

CITY OF SALEM
Written Testimony #1
City Council

555 Liberty St SE
Salem, OR 97301

Monday, November 22, 2021

6:00 PM

Virtual Meeting

3.2a. [21-503](#)

Multiple Unit Housing Tax Incentive Program application by DD Salem Center Two, LLC seeking a 10-year property tax exemption for a 157-unit apartment development located at 420 Center Street NE.

Ward(s): Ward 1

Councilor(s): Stapleton

Neighborhood(s): CANDO

Result Area(s): Strong and Diverse Economy; Welcoming and Livable Community.

Recommendation:

(1) Adopt Resolution No. 2021-46 approving an application by DD Salem Center Two, LLC for tax exemption under the City's Multiple Unit Housing Tax Incentive Program; and

(2) Direct staff to make a request to boards of other taxing districts to adopt a resolution agreeing with the policy of providing a tax exemption for the project, therefore exempting the multiple family residential portion of the project's full property tax liability.

Attachments: [Resolution No. 2021-46](#)

[Exhibit A to Resolution No. 2021-46](#)

[Exhibit B to Resolution No. 2021-46](#)

[Core Area Map](#)

[Public Comment received by 2:30 p.m. 11-22-2021.pdf](#)

Add - Written Testimony.

3.2b. [21-506](#)

Multiple Unit Housing Tax Incentive Program application by SAMAX, LLC seeking a 10-year property tax exemption for a 2-unit apartment development located at 227-229 Commercial Street NE.

Ward(s): Ward 1

Councilor(s): Stapleton

Neighborhood(s): CANDO

Result Area(s): Strong and Diverse Economy; Welcoming and Livable Community.

Recommendation:

(1) Adopt Resolution No. 2021-47 approving an application by SAMAX LLC for tax exemption under the City's Multiple Unit Housing Tax Incentive Program; and

(2) Direct staff to make a request to boards of other taxing districts to adopt a resolution agreeing with the policy of providing a tax exemption for the project, therefore exempting the multiple family residential portion of the project's full property tax liability

Attachments: [Resolution No. 2021-47](#)[Exhibit A to Resolution No. 2021-47](#)[Exhibit B to Resolution No. 2021-47](#)[Core Area Map](#)[Public Comment received by 2:30 p.m. 11-22-2021.pdf](#)*Add - Written Testimony.***4.c.** [21-518](#) Adoption of new City Council ward boundaries.

Ward(s): All Wards

Councilor(s): All Councilors

Neighborhood(s): All Neighborhoods

Result Area(s): Good Governance

Recommendation: Select one of the three alternative ward boundary scenarios.**Attachments:** [Alternative 1 Ward Boundary Map](#)[Alternative 2 Ward Boundary Map](#)[Alternative 3 Ward Boundary Map](#)[Demographic Tables for Alternative Ward Boundary Maps](#)[Public Testimony.pdf](#)[Public Comment received by 2:30 p.m. 11-22-2021y.pdf](#)*Add - Written Testimony.***7.1a.** [21-484](#) 2021 Unified Development Code Update

Ward(s): All Wards

Councilor(s): All Councilors

Neighborhood(s): All Neighborhoods

Result Area(s): Good Governance; Natural Environment Stewardship;
Welcoming and Livable Community**Recommendation:** Conduct a public hearing on Ordinance Bill No. 13-21 and advance to second reading.**Attachments:** [1 - Planning Commission Recommendation \(October 5, 2021\)](#)[2 - Summary of Proposed Amendments](#)[ORDINANCE BILL NO 13-21](#)[Ordinance Exhibit A](#)[Ordinance Exhibit B](#)[Ordinance Exhibit C](#)[4 - Comments from Church at the Park](#)[5 - Legislative Zone Change Map](#)[6 - Public Testimony](#)[Public Comment received by 2:30 p.m. 11-22-2021pdf](#)*Add - Written Testimony.*

From: noreply@cityofsalem.net on behalf of jaredreno@gmail.com
To: [citycouncil](#)
Subject: Contact City Council
Date: Saturday, November 20, 2021 6:33:45 AM
Attachments: [ATT00001.bin](#)

| | |
|------------|---|
| Your Name | Jared Reno |
| Your Email | jaredreno@gmail.com |
| Your Phone | 5035453155 |
| Street | 2475 Walker Rd Ne |
| City | Salem |
| State | OR |
| Zip | 97305 |
| Message | <p>I read in the Journal that there is consideration for tax incentives for multi-family units. I ask that you not grant these incentives. Our community depends on everyone paying their fair share of property taxes. When groups or organizations are given exemptions we don't see those exemptions trickle down into the community in the form of lower rents, or higher employment. Additionally, a firm that can build a multi-million dollar project is arguably less in need of any sort of exemptions. Finally, a 10 year exemption, if granted, is too long. It allows the developer to sell the property to a larger firm and provide them with that same status. If one is granted, it should be a one year maximum or until the project is completed. Overall, providing any tax incentives to a firm or business is a failure of this council to do what is necessary for the populus. There is no data to show the companies given tax incentives provide any MORE jobs to the economy to offset the tax loss. They do not provide lower rents when considering housing. Rax incentives allow business to build on the backs of the working population in Salem. Do not allow this Council to fail in its job to protect our citizens' interests.</p> |

This email was generated by the dynamic web forms contact us form on 11/20/2021.

From: noreply@cityofsalem.net on behalf of jaredreno@gmail.com
To: [citycouncil](#)
Subject: Contact City Council
Date: Saturday, November 20, 2021 6:33:45 AM
Attachments: [ATT00001.bin](#)

| | |
|------------|---|
| Your Name | Jared Reno |
| Your Email | jaredreno@gmail.com |
| Your Phone | 5035453155 |
| Street | 2475 Walker Rd Ne |
| City | Salem |
| State | OR |
| Zip | 97305 |
| Message | <p>I read in the Journal that there is consideration for tax incentives for multi-family units. I ask that you not grant these incentives. Our community depends on everyone paying their fair share of property taxes. When groups or organizations are given exemptions we don't see those exemptions trickle down into the community in the form of lower rents, or higher employment. Additionally, a firm that can build a multi-million dollar project is arguably less in need of any sort of exemptions. Finally, a 10 year exemption, if granted, is too long. It allows the developer to sell the property to a larger firm and provide them with that same status. If one is granted, it should be a one year maximum or until the project is completed. Overall, providing any tax incentives to a firm or business is a failure of this council to do what is necessary for the populus. There is no data to show the companies given tax incentives provide any MORE jobs to the economy to offset the tax loss. They do not provide lower rents when considering housing. Rax incentives allow business to build on the backs of the working population in Salem. Do not allow this Council to fail in its job to protect our citizens' interests.</p> |

This email was generated by the dynamic web forms contact us form on 11/20/2021.

From: [Nick Fortey](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Cc: [Lisa Anderson-Ogilvie](#); [Community Development](#)
Subject: Comments on City Council Meeting Agenda Item 4.c 11/22/21
Date: Monday, November 22, 2021 11:09:36 AM

Dear Mayor and City Councilors,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the realignment of Ward boundaries in Salem. As a longtime resident of West Salem, my strongest support would be for Option 3, since that both provides for anticipated growth in West Salem and, more important, provides a far greater adherence to the general intent of the realignment of "not dividing communities of common interest" and "using existing or geographic boundaries." Option 3 does this by focusing on creating neighborhood continuity around Eola Drive. In contrast, Option 1 provides, for me, the greatest geographic upset and severs my local community. If this Option 1 is chosen I ask that the boundaries be redrawn (affecting far less than 100 households) to include College Drive, Crozier and Turnage Streets and extend to Stoneway and Kaley to incorporate a community centered around College Heights Park. Option 2 provides a more contiguous Eola "neighborhood" but I feel this creates an "island" south of Eola Drive that omits connectivity of this sector to the rest of West Salem. In conclusion, Option 3 is preferred.

Thank you

Nick Fortey
West Salem resident

From: [E. Easterly](#)
To: [citycouncil](#); [Bryce Bishop](#)
Subject: Agenda Item #7.1a
Date: Monday, November 22, 2021 7:21:16 AM

Mr. Mayor and Council Members:

I encourage you to invite Mr. Bishop and the Planning Department to carefully consider the obligations contained the LUBA decision: Johnson v Jefferson County (2008), and the potential impact of that decision has on the middle housing portions of the proposed UDC update scheduled for a public hearing on December 6th. In summary, that decision requires local governments to address changes to Goal 5 policies in the local comprehensive plan each time there is an amendment to a land use regulation that modifies a significant Goal 5 resource.

“... a PAPA “would affect a Goal 5 resource” if it “amends a * * * portion of an acknowledged plan or land use regulation [that was] adopted in order to protect a significant Goal 5 resource.”

The proposed changes to the Salem UDC expands riparian corridor widths for middle housing developments and establishes a zero setback for dwellings in riparian corridors in single family zones obligate the City to update its Goal 5 Salem Area Comprehensive Plan policies in parallel with the adoption of the proposed UDC updates.

How the Council and City chooses to address this issue is a topic I will raise during the December 6th public hearing.

Sincerely,

E.M. Easterly
775 Fir Gardens St. NW
Salem, OR 97304