

From: [Evan Manvel](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Cc: [Linda Nishioka](#)
Subject: testimony in favor of Code Amendment Case No. CA23-02
Date: Friday, June 16, 2023 9:53:24 AM

Dear Mayor Hoy and Salem City Councilors -

Thank you for your service to the city. You have before you an unenviable hard decision on an upzoning proposal. I encourage you to support it.

As a Fairmount Hill resident, I feel lucky to live where I live. Just as my other Fairmount Hill neighbors, I appreciate walking around the neighborhood and seeing the views of Mt. Jefferson. I love the number of people who garden, and the amazing amount of work they put in. I understand the concerns they voice about the upzoning, and the potential impacts on views and sunlight.

But in balance, I support the upzoning proposal. I want *more* neighbors to meet, to play with my kids, to join us in the annual Fairmount Hill Halloween parade. I'm optimistic buildings might eventually include more coffee shops or restaurants or places to walk to. I'd rather meet my daily needs on foot, rather than having to bike or drive further afar.

We, as a city, need more housing people can afford. And we need more neighborhoods that are truly walkable, if we're going to meet our climate goals. I want a view of a Mt. Jefferson that has snow on the top of it, even if that view is slightly harder to seek out. We need to act on climate disruption, for the sake of future generations, and ourselves. This small step is one of a thousand. But I encourage you to take it.

Thank you for your time, and your thoughtful consideration.

Warm regards,

Evan Manvel
Ward 2 resident

345 Leffelle St S
Salem, OR
he/him/his

From: [Holly Carter](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Subject: Public comment on code amendment case CA23-02
Date: Monday, June 19, 2023 1:18:44 PM

Hello, I am a home owner and resident on Saginaw St, adjacent to the Saginaw St overlay zone. I am writing today to provide testimony opposing the proposal to remove this overlay zone. Our home directly faces the overlay zone and would be directly and negatively impacted should the Council vote to remove the zone lift current restrictions on building height. Please keep the current zoning in place so our neighborhood can continue to feel like a residential neighborhood.

Thank you,

Holly Carter, Salem resident since 2007
Homeowner of 915 Saginaw St S

From: [Kathleen Wallace](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Subject: Superior-Rural section CA23-02/ Ordinance Bill No.5-23 Elimination of five overlay zones in the SCAN neighborhood
Date: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 10:56:16 AM

I am a resident of Ward 7. I agree with our neighborhood association SCAN recommendations. Our 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. This is comment on the Superior-Rural section of CA23-02/Ordinance Bill No. 5-23 Elimination of five overlay zones in the SCAN neighborhood.

I oppose increasing the height limit restrictions due to the adverse impact it will have on our neighborhood.

Kathleen Wallace
Ward 7
1635 Rio Vista Way S.
Salem, Oregon
Sent from my iPad

From: noreply@cityofsalem.net on behalf of k.l.wilson321@gmail.com
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Subject: Submission
Date: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 9:30:32 AM
Attachments: [ATT00001.bin](#)

Your Name	Kristen Wilson
Your Email	k.l.wilson321@gmail.com
Your Phone	5035087518
Street	1985 Saginaw St S
City	Salem
State	OR
Zip	97302
Message	<p>I live on the west side of Saginaw St (zone 7) and write in regards to the proposed change in zoning in the Superior-Rural section of CA23-02/Ordinance Bill No. 5-23. Along with my neighbors, I am strongly opposed to the increase in height limitation from 3 to 5 stories on Commercial St. This would lead to an increase in noise and traffic in the area and directly impact quality of life in the Fairmount Hill neighborhood generally and particularly for those living on the east side of Saginaw. Please remove this proposed change from the ordinance. Thank you, Kristen Wilson</p>

This email was generated by the dynamic web forms contact us form on 6/21/2023.

From: noreply@cityofsalem.net on behalf of vjdodier@teleport.com
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Subject: Submission
Date: Monday, June 19, 2023 2:24:31 PM
Attachments: [SCAN Testimony re Overlay Zones.pdf](#)

Your Name	Victor J Dodier Jr
Your Email	vjdodier@teleport.com
Your Phone	5039104719
Street	396 Washington St S
City	Salem
State	OR
Zip	97302
Message	SCAN testimony concerning Ordinance Bill No. 5-23 repealing overlay zones

This email was generated by the dynamic web forms contact us form on 6/19/2023.



South Central **SCAN** Association of Neighbors
Salem, Oregon

June 20, 2023

To: City Council

From: Victor Dodier, President
South Central Association of Neighbors

Victor Dodier

Subject: **Testimony on Case No. CA23-02 to Eliminate Five Overlay Zones, 6/26 Council Hearing**

SCAN requests Council keep the five overlay zones, but simplify them by removing the development standards (eg. setback, landscaping, screening, site access), **except the 35-foot maximum building height**. This amendment would significantly simplify redevelopment for uses allowed in the underlying mixed use (MU) zones.

- The purpose and need for the overlay zones still exist. The purpose of the overlay zones, as stated in the code, is to establish development standards that minimize the impacts of nonresidential development on existing residential uses.
- Removing the overlay zones creates winners and losers. Properties within the overlays and near the overlays have been bought and sold over the years under the current rules. Removing the overlay zones shifts the established balance between residential and nonresidential uses in favor of the mixed-use zoned properties at the expense of the livability, quality of life, and property values of the existing residential uses adjacent to the overlay zones.
- The Land Conservation and Development Commission acknowledged the recently updated Salem Comprehensive Plan *with* the existing overlay zones as meeting all the statewide planning goals and Salem's Housing Needs Analysis and Economic Opportunity Analysis.

The updated Salem Comprehensive Plan added 1,600 new acres of MU zoning. This number was not based on a measurable need for that much more multi-family and/or commercial land. Instead it provides maximum options and flexibility by locating many acres of MU zones along major arterials. Keeping the overlay zones with a 35-foot maximum building height on a few blocks does not make a dent in the amount of density available for MU development. Furthermore, significant housing density can be achieved in a 3-floor, 35-foot tall building, especially if it is designed to include small studio apartments.

- Setback standards in MU zones abutting a residential zone provide an extra buffer based on building height, but only for those residential uses actually abutting the mixed use zone, including across an alley. But they do not apply to residential uses across a street.

If the Saginaw St Overlay Zone is removed, residents across Saginaw St from the MU-I zone could be looking at a 65-foot building with 0 feet setback from Saginaw St. Only residents south of Bush St directly abutting the MU-I zone would benefit from the extra setback.

If the three overlay zones on the east side of Commercial St are removed, residents across West Nob Hill from the MU-II zone could be looking at a 55-foot building with 0 feet setback from West Nob Hill. Residents south of Hoyt St across West Nob Hill from the MU-III zone could be looking at a 70-foot building with a 5-foot setback from West Nob Hill.

We recognize that most of the MU-II zoned properties in the Oxford-Hoyt Overlay Zone would likely not be developed with a building over 35 or 40 feet, due to the shallow lot depth and greater setback required abutting the residential zone. However, in the block north of Rural Ave there is a sharp 10-foot drop-off in land grade between the MU properties along Commercial St and the adjacent residential properties behind them. So even a 35-foot building would loom 45 feet over the residence behind it, but without the full setback required for a 45-foot building.

If the single family zoned lots within the overlay zone were ever rezoned to MU, then all the residents across West Nob Hill would be at risk of having a 55-foot building with 0 setback as a neighbor. That was a very real concern when the overlay zone was adopted, because a developer did try to buy up a block of single family-zoned lots and get them rezoned to commercial for a hotel development.

All three overlay zones along West Nob Hill require buildings to be setback at least 20 feet from West Nob Hill, recognizing that residents across the street do need that buffering protection. Without those overlay zones, there would be no minimum setback from West Nob Hill required. **That is why the 35-foot maximum building height is so important to retain.**

Attachment: Map of Overlay Zones to be Eliminated

Map 1 - Proposed Salem Overlay Change Areas Overlay Zones To Be Eliminated



- 1 - Saginaw Street Overlay Zone
- 2 - Superior/Rural Overlay Zone
- 3 - Oxford/West Nob Hill Overlay Zone
- 4 - Oxford/Hoyt Overlay Zone
- 5 - Hoyt/McGichrist Overlay Zone

Legend

- Overlay Zones Areas To Be Eliminated
- Taxlots
- Urban Growth Boundary
- Outside Salem City Limits

- Existing Zoning**
- CB
 - CG
 - CO
 - CR
 - EC
 - EFU
 - ESMU
 - FMU
 - IBC
 - IC
 - IG
 - IP
 - MU-I
 - MU-II
 - MU-III
 - MU-R
 - NH
 - PA
 - PC
 - PE
 - PH
 - PM
 - PS
 - RA
 - RM1
 - RM2
 - RM3
 - RS
 - SWMU
 - WSCB

★ Note:
Only the Overlay Zone WITHIN the
"Overlay Zones Areas To Be Eliminated"
would be impacted by these changes

This product is provided as is, without warranty. In no event will the City of Salem be liable for damages from the use of this product. This product is subject to license and copyright limitations and further distribution or resale is prohibited.



From: [Roz Shirack](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Cc: vidodier@teleport.com
Subject: Petition Attachment to SCAN Testimony for CA23-02
Date: Tuesday, June 20, 2023 11:26:17 AM
Attachments: [Overlay Zones Petition.docx](#)

Attached is a petition to accompany SCAN's testimony sent to you yesterday.

Thank you,
Roz Shirack, Chair
SCAN Land Use Committee



6/19/2023

We SCAN neighbors Oppose the Removal of the SCAN Overlay Zones

Names in Bold are adjacent to the Overlay Zone (abutting or across an alley or street)

Saginaw St Overlay Zone Neighbors

Holly Carter	915 Saginaw St
Vincent Dunn	925 Saginaw St
Debra Marsh	925 Saginaw St
Cindy Doss	965 Saginaw St
Beth Boock	170 Bush St

Superior-Rural Overlay Zone Neighbors

Katja Meyer	1848 Saginaw St
Peter Bergel	1850 Saginaw St
Alice Phalan	1850 Saginaw St
Carol Mitchell	Saginaw St
Charles Myers	1845 Saginaw St
Nathan Rafn	1950 Saginaw St
Rochelle Rafn	1950 Saginaw St
Sue Wells	160 Superior
Joseph Wells	160 Superior
P. Gil Gray	170 Superior
Kelley Caryt	185 Superior
Deborah Maloney	1660 Fir St.

Oxford -West Nob Hill Overlay Zone Neighbors

Maurice Wilson	365 Oxford
Jim Plank	1858 W Nob Hill
Kathryn Dewey	1880 W Nob Hill

Oxford-Hoyt Overlay Zone Neighbors

William Ammon	1905 W Nob Hill
Jeff Schumacher	1945 W Nob Hill
Esther Ford	1960 W Nob Hill
Cole Massey	1965 W Nob Hill
John Prohodsky	1975 W Nob Hill
Lynne Percevoy	1975 W Nob Hill
Kathleen Fish	1980 W Nob Hill
Martin Boysen	1940 W Nob Hill
Carl Rimby	2280 W Nob Hill
Kathy Rimby	2280 W Nob Hill
Steven Trahan	340 Rural
Tim Antone	360 Rural
John Saris	365 Rural
Alex Katlong	336 Jerris
Seth Young	340 Jerris
John Bagg	362 Jerris
Jennifer Mosley	335 Fawk
Susan Latham	355 Fawk
Janie Stewart	351 Hoyt

Hoyt-McGilchrist Overlay Zone Neighbors

Walker	2350 W Nob Hill
Donna Cowan	2380 W Nob Hill
Jason Hilton	2460 W Nob Hill