1. CALL TO ORDER

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

3. ROLL CALL

4. SCHEDULED BUSINESS
   a. Business from the Public
   b. Presentation from the Project Team and discussion
      1) Project Background
      2) Multi-Family & Infill Residential Standards Review
      3) Next Steps

5. ADJOURNMENT
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MEMO

TO: Albany City Council

VIA: Peter Troedsson, City Manager
      Jeff Blaine, P.E. Public Works Engineering & Community Development Director

FROM: David Martineau, Planning Manager

DATE: March 6, 2019 for the March 11, 2019, Joint City Council/Planning Commission Meeting

SUBJECT: Albany Development Code Amendment Project
Related to Strategic Plan theme | Related to: Great Neighborhoods

Action Requested:
Information and discussion.

Discussion:
Since the last PC/CC joint work session on the Albany Development Code Amendment (DCA) Project on November 19, 2018, the Project Task Force has met four times, there have been three community open houses (total attendance: 23), and an online survey. The presentation at the upcoming March 11th work session will focus on key issues and questions that have resulted from our work to date on residential code issues. For background, we have attached the following materials:

- Multifamily Code Concepts from Task Force Meeting #3 (11/15/18) and Task Force Meeting #4 (12/13/18)
  - Multi-family Code Concepts Memorandum dated 11/5/18
  - Summary of Task Force Questionnaire results dated 12/20/18

- Code Concepts for Infill and Other Housing Types from Task Force Meeting #4 (1/16/19) and Task Force Meeting #5 (2/13/19)
  - Review of Standards and Code Concepts for Infill and Other Housing Types Memorandum dated 1/9/19
  - Additional Information for Infill & Other Housing Types Multi-family Issues Needing Further Discussion Memorandum dated 2/6/19
  - Summary of Task Force Questionnaire results dated 3/6/19

- Summary of Online Community Survey responses received as of 3/6/2019
For additional background information about the project, please visit the project website at: https://www.cityofalbany.net/departments/community-development/planning/adc

**Budget Impact:**
None.
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MEMORANDUM

Multi-family Code Concepts
Albany Development Code Amendment Project

DATE: November 5, 2018
TO: Project Task Force
FROM: Kate Rogers and Cathy Corliss, Angelo Planning Group
CC: David Martineau and Jeff Blaine, City of Albany
    Ben Weber and Matt Arnold, SERA Architects

INTRODUCTION

Outline and Purpose of this Memorandum

This memo outlines draft Multi-Family Code Concepts for the Albany Development Code (ADC) Amendment Project. This memo builds on the previous memo identifying topics related to multi-family standards and incorporates input from Task Force members at the first two meetings. The intent of this memo is to outline potential amendments in a simplified, conceptual way in order to get buy-in from stakeholders and community members on the intent and desired direction for the Code amendments before the detailed code language is drafted. The Code concepts are organized into the following topic areas:

- Separation of Uses – Transitions, Setbacks and Buffers
- Recreation and Open Space Areas
- Maximum Setbacks and Building Orientation
- Functional Design and Building Details
- Pedestrian Connections
- Vehicle Circulation System
- Parking
- Landscaping
- Supplemental Residential Design Standards in Village Centers

Questions for the Task Force

Our goal for Task Force Meeting #3 is to get input on initial code concepts for multi-family development. As you read through this memo, please look for text boxes with questions for the Task Force (example at right) and be ready to discuss these issues at Meeting #3.

Questions for the Task Force will be in text boxes like this.
DRAFT CODE CONCEPTS FOR MULTI-FAMILY

Separation of Uses – Transitions, Setbacks and Buffers

Minimum Setbacks (3.190 – Table 1).

Currently, the Residential Medium Density (RM) and Residential Medium Density Attached (RMA) zoning districts require buildings over three stories have a minimum interior setback of ten feet plus three feet for each story over three -- an interior setback meaning not adjacent to a street. For example, an eight story multi-family building would require a 25-foot interior setback (10' + 3' + 3' + 3' + 3') regardless of the use next door. Parking and travel aisles are not permitted within the setback (see ADC 3.250(2)).

To avoid having unnecessarily large setbacks (especially between two multi-family developments), City may wish to consider limiting the total size of the setback that can be required. This cap could vary based on the type of zoning and/or use that is abutting the development.

In addition to the setback requirement, Table 9-4 of the Buffering and Screening section (9.210-9.330) requires a 10-foot landscaped buffer (trees, shrubs, etc.) for multi-family next to dwellings in a residential zone, or next to commercial or mixed uses or zones.¹ The buffer can be located in the setback.

Transition to Lower Density Uses (8.270).

The current introduction to this standard explains that it is intended to “...reduce the impacts of building mass and scale.” The Code should better explain which impacts (e.g., privacy and solar access [shading], etc.) are important so that when an applicant requests an adjustment, they can address

¹ Note: multi-family buffers do not apply in the urban mixed-use zones (HD, CB, DMU, and WF).
those impacts (e.g., loss of privacy) through other means, such as window placement or fence or landscape screening.

What are the important impacts of building mass and scale that need to be addressed? Loss of privacy? Loss of solar access? Visual, noise, and lighting impacts? Other? If an applicant can solve these issues through design, should they be granted an adjustment?

The current standard requires that when abutting single-family homes, multi-family buildings shall be set back at least one foot for each foot in building height from the property line.

- To protect single-family homes in single-family zones and existing single-family homes in other zones, the City could continue to apply the current one to one setback standard when the abutting single-family home is either:
  - In a single-family zoning district (RR, RS-10, RS-6.5, RS-5, HM); or
  - Built before a certain date and still in residential use.
- But, to ensure that setbacks are reasonable, the Code could set a limit on the size of setback that can be required (e.g., one-foot setback for every foot of height of the building wall next to existing single-family homes not to exceed XX feet).
- In all other situations, the Code could just rely on the multi-family minimum setback requirements in Article 3 (see above).

Should there be a cap on the size of the setback that applies to a multi-family building abutting an existing single-family home? If so, what is a reasonable maximum limit?

Should existing single-family homes trigger the additional setback even if they are in a zone that no longer allows single-family homes? If yes, does it matter how old the home is?

Future single-family dwellings in the RM zone would not trigger the additional setback, is that ok?

What more, if anything, should be done to ensure compatibility? Should parking and maneuvering areas, driveways, active recreation areas, loading areas and/or dumpsters be prohibited between multiple family buildings and abutting single-family homes? Or, should these items be prohibited within the required setback?
Recreation and Open Space Areas

Common Open Space (8.220(1))

For multi-family projects of 10 or more units, the Code requires common open space at a ratio of 0.25 square feet for each 1.0 square feet of living space (e.g., a 20-unit project with 700 square feet units would have to provide 3,500 square feet of common open space). Within this common open space, the development must include one or more amenities. The Code includes a list of amenities, but some are not very well defined, and some (e.g., swimming pools and community centers) cost much more to provide than other (e.g., natural areas). Currently, the following amenities are listed:

- swimming pools, spas, and adjacent patios and decks
- developed and equipped adult recreation areas
- sports courts (tennis, handball, volleyball, etc.)
- community centers
- food and ornamental gardens
- lawn, deck or hard surface areas in which user amenities such as trees, shrubs, pathways, covered picnic tables, benches, and drinking fountains have been placed
- natural areas

To make the list clear and objective, the items need to be better defined and include minimum size requirements. Those which can’t be clearly defined should be deleted, but other items could be added to ensure a wide range of choices. Items that could be added to the list include:

- Designated natural resource areas and viewpoints overlooking them
- Rooftop patios

The City could also consider establishing two distinct tracks of clear and objective standards: one which requires less land, but requires higher-value amenities, and one with more space and lower value amenities. Alternatively, the Code could include a menu or point system that allows a developer to make similar trade-offs. For example, the Code could include a menu of amenities each of which has been assigned a point value. The required common open space area could be reduced if a certain number of points are provided.

---

2 This common open space requirement does not apply in the CB, HD, DMU, LE, WF and MUR zoning districts.
The Code also requires that developments provide a mix of passive and active recreational uses from the above list if the open space can accommodate more than one use. Currently it is not clear how to determine if the open space can accommodate more than one use. Adding minimum sizes to the list of amenities will help address this issue. Since passive recreation amenities are typically easier to provide, the City could make this standard clear and objective by requiring that projects over a certain size must have at least one active recreation amenity.

✗ Are there other amenities that should be added to the list of acceptable amenities?
✗ Should there be an option for applicants to provide less land for common open space if they provide higher value amenities? If so, what type of amenities should be considered high value?
✗ At what size should projects be required to provide an active recreation amenity?

Children’s Play Areas (8.220(2))

Multi-family developments larger than ten units (excluding one-bedroom and studio units) are currently required to designate one or more children’s play areas, each with a minimum size of 20’ by 20’.

The play area(s) can be located within the required common open space, but don’t count as one of the required amenities. The Code requires that the children’s play areas be placed within 300 feet of the units they are intended to serve. This helps ensure that children’s play areas are centrally located within a development and that more than one play area is available in a large development; however, this requirement has proven complicated to apply. There is also a related standard that requires that these play areas to be “centrally located”, but this is too subjective and needs to either be made clear and objective or deleted.

3 Developments located in the CB, HD, DMU, LE, WF, and MUR zoning districts are exempt from this standard.
✓ In order to ensure that children's play areas are centrally located within a development, what requirements should apply to placement of children's play areas? Is distance to the units an important element (e.g., no more than 300 feet of the units which are two-bedroom or larger in size)? If yes, then how should it be measured? For example, should it be measured from the front door of at least one of these units? Or all units two bedrooms or larger? Or just a building corner?

✓ Are there any locations within a site that would generally not be acceptable (they’re already not allowed in any required setback)?

✓ In order to ensure more than one play area within a large development, would it be better to just require one play area per multi-family building?

Private Open Space (8.230)\(^4\)

Currently, apartments must have between 80 and 96 square feet of private open space each, depending on whether they are above-grade (upper units) or at-grade (ground-floor units). The Code also includes minimum dimension and privacy requirements for these private open spaces. Having private open space for each unit is a desirable amenity, but large balconies can be difficult to build and maintain on upper floors, and it may not be possible or desirable to provide a back patio for every ground-floor unit. Also, when you have a courtyard multi-family building (e.g., a donut), you’ll have double-loaded corridors with a percentage of the units facing inwards over the courtyard – and these inward-facing units might not feasibly support their own balconies or private open space. Providing some flexibility from the current standards may reduce the cost of building multi-family developments without diminishing the quality of the outcomes. Possible code concepts include:

- Only requiring private open space for a percentage of units (e.g., 80%).
- Reduce the private open space requirement by 10 to 20% both in terms of area and minimum dimensions.

\(^4\) Developments located in the CB, HD, DMU, WF, and LE zoning district and assisted-living and nursing home developments are exempt from this standard.
• Remove the screening requirement for at-grade open space so that front porches can be more easily counted.

To provide additional flexibility, the City could also explore an approach in which required open space is a sum of the private and common open space requirements; additional standards then ensure that no less than some percentage of open space (e.g., 30% - 40%) is provided by either means.

✓ Is it acceptable not to require all units to have private open space?
✓ Are there any concerns with removing screening requirements for at-grade private open space?

Maximum Setbacks and Building Orientation

The Maximum Setbacks for Street Orientation (8.240) and Building Orientation and Entries (8.260) standards are closely related and should be considered together. Multi-family developments located on local or collector streets are subject to maximum setback requirements. For sites with 100’ or more of street frontage, at least 50% of the frontage must be occupied by a building with a maximum front setback of 25’. For sites with less than 100’ of frontage, only 40% of the frontage must meet the 25’ maximum setback.

The building orientation standards are intended to ensure that buildings “...contribute positively to the streetscape and neighborhood by carefully relating building mass, entries, and yards to public streets.” Standards encourage as many dwelling unit entries as possible to face local streets. They also prevent internal units from facing a parking lot; require building entries to be clearly defined and visible; prevent parking lots or drive aisles from being located between the building and the street; and prevent the use of long, monotonous access balconies or corridors.

While the maximum setback standards are clear and objective, the building orientation standards are largely subjective and need to be clarified. For both sections, the standards are more appropriate for more urban-style or pedestrian-oriented settings, but may not be appropriate for more suburban, lower-density developments, such as garden-style apartments. More flexibility in the standards would allow a wider variety of site configurations that are still attractive and contribute positively to the pedestrian realm.

5 Developments located in the HD, CB, DMU, and WF zoning district are exempt from these standards.
As a possible solution, the City could consider combining the two sections into one, and providing two clear and objective choices:

**Choice 1: “Street Orientation”:**
This track would be in keeping with the current standards and would include the following concepts:

- a. Buildings have a maximum setback of 25’ on local (and possibly collector) streets for 60% of frontage;
- b. Entries for facades subject to the 25’ setback must be oriented to the street;
- c. Some windows are required for the street-facing façade; and
- d. Parking is not allowed between the primary buildings and the street.

**Choice 2: “Enhanced Landscaping”:**
This would be an alternate track that is more suitable to garden-style multi-family developments, and would include the following concepts:

- a. No maximum setback is required, but parking and circulation are somewhat limited between the building and the street;
- b. An additional minimum front setback is required (e.g., 15’ in addition to the required minimum);
- c. Enhanced landscaping is required within the expanded front setback including additional trees;
- d. Some windows are required, but no street-facing entries are required.

In addition, the purpose statement for the combined standards could be adapted from the existing purpose statement for building orientation, with the following additional concepts: natural surveillance of public spaces (i.e., “eyes on the street”), creating an environment conducive to walking, human-scale design, and private, efficient use of sites.

✓ **What are the most important outcomes of the setback and orientation standards (e.g., eyes on the street, attractive frontage, pedestrian-friendliness)?**

✓ **What do you think of the two tracks proposed?**
**Functional Design and Building Details (8.250)**

These building design standards are intended to “...ensure multi-family development contributes to a high-quality living environment for residents and enhances compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood.” Again, more specificity will be needed for this purpose statement to provide sufficient guidance for an adjustment.

Standards in this section are highly subjective. Buildings are required to avoid long, flat façades; to make main entrances clearly identifiable; and to incorporate stairways into building design. However, the list of potential solutions for meeting these requirements needs to be made clear and objective while still providing flexibility.

New clear and objective standards were adopted in 2017 for multi-family development in the four urban mixed-use zones (HD, CB, DMU, WF) (Section 8.255) following an extensive public process. A possible solution for updating functional design standards in the remaining zones is to largely apply the same recently-adopted standards. Those standards apply to any façade that faces toward or within 45 degrees of a front lot line (except for buildings separated from the front lot line by another building). Regulated façades are required to provide at least two architectural features from a list of options: recessed entrances, eaves, roof or façade offsets, bay windows, balconies, decorative tops such as a cornices, or other similar features. Most of these features have minimum required dimensions. The same list of features would be appropriate for multi-family development in other zones, in addition to the mixed-use zones.

- ✓ Do you agree that this is an appropriate list of design features?
- ✓ In order to ensure that some windows face the street, the code could require a minimum percentage of (e.g., 15-20%). What percentage should be the minimum?

Section 8.255 also requires street-facing façades to provide a minimum window coverage of 25% for the ground floor, and 25% for the whole street-facing façade. For the remaining zones besides HD, CB, DMU, and WF, a less urban treatment with a lower glazing (window) requirement may be more appropriate (e.g., 15-20%).

---

6 Developments located in the HD, CB, DMU, and WF zoning district are exempt from these standards.
Pedestrian Connections (8.280)

The intent of pedestrian connections standards is to ensure that multi-family development provides “...clear and identifiable connections both internally and to adjacent uses and public streets/sidewalks.” This statement doesn’t adequately address the purpose for providing these pedestrian connections and needs to be expanded. Potential concepts include safety, minimizing conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles, reasonably direct connections, and convenient pedestrian access.

Standards in this section require projects to provide clear and safe internal connections between units, to parking areas, and to shared open spaces. They are also required to provide safe crossings of streets and driveways and safe, convenient, and attractive connections to adjacent sidewalks and adjacent uses such as parks and schools. While the substance expressed through these standards is mostly acceptable and consistent with the State Transportation Planning Rule, the language is highly subjective, does not provide adequate specificity, and could be expanded to enhance pedestrian safety and comfort.

Possible code concepts include:

- Provide greater specificity about which areas within the site require pedestrian connections (e.g., ground-level entrances, children’s play areas, etc.).
- Require walkways to be separated from vehicle circulation areas with physical barriers such as curbs. Require crosswalks to be distinguished by contrasting paving material such as concrete (but allow striping to a limited extent).
- Require connections to abutting streets for every 200 linear feet of street frontage (modifying the current standard specifying connections at 200’-300’ intervals).
- Require walkways to be hard-surfaced (with certain materials specified) and to have a minimum width (e.g., 5 feet).

✓ Regarding the first bullet, which areas of a multi-family site do you think should have a pedestrian connection to them?

✓ What do you think about the minimum walkway width and lighting requirements?

Vehicle Circulation System (8.290)

This section’s emphasis on internal vehicle circulation mimicking local street networks may not be feasible or even appropriate for all multi-family developments, especially smaller sites. Currently,
development in the HD, DMU, CB and WF zoning districts on sites under three acres is exempt from these standards.

Rather than require that internal travel aisles look like public streets, the Code could simply define design standards for interior travel aisles with direct access to parking stalls along the sides (e.g., sidewalk along both sides, landscape strips, lighting, etc.).

The City could consider an approach similar to the City of Beaverton’s which requires parking lot drive aisles that connect public streets with parking stalls to be designed similar to private streets, with raised curbs, sidewalks on both sides, landscape strips, and lighting – with some exceptions for short connections, etc.

Parking

[Lot Design] (8.300)\(^7\)

The parking design standards are intended to ensure “attractive street frontages and visual compatibility with neighborhoods by minimizing the placement of parking lots along public streets.” Standards include prohibiting parking lots from being sited between multi-family buildings and local streets (unless site constraints make this necessary); requiring that parking areas be broken up by landscaping; and requiring that parking be located in proximity to building entrances (within 100-feet of each unit).

It may not be necessary for this section to prohibit parking areas between buildings and the street, since Section 8.260 already addresses this. Also, standards for parking lot landscaping are more clearly spelled out in the landscaping standards of ADC 9.150 (as described below) so this design standard requirement could possibly be resolved by simply referring to Section 9.150. The remaining standard is the requirement that parking be located within 100-feet of each unit. This 100-foot standard is ideal if your primary concern is getting to your unit in the rain with two arms.

---

\(^7\) These standards apply in all zoning districts except HD, DMU, CB, and WF.
full of groceries...but it can lead to uninspiring site designs that prioritize parking above overall design.

**Off-street Parking (9.010-9.130)**

This section of the ADC provides standards for the minimum quantity of off-street parking required for multi-family development. Minimum parking ratios are scaled based on the number of bedrooms per unit (more bedrooms require more parking).

Rick Williams Consulting recently submitted a parking demand study for multifamily housing in Albany. The study found that actual parking demand is slightly less than the current code minimum parking requirements. The study recommended that the City consider code changes that would set required parking spaces on a per unit instead of bedroom-based formula, and also consider a reduction in the minimum number of parking spaces provided.

For the following reasons staff recommends maintaining the current bedroom-based parking formula even though it has resulted in a slight over-supply of parking spaces for multifamily developments:

- A bedroom-based parking formula will more accurately represent demand if the City begins to see a higher percentage of apartments used for college student housing.
- The current minimum parking standards only slightly exceed measured average demand. A few existing facilities had measured parking demand that equaled or slightly exceeded minimum parking requirements. Reducing the minimum parking standard would result in some future developments having an undersupply of on-site parking spaces.
- There is a strong possibility that the State will require that the City’s next Transportation System Plan (TSP) include code amendments that reduce minimum parking standards as part of an effort to reduce overall vehicle miles traveled. If that occurs, there would be no credit given for any parking reduction implemented now. Staff recommends deferring consideration of any parking reductions until required by the State through future TSP efforts.

**Landscaping (9.140-9.200)**

Per Article 3, multi-family development in all zones except the urban mixed-use zones (WF, HD, DMU, and CB) is required to landscape 100 percent of yard areas adjacent to streets. The Landscaping section of Article 9 establishes minimum planting requirements (numeric standards) for these areas where landscaping is required. If the adjustment procedure is to apply to this section, a purpose statement specific to site landscaping standards will need to be created. Potential concepts to incorporate include establishing a pleasant visual character; minimizing erosion; slowing the rate of surface water runoff and improving water quality; cooling buildings and parking lots in summer months with shade; and enhancing ecological functions and provide access to nature.
The planting requirements for multi-family residential uses could also be enhanced in order to ensure sufficient landscaping to create an attractive street frontage for multi-family buildings. One way to enhance these standards would be to increase the minimum tree planting requirement for the front setbacks of multi-family developments. An example would be changing the requirement for planting one tree for every 50 linear feet to one per 30 linear feet. Another would be requiring ground cover plantings rather than allowing merely bark or rock. The Code could also be updated to allow required landscaping to be clustered on the site.

As mentioned above, the parking lot landscaping standards of Section 9.150 provide greater specificity than the design standards of Section 8.300. The Article 9 requirements are clear and objective, providing numeric landscape standards for planter bays, entryways, parking space buffers, and alternate landscape strips. Issues with Section 8.300 could be resolved by simply referring to Section 9.150.

**Supplemental Residential Design Standards in Village Centers (8.480-8.485)**

These additional design standards apply to multi-family development on sites within the Village Center Comprehensive Plan designation. The standards are “intended to promote human-scale design, mixed-use character, and a high-quality pedestrian environment.” This purpose statement should be expanded in order to provide sufficient guidance for an adjustment and to better reflect all of the standards in this section. Potential concepts to add include high-quality and attractive building materials and providing architectural relief to reduce exterior building mass.

Some elements of the current standards in this section are subjective and should be updated.

- The Code should clarify what percentage of a building’s exterior must be surfaced with wood, brick, stucco, stone, masonry, or lap siding;
- The roofline standard could be treated similarly to the functional design standards for the urban mixed-use zones;
- Street-facing facades could be required to select at least one or two roofline treatments from a menu of options;
- The standard encouraging alleyways also needs to be made clear and objective.
Multi-family Code Concepts – Questionnaire Results

Maximum Setback and Building Orientation (Slides 4 – 8)

1. Do you think Choice #2 should be offered as an option for multi-family developments? (check one)

- Yes, on all types of development sites: 8
- Yes, but only on certain development: 2
- Neutral / Don’t know: 0
- No, it shouldn’t be an option: 2

Comments:
- Don’t create more issues w/choice #2. Clear and objective w/adjusted [indecipherable]
- Enhanced landscaping: lighting for pedestrian safety? Forward facing means porch lights; fewer window implies less lighting along.
- Yes, but only as an increase in # of plantings if implemented. Also – reduce building frontage to 40% or less for lots under 3 ac or 200’ ROW frontage.
- No, use adjustment process.
- Point system to obtain goals and options
- No additional front setback and 2 or 3 year guarantee/bond on landscaping.
- Should have clear goal, be flexible, and provide an enhanced development experience.

Functional Design and Building Details (Slides 10 – 11)

2. We suggest using the same list of options in the multi-family zones. Does this approach seem reasonable? (check one)

- Yes, it seems reasonable: 11
- Neutral / Don’t know: 0
- No, a different approach should be used to avoid long, flat facades: 0

Comments:
- Delete cornices, lower glazing
• **Balcony:** would love to ensure x% of development include balcony options
• **Reduce fenestration/window requirements to 10%**
• **Amount of window on first floor may be a problem**
• **Add metal decorative feature attached or freestanding to list. Minus the % of window requirements.**

**Pedestrian Connections (Slides 12 – 13)**

3. In order to ensure connections are “clear, easily-identifiable, and safe” and “convenient” what do you think about requiring the following improvements for pedestrian connections within multi-family developments? *(check ‘OK’ or ‘Not OK’, leave blank for “neutral/don’t know”)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Neutral / don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical separation between walkways and vehicle circulation (e.g., with curbs)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrasting paving material for crosswalks (e.g., concrete; allow striping to a limited extent)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections to abutting streets for every 200 linear ft of street frontage</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard-surfaced walkways with a minimum width (e.g., 5 ft)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

• *[re: 2nd concept] Striping and lighting sufficient.*

4. The Code requires pedestrian connections to adjacent uses such as parks, schools, retail areas, and bus stops. Are there other uses that should be on the list?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes (list below in comments)</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral / don’t know</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

• **Walking or bike paths**
• **Remove requirement – encourage**
• **Not mandated but other options to consider permitted**
• **Don’t require connections to other than frontage ROW.**
• That’s what public sidewalks are for. Provide connections to public sidewalks.
• Should permit but not require the connections.
• Seems fine as is

Vehicle Circulation (Slide 14)

5. Do you agree with this approach? (check one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Neutral / Don’t know</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
• Not specific – do away with requirements
• Sidewalk only on one side? Depending upon size of property. Safe pedestrian access is good.
• That requirement increases costs, impervious surfaces.
• Yes, but only for large unit counts or length of drive aisles.
• Sidewalks on one side would be sufficient. Multiple levels for requirements of larger developments.

Parking Lot Design (Slide 15)

6. Do you think it’s important to retain a proximity requirement? (check one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Neutral / Don’t know</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. If you answered ‘yes’ to question #6, what should the standard be? (check one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 feet (current requirement)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify):</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
• Need to retain considerations for folks alter-abled. First choices of units, etc.
• Retain goal / provide flexibility

Landscaping (Slide 17)

8. Do you support increasing the minimum tree planting requirements for front setbacks? (check one)
Comments:

- More if they choose.
- Let “enhanced landscape” option be flexible.

Supplemental Residential Design Standards for Village Centers (Slides 18 – 20)

9. What minimum percentage of a building’s exterior should be required to be surfaced with one or more of the listed materials (check one)

- 100% (except for doors and windows): 1
- 80%: 5
- 60%: 3
- Other (please specify): 1
- Neutral / Don’t know: 1

Comments:

- Make clear
- Why not just forbid the material you are trying to forbid?
- Just make the verbiage clear
- One or more

Separation of Uses: Transition Setbacks (Slides 21 – 26)

10. In which of these scenarios should the additional “1:1 Transition to Lower Density Uses” setback apply? (check all that apply)

Multi-family site abutting a single-family zone:

- a. Existing single-family home in a single-family zone: 10
- b. School/church or other non-residential use in a single-family zone: 6
- c. Vacant lot in a single-family zone: 9

Multi-family site NOT abutting a single-family zone:
Comments:

- **Cap 30’**
- **Zone changes should not make multifamily get out of 1:1**
- **Capped**
  - With a cap and “grandfathered” date; “those built after xyz date.”
- **Cap at 30’. Ok as presented.**
- **Cap at 30’**
- **Maximum 30’ for RM.**
- **Limit setbacks to 30’ max**
- **30 ft is good. [Re: vacant lot in a SF zone] Should voice concern or not buy for single family residence. [Re: vacant lot or SF home built after code adoption in MF zone]**
  - Cap at 10 ft. Buyer responsibility.
- **30 feet seems great.**

Recreation and Open Space Areas (Slides 27 – 32)

11. What do you think about the following proposed concepts? (check ‘OK’ or ‘Not OK’)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A point system (or similar) for open space standards</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require less open space area in exchange for higher-quality facilities</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility to mix and match common and private open space to some degree</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce some open space minimum dimensions</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow some dwellings not to have private open space (currently 100%)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simplifying/clarifying the rules for children’s play areas</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

- **Apartments on Oak: small postage stamp size patios look ridiculous. Are they usable?**
• [Re: 3rd concept] It should maintain @ around 75%-80% for aesthetic & livability. [Re: 5th concept:] Depends on definition.
• Add fenced dog parks to amenities. All interior setbacks can be included in open space. Reduce open space to 20% or 15%.
• Point system for all design standards.
• Dwellings required to have private open space: 60%
MEMORANDUM

Review of Standards and Code Concepts for Infill and Other Housing Types
Albany Development Code Amendment Project

DATE January 9, 2019
TO Project Task Force
FROM Kate Rogers and Cathy Corliss, Angelo Planning Group
CC David Martineau and Jeff Blaine, City of Albany
Ben Weber and Matt Arnold, SERA Architects

INTRODUCTION

Similar to the Task Force’s recent work on the multi-family standards, this task evaluates the Albany Development Code (ADC or Code) requirements related to other housing types to ensure that the standards are clear and objective. The standards for other housing types include standards related to the development of four distinct housing types:

- Detached Single Family, including infill development
- Attached Single Family (aka zero lot line or townhouse)
- Two Attached Units (Duplex)
- Two Detached Units

*NOTE: More than two units (e.g., tri-plexes and above) are considered multi-family. The standards related to accessory dwelling units are being addressed through a separate process.*
The focus of our analysis and recommendations are related to the articles and sections listed in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article 3</th>
<th>Article 4</th>
<th>Article 5</th>
<th>Article 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.050</td>
<td>4.050</td>
<td>5.060</td>
<td>8.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.080</td>
<td>4.060</td>
<td>5.070</td>
<td>8.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.230</td>
<td>4.150</td>
<td>5.100</td>
<td>8.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.250</td>
<td>4.220</td>
<td>5.130</td>
<td>8.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.270</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.150</td>
<td>8.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outline and Purpose of this Memorandum

This memorandum combines both the findings of our code assessment and some initial code concepts. For each of the standards evaluated, the memo provides:

- **Summary** - A very brief summary of the applicable requirements and their intent;
- **Assessment** - Our assessment of the existing code language related to three key points (as applicable):
  - Purpose - Whether the current purpose statement language is sufficiently specific to provide guidance for an Adjustment\(^1\)
  - C & O - Whether current standards are clear and objective (C & O)
  - Substance - Whether the City Council or Project Team has identified any potential concerns with the substance of the standards. We are interested in hearing concerns from the Task Force as well.
    Note: For brevity, only those code sections where we have comments are included in the memo.
- **Code Concepts** – A description of potential code amendments in a simplified, conceptual way.

Questions for the Task Force

Our goal for Task Force Meeting #5 is to gain feedback on initial code concepts related to single-family and two-family attached and detached housing types.

---

\(^1\) Our working assumption for this memorandum is that the discretionary track of the new two-track system will allow the use of adjustments on a much broader scale than is currently permitted and that the approval criteria for the Adjustment will reference the purpose statement of the regulation to be adjusted; therefore, a robust purpose statement is needed.
Please keep the following questions in mind as you read through this memo and be ready to discuss these issues at Task Force Meeting #5.

- Do you concur with the assessments below regarding which code sections need work to make them clear and objective?
- Do you think the Infill and Redevelopment Standards of Section 8.140 are helping to preserve neighborhood compatibility (as intended), or should this section be amended or deleted in favor of relying on the setback, parking and height standards of the base zone?
- Are you aware of any other code sections applicable to single-family or two-family housing types that are not clear and objective or which otherwise should be discussed?

The project team recognizes that some of these questions are more easily answered by Task Force members with direct development experience. For members without direct development experience it may not be possible to answer these questions in advance; that is okay. As part of the Task Force meetings the project team will describe the purpose of current standards and provide examples of favorable and unfavorable outcomes for your consideration through both discussion and visual aids. The project team anticipates that as discussions progress you will formulate your own responses to the questions above, and others posed through discussion.

### A. RESIDENTIAL ZONING DISTRICTS (ARTICLE 3)

Article 3 provides the “base zone” standards for residential zoning districts. This article establishes which uses are allowed in which districts, and outlines basic development standards. The residential zoning districts are listed below.

- RR—Residential Reserve District
- RS-10—Residential Single Family District
- RS-6.5—Residential Single Family District
- RS-5—Residential Single Family District
- RM—Residential Medium Density District
- RMA—Residential Medium Density Attached District
- HM—Hackleman-Monteith District*

* The State requirements for clear and objective standards for housing do not apply to an application or permit for residential development in historic areas designated for protection under a land use planning goal protecting historic areas. Portions of the Hackleman-Monteith District may fall within this exemption.

**Uses (3.040-3.080)**

**Summary** – As outlined in the Schedule of Permitted Uses in Article 3, the housing types assessed in this memo that are permitted in the residential zoning districts include:
• **Detached Single Family** – Except for the Residential Medium Density Attached (RMA) district, this use is permitted outright in all residential zones and does not require discretionary review.

• **Attached Single Family** (aka zero lot line or townhouse) – Permitted outright in the RS-5, RM, and RMA districts. Requires Planned Development (PD) or Cluster Development (CD) approval in the RS-10 and RS-6.5 districts. Not permitted in the RR or HM districts.

• **Two Attached Units (Duplex)** – Permitted outright in the RM and RMA districts. Also permitted outright in the RS-10, RS-6.5, and RS-5 districts, but limited to corner lots, except through a PD/CD within the South Albany Area Plan boundary. Not permitted in the RR or HM districts.

• **Two Detached Units** – Permitted outright in the RM and RMA districts. Requires PD/CD review in the RS-10, RS-6.5, and R-5 zones and Site Plan approval in the HM district. Not permitted in the RR district.

**Assessment** – The recent changes to ORS 197.303 and 197.307 (adopted through Senate Bill 1051) mandate that local jurisdictions have a set of clear and objective development standards for all housing projects in zones in which residential uses are permitted. This means that there must be a clear and objective path for residential development within each residential zone. While not every housing type is permitted outright in every district, all of the housing types are allowed outright in at least one residential district and every district allows some type of residential development with clear and objective standards.

**Development Standards (3.190-3.390)**

Development standards for the residential zoning districts regulate basic site attributes for development, including minimum land requirement per unit, minimum lot width, minimum setbacks, maximum height, maximum lot coverage, and minimum landscaped area. For the most part, the development standards, as they relate to the four housing types assessed in this memo, are clear and objective. A handful of potential issues related to standards that are not objective or are unclear are identified below.

**3.220 Bonus Provisions for Reduction in Standard Lot Size Requirements**

**Summary** – This section allows reductions in the average minimum lot size and area per unit requirements (aka density bonuses) when development sites meet certain standards. Density bonuses are permitted in the following categories: proximity to a collector or arterial; transfer from a Significant Natural Resource Overlay district; energy conservation; moderate-cost housing; and alley access.

**Assessment** – Some of the language in this section needs to be clarified to avoid multiple interpretations of standards. For example, under the Significant Natural Resource Overlays standards [3.220(3-4)], the Code states that “up to 50 percent of the development density can be transferred” within a development site. But it is unclear whether the applicant or the City determines what percent can be transferred, within the maximum 50 percent allowance.
Also, in the Solar Access Protection and Moderate-Cost Housing subsections [3.220(5-6)], density bonuses are allowed if a certain percentage of the homes or units meet certain standards (10% bonus allowed when 80% of lots meet solar access standards; 5% bonus when 50% of units meet affordability standards). However, the City may consider applying some degree of density bonus if a smaller percentage of homes/units meet the standards (e.g., 70% of lots; 30% of units).

**Code Concept:** Amend language in Sections 3.220(3-6) to make it clear how the density bonuses and transfers are determined. Consider permitting a smaller density bonus in Sections 3.220(5-6) for developments that meet the standards to a lesser degree.

### 3.230 Setback Measurements - Table 2: Accessory Structure Standards

**Summary/Assessment** – This table lists setback standards for accessory structures in residential zones. Most of these standards are clear, but the “Garage or carport with access to an alley” standards should be clarified to specify that they do not apply to garages or carports that are not making use of the alley access.

**Code Concept:** Possible rewording – “Garage or carport utilizing access to an alley.” Also resolve confusion related to definition of “accessory building” relative to accessory structure standards.

### 3.240 Alternative Setbacks in Developed Areas

**Summary/Assessment** – This section allows buildings not to meet the setback standards of the zoning district, as long as the setbacks match those of either existing buildings on the same site or buildings on adjoining parcels. The Code states that “the Director may approve setbacks that are the same as those for the existing buildings…” which indicates that staff discretion is involved. Although a list of criteria is provided, which must be met for the alternative setbacks to be approved, the language is not clear about precisely what circumstances would allow the Director to not approve the proposed setbacks.

**Code Concept:** Adjust the language in this section to provide clarity about when and how the Director could/should deny such a request; or, make this section non-discretionary (i.e., request will be approved if criteria are met) and clarify the criteria to ensure they are clear and objective (e.g., define how abutting properties are determined).

**NOTE:** This section refers to the Infill Design Standards of Section 8.140. See a discussion of those standards under Section D of this memo.

### 3.250 Parking and Other Restrictions in Setback or Yard Areas

**Summary/Assessment** – This section prohibits vehicle parking in the front yard/setback area, except on a driveway that leads to a garage or carport or a driveway that provides required parking spaces. It also establishes location and dimensional standards for required parking spaces. (NOTE: “required parking” refers to the parking spaces that are required to meet the minimum off-street vehicle parking standards of Article 9). This section could be simplified and reworded to make the
standards clearer and easier to interpret. We will further evaluate the intent and purpose of the standards.

**Code Concept:** Reorganize and reword this section to clarify the standards and make them more specific.

**B. COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL ZONING DISTRICTS (ARTICLE 4)**

Article 4 provides the “base zone” standards for commercial and industrial zoning districts. The districts are listed below.

- OP – Office Professional District
- NC – Neighborhood Commercial District
- CC – Community Commercial District
- RC – Regional Commercial District
- TD – Transit District*
- IP – Industrial Park District*
- LI – Light Industrial District*
- HI – Heavy Industrial District*

*The State requirements related to needed housing do not apply to industrial districts.

**Uses (4.040-4.075)**

**Summary** – As outlined in the Schedule of Permitted Uses in Article 4, the housing types assessed in this memo that are permitted in the commercial zoning districts include:

- **Single Family Detached** – Permitted outright in the OP district, and through Site Plan Review in the NC district. Single-family homes built before December 11, 2002 may remain as a permitted use without being nonconforming in the other commercial districts.
- **Attached Single Family** – Permitted through CU review in the OP district. The same allowance for homes built before December 11, 2002 applies to single-family attached homes in other commercial districts.
- **Two Attached Units (Duplex)** – Permitted through CU review in the OP district, and through Site Plan Review in the NC district.
- **Residential units located above or attached to a business** (whether single-family, two-family, or multi-family) are permitted through Site Plan Review in the OP, NC and CC districts and permitted through CU review in the RC district.

**Assessment** – As discussed above under Section A, State statutes require that local jurisdictions provide a clear and objective path for all housing projects on land zoned for residential use or mixed residential and commercial use. Currently, some type of discretionary review is required for every residential use category except for single-family homes in the OP district.
NOTE: Because of the interrelationship of commercial and residential uses in a mixed-use development, the project team proposes that the Task Force consider the need for clear and objective standards for residential uses in commercial zones at the same time as we consider the standards for non-residential uses in those zones.

Development Standards (4.090-4.300)
As in Article 3, development standards for the commercial and industrial zoning districts regulate basic site attributes for development, including minimum land requirement per unit, minimum lot width, minimum setbacks, maximum height, maximum lot coverage, and minimum landscaped area. For the most part, the development standards, as they relate to the four housing types assessed in this memo, are clear and objective. A few potential issues related to standards that are either not objective or are unclear are identified below.

4.150 Zero Lot Line
Summary/Assessment—This section allows residential buildings to be built to the property line but only when there are no openings or windows in the lot line wall and a six-foot setback and maintenance easement is recorded on the adjoining property deed or plat. The easement must be 6 feet wide.

In those situations where there is no side or rear setback required, this standard creates an additional burden for residential development. These standards have been flagged by Task Force members as problematic and unfair because similar setbacks/easements are not required for commercial development. It appears that this requirement may have related to a Building code requirement that is no longer applicable and the allowance to allow zero lot line for attached single-family dwellings is covered by Section 4.160 Interior Setbacks for Attached Dwellings.

*Code Concept: Reassess the need for this to be a requirement. Potentially consider revising to allow an applicant to propose an easement on the adjacent property as a means of meeting the required setback.*

4.220 Parking Restrictions in Setback Areas
Similar to Section 3.250, discussed above, this section prohibits vehicle parking in required front or side setbacks, except for driveways used to fulfill parking requirements for single-family and two-family residences. Similar code provisions should be provided here for residential uses as apply in residential districts.

*Code Concept: Reorganize and reword this section to be consistent with the standards applied in the residential districts (see Section A, above).*
**C. MIXED USE ZONING DISTRICTS (ARTICLE 5)**

Article 5 provides the “base zone” standards for mixed use zoning districts. The districts are listed below.

- *HD – Historic Downtown District*
- DMU – Downtown Mixed Use District
- CB – Downtown Central Business District
- MUR – Mixed Use Residential District
- WF – Waterfront District
- LE – Lyon-Ellsworth
- MS – Main Street District
- ES – Elm Street District
- PB – Pacific Boulevard District
- MUC – Mixed Use Commercial District

*The State requirements for clear and objective standards for housing do not apply to an application or permit for residential development in historic areas designated for protection under a land use planning goal protecting historic areas. Portions of the Historic Downtown District may fall within this exemption.*

**Uses (5.050-5085)**

As outlined in the Schedule of Permitted Uses in Article 5, the housing types assessed in this memo that are permitted in the mixed use zoning districts include:

- **Single Family Detached** – Permitted outright in the MUR district. Also permitted in MUC, but must have a minimum gross density of 10 units per acre. In the DMU, CB, ES, LE, and WF districts, new construction of single-family detached housing is prohibited, but buildings originally built as single-family houses or churches may be converted to a single-family residential use without requiring a land use application (this also applies to the HD district). New single-family is prohibited in the PB district. In all districts existing single-family and two-family units built before December 11, 2002, may remain as a permitted use in any zone without being nonconforming.
- **Attached Single Family.** Permitted outright in the MUR district and in the MUC district, but in MUC must have a minimum gross density of 10 units per acre. Allowed in DMU, CB, and WF districts with site plan review if driveway standards of ADC 8.150(1) are met, otherwise conditional use is required. In the ES district, conditional use review is required. New single-family attached housing is prohibited in the PB, LE and MS districts.
- **Two Family Units (duplexes)** – Requirements are the same as for Attached Single Family (see above).
- **Residential units located above or attached to a business** (whether single-family, two-family, or multi-family) are permitted through Site Plan Review in the all of the mixed use zones
and subject to Special Condition #17 in MUC and HD (see discussion of Special Conditions, below).

As discussed above under Section A, State statutes require that local jurisdictions provide a clear and objective path for all housing projects on land zoned for residential use or mixed residential and commercial use. Currently, some type of discretionary review is required for every residential use category except for single-family and two-family units in the MUR and MUC districts.

As noted previously, because of the interrelationship of commercial and residential uses in a mixed-use development, the project team proposes that the Task Force consider the need for clear and objective standards for residential uses in commercial zones at the same time as we consider the standards for non-residential uses in those zones.

5.070 Special Conditions
Subsections 15-17 in this section identify special conditions for single-family, two-family, and other residential development in the mixed-use districts. While confusing and somewhat difficult to follow, the wording of the conditions is generally clear and objective except as noted below.

One of the special conditions in this section is subjective: 5.070(17)(a) states that in the MS and ES districts, dwelling units at the street level are discouraged unless located behind a retail, service or office storefront. This criterion should be made clear and objective.

*Code Concept: Reword Subsection 5.070(17)(a) to state that dwelling units at the street level are prohibited unless located behind a retail, service or office storefront. Applicants could request exceptions to this requirement through a discretionary review process. Another option would be to apply similar location criteria that apply to dwelling units above or attached to a business in the HD district, as outlined in 5.070(17)(c).*

Development Standards (5.090-5.370)
As in Articles 3 and 4, development standards for mixed-use districts regulate basic site attributes for development. For the most part, the development standards, as they relate to the housing types assessed in this memo, are clear and objective. A handful of potential issues related to standards that are either not objective or unclear are identified below.

5.100 Setbacks - Table 5-3: Accessory Structure Standards

**Summary/Assessment** – This table has the same issue that was identified for Article 3, Table 2—the “Garage or carport with access to an alley” standards need to be clarified to specify that they do not apply to garages and carports that are not making use of the alley access.

*Code Concept: Possible rewording - “Garage or carport utilizing access to an alley.” Also resolve confusion related to definition of “accessory building” relative to accessory structure standards.*
5.130 Alternative Setbacks in Developed Areas

Summary/Assessment – This section has the same issues that were identified for Section 3.240, above. The Code indicates that staff discretion is involved by using the phrase “the Director may approve...” Similar changes are needed for this section as are needed for Article 3, to make it clear and objective.

Code Concept: Adjust the language in this section to provide clarity about when and how the Director could/should deny such a request; or, make this section non-discretionary (i.e., request will be approved if criteria are met) and clarify the criteria to ensure they are clear and objective (e.g., define how abutting properties are determined).

5.150 Zero Lot Line

Summary/Assessment – This section has the same issues identified above for commercial and industrial districts in Section 4.150.

Code Concept: Reassess the need for this to be a requirement. Consider revising to allow an applicant to propose an easement on the adjacent property as a means of meeting the required setback.

D. ARTICLE 8 DESIGN STANDARDS – SINGLE FAMILY HOMES

The standards of ADC Sections 8.110 through 8.160 apply to all new single-family detached units, manufactured homes, two-family units (duplexes), and single-family attached units on individual lots. There are exceptions for steeply sloped lots and flag lots. However, only Sections 8.130 (Home Orientation) and 8.133 (Street-Facing Windows) apply to all new single family homes. Section 8.140 just applies to infill and redevelopment projects and Sections 8.150 and 8.160 apply only to the DMU, CB, HD, and WF Zoning Districts.

8.100 Purpose.

The purpose statement in Section 8.100 (shown below) provides the rationale for the standards in Sections 8.130, 3.133 and 8.140. The first two sentences relate to 8.130 and 8.133. The second two sentences to Section 8.140. Sections 8.150 and 8.160 include individual purpose statements.

The design standards for single-family homes are intended to create pedestrian-friendly, sociable, safe and attractive neighborhoods through human-scale design. These standards emphasize the functional relationship between the home and the street. Compatibility standards protect the architectural character of existing neighborhoods. These design standards are adaptable to many different architectural styles.

Assessment – The purpose statement generally provides adequate direction for a potential adjustment; however, it may be easier to apply if each standard had its own purpose statement.

Code Concept: Delete this section and provide individual purpose statements for Sections 8.130, 8.133 and 8.140.
8.130 Home Orientation.

**Summary** – This standard requires that at least one main entrance of each new home shall be within eight feet of the longest street-facing wall of the dwelling unit (excluding the garage); and either face the street (or be within 45 degrees) or open onto a covered porch which has an entrance facing the street. This standard relates to the overall purpose statement in 8.100 emphasis on creating “…pedestrian-friendly, sociable, safe and attractive neighborhoods through human-scale design.”

**Assessment** – The current standard is clear and objective. “Main entrance” is a defined term. The purpose statement provides adequate direction. No issues regarding implementation have been noted.

CODE CONCEPT: **Potential minor clarification with regard to how the entrance requirement applies to corner lots especially in the case of townhouses which may have a long street facing side wall.**

8.133 Street-Facing Windows.

**Summary** – This standard requires that at least 15 percent of the area of each façade that faces a street lot line must be windows or main entrance doors (excluding the area of any street-facing garage doors for motor vehicle ingress/egress). This standard relates to the overall purpose statement in 8.100 emphasis on creating “…pedestrian-friendly, sociable, safe and attractive neighborhoods through human-scale design” by providing an opportunity for eyes on the street.

**Assessment** – The current standard is generally clear and objective. The purpose statement provides adequate direction, although some additional clarity regarding the public safety benefits of having eyes on the street might be beneficial. No issues regarding implementation have been noted.

CODE CONCEPT: **Potential minor addition to the purpose statement that the standards provide a public safety benefit of ensuring “eyes on the street” and other community policing principles.**

8.140 Additional Standards for Infill and Redevelopment.

**Summary** – These standards apply to all new houses, manufactured homes, duplex, and attached houses sited as infill development, except in the HD, DMU, CB, and WF zones. These standards also apply where a home is removed to make way for a new house, manufactured home, duplex, and attached house. These standards do not apply to a dwelling that is proposed on land that is large enough that it can be divided into four or more lots.

“Infill development” means a dwelling that is proposed

- On land that is zoned for residential use
- Where at least 75 percent of the abutting parcels have a dwelling, but not counting any parcel that is too small for a residence and any parcel that is large enough that it can be divided into four or more lots.

In the example below, assuming the block is zoned for residential use, development proposed on Parcel A would be Infill and development proposed on Parcel B would not be Infill.
• Parcel A has 4 parcels within 150 feet, and 3 out of 4 (75%) have dwellings, so this parcel would be subject to the Infill Standards.
• Parcel B has 5 parcels within 150 feet, but 1 is large enough to be divided into 4 or more lots so it doesn’t count. In this case 2 out of 4 (50%) of the qualifying parcels have a dwelling, so this parcel would not be subject to the Infill Standards.

For infill development, applicants must submit a vicinity plan showing development on lots that are located within 150 feet on either side of the subject property and meet the following standards:

(a) The house can be set no more than five feet closer to the street than the closest home, and no more than five feet farther from the street than the farthest home when compared with other homes within 150 feet on either side of the lot.

(b) A garage is required if more than 50 percent of the homes within 150 feet on either side of the lot has a garage. If more than 50 percent of the homes have a carport, then a carport or garage is required. If there is a mixture of garages or carports for more than 50 percent of the homes, then a carport or garage is required. The garage or carport shall be of like materials and color as the home.
(c) A home shall be no more than one story higher than the lowest home when compared with homes on either side of the subject property.

Assessment – The current standards are generally clear and objective, but are somewhat confusing as noted below:

- The applicability is somewhat confusing in terms of how the term “abutting” is intended to be used. The term is not defined in the Code. Interpretation of which parcels “count” as “abutting” has been problematic. City staff doesn’t typically count properties behind the subject site. It’s also unclear whether to measure to the actual residences if they lie within 150 feet, or just the property line of the countable parcel, or how to handle corner properties or lots that lie within 150 feet of the subject parcel but are located in the next block over.
- The term “dwelling” is used in the applicability, do parcels with multi-family dwellings also count when abutting? What about when the site abuts parcels in another zone?
- It’s not entirely clear how to apply the garage requirement if a parcel that has a home with the garage is within 150’ but the home itself is further than 150’.
- Existing garage conversions can create a problem. It’s not clear whether a garage should be required if some of the garages on properties within 150 feet have been converted to living space.
- The requirement that “The garage or carport shall be of like materials and color as the home” when taken literally may be difficult to implement.

The purpose statement provides some direction, although additional clarity regarding what is intended by “compatibility” would be helpful. These standards have been difficult to implement. The setback standard in (a) may not lead to the best design outcome if new development is required to replicate a less-than-desirable outcome. If pedestrian-friendliness is an important purpose, it may be appropriate to allow buildings to be closer to the street, even if it changes existing “character”. The requirement for infill houses to have garages or carports in (b) can be challenging to implement and adds more cost. Finally, because these standards do not apply to remodels of existing houses, nothing would preclude an abutting property from adding an
additional floor in the future up to the maximum allowed by the zone, so the height limit in (c) could become moot.

**Code Concept:** Re-evaluate the need for these standards and consider whether they should apply in historic neighborhoods only; whether there should be a difference between the application of infill standards between an established neighborhood and a new subdivision; or whether they should be deleted (new development would still be subject to the setback, parking and height standards of the base zone).

NOTE: Section 3.240 (Alternative Setbacks in Developed Areas) provides the same reduction in setbacks at the applicant’s request for non-infill parcels. If deleted from Article 8, then additional changes will be needed in Section 3.240 (Alternative Setbacks in Developed Areas) to ensure measurement methodology is included.

### 8.150 Parking and Access in the DMU, CB, HD, and WF Zoning Districts.

**Summary** — These standards, which were recently adopted, are intended to support a pedestrian-friendly street environment by minimizing the visual and safety impacts of driveways, parking, and garages; and to preserve on-street parking.

**Assessment** — The current standards are clear and objective. The purpose statement provides adequate guidance. No issues regarding implementation have been noted. However, subsection (2), which requires conditional use review to vary from the clear and objective standards and was intended as a “placeholder”, can be deleted once a two-track system is adopted.

(2) Conditional review option. Developments that do not meet the standards of (1)(a) or (b), above, may be reviewed through a Conditional Use process, pursuant to ADC 2.230-2.265.

**Code Concept:** Delete 8.150(2) as part of adopting two-track system (i.e., new Adjustment procedures).

### 8.160 Façade design and articulation in the DMU, CB, HD, and WF Zoning Districts.

**Summary** — These standards, which were recently adopted, are intended to promote buildings that provide visual interest and façade details that give a sense of quality and permanence and provide privacy for ground floor residential uses.

**Assessment** — These standards were adopted prior to the establishment of a two-track system. The current standards in (1) and (2) both include lists with clear and objective choices, but both lists also include an option that requires the exercise of discretion.

(1)(g) Other: feature not listed but providing visual relief or contextually appropriate design similar to options a-f.

(2)(c) Other suitable landscaping that provides both privacy and visual interest and includes living plants, shrubs, and/or trees.

NOTE: Notice and an appeal period are required when discretion is applied.
**Code Concept:** Options (1)(g) and (2)(c) could be deleted from the list and the concepts included in the purpose statements since the same flexibility would be provided through the new two-track system. Alternatively, it should be clarified that applicants choosing to use either (1)(g) or (2)(c) cannot be processed as a Type I.
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MEMORANDUM

DATE       February 6, 2019
TO          Albany Development Code Amendment Project Task Force
FROM        Kate Rogers and Cathy Corliss, Angelo Planning Group
RE          Additional Information for Infill & Other Housing Types
            Multi-family Issues Needing Further Discussion
CC          David Martineau and Jeff Blaine, City of Albany
            Ben Weber and Matt Arnold, SERA Architects

Additional Information: Infill & Other Housing Types

At Task Force meeting #5 on January 16, 2019, the project team discussed Special Conditions in Article 5 that limit street-level dwelling units in the Main Street (MS) and Elm Street (ES) districts (see the zoning map in Figure 1). The Albany Development Code (ADC) language is as follows:

5.070 Special Conditions

5.070(17) Residential Development in CB, HD, MS, ES, and MUC.

(a) In MS and ES, dwelling units at the street level are discouraged unless located behind a retail, service or office storefront.

As noted in the memo provided in advance of Task Force meeting #5, this criterion is subjective and needs to be made clear and objective. The project team suggested the following code concept:

Code Concept: Reword Subsection 5.070(17)(a) to state that dwelling units at the street level are prohibited unless located behind a retail, service or office storefront. Applicants could request exceptions to this requirement through a discretionary review process. Another option would be to apply similar location criteria that apply to dwelling units above or attached to a business in the HD district, as outlined in 5.070(17)(c).

Task Force members were concerned about prohibiting street-level units outright (unless located behind a commercial storefront), and preferred the option of applying similar location criteria as those outlined in 5.070(17)(c) for the Historic Downtown (HD) district (shown in Figure 1). That code section is as follows:

(c) In HD, dwelling units above or attached to a business are limited as follows. For the purposes of this section, the non-residential portion of a live/work dwelling unit is regulated as part of the dwelling unit and subject to all of the standards below.

i. Units above a business: Dwelling units on the second story or above are permitted.
ii. Units behind a business: Dwelling units on the first story that are separated from the front lot line by a non-residential use are permitted. The non-residential use may be located within the same building or in another building.

iii. Units attached to a business on a multiple frontage lot: On a lot with three or more street frontages, dwelling units are permitted on the first story facing a street line that is considered an interior lot line pursuant to the definition of front lot line in Article 22; however, in no case shall first-story dwelling units face onto First or Second Avenue. Street-facing first-story dwelling units shall meet all applicable setbacks and design standards in Articles 5 and 8 as if the street line that the units are facing were a front lot line.

iv. All other units above or attached to a business are prohibited.

Similar location criteria in this section could be applied in the MS and ES districts. Please note the underlined text in subsection 5.070(17)(c).iii, which prohibits first-story dwelling units facing First or Second Avenues in the HD district. An equivalent standard for the MS and ES districts would be to prohibit first-story dwelling units facing Main Street or Elm Street. However, Main Street and Elm Street do not have the same commercial patterns as First and Second Streets in the HD district. Those streets anchor Albany’s historic commercial core, whereas Elm Street and Main Street have more of a mixed residential/commercial character. The Task Force may wish to consider whether prohibiting first-story dwelling units facing Main Street or Elm Street is appropriate in these districts.

Figure 1: Albany Zoning Map
Infill & Other Housing Types – Questionnaire Results

ARTICLE 3 RESIDENTIAL ZONING DISTRICTS

1. Bonus Provisions for Reduction in Standard Lot Size Requirements (Slides 11 - 12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I concur with both (a) and (b)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In part, I concur with (a) but not (b)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In part, I concur with (b) but not (a)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, I don’t concur with either concept</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral / Don’t know</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
- *May not help in many cases. Reduced lot sizes as density bonus can be more useful.*

2. Setback Measurements - Table 2: Accessory Structure Standards (Slide 13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I concur with both (a) and (b)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In part, I concur with (a) but not (b)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In part, I concur with (b) but not (a)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, I don’t concur with either concept</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral / Don’t know</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
- *Don’t require site plan review for detached garages.*

3. Alternative Setbacks in Developed Area (Slide 14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I concur with (a)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I concur with (b)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, I don’t concur with either concept</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral / Don’t know</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
• Set limits to protect minimum requirements (e.g., 3 ft min sideyard setback).
• With discretion
• Suggested exception language couldn’t possibly cover all potential exceptions; could fall along political lines and be inconsistent.
• "kind of" with criteria

4. Parking and Other Restrictions in Setback or Yard Areas (Slide 15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Concur 11</th>
<th>Not Concur 0</th>
<th>Neutral/Don't Know 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
I concur with (a)     |           |              |                      |
No, I don’t concur with the concept |           |              |                      |
Neutral/Don’t know     |           |              |                      |

Comments:
• Move parking in landscaping to municipal code. Don’t make front yards able to all park.
• Restrict the % of parking allowed in the front yard.
• Simplify. Don’t make more restrictive.
• Parking on lawn ___ unless washing the car.
• Waiting for re-write

ARTICLE 4 COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL ZONING DISTRICTS

5. Zero Lot Line (Slide 18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Concur 7</th>
<th>Not Concur 3</th>
<th>Neutral/Don’t Know 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Yes, I concur with both (a) and (b)|          |              |                      |
In part, I concur with (a) but not (b)|          |              |                      |
In part, I concur with (b) but not (a)|          |              |                      |
No, I don’t concur with either concept|          |              |                      |
Neutral/Don’t know               |           |              |                      |

Comments:
• Eliminate: easement; Add: subject to building codes for zero setback.
• Reassessment may clarify sufficient enough to not need alternative options.

6. Parking and Other Restrictions in Setback or Yard Areas (Slide 19)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Concur 11</th>
<th>Not Concur 0</th>
<th>Neutral/Don’t Know 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
I concur with (a)     |           |              |                      |
No, I don’t concur with the concept |           |              |                      |
Neutral/Don’t know     |           |              |                      |

Comments:
• Allow boat and trailer parking in sideyard.
• Yard parking is common in any neighborhood

ARTICLE 5 MIXED USE ZONING DISTRICTS

7. Special Conditions (Slide 22)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I concur with (a)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I concur with (b)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, I don’t concur with either concept</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral / Don’t know</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

• Dependent upon zoning, if area is defined a commercial redevelopment/regional com. Otherwise allow residential on 1st floor in these ES/MS zones.
• Consider simply allowing street level residences in Elm Street.
• Pose alternatives - delete "discourage". Be less restrictive.
• No limit on ground floor DU.
• What could be approvable situation for an exception? "Discouraged" could be "preferred"; no limit
• I don’t think we should prohibit ground street dwellings in the ES area.
• Residential should not be restricted.
• Should not be restricted.
• No limit/use zoning permitted uses.
• No limit.
• In the Elm Street zone

8. Alternative Setbacks in Developed Area (Slide 23)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I concur with (a)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I concur with (b)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, I don’t concur with either concept</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral / Don’t know</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

• Take it out.
9. Zero Lot Line (Slide 24)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I concur with both (a) and (b)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In part, I concur with (a) but not (b)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In part, I concur with (b) but not (a)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, I don’t concur with either concept</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral / Don’t know</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
- Match building code requirements.

ARTICLE 8 DESIGN STANDARDS – SINGLE FAMILY HOMES

10. Purpose (Slide 27)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I concur with (a)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, I don’t concur with the concept</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral / Don’t know</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: none

11. Home Orientation (Slide 28)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I concur with (a)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, I don’t concur with the concept</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral / Don’t know</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
- Needs more work. Continue to allow garage to be excluded from required 8’ setback.
- Garage windows should be included.
- Pick the street.

12. Street-Facing Windows (Slide 29)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I concur with (a)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, I don’t concur with the concept</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral / Don’t know</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
• Include garage windows in the %.
• 1) Percentage of linear width rather than area. 2) Count window in garage if area considered. 3) Must allow for prescriptive code shear panel walls.
• Will the addition make a difference? Enough issue to warrant? 2/13 meeting; garage windows should count.
• Must allow for brace panels. Why can’t we allow for garage windows?
• Count windows in street facing garage.
• Allow garage door lites to count towards 15%.
• Include garages

13. Additional Standards for Infill and Redevelopment (Slide 36)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I concur with (a)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I concur with (b)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I concur with (c)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, I don’t concur with any of the…</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral / Don’t know</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

• Should allow 5’ closer than standard setback to allow for greater development opportunity.
• The possibility of an option would be great.
• Should be optional as guideline maybe.

14. Parking and Access in the DMU, CB, HD, and WF Zoning Districts (Slide 37)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I concur with (a)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, I don’t concur with the concept</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral / Don’t know</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: none

15. Façade design & articulation in the DMU, CB, HD, & WF Zoning Districts (Slide 38)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I concur with both (a) and (b)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In part, I concur with (a) but not (b)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In part, I concur with (b) but not (a)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, I don’t concur with either concept</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral / Don’t know</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments: none
Residential Code Concepts – Community Survey Results

Part 1: Multi-family Standards

Building Orientation

1. What do you think about offering a new second design option? (check one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number / Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I like it, and think it would be fine for all residential zones that allow apartments</td>
<td>4 / 44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It’s ok, but only in certain locations (the current requirement to have entries oriented to the street should be used where possible)</td>
<td>4 / 44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. It shouldn’t be an option</td>
<td>1 / 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Neutral / Don’t know</td>
<td>0 / 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

- Exceptions can be made on case-by-case basis.
- Question should have another setback option. What is ok? 5 feet? 30 ft?
- In facing doorways create a community type feel and the landscaping creates a more natural feel for everyone.
- There is nothing in the tradeoff about trying to keep an attractive street appearance.
- Options are good
- I appreciate the “eyes on the street” concept and enjoy the added sense of increased community cohesion and public safety.

Functional Design and Building Details

2. Do you think requiring all apartment buildings to have some windows on the walls that are facing the street (e.g., 15% window coverage) and also to include at least two design features from a list is a good solution? (check one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number / Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Yes, it seems reasonable</td>
<td>9 / 90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No, a different approach should be used to avoid long, flat facades</td>
<td>1 / 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Neutral / Don’t know</td>
<td>0 / 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
• Another idea would be to incorporate public art to beautify and create more communal ownership.
• Some things like balconies make it uglier. Having a window requirement will help, but without design standards for windows this could backfire. For example vinyl windows are ugly, requiring wood windows would be more useful. Also setting up design standards for trim cornices etc.
• Be careful with using the restrictive term of a "window". How is thid defined? How about windowed doors? Or???
• If residents don't like the idea of their windows facing public ROW, they can close their blinds. Conversely, those who do like their windows facing that direction would not have the option if it was just blank wall.

Pedestrian Connections

3. Which of the following requirements do you think should apply to new walkways within apartment complexes? (check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Minimum walkway width of 5 ft</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Physical separation from cars, such as a curbs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Crosswalks that have contrasting pavement (not just paint)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Neutral / Don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

• There should be a process to allow exceptions to these rules.
• Having clearly marked sidewalks makes a space more inviting and safe feeling. Gives space for people to actually walk safely without having to avoid cars. But, reduction of need for car spaces is also a possible option as the reduction in personal vehicle use is happening with the rising generation so there really is less need.
• None of these address making a sidewalk attractive. The narrower the better from an attractive standpoint. Also use small square grids 2'x2' helps.
• All sound decent, but is this pretty typical? That would be the most desireable for a standard approval path.
• The more walkways are made ADA accessible and distinct from streets, the more inviting and comfortable residents will feel using them.

4. If you lived in an apartment complex that backed up to a park, would you rather have a path with a gate so you could have direct access to the park or just a fence for security? (check one)
Comments:

- With surveillance cameras on gates/entries. If this proves to be a problem, the option of locking could be enforced.
- Yes fence and gate. If no gate then people will bend or remove fence boards.
- Access is rarely for non-residents when parks and places intersect from a lot of apartment living. More likely, private homes have this issue as the desire for connection with open space is more likely to be blocked by private homes. The example of the northwest neighborhood in Corvallis shows how the walkways actually facilitate privacy as they create access.
- E. No fence unless it is made from wood, and not more than 3' high. No gate.
- I am not a big fan of barriers, but understand feelings of security for others.
- I believe this option cultivates a stronger sense of community and trust amongst neighbors.

Parking Lot Design

5. Do you think it’s important for the Code to say how far away parking can be from the entrance of an apartment? (check one)

- No, as long as parking is somewhere within the apartment complex, that’s fine 5 / 56%
- Yes, the Code should set a maximum distance (see next question) 3 / 33%
- Neutral / Don’t know 1 / 11%

6. If you answered ‘yes’ to question #5, what should the maximum distance be? (check one)

- 100 feet (current requirement) 2 / 100%
- 300 feet 0 / 0%
- 500 feet 0 / 0%

Comments:

- Apartments that cater to accessibility use should consider parking for accessibility as well
- Making the code more flexible and open makes it possible to create parking separate from the housing and create safety for walking persons.
- Site design should take precedence over location. Minimize the visual degradation of parking lots.
• Allow the variance process to provide for other options
• As long as the parking spaces required for these buildings is maintained I would prefer to see less of a car-centric design and focus more on green spaces.
• If a community wants to become more walkable and place less priority on design for cars, then the code must reflect that and place less priority/requirements on parking standards that ultimately sacrifice favorable or innovative site design.

Transition to Single-Family Homes

7. What do you think about reducing or eliminating this extra setback in some situations? (check all of the statements below that you agree with)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing single-family homes should be protected, but in the future the extra “1 to 1” setback should not be required next to new single-family homes that are built in zones that also allow apartments</td>
<td>3 / 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extra “1 to 1” setback should be capped in all situations (for example, the maximum setback should never have to be more than 30 feet)</td>
<td>3 / 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The current requirements should stay in place even if they make it hard to build on some sites</td>
<td>2 / 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extra “1 to 1” setback should not be required next to an existing single-family home when the home is in a zone that also allows apartments</td>
<td>1 / 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The requirement for an extra “1 to 1” setback should never apply, the requirement should be deleted from the Code</td>
<td>1 / 10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. If you selected A-D for question #7, what do you think are the most important reasons to have this type of increased setback? (choose two most important)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Privacy for residents of the adjacent single-family home</td>
<td>7 / 78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics/appearance (improving the appearance of the apartments from the single-family home)</td>
<td>4 / 44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing shade cast by the apartments onto the single-family home</td>
<td>3 / 33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2 / 22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing noise impacts from the apartments</td>
<td>2 / 22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other:
• Protect investment of existing property owners over the potential new investment of new owners coming in whether the single family home or apartment.
• Protection of existing single family neighborhoods from destruction.

Comments:
• Comment from Q7: No, the zone could have changed after the homes were built. Note on Q8: All boxes (A-D) were checked, but 1st and 2nd priority noted in response above.
• *It would be wonderful that as the city grows, the apartments can engage most effectively with the current housing.* Also, giving some guidance provides for standards that allow everyone to understand the requirements and options available for a particular section of land.
• *Existing single family neighborhoods should be protected with a 1:500 setback requirement. Stop the destruction of existing neighborhoods.*
• *Setback requirements should be less arbitrary and should not impede compact development patterns.*

Recreation and Open Space Areas

9. Is it important for all residents to have access to both private open space and shared open space, or should developers have some flexibility in terms of the type of open space they provide? *(check the statement below that best describes your views)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Votes/Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It doesn’t matter what type of open space is offered, so long as all residents have a place that they can be outdoors</td>
<td>4 / 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. All apartments should have a private patio or balcony and every complex should have common open space as well</td>
<td>3 / 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. It’s okay if not every unit has a private patio or balcony as long as most units do and there is some common open space</td>
<td>3 / 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Neutral / Don’t know</td>
<td>0 / 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The Code should not require any open space for apartment complexes</td>
<td>0 / 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

• *Reducing standards to allow sub-par living quarters is not the answer to affordable housing - it just allows unacceptable living areas that developer could make a quick buck and move on - these lesser quality developments will just lose appeal as the building ages making them a planned obsolescence.*
• *Every tenant has dogs and many smoke, so open spaces are a must.*
• *The more private space can give different pricing and allow for different affordability. It is far better to give the developer this flexibility and thus provide for a range of housing rather than creating a false baseline.*
• *I lived for 8 years in an apartment complex without a balcony and survived. We need some low-income affordable housing and balconies should not be required. Also balconies are ugly.*
• *Again, a variance process should provide alternate options.*
• *Open space should not be a requirement but a consideration/encouragement. It should not impede development of affordable housing. It is also in a developers best interest to provide open space or patios if it is feasible to make their project more attractive.*
Part 2: Single-Family Infill Standards

10. Do you think the Infill standards should be kept? (check the statement below that best describes your views)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes, these standards should be kept but they should be modified to make them work better</td>
<td>5 / 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes, these standards should be kept as they currently are</td>
<td>3 / 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>No, the Infill standards should be deleted entirely since new development would still be subject to the setback, parking, and height standards of the base zone</td>
<td>2 / 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Neutral / Don’t know</td>
<td>0 / 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. If you selected option B for question #10, which of the following modifications would you support? (check all that you would support)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Simplify the Infill standards so that they are easier to apply</td>
<td>4 / 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Drop the requirement that a new infill house has to have a carport or garage if the neighboring houses do</td>
<td>2 / 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Drop the requirement that a new infill house has to generally match the front setback of the neighboring houses</td>
<td>0 / 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Only apply the Infill standards in historic neighborhoods</td>
<td>0 / 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

- Maintain infill standards in historic neighborhoods or National Register
- It is essential to keep our current standards to preserve existing neighborhood character. Photos for preservation should show worse case—the ugly!
- The standards would protect the look, and not require exactly the same looks or exact same configurations which create more expense.
- They should be strengthened. Also need to make sure that new development matches the size, scale and style of existing houses in the neighborhood. For example a neighborhood with existing 1950s ranch houses that average 1200 sq feet should have new construction that is a similar ranch style house with a similar floor plan, similar size, design features and siding.
- Since two situations appear to be commonly cited, possibly those are the items that need to be adjusted. This should be driven by whatever has historically been the greatest challenge to the builders.
- The implementing zone should be fine for regulating infill development. Having extra code requirement makes infill development unnecessarily onerous, while the code should encourage and facilitate infill.
Part 3: Please tell us a little bit about yourself (optional)

12. How did you hear about this survey? *(check all that apply)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count/Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Media (e.g., Facebook)</td>
<td>5/71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany City Bridges eNews</td>
<td>1/14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1/14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word of mouth</td>
<td>1/14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>0/0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other:**
- email through city

13. Are you a resident of Albany?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count/Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8/80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2/20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions 14 through 16 are for Albany residents:

14. What best describes the type of place you live in?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count/Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-family detached house</td>
<td>8/100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment or condo building</td>
<td>0/0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached house (e.g., townhouse or rowhouse)</td>
<td>0/0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplex</td>
<td>0/0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile home</td>
<td>0/0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Do you own or rent your home?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count/Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Own</td>
<td>8/100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>0/0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Are you a member of a City of Albany board or commission?
Remaining questions are for all respondents:

17. What is your interest in the Albany Development Code Amendment Project? (check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count / Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albany resident</td>
<td>6 / 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3 / 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work in Albany</td>
<td>3 / 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work in the land use, building design, construction, or land development industries</td>
<td>3 / 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own a business in Albany</td>
<td>2 / 20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other:
- Live just outside city limits
- Interested in creating more diversity of building in more areas while still preserving the historic district.
- Historic Preservation

18. What age category do you fit in?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Category</th>
<th>Count / Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>7 / 70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>2 / 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>1 / 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>0 / 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>0 / 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. What is your gender?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Count / Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6 / 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3 / 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other / prefer not to say</td>
<td>1 / 10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
20. Do you consider yourself to be Hispanic or Latino?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. What is your race? *(check all that apply)*

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>White or Caucasian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. What is the highest level of school you have completed or the highest degree you have achieved?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Graduate degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Some college but no degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Associate degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>High school degree or equivalent (e.g. GED)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Less than a high school degree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. What is your approximate household income from all sources, before taxes?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Annual Income Range</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$75,000 - $99,999</td>
<td>3 / 43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$50,000 - $49,999</td>
<td>2 / 29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$100,000 - $149,999</td>
<td>1 / 14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$25,000 - $34,999</td>
<td>1 / 14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$150,000 - $199,999</td>
<td>0 / 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$200,000 or more</td>
<td>0 / 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$50,000 - $74,999</td>
<td>0 / 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Less than $25,000</td>
<td>0 / 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>