

DATE: 8 July, 2020

TO : Our Salem Zoning Subcommittee

Subject: Summary of Zoning Subcommittee Planning ideas to address Reducing Greenhouse Emissions through changes to Salem Zoning Code.

I can understand how the concept to reduce green house emissions seems like a noble goal. We imagine it will some how save the planet. I would just ask:

1. What do you believe can be accomplished?
2. What will your result be for the actions you contemplate taking?
3. What science do you have that supports the changes proposed will have a measurable effect on the world climate?

That is not what worries me. I understand those are questions you can not answer.

What does worry me is, have you all been sleeping during the Pandemic of 2020?

The risk to communities, infection, occurred where there were concentrations of people. We banned group meetings. We closed down churches and gathering places. We said you could not have more than 6 immediately family members in your home... Thanksgiving, Birthdays, even Funerals were affected.

But now you are "Planning" so that Salem will have multi-story Projects along core networks where thousand of people will be encouraged to live tightly packed together.

This sounds like sending the sick seniors back to the nursing home to live in close proximity to others.

We need to rethink these ideas. The safest environment over the past 18 months proved to be the ability for individuals to get outside and away from large numbers of residents.

Apply scientific know how to this problem so that we have more not less open space. Where we can live not be caged in a Project like they have in major cities.

Not one idea was shared that said "if we want to reduce CO2 in our community lets require more trees be kept on properties. That is a zoning code issue. Let's not let the development of land in Salem be done on treeless lots. Lets require all projects have a carbon assessment of the property and increase the landscape requirements to provide offsets for the carbon being produced. Lets make this happen not only on the new projects but on all of Salem.

If you are serious you need to act so. Packing residents in to smaller and smaller space is just feeding the next pandemic outbreak. Vaccines and lockdowns won't protect us in the hallways of the Projects.

John Shepard
Salem Resident
Ward 4

Zachery Cardoso

From: Eunice Kim
Sent: Wednesday, July 14, 2021 9:03 AM
To: Zachery Cardoso; Lisa Anderson-Ogilvie
Subject: FW: Comments on July 8 memo on six zoning options

For the zoning subcommittee

From: Phil Carver <philipcarver@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 14, 2021 8:57 AM
To: Eunice Kim <EKim@cityofsalem.net>
Cc: Alexis Biddle <alexis@friends.org>; Bob Cortright <23cort@gmail.com>; Schepcke Jim <jschepcke@comcast.net>; Laurie Dougherty <lauriedougherty@gmail.com>; Janet Lorenzen <jlorenze@willamette.edu>; Clair Clark <clairclark86@gmail.com>; Roberta A <robertaanne1@gmail.com>
Subject: Comments on July 8 memo on six zoning options

To Zoning Subcommittee members and City staff

These are comments on behalf of 350 Salem.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide oral and written comments on the Staff Memo of July 8 related to the six zoning proposals to reduce carbon dioxide emissions from vehicle use. 350 Salem appreciates the efforts by staff and subcommittee members. We agree with most ideas summarized in the memo. We recognize that some aspects (such as requiring residential units in all multi-use developments) proved impractical. Still, we are disappointed in a few aspects of the proposal. Below we outline where we agree with the staff memo and where the proposals are not consistent with the urgency of reducing emissions. Recent unprecedented wildfires and heat waves result directly from greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. All proposals should be consistent with the City Council adopted goals of large near-term reductions of GHG emissions.

1. Maximum height in the proposed Mixed Use-III (MU-III) zone

350 Salem supports a 70 foot high limit on all Mixed Use zones with a 40 foot setback from residential single-family zones. This setback will increase density compared to a 50 foot setback but still will allow for large shade trees. As part of its Climate Action Plan the City should provide incentives for all developers to retain and/or plant large shade trees that are sidewalk-appropriate.

2. Eliminate parking requirements near the Core Network

350 Salem supports this idea. Studies have shown that transit use drops off substantially beyond a quarter mile from transit service. It is important that incentives for dense residential development be concentrated within this distance. The consultant to the Climate Action Plan should assess the emissions impact of eliminating all parking minimums. If the impact is beneficial, that change should be adopted.

3. Increase minimum density requirement in the Multiple Family Residential II (RM-II) and mixed-use zones

350 Salem supports increasing the minimum density in the RM-II zone and the MU-I and MU-II zones from 12 units to 15 units per acre. We propose that a maximum density for RM-II be eliminated within a quarter mile from the core transit network. Instead there should be requirements for adequate setbacks for trees and for open spaces within developments of one acre or more. The height limit for RM-II within a quarter mile of the core transit network should be 70 feet.

4. Require multifamily housing in the mixed-use zones

350 Salem realizes that mandates for housing in mixed use zones are impractical. 350 Salem supports exploring incentives for residential development in mixed use zones within a quarter mile of the core transit network using the construction excise tax, differential system development charges and other financial tools to promote affordable housing.

5. Require minimum density in ALL developments.

350 Salem supports minimum densities for **all** residential developments based on the size of the development. The proposed minimums in the staff memo are inconsistent with the Council's GHG emission goals. For developments of less than two acres the minimum should be 5 dwelling units per gross acre. For two to five acres the minimum should be 6 units per gross acre. For developments over 5 acres the minimum should be 8 units per gross acre. These requirements should apply to all undeveloped properties and conversion of non-residential properties. There should be an exception process for unusual circumstances.

6. Establish a minimum density in the RS zone near the Core Network

350 Salem supports the proposed 15 unit minimum with a quarter mile of the core transit network. There should **not** be an exception for replacing existing housing, including single-family homes. Exemptions for single family dwellings that are rebuilt or expanded are appropriate. Exemptions for accessory dwelling units should be limited to lots under 5,000 sq. ft. Larger lots are needed for dense residential developments near transit.

Delete the following exemptions:

1. Properties greater than 13,000 square feet that are proposed for a new single-family home, provided the remainder of the property can be divided and can be developed to meet the minimum density
2. Development on a vacant lot or parcel consistent with an approved land division, except tracts identified for future phases

These exemptions are too broad. Instead have a process to allow for exemptions in unusual circumstances.

Thanks again for the opportunity to comment.

Philip H. Carver, Ph.D.
Co-coordinator 350 Salem Oregon

Zachery Cardoso

From: Chane Griggs <chanegriggs@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 14, 2021 3:13 PM
To: Zachery Cardoso
Cc: Lisa Anderson-Ogilvie; Eunice Kim; Shelby Guizar
Subject: Fwd: Neighborhood Hubs

Zachery

Will you share this please with the Commission and also with Councilor Nordyke- since she was referenced in the email?

Chane

Begin forwarded message:

From: Sally K Elmgren <selmgren@comcast.net>
Date: July 14, 2021 at 1:40:34 PM PDT
To: chanegriggs@gmail.com
Subject: Neighborhood Hubs

Chane, Sally and Dave Elmgren here.

I am wanting too talk to you about the rezoning in neighborhoods to form "hubs". We live in Laurel Springs, as you might know. We have been here since 1977. We and our neighbors heard about this plan after it was in "the plan" and had no prior notice. This is also true for at least two of the lot owners being considered.

Bottom line, MANY neighbors feel as we do. Our neighborhood is thriving with many young families. There are walkers, joggers, bikers, kids playing in yards, etc. The last thing this neighborhood needs is retail. We cannot imagine the rational for allowing this considering the extra traffic, parking, infrastructure, narrow streets, services(garbage, deliveries, etc.)

Apparently our council person is against the hubs as well.

I did listen/watch a recent planning meeting and was struck by the lack of data concerning some of this. It seemed very anecdotal.

The Planning Commission has received many letters from neighbors against the hubs.

Please keep an open mind about this neighborhood change issue.

Thanks,

Sally and Dave Elmgren

593-931-4492

selmgren@comcast.net

1222 Acacia Dr

Sent from my iPhone