



# Planning Commission Agenda

**Development and Public Works Director**  
Anette Spickard , 541-726-3697  
**Current Development Manager:**  
Greg Mott 541-726-3774  
**Management Specialist:**  
Brenda Jones 541.726.3610  
**City Attorney's Office**  
Kristina Schmunk-Krazz

City Hall  
225 Fifth Street  
Springfield, Oregon 97477  
541.726.3610  
Online at [www.springfield-or.gov](http://www.springfield-or.gov)

**Planning Commissioners:**  
Greg James, Chair  
Michael Koivula, Vice Chair  
Nick Nelson  
Tim Vohs  
Sean Dunn  
Andrew Landen  
Troy Sherwood

The meeting location is wheelchair-accessible. For the hearing-impaired, an interpreter can be provided with 48 hours' notice prior to the meeting. For meetings in the Council Meeting Room, a "Personal PA Receiver" for the hearing impaired is available. To arrange for these services, call 541.726.3610.

**Meetings will end prior to 10:00 p.m. unless extended by a vote of the Planning Commission.**

All proceedings before the Planning Commission are recorded.

**October 17, 2017**

**7:00 p.m. Regular Session  
Council Chambers**

**CONVENE AND CALL TO ORDER THE REGULAR SESSION OF THE SPRINGFIELD PLANNING COMMISSION**

**ATTENDANCE:** Chair James \_\_\_\_\_, Vice Chair Koivula \_\_\_\_\_, Nelson \_\_\_\_\_, Vohs \_\_\_\_\_, Dunn \_\_\_\_\_, Landen \_\_\_\_\_, Sherwood \_\_\_\_\_.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO THE REGULAR SESSION AGENDA**

In response to a request by a member of the Planning Commission, staff or applicant; by consensus

**BUSINESS FROM THE AUDIENCE**

Testimony is limited to 3 minutes; testimony may not discuss or otherwise address public hearings appearing on this Regular Session Agenda

**PUBLIC HEARING(S)**

**LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARING –**

**Amendment of the Springfield Development Code Accessory Dwelling Units, Journal No. 811-17-000057-TYP4-**

The City Council has been developing an affordable housing strategy with the goal of increasing the supply and accessibility of housing in Springfield throughout the housing continuum. One of the strategies is to encourage the construction of accessory dwelling units. One way to encourage accessory dwelling units is by revising the development code to make it easier and potentially less expensive to add an accessory dwelling unit.

The proposal is to encourage accessory dwelling units (ADUs) by simplifying the development code requirements and allowing accessory dwelling units not just in the Low Density Residential zoning district but also in the Medium and High Density Residential zoning districts and the Washburne Historic District.

**Staff: Sandy Belson, Comprehensive Planning Manager**  
**60 Minutes**

#### **CONDUCT OF LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE THE PLANNING COMMISSION**

- Chair opens the public hearing
- Staff report
- Testimony in support of the proposal
- Testimony opposed to the proposal
- Testimony neither in support of nor opposed to the proposal
- Questions from the Commission
- Summation by staff
- Consideration of request for continuation of public hearing, extension of written record, or both
- Close or continue public hearing; close or extend written record (continuance or extension by motion)
- Discussion of the proposal including testimony and evidence addressing the applicable approval criteria or other criteria cited in the record as applicable to the proposal; possible questions to staff or public
- Motion to recommend approval, approval with modification or conditions, or recommendation not to adopt the proposal based on the information contained in the staff report, oral and written testimony, and all other evidence submitted into the record
- Chair signs recommendation to the City Council

#### REPORT OF COUNCIL ACTION

#### BUSINESS FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION

- Upcoming Planning Commission meetings, committee assignments, appointments or other business

#### BUSINESS FROM THE DEVELOPMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR

#### ADJOURN REGULAR SESSION OF THE SPRINGFIELD PLANNING COMMISSION

---

**AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY****SPRINGFIELD  
PLANNING COMMISSION**

**Meeting Date:** 10/17/2017  
**Meeting Type:** Regular Meeting  
**Staff Contact/Dept.:** Sandy Belson, DPW  
**Staff Phone No:** 541-7436-7135  
**Estimated Time:** 60 Minutes  
**Council Goals:** Encourage Economic Development and Revitalization through Community Partnerships

---

**ITEM TITLE:** REQUEST FOR AMENDMENTS OF THE SPRINGFIELD DEVELOPMENT CODE FOR ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS, JOURNAL # 811-17-000057-TYP4

---

**ACTION REQUESTED:** Conduct a public hearing on the proposed legislative amendments and consider written and oral testimony along with the staff report prior to forwarding a recommendation to the City Council regarding adoption of language amending the Springfield development code.

---

**ISSUE STATEMENT:** The City Council has been developing an affordable housing strategy with the goal of increasing the supply and accessibility of housing in Springfield throughout the housing continuum. One of the strategies is to encourage the construction of accessory dwelling units. One way to encourage accessory dwelling units is by revising the development code to make it easier and potentially less expensive to add an accessory dwelling unit. The proposal is to encourage accessory dwelling units (ADUs) by simplifying the development code requirements and allowing accessory dwelling units not just in the Low Density Residential zoning district but also in the Medium and High Density Residential zoning districts and the Washburne Historic District.

---

**ATTACHMENTS:**

1. Briefing Memo
2. Order and Recommendation
  - Exhibit A – Staff Report and Findings
  - Exhibit B – Amendments to the Springfield Development Code
  - Exhibit C – Public Comments
  - C1 – Letter from Tim Hilton, Chair of the Springfield Historic Commission, dated Oct. 3, 2017
  - C2 – Open House Comments

---

**DISCUSSION:** The attached code amendments (Exhibit B) were developed based on Council direction and Planning Commission input. The Planning Commission conducted its first work session on the proposed amendments in July. The Commission's second work session in October followed a public Open House on ADUs and a meeting and recommendation from the Historic Commission regarding allowing ADUs in the Washburne Historic District. The code amendments are ready for testimony prior to the Planning Commission forwarding a recommendation to City Council. The public hearing is the opportunity for members of the public to express their support, objections, questions, and concerns regarding the proposed amendments. The Commission will then decide if there is a need to accept additional testimony or for staff to provide additional information for the record. If not, the Commission can deliberate toward a recommendation to the Springfield City Council. The Commission may adopt the code amendments and attached Order as written, recommend limited revisions and forward them to City Council, or direct staff to modify the proposal in response to public comment for Planning Commission review at its meeting on November 7.

---

# MEMORANDUM

City of Springfield

---

Date: October 17, 2017

To: Planning Commission

From: Sandy Belson, Comprehensive Planning Manager

Subject: Request for Amendments of the Springfield Development Code for Accessory Dwelling Units, Journal #811-17-000057-TYP4

---

## ISSUE

The City Council has been developing an affordable housing strategy with the goal of increasing the supply and accessibility of housing in Springfield throughout the housing continuum. One of the strategies is to encourage the construction of accessory dwelling units. One way to encourage accessory dwelling units is by revising the development code to make it easier and potentially less expensive to add an accessory dwelling unit. The proposal is to encourage accessory dwelling units (ADUs) by simplifying the development code requirements and allowing accessory dwelling units not just in the Low Density Residential zoning district but also in the Medium and High Density Residential zoning districts and the Washburne Historic District.

## DIRECTION FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION

The Planning Commission has held two work sessions to review proposed code amendments. At the work session on October 3, the Commission gave direction as follows:

**1. Include the recommendations of the Historic Commission regarding allowing accessory dwelling units within the Washburne Historic District.**

See pages 1 and 2 of Exhibit B for the code amendments that incorporate the recommendations from the Historic Commission. At this point, there has been nothing added to require the property owner to live on-site. The Historic Commission will meet on November 16 to further discuss this question and their recommendation will be provided to the City Council as part of the public record.

**2. Include the requirement for a foundation and other design requirements, as suggested by Commissioner Sean Dunn and agreed to by the Commission.**

In response to some of the Open House comments regarding allowing manufacture homes and towable structures (see Exhibit C2), the Commission discussed potential design standards to make those structures appear permanent and better match the character of single-family dwellings. The requirement for a permanent foundation and other design requirements can be incorporated into the code amendments prior to the Planning Commission taking action on the order and recommendation.

**3. Research other approaches to window regulations for ADUs.**

As requested by the Commission, staff will research other options for design requirements for windows that allow for windows that may be wider than they are tall, but also maintain a residential aesthetic appropriate to Springfield.

**4. Include information about the parking requirements of other cities that permit ADUs in the packet for further consideration.**

In 2016, the Department of Conservation and Development compiled a table comparing the requirements for accessory dwellings of cities throughout Oregon. This table shows that 80 cities allowing ADUs have parking requirements. (Other cities allow ADUs, but do not specifically address parking). Of these, 45 of them require one or more parking spaces on-site, 8 have requirements similar to what is being considered by Springfield, and 18 have requirements that do not require an additional parking space or only require a total of two on-site spaces for both the primary and accessory dwellings and 9 do not have specific parking requirements.

Some other approaches taken by cities similar to what Springfield is considering include the following:

- No off-street parking required if the ADU is added to a site with an existing residence that abuts a street that has a paved width of 28 feet – otherwise an one on-site space is required  
*King City, Oregon City, LaGrande, Aurora (paved width of 18 feet)*
- No off-street parking required if the street frontage is at least 18 feet/20 feet wide unless the ADU is constructed at the same time as the primary dwelling  
*Columbia City (18 feet), St. Helens (20 feet)*
- On-street parking is allowed if existing along the frontage of the lot, or within 100 feet of the front lot line AND no more than 25% of lots in the block will have ADUs.  
*Wilsonville*
- Minimum of two combined spaces for primary dwelling and ADU plus one if no on-street parking abuts the property  
*Veneta*

The Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) in conjunction with the Transportation and Growth Management Program produced “Character-Compatible, Space-Efficient Housing Options for Single-Family Dwelling Neighborhoods” in May 2016. The authors Eli Spevak and Madeline Kovacs of Orange Splot LLC, identify parking requirements that support and limit ADUs on page 47. They also cite DEQ research showing that “because ADUs are extremely rare (Portland, the nation’s ADU ‘leader,’ has them on less than 1% of eligible lots), and because ADU households have fewer cars than other households, ADUs should have virtually no effect on parking conditions on a citywide basis.”<sup>1</sup>

Parking requirements that support ADUs:

- Require no on-site parking beyond what’s required for the primary house
- Waive on-site parking requirement for ADU if site is near transit

Parking requirements that limit ADUs:

- Require one or more additional on-site parking spaces per ADU

<sup>1</sup> Martin Brown, “Accessory Dwelling Units in Portland, OR: Evaluation and interpretation of a survey of ADU owners” (Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, June 2014, <http://accessorydwellings.org/2014/07/09/are-adus-green-housing/>).

### **OTHER CHANGES TO CODE AMENDMENTS**

In on-going staff discussions about the proposed amendments, it became clear that allowing two ADUs in the MDR and HDR zones could be a way to avoid multi-unit design standards in Section 3.2-240 that apply to three or more attached units. Thus, staff added a fourth requirement for ADUs in the MDR and HDR zone that if two ADUs are added to the lot, that at least one of them be required to be detached (see page 4 in Exhibit B).

### **PUBLIC HEARING**

The Planning Commission will hold the public hearing on October 17. Following the hearing, the Commission has the option to continue the public hearing to a date certain, close the hearing but leave the record open, or close the public hearing and the record and proceed to deliberations. The Commission may wait until the November 7 meeting to take final action on the Order and Recommendation to allow staff to incorporate the Planning Commission's recommendations into Exhibits A and B. The changes may include the options for design standards that will be provided by staff as discussed above (windows and requiring a permanent foundation.) The Commission may also recommend other modifications in response to public testimony.

**BEFORE THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF SPRINGFIELD, OREGON  
ORDER AND RECOMMENDATION FOR:**

**AMENDMENT TO THE SPRINGFIELD DEVELOPMENT CODE FOR  
ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS**

] ] 811-17-000057-TYP4

**NATURE OF THE PROPOSAL**

Request that the Springfield Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval to the Springfield City Council regarding amendments to the following sections of the Springfield Development Code as shown in Exhibit B:

Chapter 3 Land Use Districts:

- Section 3.2-210 Schedule of Use Categories
- Section 3.3-900 Historic Overlay District

Chapter 5 The Development Review Process and Applications

- Section 5.5 Accessory Dwelling Units

Chapter 6 Definitions

- Section 6.1-110 Meaning of Specific Words and Terms

Notice was sent to the Department of Land Conservation and Development on September 8, 2017, not less than 35 days prior to the first evidentiary hearing in compliance with OAR 660-018-0020.

Timely and sufficient notice of the public hearing has been provided, pursuant to Springfield Development Code Section 5.2-115.

On October 17, 2017, the Springfield Planning Commission held a duly noticed public hearing on the proposed text amendments. The public hearing was conducted in accordance with Springfield Development Code Sections 5.2-120 through 5.2-145. After review of the staff report, evidence in the record, written comments (Exhibit C), and testimony of those who spoke at the public hearing, the Planning Commission determined that the code amendments meet the approval criteria.

**CONCLUSION**

On the basis of the Findings of Fact (Exhibit A) and evidence in the record, the proposed code amendments (Exhibit B) meet the approval criteria of Springfield Development Code Section 5.6-115.

**ORDER/RECOMMENDATION**

It is ORDERED by the Springfield Planning Commission that a RECOMMENDATION for approval of 811-17-000057-TYP4 be forwarded to the Springfield City Council for consideration at an upcoming public hearing.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Planning Commission Chairperson

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**ATTEST**  
**AYES:**  
**NOES:**  
**ABSENT:**  
**ABSTAIN:**

## EXHIBIT A

### DRAFT STAFF REPORT AND FINDINGS SPRINGFIELD PLANNING COMMISSION CODE AMENDMENTS FOR ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS (ADUs)

---

**Public Hearing Date:** October 17, 2017  
**Date of Draft Report:** October 10, 2017  
**Journal #:** 811-17-000057-TYP4

#### PROPOSAL DESCRIPTION

**Proposal:** Encourage accessory dwelling units (ADUs) by simplifying the development code requirements and allowing accessory dwelling units not just in the Low Density Residential zone but also in the Medium and High Density Residential zoning districts and the Washburne Historic District

**Applicant:** City of Springfield

**Location:** Applies to all residential zoning districts (Low Density Residential – LDR, Medium Density Residential – MDR, and High Density Residential – HDR) within the city limits

#### BACKGROUND

The City Council has been developing an affordable housing strategy with the goal of increasing the supply and accessibility of housing in Springfield throughout the housing continuum. One of the strategies is to encourage the construction of accessory dwelling units. One way to encourage accessory dwelling units is by revising the development code to make it easier and potentially less expensive to add an accessory dwelling unit.

#### SUMMARY OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Proposed amendments are shown in legislative format in Exhibit B. The proposed amendments expand options for accessory dwelling units in the following ways:

- **Allow an existing small dwelling to become an ADU** (if it is less than 750 square feet), and build a primary dwelling unit.
- **Allow ADUs on properties zoned medium and high density residential.**
- **Allow ADUs in the Washburne Historic District**, subject to the requirements of Springfield Development Code Section 3.3-900 (Historic Overlay District).
- **Remove the minimum size requirement** of 300 square feet for an ADU.
- **Remove the ratio requirement** (currently an ADU cannot exceed 40 percent of the size of the primary dwelling), while maintaining the maximum ADU size requirement of 750 square feet.
- **Allow more flexibility in the location of the entrance** to the ADU.
- **Waive the on-site parking requirement if there is on-street parking available** directly abutting the property (and there are no adopted plans to remove the on-street parking).
- **Allow an unpaved parking space on-site, if there is a paved driveway** (at least 18 feet long measured from the property line) that serves the parking space for the ADU.
- **Remove requirement for the property owner to live on site.**
- **Allow more options for meeting design standards**, including removing requirements that exterior finish materials, trim, roof pitch, windows, and eaves be essentially the same as the primary dwelling.

- **Allow manufactured homes (Type 2) and approved towable structures** as ADUs so long as they are permitted, inspected, and approved by the local authority.

## NOTIFICATION AND WRITTEN COMMENTS

In accordance with the Oregon Administrative Rules (OARs) 660-018-0020, prior to adopting a change to an acknowledged comprehensive plan or land use regulation, local governments are required to notify the state Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) at least 35 days prior to the first evidentiary hearing. A Notice of Proposed Amendment was transmitted to the DLCD on September 8, 2017, which is 39 days prior to the Springfield Planning Commission public hearing on the matter.

Notice of the Planning Commission's public hearing was mailed to the Washburne Neighborhood Association Board on October 3, 2017 as required by Springfield Development Code 5.2-115 A; published in the legal notices section of *The Register Guard* on October 6, 2017 as required by Springfield Development Code 5.2-115 B; and emailed and mailed to the interested parties list on October 5, 2017.

## APPROVAL CRITERIA

Springfield Development Code Section 5.6-115 lists the approval criteria for an amendment to the code.

- A. In reaching a decision on the adoption or amendment of refinement plans and this Code's text, the City Council shall adopt findings that demonstrate conformance to the following:
1. The Metro Plan;
  2. Applicable State statutes; and
  3. Applicable State-wide Planning Goals and Administrative Rules.

## FINDINGS OF FACT

### 1. Consistency with the Metro Plan

The *Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan (Metro Plan)* is the prevailing Comprehensive Plan. The *Springfield 2030 Refinement Plan Residential Land Use and Housing Element* was adopted in 2011 through Springfield Ordinance 6268 and Lane County Ordinance No. PA. 1274 as a refinement to the *Metro Plan*. Amendments to the development code must be considered within the context of the Springfield's adopted policies. Thus any proposed amendments must be consistent with the *Metro Plan Residential Land Use Element* and the *Springfield 2030 Residential Land Use and Housing Element*. The *Springfield 2035 Transportation System Plan* adopted in 2014 by Springfield Ordinance 6314 and Lane County Ordinance No. PA 1303 is a functional plan of the *Metro Plan*. Applicable policies and findings of fact showing compliance with those policies are presented below.

The following *Metro Plan* policy from the "Citizen Involvement Element" is an applicable approval criterion for the development code amendments.

*K.3 Improve and maintain local mechanisms that provide the opportunity for residents and property owners in existing residential areas to participate in the implementation of policies in the Metro Plan that may affect the character of those areas.*

Finding: The code amendments implement the housing policies of the *Metro Plan*. Residents and property owners have had the opportunity to participate in the preparation and

adoption of the amendments to the Springfield Development Code as per the Citizen Involvement Plan approved by the Committee for Citizen Involvement on October 3, 2017.

The primary ways for residents and property owners to participate in the development of the code amendments is through an Open House on September 28, 2017 and the Planning Commission's public hearing on October 17, 2017. There is one active neighborhood organization in the City, the Washburne Neighborhood Association. Staff had verbal communications with the Board in August and invited them to the Open House on September 19, 2017 and sent them formal notice of the public hearing as per Springfield Development Code 5.2-115.A on October 3, 2017. People who signed up on the city's interested parties list for Affordable Housing or the Department of Development and Public Works were sent an invitation to the Open House on September 19, 2017, and a notice of the public hearing on October 5, 2017. An article in the city's newsletter, "Springfield Connection" advertised the Open House. The Eugene Weekly included the Open House on the Community Calendar in the Sept. 21 and 28 issues. The City provided notice of the Open House via Twitter on Sept. 13, 26, and 28 and via Facebook on Sept. 13 and 26. The City's News Release on Sept. 14 and 25 that featured the Open House and mentioned the public hearing resulted in the KVAL/KMTR piece that ran on Sept. 28. Notice of the public hearing was published in the legal notices section of *The Register Guard* on October 6, 2017 as required by Springfield Development Code 5.2-115B. The general public and community groups were informed throughout the process by media coverage and the internet, including social media and the city's website.

All City Council and Planning Commission meetings are advertised and open to the public, including the work sessions during which the elected and appointed officials discussed the code amendments.

Thirty-six people signed in at the Open House, the comments of which are included as Exhibit C1.

The Historic Commission met on September 26, 2017 to provide a recommendation regarding allowing ADUs in the Washburne Historic District. A letter from the Chair is included as Exhibit C2.

The following ***Metro Plan*** policies from the "Metropolitan Residential Land Use and Housing Element" are applicable approval criteria for the development code amendments.

*Residential Density*

*A.10 Promote higher residential density inside the UGB that utilizes existing infrastructure, improves the efficiency of public services and facilities, and conserves rural resource lands outside the UGB.*

**Finding:** In the LDR zone, adding an ADU doubles the number of dwelling units on the lot and therefore increases the residential density. In the MDR and HDR zones, either one or two ADUs will be permitted bringing the density of the lot up to the minimum density allowed in the zone. The ADUs will tap into the utility lines in place to serve the primary dwelling. Transportation access to the ADUs will be from rights-of-way which in most cases will already be developed. In some cases where the primary dwelling takes access from a street and the access to the ADU is from an unimproved alley, the alley would need to be improved. Public services and facilities already in place to serve the residents

in the primary dwellings would also be available to serve the residents in the ADUs. Thus, promoting ADUs promotes higher residential density inside the UGB while utilizing existing infrastructure, improving the efficiency of public services and facilities, and conserving rural resource lands outside the UGB.

*A.13 Increase overall residential density in the metropolitan area by creating more opportunities for effectively designed in-fill, redevelopment, and mixed use while considering impacts of increased residential density on historic, existing and future neighborhoods.*

**Finding:** ADUs add dwelling units in areas that are already developed with existing homes. Thus, these new units are designed as in-fill projects, either within existing structures or as new structures on developed residential lots. All the development standards such as lot coverage, setbacks, and solar access will continue to apply to all buildings on the lot. These standards thus will continue to address potential impacts of development on adjacent neighbors. ADUs in the Washburne Historic District will be processed as a Type II land use application that must comply with the Alternation Standards in 3.3-945 of the Development Code to protect the historic character of the Historic Landmark District. Thus, the proposed amendments increase overall residential density in the metropolitan area by creating more opportunities for effectively designed in-fill while considering impacts of increased residential density on historic, existing and future neighborhoods.

*A.14 Review local zoning and development regulations periodically to remove barriers to higher density housing and to make provision for a full range of housing options.*

**Finding:** Given that there have only been two ADUs permitted in the City in the past ten years, Council initiated these code amendments to make it easier and potentially less expensive to add an ADU. Removing the on-site parking requirement in situations where parking is available allows development of ADUs in situations that would not be possible if on-site parking was required. Allowing for unpaved parking in certain situations also reduces the cost of development which could be a barrier to development. Removing the owner-occupancy requirement allows property owners who do not live in the property more options for developing their property. Removing the owner-occupancy requirement also allows homeowners to sell their property without a restrictive covenant that binds potential buyers to a residency requirement. The code amendments provide more options for designing an ADU by allowing an existing dwelling to become an ADU, removing the minimum size requirement for the ADU, removing the ratio requirement for the size of the ADU, allowing more flexibility in the location of the entrance to the ADU, allowing more options for meeting design standards, and allowing manufactured homes and approved towable structures as ADUs. The code amendments remove barriers to higher density housing and increase the feasibility of an ADU as a housing option.

*A.16 Allow for the development of zoning districts which allow overlap of the established Metro Plan density ranges to promote housing choice and result in either maintaining or increasing housing density in those districts. Under no circumstances, shall housing densities be allowed below existing Metro Plan density ranges.*

**Finding:** Per Policy A.9, the Metro Plan density ranges for low density is up to 14.28 dwelling units per net acre, 14.28 through 28.56 units per net acre for medium density, and over 28.56 units per net acre for high density. ADUs are allowed in the MDR and HDR zones

only if the lot sizes are small enough such that the resulting number of dwellings on the lot meets the minimum density requirement for the zoning district (14 units per net acre for MDR and 28 units per net acre for HDR). Thus, housing densities will be within the existing Metro Plan density range.

Housing Type and Tenure

A.17 *Provide opportunities for a full range of choice of housing type, density, size, cost, and location.*

Finding: ADUs offer a small size home (less than 750 square feet) option in neighborhoods that will often be developed with single-family homes. This housing type provides an alternative to apartment complexes for renters that are generally available in medium and high density residential areas. ADUs also provide an option for housing family members or on-site caregivers that desire independence and proximity. Due to their smaller size and the fact that they do not need additional land, ADUs are more affordable than single-family homes. Thus ADUs add to the range of choice of housing types, density, size, cost and location.

A.18 *Encourage a mix of structure types and densities within residential designations by reviewing and, if necessary, amending local zoning and development regulations.*

Finding: Eight-four percent of the units added to the housing stock in Springfield from 2008 to 2016 were single-family homes. Two were ADUs. The code amendments remove regulatory barriers (on-site parking, owner occupancy, prohibition against manufactured homes and towable structures, prohibition in the MDR and HDR zones and the Washburne Historic District) and allow more flexibility (size requirements and design options). These amendments to development regulations encourage ADUs to be a part of the mix of structure types available within residential designations.

Affordable, Special Need, and Fair Housing

A.33 *Consider local zoning and development regulations impact on the cost of housing.*

Finding: Providing a paved parking space on-site adds cost to the development of an ADU. The proposed amendments offer two opportunities to reduce the cost of providing parking for the ADU: 1) removing the requirement for on-site parking if on-street parking is and will continue to be available; and (2) allowing for on-site parking to be unpaved in certain circumstances. Thus, the impact of development regulations on the cost of housing is considered in the code amendments.

The following policies from the ***Springfield 2030 Comprehensive Plan Residential Land Use and Housing Element*** are applicable approval criteria for the development code amendments.

Plan for Growth and Needed Housing

H.6 *Continue to seek ways to reduce development impediments to more efficient utilization of the residential land supply inside the UGB, especially in the City's sloped areas (southeast Springfield and Willamette Heights).*

Finding: ADUs add housing units to land that is already developed. Thus, they help make efficient use of the residential land supply inside the UGB. Regulatory requirements can be an impediment to development if they add cost or do not allow the location, size, type, or design of a house desired by the property owner. The code amendments increase the

area where ADUs are allowed (MDR and HDR zones, Washburne Historic District), remove the minimum size and ratio requirements, allow for manufactured homes and towable structures as ADUs, and allow more flexibility in the design standards. Thus, the amendments reduce development impediments to more efficient utilization of the residential land supply inside the UGB.

*Foster Housing Choice and Affordability*

*H.9 Provide a broad range of quality accessible and affordable housing options for very low, low and moderate income residents. Affordable housing is defined as housing for which persons or families pay 30 percent or less of their gross income for housing, including necessary and essential utilities [Oregon Revised Statute 456.055].*

**Finding:** The data analysis completed as part of developing an affordable housing strategy indicated that vacancy rates for rentals are very low and that the waiting lists are longest for the one-bedroom and studio units. Based on the American Community Survey, in 2013, 53% of Springfield renters paid more than 30% of their gross income for housing, including necessary and essential utilities. Accessory dwelling units have the potential to provide additional housing options for these smaller units which by size tend to be more affordable to those with low and moderate incomes. Thus, code amendments that make it easier to add an ADU provide the opportunity for a broader range of affordable housing options for very low, low and moderate income residents.

*Encourage Housing Diversity & Quality Neighborhoods*

*H.11 Continue to seek ways to update development standards to introduce a variety of housing options for all income levels in both existing neighborhoods and new residential areas that match the changing demographics and lifestyles of Springfield residents.*

**Finding:** ADUs add another rental housing option to those with low to moderate incomes in existing neighborhoods. These ADUs create opportunities for income generation that may be particularly useful for retirees, especially as Springfield's population continues to age. They also provide opportunities for seniors to age in place by allowing for on-site caretakers. ADUs allow for intergenerational living and provide an alternative housing option for people wanting to remain in their neighborhood even if their life circumstances change. The code amendments that encourage ADUs update the development standards to encourage ADUs as an option in both existing neighborhoods and new residential areas that match the changing demographics and lifestyles of Springfield residents.

*H.15 Update residential development standards to enhance the quality and affordability of neighborhood infill development (e.g. partitions, duplex developments, transitional neighborhoods, rehab housing, accessory dwelling units) and multi-family development.*

**Finding:** ADUs are a type of infill development. Removing on-site parking requirements if on-street parking is and will continue to be available, and allowing for unpaved parking in certain circumstances reduce the cost of developing an ADU and allows for more design options on the lot. Other code amendments addressing size and design allow for more flexibility while continuing to ensure quality. Thus, these amendments update residential development standards to enhance the affordability of ADUs as neighborhood infill development.

The following policy from the *Springfield 2035 Transportation System Plan* is an applicable approval criterion for the development code amendments.

2.6 *Manage the on-street parking system to preserve adequate capacity and turnover for surrounding land uses.*

Finding: DEQ research shows that “because ADUs are extremely rare (Portland, the nation’s ADU ‘leader’ has then on less than 1% of eligible lots), and because ADU households have fewer cars than other households, ADUs should have virtually no effect on parking conditions on a citywide basis.”<sup>1</sup> The amendments require one on-site parking space for the ADU (in addition to that required for the primary dwelling) if there is no on-street parking abutting the property or if there are adopted plans to remove the on-street parking. Thus, the code amendments help manage the on-street parking system to preserve adequate capacity and turnover for surrounding land uses.

Finding: The code amendments comply with applicable policies from the *Metro Plan* including the *Springfield 2030 Comprehensive Plan Residential Land Use and Housing Element* and the *Springfield 2035 Transportation System Plan*, and therefore meet Criterion A.1.

**2. Consistency with State statutes.**

Earlier this year, the legislature passed Senate Bill 1051 which resulted in changes to ORS 197. Applicable statutes are listed below as approval criteria.

*ORS 197.312 (5)(a) A city with a population greater than 2,500 or a county with a population greater than 15,000 shall allow in areas zoned for detached single-family dwellings the development of at least one accessory dwelling unit for each detached single-family dwelling, subject to reasonable local regulations relating to siting and design.*  
*(b) As used in this subsection, “accessory dwelling unit” means an interior, attached or detached residential structure that is used in connection with or that is accessory to a single-family dwelling.*

Finding: Springfield’s estimated population for 2016 is 61,893 which makes this statute applicable to the city. The LDR, MDR, and HDR zones allow detached single-family dwellings and therefore are required to allow at least one ADU for each detached single-family dwelling. The definition of accessory dwelling states that it “may be located within, attached to or detached from the primary single-family dwelling” which complies with subsection b. The code amendments allow one or two ADUs in the MDR and HDR zones (depending on lot size) where they were not previously allowed. ADUs were already allowed in the LDR zone. As shown through the findings above, the siting and design standards comply with Springfield’s adopted policies and are reasonable. Thus, the code amendments comply with this statute.

*ORS 197.307 (4)(b)(A) A city may not deny an application for a housing development located within the urban growth boundary if the development complies with clear and objective standards, including but not limited to clear and objective design standards contained in the city comprehensive plan or land use regulations.*  
*(B) This paragraph does not apply to:*

---

<sup>1</sup> Martin Brown, “Accessory Dwelling Units in Portland, OR: Evaluation and interpretation of a survey of ADU owners” (Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, June 2014, <http://accessorydwellings.org/2014/07/09/are-adus-green-housing/>).

- (i) *Applications or permits for residential development in areas described in ORS 197.307 (5); or*
- (ii) *Applications or permits reviewed under an alternative approval process adopted under ORS 197.307 (6).*

Finding: Amendments to the design standards for ADUs require that the ADU either match the primary dwelling or meet clear and objective standards for exterior finish materials, roof pitch, trim, windows, and eaves. The amended code also sets objective height limits. ORS 197.307 (5) (b) covers an application or permit for residential development in historic areas designated for protection under a land use planning goal protecting historic areas. Therefore, the design standards for ADUs in the Washburne Historic District are not required to be clear and objective and the alteration standards for the Historic District may remain in place. The definitions for manufactured dwellings are amended to identify the specific materials that are allowed rather than somewhat discretionary requirement that the materials be similar to the materials used in residential dwellings in the community or which are comparable to the predominant materials used on surround dwellings. Thus the amendments make the design standards for ADUs clear and objective in the land use regulations.

Finding: The code amendments comply with applicable statutes and therefore meet Criterion A.2.

### **3. Applicable State-wide Planning Goals and Administrative Rules.**

The *Metro Plan* (including refinement and functional plans) has been acknowledged as being in compliance with State-wide Planning Goals and Administrative Rules. Therefore, if the amendments to the development code are in compliance with the *Metro Plan*, they are also in compliance with the State-wide Planning Goals and Administrative Rules.

Finding: As the code amendments comply with the acknowledged Comprehensive Plan (*Metro Plan*), there is no need to provide additional findings of compliance with the Statewide Planning Goals and Administrative Rules.

## Exhibit B

### Amendments to the Springfield Development Code to Encourage Accessory Dwelling Units

The amendments are shown in legislative format (deleted text with strike-thru red font and new text with double underline red font). Commentary is shown in purple italics font.

#### Chapter 3 Land Use Districts Section 3.2-210 Schedule of Use Categories

*Commentary: Allow accessory dwelling units in all areas zoned for detached single-family dwellings as required by Oregon Revised Statutes 197.312 (5) which was added by Senate Bill 1051.*

Use Categories/Uses	Zoning Districts			
Residential Uses	LDR	SLR	MDR	HDR
<b>Dwellings</b>				
Accessory dwelling unit (Section 5.5-100)	P	P	<del>NP</del>	<del>NP</del>

#### Section 3.3-900 Historic Overlay District

*Commentary: Allowing accessory dwelling units in the Washburne Historic Landmark District requires that they be addressed in the Historic Overlay District.*

#### 3.3-915 Review

- B. The following major alterations of Historic Landmark Sites or Structures shall be reviewed under Type II procedures as specified in Section 3.3-945;
1. Additions, partial demolitions, or substantial alterations to a building façade;
  2. A change to a more intensive use category as defined in the underlying zoning district;
  3. Installation of 4 or more parking places;
  4. Removal or radical trimming of large established trees or vegetation, except where necessary for immediate public safety as determined by the City Engineer;
  5. Specific Development Standards in the Washburne Historic Landmark District specified in Section 3.3-935B;
  6. New construction of 1,000 square feet or more within the Washburne Historic Landmark District;
  - ~~6.7.~~ Addition of an accessory dwelling unit that complies with the Development Standards in Section 3.3-940; or

~~7.8.~~ Any other alteration or use that the Director determines may detract from the historic character of a Historic Landmark Site or Structure.

**3.3-940 Development Standards**

A. Garage Placement. ~~In order to~~ protect the historic character of ~~an~~the Washburne Historic Landmark District or an individual Historic Landmark Structure, residential garages may be permitted to abut an alley, provided that:

- A1. Minimum fire separation as required by the Building Safety Codes is not exceeded; and
- B2. Access is taken from the alley.

B. Accessory Dwelling Units. ~~To protect the historic character of the Washburne Historic Landmark District or an individual Historic Landmark Structure, the following standards apply to accessory dwelling units in residential districts:~~

- 1. Accessory dwelling units must meet the requirements in Sections 5.5-105 through 5.5-140 of this Code, except where they conflict with the standards of the Historic Overlay District.
- 2. New or expanded curb cuts are not allowed unless there is no other alternative for providing the required parking for the accessory dwelling unit. Alternatives that must be considered include, but are not limited to, providing a parking space that is accessed from the alley rather than the street, and using on-street parking abutting the property.
- 3. Accessory dwelling units that are attached to or within the primary dwelling shall not have an entrance located on the same side of the dwelling as the entrance of the primary dwelling.
- 4. Type 2 manufactured homes shall not be used as an accessory dwelling unit.

**Chapter 5 The Development Review Process and Applications**  
**Section 5.5 Accessory Dwelling Units**

**5.5-105 Purpose**

*Commentary: Delete the first section of the Purpose which actually defines an accessory dwelling unit and rely on the definition that is in Chapter 6.*

~~A. A single family accessory dwelling unit:~~

- ~~1. Is a secondary, self-contained dwelling that may be allowed only in conjunction with a detached single family dwelling;~~
- ~~2. Is subordinate in size, location, and appearance to the primary detached single family dwelling;~~

- ~~3. Generally has its own outside entrance and always has a separate kitchen, bathroom and sleeping area; and~~
- ~~4. May be located within, attached to or detached from the primary single family dwelling.~~

*Commentary: Match the purpose of accessory dwelling units to policy language in the **Springfield 2030 Comprehensive Plan Residential Land Use and Housing Element** (Policies H.6, H.9, H.11, and H.15).*

**BA.** An accessory dwelling unit is intended to:

1. Provide the opportunity to Add accessible and affordable units to existing housing stock neighborhoods and new residential areas;
2. Provide flexibility to accommodate ~~for~~ changes in household size or composition over the course of time, allowing for intergenerational living and on-site caretakers/assistants;
3. Make efficient use of residential land; and
4. Fit into the ~~Protect~~ neighborhood while maintaining stability, property values, and in the case of low-density residential zones, the single-family residential appearance of the neighborhood ~~by ensuring that Accessory Dwelling Units are constructed under the provisions of this Section.~~

*Commentary: Make grammatical structure consistent for each phrase.*

**CB.** An accessory dwelling may be established by:

1. ~~Conversion of~~ an attic, basement or garage or any other portion of the primary dwelling;
2. Adding floor area to the primary dwelling, including a second story; or
3. ~~Construction of~~ a detached accessory dwelling unit on a lot/parcel with a primary single-family dwelling.

*Commentary: Allow existing small dwellings to become the accessory dwelling unit.*

4. Converting an existing dwelling unit to the accessory dwelling unit (if it is less than 750 square feet) and building a primary dwelling unit.

### 5.5-110 Applicability

*Commentary: Allow accessory dwelling units to be built first or at the same time as the primary dwelling.*

- A. Accessory dwelling units are permitted on LDR properties with an ~~existing~~ primary dwelling, within the city limits.

*Commentary: Allow accessory dwelling units in all areas zoned for detached single-family dwellings as required by ORS 197.312 (5) which was amended by SB 1051 as long as the new development would meet the minimum density requirements in the MDR or HDR zoning district. If the lot or parcel developed with a single-family house is larger than those listed below, then the property owner would need to consider other options such as land divisions or building multi-family dwellings in order to achieve the minimum density requirements. Multi-unit design standards apply to three or more attached units. Therefore, if there are two accessory dwelling units, one must be detached from the main structure.*

- B. Accessory dwelling units are permitted on MDR properties with a primary dwelling, within the city limits, according to the following standards:

1. On a lot or parcel with area 6650 square feet or less, one or two accessory dwelling units are permitted.
2. On a lot or parcel with area greater than 6650 square feet but not greater than 10,000 square feet, two accessory dwelling units are permitted. A single accessory dwelling unit on such lot or parcel is not permitted.
3. An accessory dwelling unit is not permitted on a lot or parcel with area greater than 10,000 square feet.
4. If two accessory dwellings are constructed, at least one must be detached from the primary dwelling.

- C. Accessory dwelling units are permitted on HDR properties with a primary dwelling, within the city limits, according to the following standards:

1. On a lot or parcel with area 3200 square feet or less, one or two accessory dwelling units are permitted.
2. On a lot or parcel with area greater than 3200 square feet but not greater than 4800 square feet, two accessory dwelling units are permitted. A single accessory dwelling unit on such lot or parcel is not permitted.
3. An accessory dwelling is not permitted on a lot or parcel with area greater than 4800 square feet.
4. If two accessory dwellings are constructed, at least one must be detached from the primary dwelling.

*Commentary: Allow accessory dwelling units in the Washburne Historic District.*

~~B.D.~~ **EXCEPTION:** Accessory dwelling Units are ~~prohibited~~ permitted on lots/parcels within the Washburne Historic Overlay District subject to the provisions of Section 3.3-910 through 3.3-945.

### 5.5-115 Review

An accessory dwelling unit is reviewed under Type I procedure.

### 5.5-120 Submittal Requirements

A plan drawn to scale showing the proposed accessory dwelling unit and its relation to the primary dwelling; existing and proposed trees and landscaping, lot/parcel area and dimensions, percent of lot/parcel coverage, building height, entrance locations, location of utilities and meters, off-street parking area; a detailed floor plan of the accessory dwelling unit, drawn to scale with labels on rooms indicating uses or proposed uses; and a separate written response demonstrating how the required development standards listed in Section 5.5-125 can be met.

### 5.5-125 Development Standards

*Commentary: Make accessory dwelling unit "single" for style consistency.*

An accessory dwelling units shall meet the following standards:

- A.** The accessory dwelling unit shall meet all applicable standards in this Code including, but not limited to; setbacks, height, lot/parcel coverage, solar access and building codes in effect at the time of construction.

*Commentary: Rely on 5.5-140 to regulate the minimum lot/parcel size.*

~~**B.** The minimum lot/parcel size to construct an accessory dwelling unit is as specified in Section 3.2-215.~~

- CB.** The accessory dwelling unit shall contain a kitchen, bathroom, living, and sleeping area that are completely independent from the primary dwelling.

*Commentary: Remove the ratio requirement for size of the accessory dwelling unit.*

~~**DC.** The accessory dwelling unit shall not exceed 750 square feet or the square footage of the accessory dwelling unit shall not exceed 40 percent of the primary dwelling (exclusive of the garage for the primary dwelling), whichever is less. Within this standard, the minimum area shall not be less than 300 square feet. The maximum area shall not exceed 750 square feet.~~

~~**EXCEPTION:** The 40 percent requirement will not apply when the primary structure is less than 750 square feet in size, in order to ensure a 300 square foot minimum accessory dwelling unit. The minimum and maximum square footage shall be 300 square feet when the existing primary structure is less than 750 square feet in size.~~

*Commentary: Incorporate building code requirement that an accessory dwelling unit must have its own outside entrance and remove requirement that allows only one entrance.*

**ED.** ~~The accessory dwelling unit shall have~~ When separate an outside entrances to the accessory dwelling unit ~~are proposed; that is separate from the entrance to the primary dwelling.~~

*Commentary: Allow more flexibility in the location of the entrance.*

~~1. Only 1 entrance may be located on the front or street side of each residence.~~

~~2.~~ A hard surface walkway, a minimum of 3 feet wide, shall be required from the primary entrance of the accessory dwelling unit to the street or walkway serving the primary dwelling.

**FE.** Each dwelling shall have its own address.

*Commentary: Waive the on-site parking requirement in some situations where on-street parking is available. Also, remove the requirement for the on-site parking space to be paved if there is a paved driveway providing access to the parking space.*

**FG.** ~~One paved,~~ off-street parking space 9 feet by 18 feet in size, in addition to that which is required by Section 4.6-100 is required unless there is on-street parking available directly abutting the property and there are no adopted plans to remove the on-street parking. The on-site parking space for the ADU must be paved, except when there is a paved driveway at least 18 feet long measured from the property line that serves the parking space for the ADU.

*Commentary: Remove this requirement to allow existing small homes to become the accessory dwelling unit.*

~~H. The accessory dwelling unit may not be occupied prior to occupancy of the primary dwelling.~~

*Commentary: Remove the requirement that the property owner live on site.*

~~I. Before final occupancy of the accessory dwelling unit, the property owner shall record a deed restriction that states the property owner shall reside on the property and the accessory dwelling unit shall not be sold separately from the primary dwelling, unless lawfully partitioned.~~

### 5.5-130 Design Standards

*Commentary: Provide the property owner more flexibility in design of the new dwelling while also including clear and objective design standards (as required by Oregon Revised Statutes 197.307 (4) which was amended through Senate Bill 1051).*

An accessory dwelling unit shall comply with the following standards, ~~where practicable the:~~

~~A.~~ A. Exterior finish materials shall be either:

1. ~~The same or essentially the same visually matching those of in terms of type, size, placement and finish as the primary dwelling in terms of type, size, and placement, or~~
  - 1-2. ~~Made from wood, composite boards, vinyl or aluminum products composed in a shingle pattern, or in a horizontal clapboard or shiplap pattern with boards 7 inches or less in width.~~
- B. ~~Roof pitch shall match the roof pitch of the primary dwelling. Minimum roof pitch shall be 2 to 12.~~
- C. ~~The trim around all doors and windows shall be either the same in type, location and finish as the primary dwelling or shall be at least 3 ½ inches wide.~~
- D. ~~Windows on all street facing facades shall either match those of the primary dwelling in terms of proportion (height and width ratio) and orientation (vertical vs. horizontal) or no window shall be wider than it is tall.~~
- E. ~~Eaves shall either project from the accessory dwelling unit addition the same distance as the eaves on the primary dwelling or shall project from the building walls at least one foot on all elevations.~~

*Commentary: Add a height limit for a detached accessory dwelling to ensure that it is subordinate in size and appearance.*

- F. ~~If the accessory dwelling is detached from the primary dwelling, it may not exceed the height of the primary dwelling. Adding an accessory dwelling within the primary dwelling or attached to the primary dwelling can result in additional height of the primary dwelling as long as it continues to comply with overall height requirements.~~

*Commentary: Remove this subsection as it is no longer necessary.*

#### **5.5-135 Prior Uses**

-

~~The Director shall approve any accessory dwelling unit existing at the time of the adoption of this amendment if the following conditions can be met:~~

-

- A. ~~The accessory dwelling unit complies with the provisions of Sections 5.5-105 through 5.5-130; and~~

-

- B. ~~A building permit was issued when the accessory dwelling unit was constructed or remodeled. The burden of proof is the responsibility on the property owner to show proof of building permits.~~

#### **5.5-140 Non-conforming Lot/Parcel Sizes**

*Commentary: Improve the wording.*

Accessory dwelling units shall not be permitted on lots/parcels that do not meet the applicable minimum lot/parcel size stated in Section 3.2-215.

### 5.5-1435 Prohibited Use

*Commentary: Allow Type 2 Manufactured Homes and approved towable structures as accessory dwelling units.*

Mobile homes, ~~manufactured homes~~, recreational vehicles, motor vehicles, and travel trailers ~~and all other forms of towable or manufactured structures~~ shall not be used as an accessory dwelling unit. Type 2 Manufactured Homes and towable structures that are permitted, inspected and approved by the local authority having jurisdiction are allowed.

## Chapter 6 Definitions

### Section 6.1-110 Meaning of Specific Words and Terms

*Commentary: Remove redundant definition and replace with a cross reference.*

**Accessory Dwelling Unit** ~~A secondary, self-contained dwelling that may be allowed only in conjunction with a detached single-family dwelling. An accessory dwelling unit is subordinate in size, location, and appearance to the primary detached single-family dwelling. An accessory dwelling unit generally has its own outside entrance and always has a separate kitchen, bathroom and sleeping area. An accessory dwelling may be located within, attached to or detached from the primary single-family dwelling. See Dwelling Unit, Accessory~~

*Commentary: Change definition to allow an existing house to become the accessory dwelling unit. Also, require a separate outside entrance for the accessory dwelling unit as required by building codes.*

**Dwelling Unit, Accessory** A secondary, self-contained dwelling that may be allowed only in conjunction with a detached single-family dwelling. An accessory dwelling unit is subordinate in size, ~~location, and appearance~~ to the primary detached single-family dwelling. An accessory dwelling unit ~~generally~~ has its own outside entrance and ~~always has~~ a separate kitchen, bathroom and sleeping area. An accessory dwelling may be located within, attached to or detached from the primary single-family dwelling.

*Commentary: Change definition to recognize that accessory dwelling units could share a wall with the single-family dwelling.*

**Dwelling, Detached Single-Family** A single-family dwelling on its own lot/parcel that does not share a wall with any other dwelling other than an accessory dwelling unit. ~~This~~ A detached single-family dwelling may be either site built or a manufactured dwelling.

### Dwelling, Manufactured.

- A. Residential Trailer:** a structure constructed for movement on the public highways that has sleeping, cooking and plumbing facilities, that is intended for human occupancy, is being used for residential purposes and was constructed before January 1, 1962.

**B. Mobile Home:** a structure constructed for movement on the public highways that has sleeping, cooking and plumbing facilities, that is intended for human occupancy that is being used for residential purposes and was constructed between January 1, 1962 and June 15, 1976, and met the construction requirements of Oregon Mobile Home Law in effect at the time of construction.

**C. Manufactured Home:** a structure constructed for movement on the public highways that has sleeping, cooking and plumbing facilities, that is intended for human occupancy that is being used for residential purposes and was constructed on or after June 15, 1976 in accordance with Federal Safety Standards Regulations in effect at the time of construction. In addition, manufactured homes sited within the jurisdictional boundaries of Springfield shall be of either Type 1 or Type 2 classification and shall comply with the following standards:

**1. Type 1 Manufactured Home:**

- a. Multi-sectional configuration enclosing a minimum floor area of 1,000 square feet;

*Commentary: Make the design standards clear and objective as required by Oregon Revised Statutes 197.307 (4) which was amended through Senate Bill 1051.*

- b. Siding ~~and roofing~~ materials made from wood, composite boards, vinyl or aluminum products composed in a shingle pattern, or a in a horizontal clapboard or shiplap pattern with boards 7 inches or less in width ~~similar to the materials used in residential dwellings in the community or which are comparable to the predominant materials used on surrounding dwellings;~~

*Commentary: Make the language for roof pitch consistent with other sections of the code.*

- c. Minimum roof pitch of 3 ~~feet vertical~~ in 12 ~~feet of width~~;
- d. Thermal efficiency equivalent to the Oregon One- and Two-Family Dwelling Specialty Code excluding units built prior to the effective date of this Ordinance (5-1-94). These units shall meet or exceed the HUD energy standards that were in effect at the time of construction.

**2. Type 2 Manufactured Home:**

*Commentary: Allow manufactured homes larger than 500 square feet but smaller than 1000 square feet to be included as a Type 2 Manufactured Home. Manufactured homes up to 750 square feet could be used as an accessory dwelling unit.*

- a. Single-wide unit ~~of not less than 12 feet wide~~ enclosing less than a minimum floor area of 500-1000 square feet;

*Commentary: Make the design standards clear and objective as required by Oregon Revised Statutes 197.307 (4) which was amended through Senate Bill 1051.*

- b.** Siding ~~and roofing~~ materials made from wood, composite boards, vinyl or aluminum products composed in a shingle pattern, or a in a horizontal clapboard or shiplap pattern with boards 7 inches or less in width similar to the materials used in residential dwellings in the community or which are comparable to the predominant materials used on surrounding dwellings;

*Commentary: Make the language for roof pitch consistent with other sections of the code.*

- c.** ~~m~~ Minimum roof pitch of 2 in feet vertical in 12 feet of width;

- ed.** Thermal efficiency equivalent to the Oregon One- and Two-Family Dwelling Specialty Code excluding units built prior to May 1, 1994. These units shall meet or exceed the HUD energy standards that were in effect at the time of construction.

*Commentary: Correct inconsistent labelling (Arabic numeral instead of Roman numeral).*

**Note:** Multi-sectional units placed on lots/parcels eligible for Type 2 units shall comply with all of the standards of a Type 1 manufactured home.

# CITY OF SPRINGFIELD, OREGON

## DEVELOPMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS



225 FIFTH STREET  
 SPRINGFIELD, OR 97477  
 PHONE: 541.726.3753  
 FAX: 541.736.1021  
[www.springfield-or.gov](http://www.springfield-or.gov)

October 3, 2017

City of Springfield  
 Planning Commission  
 225 5<sup>th</sup> Street  
 Springfield, OR 97477

The Historic Commission convened on Tuesday, September 26<sup>th</sup> for a regular bimonthly meeting and discussed proposed amendments to the Springfield Development Code that pertain to accessory dwelling units. City staff presented an overview of the proposed amendments and requested the Historic Commission to provide a recommendation to the Planning Commission with regards to allowing accessory dwelling units (ADUs) within the Washburne Historic District. The Commission actioned support for the proposed revisions with the following notations:

1. The Historic Commission conveyed support for on-street parking to satisfy additional parking requirements for ADUs while prohibiting any new curb-cuts to create driveways.
2. The Commission noted that ADUs that are attached to the primary dwelling should not be designed to have the ingress/egress door on the same side as the front door of the primary dwelling.
3. The Commission does not want to allow manufactured homes as ADUs but thought that the existing alteration standards would prohibit this type of structure.
4. The Commission did not come to a conclusion on whether or not to require the property owner to occupy the primary dwelling or accessory dwelling unit by recording a deed restriction against the property. The Commission rescheduled its next meeting for the afternoon of November 16 to allow further discussion prior to the City Council's public hearing.

City staff asked the Commission to provide input on the type of procedure to evaluate ADUs in the Washburne Historic District. The Commission's recommendations are summarized below:

### **Rely on existing development code Section 3.3-945 and Historic Design Guidelines**

These code regulations include standards for major and minor alterations that apply to any alterations, additions, and new construction. Every applicant is provided a copy of the *Springfield Historic Design Guidelines*. Although not regulatory in nature, these Guidelines address the exteriors of buildings that may undergo alteration, and include sections on additions and new construction. There are also guidelines that apply to accessory structures that would pertain to a conversion of an accessory structure to an accessory dwelling unit.

**Create new guidelines for accessory dwelling units.**

Modify or add to the suggestions listed in the *Springfield Historic Design Guidelines*. These would then help educate people about the best ways to add a dwelling unit on a property while retaining the integrity of the historic district. The regulatory requirements would remain as written in Section 3.3-945 of the development code.

**Allow accessory dwelling units as Major Alterations (Type II procedure)**

The decision would be made by the Planning Director unless s/he determines that it should be reviewed as a Type III decisions due to the complexity of the application or the need for discretionary review. The Historic Commission determined that adding an accessory dwelling unit is “a change to a more intensive use category as defined in the underlying zoning district”, and therefore fits the category of a major alteration under Subsection 3.3-915 B.2. The Commission recommended adding accessory dwelling units to the list in subsection B of Section 3.3-915.

We look forward to future correspondence on this subject.

Best,

---

*Tim Hilton, Chair*  
*Springfield Historic Commission*

**Open House Comments**  
**On Proposed Amendments to the Springfield Development Code to Encourage ADUs**

The Open House was held on September 28, 2017 from 4-7 pm in the Library Meeting Room at City Hall. Thirty-six people signed in (excluding staff). The following comments are compiled from sticky notes placed on a poster of proposed code amendments and from comment forms.

What positive opportunities do you see from the proposed code amendments?

- The obvious - incentive to add more affordable housing without expanding into open land and forests.
- More interesting, creative homes NOT designed en masse by a developer.
- Increased housing
- More affordable housing
- Housing that requires/uses fewer resources, including less drain on the grid
- Potential for seniors to live in their homes longer
- The young being housed without going into debt
- Potential to shift from a life focused on accumulation of stuff to a life focused on community (less space = less stuff)
- Affordable housing for owner
- Affordable housing for renters
- Muy buena idea para ayudar a familias de pocos recursos. Translation: Very good idea to help low income families.
- Yes to all proposed changes. All are barriers to entry.
- Yes to allowing an existing smaller dwelling to become an ADU. Wonderful.
- Yes, allow ADUs in the Washburne Historic District.
- Same opportunity for historic district
- I love removing min. size requirement.
- Yes, remove the minimum size requirement. Yes, Definitely! Absolutely! Wonderful!
- Yes, remove the ratio requirement while keeping the max size of 750 sq. ft.
- I love entrance flexibility.
- Yes, allow more flexibility in the location of the entry door.
- I love allowing unpaved or on-street parking.
- Yes, yes, waive the on-site parking requirement if on-street parking available.
- Yes, allow an unpaved parking space.
- Yes, remove the requirement for the property owner to live on site. It's important to me to be able to leave my property to travel . . . and at the same time know that someone is there to keep an eye on things. I don't want to be restricted just because of a 2<sup>nd</sup> unit.
- I love increasing options for design standards.
- Yes, yes! Allow more options for meeting design standards.
- Allowing more options for meeting design standards is especially important for steeply sloped lots ( $\geq 8\%$  diagonal) and riverside lots, where the best building style for one section of the lot may not be the best for another section.
- Yes! (and again yes!) for allowing manufactured homes and approved towable structures.

What concerns do you have about the proposed code amendments?

- None
- I do not agree with accepting mobile homes (cheap construction, always ugly, doesn't promote local business & construction)
- ? on manufactured homes and approved towable structures
- I do not agree with non-owner occupied (promotes people flipping houses, focused on money not quality, encourages wealthy to buy up available good family homes and charge more than necessary)
- I think it best to keep the requirement to live on site.
- Make the max. size 750 sq. ft. or 10% of lot size, whichever is greater.
- I support the proposed amendments and applaud the city for taking these steps to allow people to live in smaller, more affordable ways! My concern has to do with the process of hearing everyone's ideas – my hope is that all concerns will be heard/considered, rather than the loudest voice or the voice with the most money being valued over others.

What else would you like the City to know regarding ADUs?

- Thank you! Great idea & incentive to do something I was already considering.
- Please consider tiny house villages (similar to mobile home park with multiple units, but different in layout where units are circled around a common space and resources are shared.)
- It seems people are afraid of their neighborhood changing; I think that it's important to keep in mind that given the current housing shortage, things WILL have to change.
- Way to go!

U:\Community Development\Affordable Housing\ADU Program\Comms & Outreach Materials\Open House 9-28-17\Public Comments.docx