

RECEIVED
JUN 21 2017
CITY OF SALEM
LEGAL DEPARTMENT

June 21, 2017

Mayor and City Council
Salem City Hall
555 Liberty Street SE
Salem, OR 97301

RE: Accessory Dwelling Units, Public Hearing June 26, 2017

Dear Mayor and Council:

The proposal before you is to enable ADU's [Accessory Dwelling Units] in the Residential Single Family Zone. My recommendation to you quite simple:

As stated in its title, maintain the purpose of Single Family Residential Zone as a location for **SINGLE FAMILY** use, and reject the ADU proposal in this zone.

The ADU proposal would allow two complete dwelling units on each lot. Clearly, two units on a lot is equivalent to allowing a duplex.

Having lived in Salem for 40 years, and served the City as an urban planner, I recognize conditions and values evolve. In land use, coincident with a community's own values is the attendant focus of DLCD for changes based on State Land Use Goals and Guidelines.

My home is located in a subdivision platted many years before the advent of Senate Bill 100. When I purchased my home, the intended use of the property was clear. In addition to the underlying RS zone, the developer established CC&R's that prohibit a second dwelling unit on a platted lot.

Since that time I have seen the pallet of rules governing development, but not primary use, in the RS zone change with the times. Perhaps the greatest move was reducing the minimum lot size from 6,000 sq ft to 4,000. Later on, State law enabled the siting of manufactured dwelling units.

While development standards have been modified, for the most part the primary use within the RS zone is recognized as a single family residence. Yes, duplexes are allowed on corner lots of 7,000 sq ft, or more. And of course, there are provisions for "two-family shared housing." That was the outcome of a previous attempt some years ago to allow ADU's. An attempt that failed.

While the proposal at hand is interesting, development standards do not the mask change and increase in activity enabled by allowing two dwellings on a single lot. That includes traffic generation. There seems to be a total disconnect relative to the City's interest in recent years regarding on-site parking in RS. There has been a recent change to require a double garage for every dwelling unit. No on-site parking

accommodation at all is proposed for an ADU, whereas a traditional duplex would be bound to on-site parking requirements.

As for accommodating more housing and housing density, I suggest Salem look at the history of Boulder, CO in this regard. Boulder, a university city of over 100,000 population, has accommodated ADU's for more than 30 years. As of 2012, the city had 186 ADU's. To me, it is worth pondering whether 6 or so additional DU's [dwelling units] per year is of real consequence particularly when the potential disruptive impacts on established residential patterns is seriously considered.

Should the ADU proposal proceed, it would be appropriate to have measurable objectives to evaluate over time. Based on the outcomes, revaluation would provide the basis for refinement or repeal. I recall the "innovative provisions" of the IRD, Increased Residential Density subdivision of the 1980's, with narrow streets and reduced parking. Upon evaluating actual results, the provisions were repealed.

Yes, conditions change. When I bought my home in Salem, I was within 300 feet of the Cherriot stop I used to get to work. Today, I am in the same house, 1.4 miles from the nearest Cherriot, with a 400 foot total difference in vertical elevation. It's apparent to me takes that multiple factors are necessary to support denser development, and my particular neighborhood is not a good fit for the ADU approach.

Sincerely yours,



Roger J. Budke

3290 Sumac Drive S
Salem, OR 97302

cc: Lisa Anderson-Ogilvie, AICP
Eunice Kim, Project Manager