

**From:** [Roger Bell](#)  
**To:** [CityRecorder](#)  
**Subject:** Salem City Council Meeting 27 Nov 2023 Comments regarding Ord Bill 7-23, File # 23-449  
**Date:** Sunday, November 26, 2023 2:55:01 PM

---

From: Roger Bell  
Ward 4  
1386 Rees Hill Rd SE  
Salem, Oregon

Subject: Comments and requested action on Ordinance Bill No. 7-23

To: Salem City Council

Referring to the Oregon Senate, A-Engrossed HB 3395, including House Amendments dated June 13, references to Single Room Occupancy start on page 25, line 4 and continue thru to page 27, line 13.

There are four Sections (Section 16, 17, 18 and 19) within the Single Room Occupancy part of HB3395.

Section 16 (lines 6 and 7) is legalese for adding Section 17 and ORS 197.758 to ORS 197.286 to 197.314.

Section 17 (lines 8 thru 18) has two primary paragraphs.

Paragraph (1) defines Single Room Occupancy.

Paragraph (2) - this is where I believe the Planning Commission made an overreach reading HB3395. HB3395 says "Within an urban growth boundary, each local government shall allow the development of a single room occupancy:"

Paragraph (2) has 2 subparagraphs.

Subparagraph (a) of paragraph 2 says:

"With up to six units on each lot or parcel zoned to allow for development of a detached single-family dwelling; and"

Subparagraph (b) of paragraph 2 says:

"With the number of units consistent with the density standards of a lot or parcel zoned to allow for the development of residential dwellings with five or more units."

Section 18 (page 25 line 19 thru page 26 line 25) defines needed housing to include single room occupancy as defined in Section 17. The bulk of the Section is dedicated to procedures involving Metro (greater Portland area).

Section 19 (page 26 line 26 thru page 27 line 13) includes single room occupancy in the required 20-year planning period in effect when the city's housing capacity is determined.

Based on the proposed changes to the SRC that are put forward by the Planning Commission in Ordinance Bill No. 7-23 it appears that paragraph (2) subparagraph (a) of HB3395 was interpreted to mean that all areas currently zoned to allow single family dwellings **must** allow single room occupancy. That is not true. Salem's current zoning meets the requirements of Section 17 paragraph 2 – the primary paragraph. Within the areas currently zoned to allow single room occupancy the requirements of subparagraphs (a) and (b) are also met.

In support of my contention, I refer you to SRC Title X (UDC), Chapter 400, Use Classification. Section 400.035 is where the details of Group Living are spelled out. In paragraph (a) Room and Board, subparagraph (2) Examples, is where single room occupancy is referred to as an example of Room and Board within the Group Living

Use classification.

Furthermore, SRC Title X (UDC) currently has 15 Use Tables in the 500 Chapters that permit Group Living per the current Chapter 400, Sec 400.035.

Chapter 513 permits Single Family and Room and Board.

Chapter 514 permits Single Family and Room and Board.

Chapter 515 permits Single Family and Room and Board.

Chapter 521 permits Single Family and Room and Board.

Chapter 522 permits Single Family and Room and Board.

Chapter 523 permits Single Family and Room and Board.

Chapter 524 permits Single Family and Room and Board.

Chapter 525 permits Single Family and Room and Board.

Chapter 530 permits Single Family and Room and Board within the AU and VC.

Chapter 534 permits Single Family and Room and Board.

Chapter 535 permits Single Family and Room and Board.

Chapter 536 permits Single Family and Room and Board.

Chapter 537 permits Single Family and Room and Board.

Chapter 545 permits Single Family and Room and Board.

Chapter 551 permits Single Family and Room and Board.

Based on the information provided, I request that the city council refer City Ordinance Bill 7-23 back to the Planning Commission for rewriting; directing the removal of changes to the SRC that permit single room occupancy within the SRC Title X Chapters 510, 511, 531, 532 and 533. These proposed changes do not meet the criteria in SRC 110.085(b)(1) requiring that an amendment to the UDC is in the best interest of the public health, safety, and welfare of the City. These changes would be detrimental to neighborhoods where Room and Board is not permitted per the current SRC Title X. Crime would go up, safety of citizens would be diminished, property values would decrease, tax revenue would decrease, citizen stability would decrease. The only upside would be for investors and the vagrant population.