

# Salem Multifamily Housing Design Review Code Update

## Draft Code Update Recommendations

### Task #2 Deliverable

To: Eunice Kim, City of Salem  
Laura Buhl, DLCD

From: Heather Austin, 3J Consulting  
Elizabeth Decker, JET Planning

Date: February 25, 2019

---

#### **Chapters of the Salem Unified Development Code Proposed for Update**

- Chapter 112- Measurements
- Chapter 250- Adjustments
- Chapter 400- Use Classifications
- Chapter 513- RM-I Multiple Family Residential
- Chapter 514- RM-II Multiple Family Residential
- Chapter 515- RH Multiple Family High-Rise Residential
- Chapter 520- CN Neighborhood Commercial
- Chapter 521- CO Commercial Office
- Chapter 522- CR Retail Commercial
- Chapter 523- CG General Commercial
- Chapter 525- WSCB West Salem Central Business District
- Chapter 631- Compact Development Overlay
- Chapter 702- Multiple Family Design Review Guidelines and Standards
- Chapter 806- Off-Street Parking, Loading, and Driveways

#### **Chapter 112- Measurements**

Existing: For density calculations, section 112.015 of the code currently rounds all fractions up to the next whole number, regardless of the fraction.

Proposed: Revise Section 112.015 to state, “Any density computation that yields a fraction of less than 0.5 shall be rounded down to the nearest whole number and any computation that yields a fraction of 0.5 or greater shall be rounded up to the next nearest whole number.”

Analysis: This was identified by staff as a needed update. This is consistent with other jurisdictions in Oregon and with the language existing in code section 112.025, which applies to fractions in calculations of numerical standards other than density.

#### **Chapter 250- Adjustments**

Existing: Section 250.005(a)(2)(J) currently prohibits “A design review guideline or design review standard” from utilizing the adjustment process.



Proposed: Remove Section 250.005(a)(2)(J) of the Unified Development Code to allow applicants to apply for an adjustment to the design review standards. The adjustment process is a Type II review which includes public notice and a staff-level decision.

Analysis: The design of multifamily developments are generally reviewed through one of two processes today. A Type I administrative review without public notice or public hearing is utilized when a proposal can meet all (60+) design review standards. If a proposal cannot meet just one of the design review standards, it must be reviewed by the Planning Commission in a public hearing, utilizing the design review guidelines.

The City has a Type II administrative review process with public notice but without a public hearing, as identified in Section 250.005; however, design standards are currently prohibited from being adjusted. The City could utilize the existing adjustment process to review departures from the multiple family design review standards, rather than requiring compliance with the design guidelines through a Type III review. This Type II review would include public notice, allowing neighboring property owners and interested parties a chance to submit public testimony on the proposed adjustment.

#### **Chapter 400- Use Classifications**

Existing: “Residential” Classification includes “Household Living” category, divided into three subsets: single family, two family and multiple family.

Proposed: Add three family and four family to the subsets of the “Household Living” category. Add characteristics, examples and exceptions for three family and four family to Sec. 400.030. - Household living and revise multiple family to be 5 or more units.

Analysis: Differentiate between three family and four family and multiple family uses.

#### **Chapter 513- RM-I Multiple Family Residential**

#### **Chapter 514- RM-II Multiple Family Residential**

#### **Chapter 515- RH Multiple Family High-Rise Residential**

#### **Chapter 520- CN Neighborhood Commercial**

#### **Chapter 521- CO Commercial Office**

#### **Chapter 522- CR Retail Commercial**

#### **Chapter 523- CG General Commercial**

#### **Chapter 525- WSCB West Salem Central Business District**

Existing: Each of these chapters permits “single family”, “two family” and “multiple family” developments, either outright or subject to certain limitations, and applies lot coverage, setbacks and height standards. The Lot Coverage standards for these base zones are: 50% (RM-I, RM-II and CN), 60% (CO) and No Max. (RH, CR, CG, WSCB).

Proposed: Add “three family” and “four family” uses as a separate use category, consistent with the changes proposed to Chapter 400, to all applicable tables, including “uses”, “dwelling unit density”, “setbacks” and “lot coverage; height” in each of the multiple family residential and commercial zones identified above.

Increase the maximum lot coverage standard in RM-I and RM-II to 60%.

No changes are recommended to the maximum height in these zones.

Analysis: The zoning designations identified above currently permit, either outright or subject to certain limitations, “single family”, “two family” and “multiple family” uses and provide development standards for each. Based on staff and project team analysis and stakeholder feedback, three family and four family residential developments should be held to the same standards as single family and two family developments, such as building height, setbacks and lot coverage. In addition, three family and four family uses would have minimum requirements for building orientation (facing a street or common open space) and roof pitch. This could potentially be accomplished via the special use provisions of Chapter 700. The current requirement that three family and four family developments must meet multifamily design standards, such as inclusion of a parking lot, has the undesirable result of making these small residential developments stand out from existing neighborhoods, particularly when adjacent to RA or RS-zoned sites. Development of three family and four family projects in Salem has been limited in part due to the application of the design review standards and guidelines.

The current lot coverage standards for the RM-I and RM-II zones of 50% may limit the amount of housing provided on a site. An increase in the lot coverage maximum for these two zones would be compatible with the existing standard in the CO zone and the proposed reductions in off-street parking and on-site open space, freeing up additional site area to be used for residential development.

There were some concerns voiced about the impact of multistory multiple family projects adjacent to single-family development; however, no reduction to the height limits (currently 50 feet in the RM-II, CR and CO zones) is recommended. Instead, changes to the setbacks and buffering options are recommended to manage height transitions between abutting properties.

### **Chapter 631- Compact Development Overlay Zone**

Existing: Overlay tool used to establish development standards to promote increased density infill development on vacant and underutilized Single Family Residential (RS) zoned land, in the form of a variety of housing types and in a manner that is consistent with, and conforms to, the established character of existing neighborhoods.

Proposed: The compact development overlay zone may need to be revised or replaced with a new zone, particularly regarding the development of three family and four family projects, and multifamily projects with 5 to 12 dwelling units.

Analysis: The Compact Development Overlay Zone is meant to provide flexibility but is rarely utilized. The overlay zone should be revised or replaced so that it aligns with the other proposed changes related to multifamily development. This could reduce barriers to infill housing development.

### **Chapter 702- Multiple Family Design Review Guidelines and Standards**

Existing: The City’s multifamily design standards and guidelines consider open space, landscaping, crime prevention through environmental design, parking lot design, site access, circulation, building mass, façade design, and recycling. The 60+ design review standards and corresponding guidelines result in a



cumbersome review process for proposed multifamily developments. In general, little distinction is drawn between small (3 unit) developments and very large (100+ unit developments).

Proposed: Substantial changes are needed to Chapter 702 to implement changes to the way multifamily developments are reviewed and constructed in the City of Salem. Redundancies between the standards of Chapter 702 and elsewhere in the Code will be addressed. Recommended changes to this chapter include (but are not limited to):

- Delete the discretionary design review guidelines
- Exempt three family and four family structures from compliance with the multiple family design standards
- Limit the multifamily design review standards applicable to 5-12 unit multifamily projects, including provisions that would facilitate bungalow court or cottage cluster style developments. These limited design review standards may include:
  - A reduced per-unit requirement for off-street parking (based on the limited on-street parking impact smaller developments would have on the surrounding neighborhood)
  - A reduction in the minimum setbacks in exchange for a lower height limit
  - Requiring an entryway or courtyard facing the street, and some architectural details like window coverage and trim.
  - Potentially a shorter maximum building length (not 150 ft) and less roof line without interruption (less than 100 ft)
- Revise the open space requirements to eliminate individual requirements for common open space, private open space and children’s play areas and replace with a single standard for open space of 30% of an overall site provided through any mix of those elements, and add indoor or covered open space
- For developments providing more than 20 dwelling units, require a minimum of 20% of residential units to have private open space
- Provide a 50% reduction in the on-site open space requirement if the site is within a one-quarter mile radius of a public park
- Reduce the minimum parking lot planter bay width from 18-feet to 9-feet consistent with the width of a standard parking space (Chapter 806- Off-Street Parking, Loading and Driveways requires a 5-foot minimum parking lot planter width)
- Remove requirement for spacing of 10-feet between pathways and dwelling
- Retain existing setback standards to reflect RM-I and RM-II setbacks where abutting RA and RS-zoned property (requiring landscaping to a C standard per Code Section 807.015):
  - 14-ft minimum for 1 story
  - 20-ft for 2- or more
  - 1:1 ratio of setback to building height, so the setback for a 50-foot building is 50 feet
- Setback reductions may be earned through additional buffering, including a mixture of trees, shrubs, groundcover and a minimum 6-foot-tall fence or wall
- No changes are proposed to building height requirements
- Balconies are not permitted overlooking property zoned RA or RS
- Refine façade and building design standards, clarifying the requirement to provide vertical and horizontal articulation. Language may include (this is subject to further refinement between staff and the consultant team):

Articulation Requirement. To preclude large expanses of uninterrupted wall surfaces, exterior elevations of buildings shall incorporate design features such as offsets, projections, balconies, bays, windows, entries, porches, porticos, or similar elements.

1. Horizontal Surface. At least 2 of the design features outlined above shall be incorporated along the horizontal face (side to side) of the structure, to be repeated at intervals of no more than 40 feet.
  2. Vertical Surface. At least 2 of the design features outlined above shall be incorporated along the vertical face (top to bottom) of the structure, to be repeated at intervals of no more than 25 feet.
  3. Every two attached dwelling units must be differentiated from adjacent attached units by at least two of the design features outlined above.
  4. When offsets and projections are used to fulfill articulation requirements, the offset or projection shall vary from other wall surfaces by a minimum of 2 feet. Such changes in plane shall have a minimum width of 6 feet.
  5. Retain requirement that common entrances serve no more than 4 dwelling units and require entrances to be articulated.
  6. Revise roof requirement to keep the maximum horizontal length of 100 feet, separated from other horizontal lengths by either an elevation difference of at least 4 feet or a chimney.
- Simplify recycling standards to only require protection against environmental elements, such as rain, and reference standards in Section 800.055 that address solid waste areas.

Analysis: The design review guidelines will no longer be necessary or useful based on the code changes proposed to Chapter 250, allowing adjustments to the design review standards. Three family and four family developments will be exempted from the design review standards, as discussed previously. Proposed changes to open space, parking, setbacks, façade and building design, and recycling standards are balanced between the need to reduce barriers to multifamily development and the need to limit the impact of the project on adjacent properties.

### **Chapter 806- Off-Street Parking, Loading, and Driveways**

Existing: The code currently requires two (2) off-street parking spaces for three family dwellings and one and one-half (1.5) off-street parking spaces for all other multiple family developments.

Proposed: The minimum number of required parking spaces for two family, three family, four family and multiple family developments with 5-12 dwelling units and regulated affordable housing of any type is 1 space per dwelling unit. The minimum number of required parking spaces for multiple family developments with greater than 12 dwelling units is based on the unit type: 1 per dwelling unit for SRO, studio and one-bedroom units, 1.5 per dwelling unit for two- or more bedroom units.

Credits to the required minimum number of off-street parking spaces are available for multiple family housing projects for: on-street parking, location near the core transit network and provision of shared cars or on-site shuttle service. Total credits could not exceed a 25% reduction in required off-street parking.

Analysis: The on-street parking requirements have been identified as one of the larger impediments to building multifamily housing in Salem, particularly small- and medium-sized developments. Parking is also

identified by neighborhood associations as being one of the major issues with multifamily developments, both unattractive parking lots on the development site and spillover parking into the neighborhoods. The proposed code changes strive to balance the need to provide a reasonable amount of parking on-site (both to serve the development's residents and to limit impacts on the surrounding neighborhood) with the need to reduce barriers to providing multifamily housing.

**Next Steps:**

The project team will present these draft recommendations to the city at a public workshop on February 27, 2019. Feedback received from this outreach effort will guide further refinement of these recommendations. Another public meeting will then be scheduled to present the refined recommendations.

