

Equitable Housing Input

My name is Ray Crisp. I have lived in Oregon City for forty-nine years. I have been building houses for thirty. Mostly in Oregon City and Canby, also in Happy Valley. My company has built twenty-four units of Townhouses in the last decade in Oregon City and Canby. We own twelve rental units. That is my resume. We have never done multi-family or commercial so I have no input on that. I have read the proposed code changes and have some ideas I would like for you to consider. JAN14 2:34PM

Ch 17.10 Medium Density- Townhomes (single family attached) in the R3.5 zone, for example, require a 2500 sq. ft. lot minimum. Yet the lots are only required to be 20' wide. If then, the lot for an inside unit is 20' wide, then to achieve min. 2500 sq. ft. requirement, the lot must be 125' deep. I see that as somewhat unnecessary and wonder if it was intentional.

The proposed code allows for up to six units in any one structure. There is one problem that I have noticed with many of the townhome units built in O.C. that you might want to address. On the inside units, unless there is an alley behind (which most don't) there is no access to the back of the unit except through the front door. That means, for example, if you wanted to repair your siding (or mow your lawn), all of the materials and labor would have to come through the front

door, down the hall, through the living room, dining room and out the back door. It would be good to require some sort of easement for access to the inside units back yard.

Ch 17.16.060 b. Allows for a min. of (2) off-street parking spaces total for either a 3-plex or a 4-plex. Two parking spaces! It would be of poor judgement to allow for such inadequate parking in any neighborhood. In Oregon City there are two things that every residence absolutely requires. One is a place for the dog to poop, the other is a place to park cars. I know this from being a landlord. If those things are not provided then an ongoing tension resides in the neighborhood, quality of everyday life is diminished, along with the neighborhood, seriously. Oregon City is, for the most part, a bedroom community. Most people who live here need to commute to work elsewhere. Currently (in 2019) public transportation is not sufficient to adequately support this suburban community. I don't expect that to change any time soon. When it does then adjust the code at that time. Please change this mistake before someone actually has the lack of incite to implement it.

Ch 17.20.010 ADU's- The current proposal would allow for one ADU a max. of 800 sq. ft. I would propose that you consider allowing up to four attached units separate from the main dwelling. That is, provided that all other criteria is met regarding setbacks, parking, etc... The max. size of unit could

vary from: 1 unit @ 800 sq. ft. (as proposed), 2 units @ 600 sq. ft. each, 3 units @ 500 sq. ft. each, 4 units @ 400 sq. ft. each. This proposal could be ideal for some of the many existing oversized lots in town where, based on existing (overwhelming) development criteria, would be too expensive to develop otherwise. Make it a Type 1 Land Use Application and keep it simple.

Ch 17.20.020 Cluster Housing- The current proposal would allow for flag lots. It then refers to CH 16.08.050 A-F (the section on flag lots) where the new and improved width of the flag pole is 10'. That, of course, wouldn't be very practical if you had twelve cluster units each needing a 10' wide pole. Somebody should take a look at the flag pole criteria to see if a modification is in order in regards to cluster housing.

The other thing about cluster housing, in order to make it work, the SDC fees would need to be reduced based on increased density and reduced unit size. Getting slammed with the full residential SDC fee would make the cluster housing option unworkable.

That is the extent of my input for now.

Ray Crisp

President, Crisp Homes