

CITY OF KEIZER MISSION STATEMENT
***KEEP CITY GOVERNMENT COSTS AND SERVICES TO A MINIMUM BY PROVIDING CITY
SERVICES TO THE COMMUNITY IN A COORDINATED, EFFICIENT AND LEAST COST FASHION***

A G E N D A

KEIZER CITY COUNCIL/PLANNING COMMISSION
SPECIAL SESSION

Tuesday, November 13, 2007

12:00 p.m. (Noon)

Robert L. Simon Council Chambers

Keizer City Hall

Keizer, Oregon 97303

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ROLL CALL

3. PUBLIC TESTIMONY

This time is provided for citizens to address the Council/Civic Center Task Force on matters not scheduled on the agenda.

4. DISCUSSION

a. Salem Keizer Transit District – Transit Center

b. City of Keizer Infill Standards

5. OTHER BUSINESS

6. ADJOURNMENT



INFILL WORK SESSION November 13, 2007

The following bulleted items were identified during the City Council / Planning Commission work session on October 8, 2007 as meriting further discussion. It is envisioned that the work session on November 13th will allow for focused discussion on the items listed below, and direction to staff on whether to proceed with revisions to the infill regulations, and what areas should be most considered.

- Compatibility with existing neighborhood
- Parking
- Functionality of access for emergency vehicles
- Opt out clause
- House design considerations
- Dual code requirements
- Minimum density requirements
- Compatibility with surrounding property values
- Street connectivity

1. *Compatibility with existing neighborhood*

Recap - Infill development should be done in a manner without causing significant adverse impacts to existing residential development.

Issue – Complaints are often related to the proximity of new homes to existing homes, size of new homes compared to existing nearby homes, aesthetics of proposed new homes, loss of privacy, size of new lots compared to nearby parcels. While arguably any type of development is capable of producing impacts the key is to find ways to mitigate as many impacts as possible.

Consideration - Require the following for new infill:

- A sight obscuring fence, wall, or hedge be placed along the common property lines with adjacent properties.
- Increase building setbacks depending on the size and height of the structure.
- Increase building design requirements.
- Building massing requirements.
- Increase the lot dimension standards or size of lots served by a private access easement.
- Area used as part of access easement can not be included when calculating either lot dimension or lot area.

2. *Parking*

Recap – New infill development is sometimes perceived as not providing enough parking spaces.

Issue – The issue of lack of parking spaces is directly related to the fact that no parking is permitted within the access easement. In an obscure section of the code is a requirement for 3 parking spaces per lot that is served by an access easement. Tandem parking can be allowed.

Consideration – Private access easement:

- Modify the access easement standards to accommodate parking along one side of the easement or in parking bays.
- Clearly require that each house that is served by a private access easement provide 3 parking spaces.
- Stronger parking enforcement

Public infill streets:

- Adjust threshold on number of lots served by street types.

3. *Functionality for emergency vehicle*

Recap - Infill lots that are served by a private access easement are sometimes seen as not always being adequate for emergency vehicles.

Issue – The issue is that every new infill development should be developed so that emergency vehicles can provide service to the new homes. Currently, not every access easement is required to provide a turn around. This depends on the length of the access easement. For example, access easements less than 150 feet are not required to have a turn around.

Consideration - To improve emergency vehicle operations:

- Require that a turn around is provided on each access easement that serves two or more houses regardless of distance.
- Adjust dimensional standards for turn arounds.

4. *Opt out clause*

Recap – Currently, the infill regulations capture virtually all developments proposals that are less than 2 acres in size.

Issue - There was consensus that there should be a means to allow an applicant to opt out of the requirements and so that the requirements then can be optional and not mandatory for all applications.

Consideration - Allow new subdivisions served by a street which complies with city street standards the option of, in certain cases, “opting out” of the in-fill requirements.

5. *House design considerations*

Recap – In an effort to have new infill development be compatible to nearby residential homes building design is required.

Issue - Building design is within the existing code and the logic perhaps reflects an attempt to have new infill developments be compatible with the existing neighborhood through architectural design. Currently, the infill regulations require that only 2 out of 10 identified architectural features be included in the design of a home. The current standard is ineffective.

In addition, there is the issue associated with the design of homes that have a garage forward of the architectural front of the home. Current regulations require that the garage be flush with the front of the house or be recessed back. The intent of this requirement is to limit the design of new infill homes where the garaged is the predominant feature of the house.

Consideration – Two strategies could be explored:

- Require a greater number of architectural features on new homes.
- Adjust garage setback provisions, or require only on small lots.
- Clarify language governing design setbacks for single car / two car garage setbacks.

6. *Dual code requirements*

Recap – There are differing sections of the development code between infill and non-fill standards and often no clear direction to the infill requirements.

Issue - The significant issue in this item is that there are certain requirements for infill development that area different from non infill development. This can result in problems when property owners or builders only look at one section of the code and skip the infill section.

Consideration – Revise all sections of the zone code to be consistent with changes envisioned as part of the revisions to the Infill Development regulations. These will include:

- Standard building setbacks
- Building design requirements
- Lots size and dimension requirements
- Provide clear references to the requirements in the Infill Development regulations
- Adjust thresholds on types of streets and dimensional requirements.

7. *Minimum density requirements*

Recap – Criticism often is aimed at the perceived dense nature of infill development.

Issue – The zone code contains minimum lot size and minimum density requirements for each zone.

Consideration - Staff is not recommending any changes to the minimum density provisions in the zone code.

8. *Compatibility with surrounding property values*

Recap – A complain of infill is that the new development will impact property values.

Issue - This is a difficult criterion to develop since it would require detailed reports from appraisers as part of the application process and even then would still require planning staff to make judgments.

Consideration - Staff is not recommending any changes that would require this to become a requirement.

9. *Street connectivity*

Recap – Allow for the connection, or extension, of public streets and avoid dead end streets.

Issue - This provision is currently within Section 2.310 (Land Divisions) and is proposed to also be addressed in the update of the city's transportation system plan and so no revisions are proposed at this time.

Consideration – Defer to the Transportation System Plan update process.