

## Zachery Cardoso

---

**From:** Eunice Kim  
**Sent:** Monday, July 12, 2021 8:34 AM  
**To:** Zachery Cardoso  
**Cc:** Lisa Anderson-Ogilvie  
**Subject:** FW: Comments for Our Salem Zoning Subcommittee meeting on 7/15

For the zoning subcommittee

**From:** Marissa Theve <marissatheve@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, July 10, 2021 10:56 AM  
**To:** Eunice Kim <EKim@cityofsalem.net>  
**Subject:** Comments for Our Salem Zoning Subcommittee meeting on 7/15

Greetings!

I would like to provide written comments for the 7/15/2021 Our Salem Zoning Subcommittee concerning zoning option #2:

First, I am proud to see Salem progressing towards a denser, greener city. Eliminating parking minimums is a simple way to steer the city in that direction, for the reasons Cherriots outlined in their letter. Additionally, I will point out that achieving all of the other 5 zoning options will be significantly more difficult if you do not adopt #2. Similarly, the other 5 zoning options which all deal with facilitating denser housing each complement a city with less car-centric planning and more space dedicated to other means of transportation (walking, scooting, rolling, biking, jogging or running, and of course transit). Dictating how much parking a home or businesses must pave and maintain has predictably resulted in large unnecessary swaths of blacktop over fertile Willamette Valley soil and contributed to the housing shortage, especially affordable housing, we now face. You may refer to my written and oral comments from the June 21st meeting for references linking parking minimums to housing inequity and homelessness. Subcommittee members, I encourage you to take the time to educate yourselves on all the negative repercussions minimum parking requirements has for growing cities like ours. Weigh those honestly against the minimal benefits car owners perceive: protecting public on-street parking for their own use.

Removing parking minimums is the right thing to do for Our Salem now and Our Salem tomorrow.

Marissa Theve  
Gaines Street NE  
Salem, OR 97301

--

Marissa Theve  
Pronouns: she/her/hers

## Zachery Cardoso

---

**From:** Eunice Kim  
**Sent:** Monday, July 12, 2021 8:36 AM  
**To:** Zachery Cardoso  
**Cc:** Lisa Anderson-Ogilvie  
**Subject:** FW: Zoning subcommittee

For the zoning subcommittee

---

**From:** lmgb@earthlink.net <lmgb@earthlink.net>  
**Sent:** Sunday, July 11, 2021 2:10 PM  
**To:** Eunice Kim <EKim@cityofsalem.net>  
**Subject:** re: Zoning subcommittee

Unfortunately, we have not listened to all of the public hearings. However, we find one major flaw regarding Greenhouse Gas Emissions: 1) changing our tree ordinance to preserve 80-90% of our present tree canopy. Nothing absorbs carbon dioxide better than trees. We have to stop developer from almost clear cutting all trees off vacant property and we need to plant more trees in the city. Less cement more trees. No one seems to be addressing the loss of our tree canopy. Thank you.

-----  
Lora Meisner & Glenn Baly  
1347 Spyglass Court SE  
Salem, OR 97306  
503-588-6924

## Zachery Cardoso

---

**From:** Eunice Kim  
**Sent:** Monday, July 12, 2021 8:41 AM  
**To:** Zachery Cardoso  
**Cc:** Lisa Anderson-Ogilvie  
**Subject:** FW: Comments for Zoning Subcommittee

For the zoning subcommittee

**From:** Jeff Schumacher <jeff.schumacher@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 12, 2021 7:47 AM  
**To:** Eunice Kim <EKim@cityofsalem.net>  
**Subject:** Comments for Zoning Subcommittee

Hello Eunice,

I am hoping my comments below can be forward to the Zoning Subcommittee for consideration at the July 15th meeting. If I should forward them to someone else please advise.

Thank you,  
Jeff

-----

In general I'm in favor of higher density along our major transportation corridors just because it presents good opportunities for mass transit. But my definition of higher density isn't the same as the city's definition. If a single family home on a large lot is a "1" on the density scale and the new seventy foot mixed use building at State and Commercial downtown is a "10" I am interested in everything from 3 to 7.

The more I hear city staff discuss this stuff the more I believe our zoning should be greatly simplified. So implement minimum and maximum housing density limits that both increase our current minimums and decrease our current maximums. I do worry that we are heading towards greater stratification in our housing stock where we will end up with large housing developments on corridors but very little if any redevelopment of single family homes into three or four housing units.

This idea that the Zoning Subcommittee is going "bold" strikes me as ridiculous. When I hear Subcommittee members express concern about someone not being able to build their "dream home" because it may not meet a new minimum density, that is hardly a bold sentiment. Going bold requires an acknowledgment that we live within an urban growth boundary; with that in mind, we should be doubling or tripling our housing density with all new construction. We shouldn't see new 3500 square foot homes on 7000 square foot lots anywhere in this city.

At the same time, we also should stop seeing pods of three story apartment buildings surrounded by surface parking lots. Is that really the style of multifamily housing we all want? Or do we just accept that is the best we as a city can do?

I think we need medium density housing across the board with the higher end of that density along transportation corridors and the lower end of that density everywhere else. I think the Zoning Subcommittee is heading towards an outcome where very low density housing and redevelopment will still be allowed and very high density housing will be allowed in a very small area. And in that small area, we will eventually see a maximization of size limits (when I hear the Zoning Subcommittee being excited about a seventy foot height limit I cringe).

My view is that the city as a whole should bear the brunt of increased density. More density along transportation corridors and less density as we move away from those corridors, but everyone should notice an increase in density.

As a fan of moderate density I'm a little frustrated with where this is headed. It seems like the high density limits (as evidenced by a seventy foot height limit) are just an excuse or trade off for continuing to allow low density stuff elsewhere.

Thanks for your work on these issues and thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Jeff Schumacher  
1945 W Nob Hill St. SE

2966 Dogwood Dr. S.  
Salem, OR 97302  
July 10, 2021

Eunice Kim  
Community Development Department  
City of Salem  
555 Liberty St. S.E., # 305  
Salem, OR 97301

I am submitting this written comment prior to July 14, 2021 for Subcommittee:

My spouse and I live in Laurel Springs Place subdivision, and have enjoyed the peace, tranquility, residential character, and "neighborliness" of this neighborhood for the last quarter century. The plan to have a "neighborhood hub" at the 4 corner lots that border Camellia Dr. S. and Acacia S. is not wanted nor needed.

This established, existing neighborhood should not be negatively impacted by the plan for commercial uses in the middle of our peaceful, residential, close knit neighborhood. Our neighborhood is in close proximity to many commercial properties, thus it is not a hardship to access them.

The neighborhood hub concept is currently in downtown Salem: commercial uses with residential housing above/in the midst of downtown. Unfortunately, our downtown core has been overwhelmed by the trash, human filth, debris, shopping carts and tents of the homeless/vagrant population. I suggest that the downtown be made livable by addressing those issues so folks who want the neighborhood hub concept can enjoy it there. If our downtown was made safe, clean, and welcoming again, many of us would be drawn there for activities; rather than repelled, as it is currently. This mix of commercial and residential uses can be instituted in new subdivisions and new developments, so that folks may be free to choose that neighborhood and lifestyle.

Please do not force this neighborhood concept upon established, older, pre-existing neighborhoods, such as mine.

I appreciate your consideration in this matter.

Thank you.



Ernest J. Heuberger  
503-375-6270