior- Rural)

Hello,

I am a resident of the Fairmount Hill neighborhood in Ward 2 and I'm writing to express my concern regarding the proposed elimination of the Superior-Rural Overlay Zone. I would like to contribute my voice in support of maintaining the existing building height restriction of 35 feet. I have read the letter to you from my neighbor, Katja Meyer, and she details the many potential consequences of allowing increased building height. I agree with these arguments and ask that City Council maintain the existing height limit.

Thank you for your time,
Ashley

From: noreply@cityofsalem.net on behalf of ajasso@q.com
To: CityRecorder
Subject: Submission
Date: Sunday, June 25, 2023 9:08:34 PM
Attachments: ATT00001.bin

Your Name	Albert Jasso
Your Email	ajasso@q.com
Your Phone	503 362 0465
Street	Fairmount Ave s.
City	Salem
State	OR
Zip	97302
Message	Hello My name is Albert Jasso I live at 1795 Fairmount Ave S. My wife and I would like to register our objections to the proposed building height along Commercial Street. We feel an increase in building height would seriously affect (in a negative manner) the quality of life of those living along Commercial Street and adjacent neighborhoods. Simply stated, the height increase would damage the residential quality of life by the increase in building density, traffic and human traffic. Sincerely, Al & Naomi Jasso

This email was generated by the dynamic web forms contact us form on 6/25/2023.

From:	Carlene Benson
To:	CityRecorder
Cc:	Linda Nishioka; Chris Hoy
Subject:	Superior-Rural section of CA23-02/Ordinance Bill No. 5-23
Date:	Monday, June 26, 2023 9:02:15 AM

I am writing in opposition to Superior-Rural section of CA23-02/Ordinance Bill No. 5-23, elimination of five overlay zones in the SCAN neighborhood.

Our neighborhood association, SCAN, has studied the proposal and agrees to the goal of the council, to simplify development by removing current restrictions—except for the height limit. SCAN opposes increasing the height limit, as do I.

The additional 2 stories will dramatically block the sunlight and view of the neighbors to the west and have people looking down into their homes and yards. The additional traffic impact at the already busy intersections of Commercial, Liberty, and Rural must be considered as well as more traffic on the residential streets of Saginaw and the east-west streets from Commercial and Saginaw.

Please adjust this bill to not allow the 5 stories and leave it at 3 stories.

Regards,

Carlene Benson

545 Leslie St. SE, Salem

From: Carol M
To: CityRecorder
Cc: Austin Ross
Subject: Monday"s agenda CA23-02/Ordinance Bill No. 5-23
Date: Friday, June 23, 2023 9:32:51 AM

Dear Mayor Hoy and Councilors,

While I appreciate moves to simplify government, one section of proposed CA23-02/Ordinance Bill No. 5-23 Superior-Rural section of overlay in SCAN, is particularly worrisome.

The affected section of Commercial Street involved butts up to a residential area of Saginaw. This is an established neighborhood with historic homes and pretty gardens. Residents take pride in their neighborhood, maintaining homes and gardens. It is a family neighborhood. People from other parts of Salem also enjoy visiting Fairmount Park at the top of the hill. Walkers enjoy seeing the gardens.

The proposal as I understand it would allow buildings up to and including five stories to be built up against the residential area. A five-story building in our backyards on Saginaw would block our sunshine, air, view. That would impact neighbors ability to enjoy their homes, gardens, privacy. It could literally darken our backyard gardens.

The additional density would increase traffic problems at the intersection of Rural/Liberty/Commercial. That's already a difficult intersection but the city has consistently refused residents' requests to add left-turn lanes there. There have been a number of accidents and near-misses there. Not just cars use the intersection--kids walking to nearby schools, people with small children or pets, runners, walkers, bikers.

Visitors use Rural Street to access Fairmount Park. Saginaw, the only north-south through street on the hill, already gets additional traffic when Commercial is backed up.

Please don't make the traffic and congestion any worse. Retain the residential character of the neighborhood for all to enjoy.

Pass the measure but keep the current height restriction.

Thank you.

Carol Mitchell,

Ward 2

From: Evan West
To: CityRecorder
Subject: Case N0: CA23-02/Ordinance Bill No. 5-23
Date: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 3:44:36 PM

Dear Mayor Hoy and members of the City Council:

I am writing in regards to the proposal before the City Council to eliminate overlay zones in the SCAN neighborhood. I intend to provide additional testimony in person at the 6/26 public hearing.

I am writing in support of the position taken by the neighborhood association (SCAN) - that the overlay zones *should be maintained* with the only requirement being the maximum building height, which is currently 35 feet. In the quest for equity in development in our community it is important for the City Council to recognize the difference between equity and equality, and to acknowledge that a "one size fits all approach" will never be correct for planning the future of our community.

The majority of the overlay zones in the SCAN neighborhood sit in an area of unique topography. There is roughly 100 feet of elevation change from John Street to West Knob Hill. Potential development in the Superior-Rural overlay zone taller than the current maximum height would severely impact the human scale of this neighborhood. Mixed development, including transit-oriented development, is welcomed and championed by members of the south Salem community. However, to remove all of the restrictions on development that are currently in place in consideration of the unique challenges of our community does not serve a future-oriented Salem.

I know that I join my neighbors in a desire to see walkable grocery stores and other retail options. I know that I join neighbors who hope to see more office spaces within walking or biking distance of their residences. I know that I join neighbors who want to see mixed residential development, so that our housing crisis can continue to be dealt with. None of those uses reasonably require buildings of 50+ feet height (four or more stories). To the contrary, a building of 50+ feet height would adversely impact many of the most unique and livable features of south Salem, such as the many micro farmers who depend on west-facing light to grow beautiful flowers, fruits, and vegetables, right here in our city.

These are just a few of the myriad reasons why the building height requirement of the overlay zones are critical. Please join my south Salem neighbors in affirming a commitment to human scale amid mixed development by maintaining the overlay zones with their current maximum building height requirements. Thank you.

Websites hyperlinked above:

https://interactioninstitute.org/illustrating-equality-vs-equity/

https://www.pps.org/article/placemaking-and-the-human-scale-city

--
Evan West, M.A.
He/Him/His

970-980-1445
evanwest714@gmail.com

From: Jacque Heavey
To: CityRecorder
Subject: Superior-Rural sec. of Ca23-02/ordinance bill no. 5-23
Date: Sunday, June 25, 2023 6:48:41 PM

To whom it may concern- As a resident of Ward 2- I want to express my support for the neighbors that are advocating for the current height restrictions to remain in place for future housing developments in the Fairmont Hill neighborhood of Salem.

Do not allow neighborhoods and livability to be undermined for the interests of a few by allowing completely outsized buildings in a low rise neighborhood. Scale matters. Listen to neighbors that are asking for reasonable accommodations and some restraints on building height.

Thank you~ Jacque Heavey, Ward 2.

From: Mary Anne Spradlin
To: CityRecorder
Subject: Increasing the height limit for buildings on Commercial Street
Date: Friday, June 23, 2023 2:51:44 PM

I am opposed to increasing the height limit for the buildings on Commercial Street.
Mary Anne Spradlin
1547 Chemeketa Street NE
Salem. OR. 97301
Please include my comments for the next city council meeting, Thank you

Sent from my iPhone

From: noreply@cityofsalem.net on behalf of patdex@comcast.net
To: CityRecorder
Subject: Submission
Date: Friday, June 23, 2023 7:03:47 PM
Attachments: ATT00001.bin

Your Name	Patricia Deminna
Your Email	patdex@comcast.net
Your Phone	503-581-6351
Street	635 Church St. SE
City	Salem
State	OR
Zip	97301
Message	June 22, 2023 To: City Council From: Patricia Deminna Re: Superior-Rural section of CA23-02/Ordinance Bill No. 5-23 I'm a resident of Ward 2. I support the City's goal to encourage housing and mixed used development near frequently used transit services, which this bill seeks to accomplish. I am opposed, however, to the component that eliminates the 35 foot maximum building height limit on the Superior-Rural stretch of Commercial. Some consideration needs to be given to residents who live in the neighborhood adjacent to the Superior/Rural overlay. If buildings on Commercial are allowed to be 65 feet high, they will loom above the houses on Saginaw, whose residents will be facing 5-story buildings in close proximity to their homes. Their personal privacy, their backyard comfort, and what we experience as residential livability will be seriously impacted. The City's goals to address multi-use zoning can be accomplished without the removal of the 35 foot maximum building height limit. Keeping 35 foot high buildings on this short stretch of Commercial, instead of allowing 65 foot high buildings, isn't a significant loss to MU zoning; nor is it necessary when more than one thousand acres of MU zoning was added by the Comprehensive Plan. I urge you to retain the 35 foot maximum building height limit. Thank you. Patricia Deminna

This email was generated by the dynamic web forms contact us form on 6/23/2023.

From: noreply@cityofsalem.net on behalf of irelon@msn.com
To: CityRecorder
Subject: Submission
Date: Sunday, June 25, 2023 11:47:09 AM
Attachments: ATT00001.bin

Your Name	irene longaker
Your Email	irelon@msn.com
Your Phone	503-581-0265
Street	975 High Street SE Salem Oregon
City	SALEM
State	OR
Zip	97302
Message	RE: Superior Rural Section of CA23-02/Ordinance Bil No. 5-23 We need to maintain these liveable and lovely neighborhoods close to downtown to keep downtown viable. When a downtown fails so does the city. Erecting buildings with more that one story along Commercial Street is not only unsightly but will ruin the views of neighbors on streets west of Commercial and make properties less desirable. Please do not allow this to pass. Thank you, Irene Longaker

This email was generated by the dynamic web forms contact us form on 6/25/2023.

From: noreply@cityofsalem.net on behalf of suevannoord@gmail.com
To: CityRecorder
Subject: Submission
Date: Friday, June 23, 2023 3:28:58 PM
Attachments: Sue Wells Comment Superior-Rural Overlay Zone.docx

---

Your Name	Susan Wells
Your Email	suevannoord@gmail.com
Your Phone	503-575-6677
Street	160 Superior St S
City	Salem
State	OR
Zip	97302
Message	Please see attached letter containing public comment. Thank you!

This email was generated by the dynamic web forms contact us form on 6/23/2023.

Dear Councilors,

My name is Sue Wells, and I'm writing in regards to the Superior-Rural section of CA23-02/Ordinance Bill No. 5-23 elimination of five overlay zones in the SCAN neighborhood.

I'm writing on behalf of myself, my husband Joseph and our two daughters, age 2 and 5. We live at **160 Superior St. S,** which as you can see on the map of proposed overlay zone removal, is **one of the few properties with a home site directly adjacent to the proposed overlay removals, and the only one in this unique position in the Superior-Rural overlay zone.** Whatever happens on the Superior-Rural overlay zone happens right outside our kitchen window.

We are a working family with young children. We have made this neighborhood home and fiercely believe in the practice of neighborhood, community and mutual care. As our neighbors can attest, my daughters ride their bikes down the alley between Superior and Rural streets every day. We pick up trash in the alley, feed the birds, share and receive garden space and garden abundance with other folks our block. We belong to the fabric of the neighborhood on both sides of the alley, both up the hill and our neighbors who live on the Commercial street side. We have shared chainsaws and generators during the ice storm, shared meals with Commercial street neighbors when they had a baby, shared our sump pump with another when their yard and basement flooded (please refer to our neighbor Katja Meyer's earlier letter with concerns about storm drain overflow). We walk and ride regularly down and across Commercial street, and will do more so as my daughter attends school this fall.

I haven't spoken earlier as I've honestly been a bit ambivalent about this issue- I agree with the aims of the city to build walkable and transit-oriented development, and as a regular walker passionately believe in a future Salem that is climate- resilient, where it's possible to live car-free, and where everyone who needs a home has access to one. However, the more I've learned about this proposal, the more I realize that the removal of the Superior-Rural overlay zone will not effectively meet these goals, and will in the process be a significant detriment to the livability of our home and our block.

The removal of the 35-foot height restriction in the overlay zone opens the neighborhood to development that would change the human scale of where we call home. A 5-story midrise building would be not only completely incongruous with its neighbors, but would dwarf our home and fundamentally and permanently change the livability of our home and our block. This ranges from significantly blocking out the little natural light we receive, to opening up real privacy concerns as even with a 70' setback, we would still have a massive building with a direct view into both our dining room and the yard where our kids play.

Additionally, there are real safety concerns that will directly affect us as next-door neighbors. The increased traffic, both human and vehicle, will make our block less safe and possibly prohibitive for kids to play and ride. Depending on the type of development, we may also face

the issues of nightlife noise, waste and other issues, and will certainly be faced with an increase in light and sound pollution.

Further, the street parking situation on our street is somewhat tenuous right now as the street is extremely narrow, and we already have strangers walking in our front yard from their cars parked in front of our house. This would only be exacerbated by a 5-story development directly next door. There is not adequate space for parking to meet these needs, and we are a long way away from a brighter reality in which Salem is a place where people simply won't bring or need cars. (One only need to look at many examples in Portland to see the unintended consequences of developing for an aspirational car-free future rather than the reality of what is).

Our request is that the city council please consider the real needs and concerns of the people who live here and will be directly affected by this change. We believe that our neighborhood association SCAN has formulated a measured and thoughtful compromise. To this end**, we support the position of SCAN to remove the overlay zone but keep the building height restriction.**

This is not a matter of losing our mountain view or even changing the character of the neighborhood- we welcome new neighbors and understand that new approaches to housing are necessary for the future. What we are concerned with is a fundamental change to the livability of this city block for our family. We live in a simple home and work very hard. We don't have the luxury of choosing just anywhere to live, but we love and care for our home, our neighbors and our neighborhood.

We know you are working hard throughout the city to find creative ways to meet the challenges of the present and the future. To you, this may be just one city block. To us, it's our home. To my kids, it's where they can ride bikes, play in their backyard without worrying, walk to school, and learn about generosity and what it means to be part of the fabric of a neighborhood. It's easy to support this proposal in theory if you aren't the one who lives next door. In so many cities, actual livability has been the casualty of so-called "progress." It's possible that our family could be the unfortunate yet inevitable casualty of this "progress." But you, councilors, have the ability to listen to your neighbors here and make a different choice. We urge you to chart a different path for Salem by accepting this reasonable and well-considered compromise.
Thank you so much,

Sue Wells
160 Superior St. S.
Ward 2

From: Walter Benson
To: CityRecorder
Subject: Zoning change
Date: Friday, June 23, 2023 1:44:01 PM

Salem city councilors,

Please consider carefully the zoning change before you to increase building height limits on Commercial Street South. The changes to neighbors on Saginaw and perhaps beyond would be regretful if not invasive should buildings go to five stories. Privacy for these folks should be taken into consideration strongly.

Thank you.

Wally Benson
Ward 2