



CITY OF OREGON CITY

CITY COMMISSION JOINT WORK SESSION WITH THE PLANNING COMMISSION

AGENDA

Commission Chambers, Libke Public Safety Facility, 1234 Linn Ave, Oregon City
Tuesday, March 07, 2023 at 6:00 PM

Typically there are no public comments at work sessions, but written comments are accepted by:

- *Email recorderteam@orccity.org (deadline to submit written testimony via email is 3:00 PM on the day of the meeting)*
- *Mail to City of Oregon City, Attn: City Recorder, P.O. Box 3040, Oregon City, OR 97045*

CONVENE WORK SESSION AND ROLL CALL

DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Summary of Middle Housing Policy Discussion Topics (Package #2 of Legislative File: GLUA 22-0002/LEG-22-0001- HB 2001 Housing Choice Code Update)

ADJOURNMENT

PUBLIC COMMENT GUIDELINES

Complete a Comment Card prior to the meeting and submit it to the City Recorder. When the Mayor/Chair calls your name, proceed to the speaker table, and state your name and city of residence into the microphone. Each speaker is given three (3) minutes to speak. To assist in tracking your speaking time, refer to the timer on the table.

As a general practice, the City Commission does not engage in discussion with those making comments.

Electronic presentations are permitted but shall be delivered to the City Recorder 48 hours in advance of the meeting.

ADA NOTICE

The location is ADA accessible. Hearing devices may be requested from the City Recorder prior to the meeting. Individuals requiring other assistance must make their request known 48 hours preceding the meeting by contacting the City Recorder's Office at 503-657-0891.

Agenda Posted at City Hall, Pioneer Community Center, Library, City Website.

Video Streaming & Broadcasts: The meeting is streamed live on the Oregon City's website at www.orccity.org and available on demand following the meeting. The meeting can be viewed on

Willamette Falls Television channel 28 for Oregon City area residents as a rebroadcast. Please contact WPMC at 503-650-0275 for a programming schedule.



CITY OF OREGON CITY

Staff Report

625 Center Street
Oregon City, OR 97045
503-657-0891

Item 1.

To: City Commission and Planning Commission **Agenda Date:** 3.7.23
From: Christina Robertson-Gardiner, Senior Planner

SUBJECT:

Planning Commission Policy Recommendations (Package #2 of Legislative File: GLUA 22-0002/LEG-22-0001- HB 2001 Housing Choice Code Update)

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

This joint work session is intended to review the policy recommendations from the Planning Commission to expand housing options in Oregon City. Any policy items that the City Commission wishes to pursue can be added to their goals for the next biennium. Staff can return at a future date to review work plan approaches.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

On June 1, 2022, the City Commission voted 4-0 to approve the second reading of ORDINANCE NO. 22-1001 and remand LEG 22-001 to the October 24, 2022 Planning Commission Meeting to review a second package of outstanding policy questions.

Some of the topics were approved through code modifications recommended to the City Commission, while others were more complex and will need further direction from the City Commission. These more complex topics have been forwarded in the form of policy recommendations for a future work plan.

Hearings Process

The Package #2 code revision process generally followed the same method the Planning Commission utilized when adopting code revisions to the Thimble Creek Concept Plan area in 2019-2022. Policy topics were assigned specific hearing dates in advance to allow Planning Commissioners, staff, and the public the ability to concentrate their efforts on a few issues at a time. Each topic started with a presentation of background information from staff, a review of oral and written public comments on the topic, and a discussion of whether the policy question should be addressed through code revisions. If the Planning Commission provided direction on the policy question, a policy tracker was updated to reflect the Planning Commission's direction. Toward the end of the hearings process- the Planning Commission reviewed the entire proposal to ensure that there was consensus on the package being forwarded to the City Commission. The Planning Commission reviewed these topics from November 2022- January 2023 and approved the enclosed memo at the February 13, 2023 Planning Commission Meeting.

Policy Topic	Should the City Commission pursue this topic in a future work plan? (Y/N)	Priority of topics	Does the City Commission need additional information before providing direction on this topic?
Land Use Affordability Incentives Should the city create flexible code provisions for middle housing selectively targeted at projects meeting affordability requirements to improve those projects' feasibility and explicitly encourage affordable housing development?			
Tiny Homes and Recreational Vehicle Occupancy Options Should the city expand options for housing that falls outside of traditional dwelling units that hook up to city utilities and pay System Development fees? Where and when are they of value to the City?			
Micro Shelters Should the city create a work plan to research/investigate allowing micro shelter villages as a transitional housing option in Oregon City?			
Multiple Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) per Lot Consider permitting multiple ADUs per lot for greater parity with new provisions for (2,3,4) plexes, could offer additional rental housing opportunities in the community.			
System Development Fees While not part of the initial list of topics, the Planning Commission found that the development cost associated with substantially smaller units contributed to the complexity of allowing them as a viable option in the city. The Planning Commission recommends the City Commission look into ways to creatively break up residential system development fees for unit size and location and better understand the proportional impact that much smaller units have on the system.			

BACKGROUND:

[House Bill 2001](#), passed by the State Legislature in 2019, calls for cities to allow a range of middle housing types, including duplexes, triplexes, quadplexes, townhouses, and cottage clusters in single-family neighborhoods. The Planning Commission and City Commission held hearings in the Spring of 2022 to advance code revisions that met the requirements of HB 2001. These code revisions were required to be adopted by June 30, 2022, and effective by July 1, 2022. A second package of amendments was continued to the Fall of 2022 for code sections and policy questions that were not required for adoption but are still linked to the larger middle housing implementation discussion.

OPTIONS:

1. Review HB 2001 Package #2 memo and provide direction on any needed revisions or additions.

LEG 22-001 Package #2 Policy Questions		Issue	Potential Outcome	Hearing Date	Planning Commission Direction
Duplex Lot Coverage in Medium-Density Zones - Should the City increase maximum building lot coverage for duplexes to match the current allowance for a single-family dwelling plus an ADU (60-65%) - Should the City increase maximum building lot coverage across the board for specific middle housing types in rough proportion to increased numbers of units? - If there is no consensus for code revisions for this topic, should the City review this question in 2-3 years to determine if lot coverage is a barrier to middle housing construction?		Consider increasing building lot coverage for duplexes to match the current allowance for a single-family dwelling plus an ADU	None	November 14, 2022	The Planning Commission did not recommend any code revision for this issue as part of Package #2. They found that there was a general uncertainty about the impact of the newly adopted middle housing code and, therefore, code revisions would be premature at this time.
Lot Coverage in Low-Density Zones. - Should the City increase maximum building lot coverage for duplexes to match the current allowance for a single-family dwelling plus an ADU (45%) - Should the City increase maximum building lot coverage across the board for specific middle housing types in rough proportion to increased numbers of units? - If there is no consensus for code revisions for this topic, should the City review this question		Consider increasing maximum building lot coverage for specific middle housing types in rough proportion to increased numbers of units.	none	November 14, 2022	The Planning Commission did not recommend any code revision for this issue as part of Package #2. They found that there was a general uncertainty about the impact of the newly adopted middle housing code and, therefore,

LEG 22-001 Package #2 Policy Questions	Issue	Potential Outcome	Hearing Date	Planning Commission Direction
in 2-3 years to determine if lot coverage is a barrier to middle housing construction?				code revisions would be premature at this time.
High-Density Zone Development Standards 1. Should the City increase middle housing density standards in the R2 zone to match the allowed density of the medium-density (R3.5) residential zoning? Should it be higher? 2. Should the City increase the allowed density for multi-family projects in the R2 zone to be higher than the density for middle housing in the R2 zoning? If yes, should staff return with mitigation, location, or scaling strategies to reduce community impact? 3. Should the City remove or restrict townhomes/townhome subdivisions as an allowed use in the R2 zoning district but still allow tri/quad plexes on infill lots? 4. If there is no consensus for code revisions for this topic, should the City review this question in 2-3 years?	With the introduction of middle housing at greater densities in the low and medium densities zone, there could be a broader discussion about the purpose and standards for the high density R-2 zone	None	November 14, 2022	The Planning Commission did not recommend any code revision for this issue as part of Package #2. They found that there was a general uncertainty about the impact of the newly adopted middle housing code and, therefore, code revisions would be premature at this time.
Land Use Affordability Incentives	More flexible code provisions for middle housing could be selectively targeted at projects meeting affordability requirements, both to improve feasibility of those projects and to	Policy or workplan request as this is a complex issue	November 28, 2022	The Planning Commission supported a recommendation to the City Commission for a work plan on this

LEG 22-001 Package #2 Policy Questions	Issue	Potential Outcome	Hearing Date	Planning Commission Direction
	explicitly encourage affordable housing development.		Moved to January 9, 2023	topic. A Planning/City Commission joint work session is scheduled for March 2023 to review the policy recommendations of Package #2 of Leg 22-01
Micro shlters, Tiny homes, RV hardship allowances, tiny home shelter/cluster homes (not hooked up to city sewer/water)	Additional options for housing should be discussed that fall outside of traditional dwelling units that hook up to city utilities and pay System Development Fees. Where and when are they a value to the city?	Policy or workplan request as this is a complex issue.	November 28, 2022 Moved to January 9, 2023	The Planning Commission supported a recommendation to the City Commission for a work plan on this topic. A Planning/City Commission joint work session is scheduled for March 2023 to review the policy recommendations of Package #2 of Leg 22-01
Parking Standards for Triplexes and Quadplexes	Technical clarifications to reflect that standards apply per development, not per unit, and consider increasing or eliminating the maximum parking ¹ standard. Consider relocating the standards to the triplex and quadplex design section. At this time, Staff does	None	December 12, 2022	the Planning Commission did not recommend any code revisions at this time for this topic.

¹ <https://www.oregon.gov/lcd/CL/Documents/ParkingReformOverview.pdf>. Code edits that address the requirements of Climate-Friendly and Equitable Communities Oregon Administrative Rules are recommended to be reviewed in a future separate package.

LEG 22-001 Package #2 Policy Questions	Issue	Potential Outcome	Hearing Date	Planning Commission Direction
	not recommend any revisions to the parking sections for Triplexes and Quadplexes and will review for any needed technical corrections in preparation for any compliance with Climate-Friendly and Equitable Communities .			
Middle Housing Driveway Specifications.	Coordinate with Public works-Development Services to revise driveway widths to better align across code sections and meet policy goals.	Recommended redline code	December 12, 2022	The Planning Commission provided general consensus to recommend approval to the City Commission. The Planning Commission formally recommended approval to the City Commission at the January 9, 2023 Public Hearing.
Technical Revisions	Reduce the number of townhome units allowed through the Middle Housing Land Division process (four). Require review through the Subdivision or Expedite Land Division process for townhome proposals with more than four units. Allowing an exemption of the maximum front yard setbacks and minimum	Recommended redline code	December 12, 2022	The Planning Commission provided general consensus to recommend approval to the City Commission. The Planning Commission formally recommended approval to the City Commission

LEG 22-001 Package #2 Policy Questions	Issue	Potential Outcome	Hearing Date	Planning Commission Direction
	density standards for standalone residential development of four units or less in the Mixed Use Corridor and Mixed Use Downtown Zoning Districts and creating a Type II Modification process for projects that need an adjustment to the middle housing design standards.			at the January 9, 2023 Public Hearing.
Multiple Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) per Lot Currently, only one accessory dwelling unit is allowed per site.	Consider the future role of ADUs and how ADU standards compare to plex standards. Consider whether to permit multiple ADUs per lot for greater parity with new provisions for plexes, which could be written to require one attached and one detached unit, or in any combination. City Commission did not recommend further consideration as part of Package #1	Request for policy clarification	January 9, 2023 January 23, 2022	The Planning Commission supported the concept of multiple ADUs on a site- as they were within one ownership, could provide additional smaller rental housing, and could be commensurate in neighborhood impact as detached duplexes or triplexes. The Planning Commission is looking for clarification from the City Commission on the policy item. A Planning/City Commission joint work session is scheduled for

LEG 22-001 Package #2 Policy Questions	Issue	Potential Outcome	Hearing Date	Planning Commission Direction
				March 2023 to review the policy recommendations of Package #2 of Leg 22-01
Lot Averaging for Subdivisions	Consider whether and how lot averaging should apply to middle housing options beyond duplexes, and whether lot averaging remains a useful tool for new subdivisions along with middle housing opportunities	none	January 9, 2023 January 23, 2022	The Planning Commission did not recommend any code revision for this issue as part of Package #2 They found that there was a general uncertainty about the impact of the newly adopted middle housing code and, therefore, code revisions would be premature at this time.



To: City Commission
From: Planning Commission
RE: Package #2 of Legislative File: GLUA 22-0002/LEG-22-0001- HB 2001 Housing
Choice Code Update – Policy Questions.
Date: February 22, 2023

On June 1, 2022, the City Commission voted 4-0 to approve the second reading of ORDINANCE NO. 22-1001 for the HB 2001 Housing Choices Update and remand the LEG 22-001 to the October 24, 2022 Planning Commission Meeting to review the second package of outstanding policy questions. These questions ranged from reviewing changes to siting standards not mandated by HB2001 to potentially allowing new uses such as tiny homes on wheels and micro shelters in the city.

Copies of the 2021 HB2001-Middle Housing adopted code and application packets can be found by visiting the [Housing Choices Code Update project page](#). The [online municipal code](#) was updated to include these changes in February 2023.

Hearings Process

The Package #2 code revision process generally followed the same method the Planning Commission utilized when adopting code revisions to the Thimble Creek Concept Plan area in 2019-2022. Policy topics will be assigned specific hearing dates in advance to allow Planning Commissioners, staff, and the public the ability to concentrate their efforts on a few issues at a time. Each topic started with a presentation of background information from staff, a review of oral and written public comments on the topic, and a discussion of whether the policy question should be addressed through code revisions. If the Planning Commission provided direction on the policy question, A policy tracker was updated to reflect the Planning Commission's direction. Toward the end of the hearings process- the Planning Commission reviewed the entire proposal to ensure that there was consensus on the package being forwarded to the City Commission. The Planning Commission reviewed these topics from November 2022- January 2023.

Housing in Oregon

The recently adopted [Oregon Housing Needs Analysis](#) provides a strong overview of issues facing both Oregon and Oregon City. *“Oregon's lack of housing threatens the very core of our common purpose. Decades of underbuilding have driven up home prices and rents and left too many without adequate housing choices. Too often, people can't afford housing at all. We won't be able to grow sustainably, move toward a more equitable economy, or address the full complexity of the homelessness crisis unless we substantially increase our pace of building new homes. ...We cannot equitably distribute what is being underproduced. The people who are suffering most acutely from our housing shortage are disproportionately lower income households and communities of color. The lack of housing options perpetuates segregation through economic exclusion. By restricting people's housing choices, we make Oregon less fair, deprive people of basic human dignity, and limit our collective growth and prosperity. Where housing is built and for whom dramatically impacts who prospers and how our neighborhoods function. We need a range of housing types for all income levels, distributed equitably around and within*

each region of the state, providing access to employment and critical services and reducing the overall cost-burden to families and individuals. “¹

PURPOSE OF MEMO

This memo is not intended to encapsulate every issue and idea relating to making housing more affordable in Oregon City; rather, it will attempt to frame some policy work to date on the subject and provide some initial background on the specific topics forwarded for further discussion after the initial approval of HB 2001 code amendments.

As the purpose of the Planning Commission is to serve as an advisory body to, and a resource for, the City Commission in land use matters, the Planning Commission framed their discussion on items or topics they believe the City Commission should pursue as a future work plan item. The topics addressed in this memo, affordable housing incentives, multiple Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs), tiny homes, RV hardship allowances, System Development Fees, and micro shelters, are just subsets of larger housing production strategies that cities can pursue to support the creation of housing for all income levels. The Planning Commission looks forward to further discussion of these items at a joint work session in March 2023.

Planning Commission Recommendation: *Accelerated schedule for technical revisions.*

Staff initially recommended, and the Planning Commission concurred that the following topics and revisions be forwarded to the City Commission for review at the next available City Commission Meeting. These revisions provide clarity to existing policies or are needed to process currently submitted building permit applications. The Planning Commission provided direction to Staff at the December 12, 2022 Hearing, with a formal vote at the January 9, 2023 Hearing, which provided the required 35 days' notice to the Department of Land Conservation and Development. At the January 9, 2023, Hearing, the Planning Commission voted 7-0 to forward this small package to the City Commission and continue the hearing to review the remainder of the policy topics.

Middle Housing Driveway Specifications

Coordinate with Public Works- Development Services to revise driveway widths to better align across code sections and meet policy goals.

Townhome Restriction in Middle Housing Land Division

Reduce the number of townhome units allowed through the Middle Housing Land Division process (four). Require review through the Subdivision or Expedited Land Division process for townhome proposals with more than four units.

Dimensional Standards Revisions for Mixed-Use Downtown and Mixed-Use Corridor Districts

Allowing an exemption of the maximum front yard setbacks and minimum density standards for standalone residential development of four units or less in the Mixed-Use Corridor and Mixed Use Downtown Zoning Districts.

¹ [Oregon Housing Needs Analysis Legislative Recommendations Report: Leading with Production \(2022\)](#) P.10

Planning Commission Recommendation: Future work plan item.

The Planning Commission is recommending the following topics for future work plans. The Planning Commission is looking for City Commission verification for these topics. If the City Commission supports adding any of these topics as a future city work plan, staff will initiate a new effort outside of LEG 22-0001 Housing Code Choices Update Package #2.

Land Use Affordability Incentives

In May 2022, the City Commission recommended further discussion though some portions of the policy question may require additional direction or work plans.

Should the city create flexible code provisions for middle housing selectively targeted at projects meeting affordability requirements to improve those projects' feasibility and explicitly encourage affordable housing development?

Planning Commission Direction: The Planning Commission felt that providing siting and dimensional standard incentives for qualified affordable housing projects that remained affordable over the lifetime of the project would be valuable for the community. Outreach to non-profit developers to see what incentives provide the most benefit, along with general community engagement, will be needed in a future work plan.

Tiny Homes and Recreational Vehicle Occupancy Options

In May 2022, the City Commission recommended further discussion. As this issue is complex, involves multiple city departments, and has future budgetary implications, the Planning Commission will discuss policy options and recommend workplan direction on this item.

Should the city expand options for housing that falls outside of traditional dwelling units that hook up to city utilities and pay System Development fees? Where and when are they of value to the city?

Planning Commission Direction: Allowing tiny homes (either on or off a chassis) can provide entry-level housing for residents. These units can be hooked up to city utilities and be seen as a permanent housing option. However, additional work will need to occur to see if system development fees could be further scaled to reflect the actual impact compared to a typical middle housing unit. The Planning Commission did not wish to pursue allowing RV use on residential lots, as it was worried about the transitory nature of these uses, their impact on the neighborhood as well as sanitary concerns relating to adequate dumping of grey and blackwater tanks. The Planning Commission does feel that recreational vehicles are one of the most affordable residential options, and additional opportunities for private commercially zoned RV parks that have access to sanitary sewer and city water could be a valuable low-cost entry option for the community.

Micro Shelters

While initially grouped into the above tiny home/RV category. The Planning Commission moved this item into a separate policy question as it is related more to transition housing in non-residential areas.

Should the city create a work plan to research/investigate allowing micro shelter villages as a transitional housing option in Oregon City?

Planning Commission Direction: Micro shelters could be a valuable tool in supporting those experiencing homelessness transition to more permanent housing. Additional outreach to Salem and Corvallis is needed to understand better the opportunity and impacts of this type of housing. Planning

Commissioners were intrigued about the City of Corvallis’s approach that saw micro shelter approvals subject to revocation at any time, so they have, in effect, a continuous evaluation period.

Multiple Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) per Lot

In May 2022, the City Commission did not recommend further consideration.

Consider the future role for ADUs and how ADU standards compare to plex standards. Consider permitting multiple ADUs per lot for greater parity with new provisions for plexes, which could be written to require one attached and one detached unit, or in any combination. Discuss the relationship between ADUs and detached middle housing, especially regarding accessory building setback standards and Middle Housing Land Division.

Planning Commission Direction: Planning Commission was initially hesitant to move this topic forward as it seemed to fit within the category of topics where the impact of the recent HB2001 code changes created uncertainty. However, after further discussion, the Planning Commission felt there was value in allowing more than one ADU on the property as ADUs are not subject to Middle Housing Land Divisions, remain on the parent parcel, and could offer additional rental housing opportunities in the community.

System Development Fees

Planning Commission Direction: While not part of the initial list of topics, the Planning Commission found that the development cost associated with substantially smaller units contributed to the complexity of allowing them as a viable option in the city. The Planning Commission recommends the City Commission look into ways to creatively break up residential system development fees for unit size and location and better understand the proportional impact that much smaller units have on the system. While a more comprehensive analysis will occur during the upcoming [Housing Production Strategy](#), required in 2027-2029 and most likely initiated in 2025-2027, some initial efforts could be made to support the construction of smaller units or qualified affordable housing.

Planning Commission Recommendation: No recommended code revisions or future work plan items at this time.

The Planning Commission does not recommend any revision or work plans for the following topics at this time. The Planning Commission found that the impact to the community from HB2001 Middle Housing projects was uncertain, and any revision to the code for the topics below was premature.

High-Density Zone Development Standards

With the introduction of middle housing at greater densities in the low and medium densities zone, there could be a broader discussion about the purpose and standards for the high-density R-2 zone.

Duplex Lot Coverage in Medium-Density Zones

Consider increasing maximum building lot coverage for duplexes to match the current allowance for a single-family dwelling plus an ADU.

Lot Coverage in Low-Density Zones

Consider increasing maximum building lot coverage for specific middle housing types in proportion to increased units.

Lot Averaging for Subdivisions

City Commission did not recommend further consideration.

Consider whether and how lot averaging should apply to middle housing options beyond duplexes and whether lot averaging remains a useful tool for new developments along with middle housing opportunities.

Exhibits

1. HB 2001 Package #2 Hearing Topic Timeline
2. Public Comment Matrix
3. [Oregon City Zoning Map](#)
4. [Dimensional Standards Chart](#)
5. [Housing Choices Code Update project page](#)

Planning Commission Agendas and Memos

1. [October 24, 2022 Planning Commission Agenda](#)
 - a. Planning Commission Memo
2. [November 14, 2022 Planning Commission Agenda](#)
 - a. Planning Commission Memo
3. [December 12, 2022 Planning Commission Agenda](#)
 - a. Planning Commission Memo
4. [January 9, 2023 Planning Commission Agenda](#)
 - a. Planning Commission Memo
5. [January 23, 2023 Planning Commission Agenda](#)
 - a. Planning Commission Memo
6. [February 13, 2023 Planning Commission Agenda](#)
 - a. [Planning Commission Memo](#)

Policy Resource Documents

1. [Oregon System Development Charges Study: Why SDCs Matter And How They Affect Housing](#)
2. Micro Shelters
 - a. [City of Salem: Learn about Micro Shelter Villages](#)
 - b. [Microshelters In Corvallis](#)
3. Tiny Home/Mobile Dwellings
 - a. [Tiny Home: Legislative Regulation Background Brief](#)
 - b. [Mobile Dwellings in Oregon: Legislative Opportunities for Interim Housing, Mobile Dwellings Policy Workgroup](#)
 - c. [Legalizing Mobile Dwellings: A guide for expanding a unique affordable housing option in your city, PSU Masters of Urban and Regional Planning Workshop 2022=](#)
 - d. [American Planning Association Zoning Practice- Tiny Homes](#)
 - e. [Tiny Home Industry Association: Groundbreaking Regulations: Tiny Houses and RVs Allowed As Housing In Portland](#)

Date	Topic	Issue / Comment / Concern	Staff Comment	Has this been Addressed? How?
Paul Edgar 11.1.22 email 11.10.22 email 11.23.22 email 1.9.23 public testimony	Tiny homes, Clustered, Safe & Rest Communities	We could create and build new master planned communities within a Manufactured Home Park mindset of design, with conventional and most importantly, affordable manufactured homes, prefabbed modular homes and also create communities of where very, very affordable tiny homes of under 200 Sq. Ft. with post and beam. We need the codes and zoning for building communities of all sizes, that have one thing in common, that permanent and semi-permanent dwelling/houses - structures that are under \$100,000	This policy question is scheduled for the November 28, 2022 January 9, 2023 Planning Commission meeting	The Planning Commission supported a recommendation to the City Commission for a work plan on this topic. A Planning/City Commission joint work session is scheduled for March 2023 to review the policy recommendations of Package #2 of Leg 22-01
Jim Nicita 1.9.23 emails 1.9.23 public testimony 1.23.23 public testimony & emails	Tiny homes/ADUs, cost of development	Supporting more infill within Oregon City's core is a great opportunity to increase the housing supply in an area with transit and amenities. There are lots of open areas within Mcloughlin that can support additional small units. It also gives young families the ability to invest in the housing market with more affordable options. Cost of development (fees, SDc) is still a big barrier for this to occur	As part of the June 30, 2023 code amendments, Oregon City now allows detached duplexes and triplexes, if one of the units is older than five years old. Detached units can additionally be developed through the middle housing land division process. ADUs and Duplexes were also added to the permitted uses of the Mixed-Use Corridor zone. The current system development fee for ADUs and middle housing units is a base fee of \$25,167 and is currently not calculated on the size of the unit.	The Planning Commission supported a recommendation to the City Commission for a work plan on this topic. A Planning/City Commission joint work session is scheduled for March 2023 to review the policy recommendations of Package #2 of Leg 22-01

From: [Paul O. Edgar](#)
To: [Christina Robertson-Gardiner](#); [Aquila Hurd-Ravich](#); [John M. Lewis](#); [Josh Wheeler](#)
Cc: [Denyse McGriff](#); [Dirk Schagenhauser - OC Planning](#)
Subject: Cluster Housing in Nigeria, and how we can learn from this
Date: Tuesday, November 1, 2022 12:40:50 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Can this be shared as comment and testimony to the Planning Commission and City Commission, as part of HB 2001 Middle Housing discussions and code revisions

Paul Edgar

[How One Architect Helped Imagine a Better Future for a Nigerian Village in Crisis - Dwell](#)

Middle Housing and Tiny Housing, became an answer for those displaced, where the United Nations stepped in and brought in a Nigerian Architect to design and build their type of a cluster housing community. These displaced people, needed security housing and roofs over their heads, and just think about this, as we have a parallel in Oregon, Clackamas County, and even Oregon City, with our homeless and houseless.

We could create and build new master planned communities within a Manufactured Home Park mindset of design, with conventional and most importantly affordable manufactured homes, prefabbed modular homes and also create communities of where very, very affordable tiny homes of under 200 Sq. Ft. with post and beam foundations if we have places where they could be sited. We need the codes and zoning for building communities of all sizes, that have one thing in common, that permanent and semi-permanent dwelling/houses - structures that are under \$100,000 to where they could be located.

We could also have additional master planned communities that could have modular built Tiny Houses of under \$50,000 in cost and other community could be under \$25,000 in providing a starting places of what would be semi-permanent housing. Oregon Community Housing has funded opportunities to make things like this happen and even provide programs for home ownership. Metro also has programs that can provide funding to create these Master planned Communities, with funding. A one acre parcel, could be a site, that could support a beautifully designed of housing community for 24 to 40 people when it has access to public utilities, transportation, and retail stores. Re-Thinking Zoning, where there are the existence of critically required and needed utilities and public transportation and has limited negative "Not In My Back Yard" impacts and acceptance within the neighboring community, might require a greater ability to gain the ability to re-zone parcels to enable the high priority need of new affordable housing communities.

Very small Tiny Houses, of under 200 Sq. Ft. of foundations sizes may need to be expanded to 300 Sq. Ft. and the height of these affordable housing structures to 20' feet in height. Allowing things and changes to codes that enable housing structures that could be built on post and beam is equally important in reducing housing costs.

Envision mini housing structures that reduce building waste/costs, that are 8' x 20' that includes in its design a 4' x 8' poach, a 4' x 8' bathroom, 8' x 12 living space that includes &

mini-kitchen and a sleeping loft-bed area. These Tiny House Structures could have 12' ft. high walls that support a loft floor and a 8, 10, or 12-12 pitch roofs, thus creating a 1 and 1 half story Vernacular Type Design structures. Using this design a very, very affordable permanent tiny house structure, could be engineered that meets building codes, and is created without SDC fees and should only require, over the counter approval on and with pre approved plans.

This concept requires engineered and approved designs, that opens the ability of approval by the building department, to place these housing units into Master Planned and Built Out Communities, with in ground utilities.

Very, very affordable Tiny Houses of under 200 Sq. Ft. of foundation size could also be represented in an example of a 12' x 16' where the Tiny House is squared up, but again on post and beam, and with 12' ft. high walls that support larger loft sleeping areas that can be enhanced with 12-12 pitch roofs, and with a shed roof dorms. These type of type of permanent housing structures, going into a master planned manufacture home park, for middle housing, need to be allowed and zoned, to where the structure do not require SDC Fees, when coming from a modular home factory, with approved plans and assembled onsite.

These very, very affordable permanent housing units, could come from, a local modular housing factory that could also be part of Trade School Program, that builds student proficiency's in all of the trade skills needed within building housing. The key to this concept is within creating very, very affordable housing and educated students trade skills, within massively reducing costs, and creating affordable Master-Planned Community, that have small lots, will all of the utilities available and underground.

Within the creating these communities, there needs to be a focus on central common open spaces and areas that need to have park like settings, that enhance livability, walking paths, gardens, trees, and when possible central facilities like laundry facilities and parking lots that become part of limiting on-site cars. Doing this with a focus on having porches that connect people and make possible the building of a community atmosphere, as the people access these affordable Housing Structures all coming from a central common access areas.

We could also design and build Clustered, Safe & Rest Communities, where we centralized access to sanitary sewer, water, electricity, and communal structures, and have open common area's. These Safe & Rest developments become the first step away from the streets, parks and public properties where people in need are sleeping under a tarp or in a tent. We plan and create Safe & Rest Communities and provide a roof, insulated walls, wired to provide; lights, heat and cooling and lockable doors. These communities are to be controlled place where it becomes possible to transition the homeless and houseless and they must be very good looking & inviting, and in an analogy, "like a good fishing lure where the fish will bite at it". Stick built, shelter housing structure can cost less than tents structures, where the cost of each dwelling unit can be well under \$5,000 and as low as \$3,000. These Safe & Rest Communities need "Communal Buildings", can house and enable intervention specialist, with drug and addiction specialists, mental health specialists, limited health-first aid location & personal, kitchens, showers, sanitary toilets facilities, counseling facilities, administration facilities. Idealistically all structures where possible would have integrated "Solar Power Panels" to provide all of the electrical power needed whereby this community only adds to the local power grid.

From: [Paul O. Edgar](#)
 To: [Denyse McGriff](#)
 Cc: [Christina Robertson-Gardiner](#); [Aquila Hurd-Ravich](#)
 Subject: Affordable Housing opportunity, coming from Better Built Barns
 Date: Wednesday, November 23, 2022 1:06:16 PM
 Attachments: [untitled](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Denyse, look at this for its potential, of a very affordable Tiny House structure that is pre cut and brought in assembled on the land in Oregon City. It is an example of a very affordable housing that could have a mini-kitchen and bathroom on the main floor, Ductless Heating/Air, Tank-less Hot Water, and the only thing is getting a potential waver to exceed the height limitation of 15' feet. Have Solar Panels on the roof and make it very energy efficient with the new insulation and it is created as an example of what can be done in creating an affordable minimal living Model House.

This could be an ADU on an existing lot with a primary house, were it shares existing water and sewer, built without SDC Fees and require only Engineering Approval of the building department, and electrical inspection. An affordable Tiny House, can be this great, guest cottage, independent living for children or grandchildren and/or rental for someone in need of an affordable roof over their head.

To picture this structure go to www.betterbuiltbarns.com and it is on the upper left of this web site and it is barn red.

On 11/23/2022 11:03 AM, customerservice@betterbuiltbarns.com wrote:

Hello,

That building is our most expensive model. It is a 12x16 and runs about \$20,000.00

Thank you!
 -Julia



----- Original Message -----

Subject: Re: Live Chat offline message received from (Paul Edgar<pauloedgar1940@gmail.com>)
 From: "Paul O. Edgar" <pauloedgar1940@gmail.com>
 Date: 11/17/22 9:26 am
 To: "customerservice@betterbuiltbarns.com" <customerservice@betterbuiltbarns.com>

On your web site on the upper left is a barn red, basically 2 story structure design and what are the de-mentions and are there options like having only a 3.0 man-door centered more to the left windows. What would the price be for this structure? Can you send more and information and design drawings on that structure. It needs to be under 200 Sq. Ft for the foundation of the main structure to where it does not require building permits. However, to get an occupancy permit, we would need to validate its structural engineering.

Paul Edgar

On 11/17/2022 8:56 AM, customerservice@betterbuiltbarns.com wrote:

Hello,

Thank you for your shed inquiry!

We do not do electrical or interior finish work, however, we do build shells that some customer turn into finished rooms. For most customers, we can build up to a 10x20 without permits. At our website, you may wish to try our Build My 3D Shed option as this gives a good estimate and lets you place windows and doors.

We look forward to working with you on your outbuilding project!

Sincerely,
 - David



----- Original Message -----

Subject: Live Chat offline message received from (Paul Edgar<pauloedgar1940@gmail.com>)
From: "Paul Edgar via mylivechat" <sendmail@mylivechat.com>
Date: 11/14/22 9:38 pm
To: "customerservice@betterbuiltbarns.com" <customerservice@betterbuiltbarns.com>

My Live Chat

My Live Chat

LiveChat Offline Message Received

Dear Better Built,

You have received an offline message, sent from mylivechat.com with the following details:

Name: Paul Edgar
Email: pauloedgar1940@gmail.com
Time: 2022-11-14 22:37:49
Referrer: <https://www.mylivechat.com/>
IP: [97.120.29.144](#)
Location: Portland, Oregon, United States
Client: Android/ Chrome107/ en-US
Subject: Want to use to live in
Message: I am on a housing board and your company could be a supplier.

Thank you for using mylivechat.com for your Live Chat services.

Sincerely,
My Live Chat Team

Copyright 2021 mylivechat.com All rights reserved.

From: [Paul O. Edgar](#)
To: [recorderteam](#); [Christina Robertson-Gardiner](#); [Aquila Hurd-Ravich](#); [Pete Walter](#)
Cc: [Dirk Schagenhauser - OC Planning](#); [Denyse McGriff](#)
Subject: Re: What are the impacts of Inflation in Oregon City going to be and what type of affordable housing options will we need, and please include this as part of the record of the Planning Commission on the Middle Housing Considerations
Date: Thursday, November 10, 2022 9:27:20 PM
Attachments: [UaX8RiC9H71IssDq.png](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I would like to talk about this within Citizens Comments or as a member of Clackamas County's Community Action Board before the Planning Commission meeting, or in the Work Session 11/14/2022.

Below in this "Self-Sufficiency Standard Chart", prepared by the University of Washington are the numbers represented, specifically for Clackamas County.

This is about, more than housing and what it takes to live in Clackamas County, as we all know that we now have to look at this within the impacts of this 2022 inflation. What we have experienced dramatically changes this chart below, that represented costs that existed in 2021 time period. What we need to do is **envision with inflation** with what now exist within the 2022 Period for; Food, Housing, Property Tax, Utilities, Home or Rental Insurance, Transportation & Vehicle Cost, Car Insurance, and Vehicle Fuel Costs.

Look at what it took in 2021 income in the 7th column from the left to the right, representing 2 Adults, an infant and a preschooler.

Then attempt to apply the known 2022 inflation factors to each of the monthly costs and just think about keeping roof over the heads of the citizenry, impacted by the new local cost of housing, with property taxes, utilities, insurance in our marketplace it may well be double what is reflected from 2021 time frame.

What we must also attempt to do is calculate the cost changes with how to make this work with enough money to cover these costs within "Self-Sufficiency", I think we can all see that both adults will have to be working very hard and maybe with multiple jobs. Both kids will be in some type of childcare and then with all of this, think about the transportation implications and expense. Transportation costs surely will triple or quadruple over what is reflected, where both adults will need cars with car or lease payments, insurance, and now fuel-gas prices up 38% and plus maintenance.

Some where through this, everyone has to eat and the cost of food and getting it to us - through the supply chain, has resulted in significant increases of prices in the 2022 time frame that have reached a 40 year high in inflated costs. The farmer or food producer has seen their operating expense triple and that is consistent with the increases in supply chain costs.

This leads me to believe that we are going have to get very creative and do whatever we can do to create roofs that can be made available that people can afford and it is more than "Middle Housing".

The Planning Commission, needs to envision what needs to be done, starting at and with Shelter Housing to get people off the street and go from there.

There are things that can be learned from the actions taken in the early 1930s, 1940s, and 1950s, 60s with HUD housing developments, and smaller housing units, some which currently exist in Oregon City. Semi-Permanent Housing Structures, under 200 Sq. Ft., 400 Sq. Ft., 600, 800, and 1,000 Sq. Ft. New minimal living structures, often clustered with central shared facilities need to be part of any considerations.

I think we must examine factory modular construction techniques, and years ago that was an available option with Sears Houses, bought from a catalog that still exist all over the Portland Region.

We could be going into a world where one little thing could set-off a chain of events, when 80% of the people are going paycheck to paycheck, trying to weather the storm, and it ends up they cannot. We have to enable this type of creativity within our codes, in our HB 2001, Middle Housing Revisions to address all of the conditions that might arise. How do we create housing options at price tags of: \$25K, \$50K, \$100K, \$150K, \$200K, \$300K and now is the time to start thinking about it. What has to be enabled to create housing at all of these price points?

Paul Edgar

On 11/5/2022 1:19 PM, Paul O. Edgar wrote:

TABLE 3. The Self-Sufficiency Standard for Clackamas County, OR 2021

	Adult	Adult Preschooler	Adult Infant Preschooler	Adult Preschooler School-Age	Adult School-Age Teenager	2 Adults Infant	2 Adults Infant Preschooler	2 Adults Preschooler School-Age
MONTHLY COSTS								
Housing	\$1,366	\$1,576	\$1,576	\$1,576	\$1,576	\$1,576	\$1,576	\$1,576
Child Care	\$0	\$1,070	\$2,365	\$1,821	\$751	\$1,296	\$2,365	\$1,821
Food	\$298	\$450	\$592	\$681	\$790	\$703	\$831	\$916
Transportation	\$311	\$319	\$319	\$319	\$319	\$614	\$614	\$614
Health Care (Net)	\$168	\$536	\$555	\$574	\$610	\$609	\$628	\$647
Premium	\$95	\$444	\$444	\$444	\$444	\$444	\$444	\$444
Out-of-Pocket	\$73	\$92	\$111	\$130	\$166	\$164	\$183	\$203
Miscellaneous	\$214	\$395	\$541	\$497	\$405	\$480	\$601	\$557
Taxes (Net)	\$636	\$819	\$1,132	\$913	\$559	\$1,047	\$1,123	\$1,001
Federal Income Taxes	\$217	\$408	\$737	\$584	\$390	\$475	\$644	\$572
Federal and Local Payroll Taxes	\$232	\$400	\$549	\$495	\$388	\$490	\$600	\$553
State Sales Taxes	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State Income Taxes	\$187	\$311	\$446	\$385	\$281	\$382	\$479	\$427
Federal Child Tax Credit (-)	\$0	(\$300)	(\$600)	(\$550)	(\$500)	(\$300)	(\$600)	(\$550)
SELF-SUFFICIENCY WAGE								
Hourly (per worker)	\$17.00	\$29.35	\$40.22	\$36.26	\$28.47	\$17.96	\$21.98	\$20.26
Monthly	\$2,992	\$5,165	\$7,079	\$6,381	\$5,010	\$6,323	\$7,738	\$7,132
Annual	\$35,908	\$61,984	\$84,950	\$76,577	\$60,118	\$75,876	\$92,856	\$85,586
Emergency Savings Fund (Monthly)	\$36	\$125	\$313	\$263	\$134	\$51	\$70	\$66
ANNUAL REFUNDABLE TAX CREDITS								
Federal & Oregon Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Federal Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit (CDCTC)	\$0	\$4,000	\$8,000	\$8,000	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$8,000	\$8,000
Oregon Working Family Household and Dependent Care Credit (WFHDC)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$361	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Annual Resources	\$35,908	\$65,984	\$92,950	\$84,577	\$64,479	\$79,876	\$100,856	\$93,586

We need to address all of this and these foreseeable conditions and realities immediately, as an emergency.

We need to also additionally consider creating new affordable housing communities and options with houses that cost less than \$100,000 to build for families of 3 or more people. There needs to be consideration of how these new communities fit into Transportation needs and realities with transit routes.

We may need to look at this like an emergency and consider what was done in WPA Days of the Great Depression in the mid 1930s and do what is needed.

PS: What are the impacts of Inflation in Oregon City, West Linn, Canby & Gladstone going to be and it is for sure that the users of the I-205 Corridor and the I-205 Abernethy Bridge will not be able to afford \$300 per month in Tolls per vehicle. To survive these proposed Tolls with the inflation that we have to live with what will they have to do?

Christina Robertson-Gardiner

From: James Nicita <james.nicita@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 9, 2023 3:42 PM
To: Dirk Schlagenhauser; Daphne Wuest; Gregory Stoll; Bob La Salle; Karla Laws; pespe@ci.oswego.or.us; cstaggs@orcify.org
Cc: Christina Robertson-Gardiner; Jakob Wiley
Subject: GLUA 22-0002/LEG-22-0001- HB 2001 Housing Choice Code Update

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Greetings All:

I hope everyone had a great holiday season.

I write regarding tonight's PC hearing.

Below please find an excerpt from a comment I made last year during the main hearings on missing middle housing. I hope the Planning Commission might consider the idea of authorizing/enabling "tiny lots" for "tiny houses," the idea again to assist young families to get a foot on the ladder of home ownership, and being able to benefit from property value appreciation over time.

Thanks,

Jim Nicita
 Oregon City

I offer a single illustrative example of an obstacle in the existing code to missing middle housing.

If one walks through the areas of Oregon City - especially the older, established areas - zoned for mixed use and higher density, it is easy to perceive in the interstices of the built fabric numerous, sometimes underutilized, spaces into which it would be fairly easy to slip in a tiny house. But the current code does not really enable people to take advantage of these opportunities.


There is no minimum lot size in zones such as NC, MUC, and MUD, which therefore would be good candidates for individual single family detached tiny house development (for MUD, see e.g. the small historic houses on the south side of 14th between Main and Center streets); however, they do not allow single family detached houses, including tiny houses.

Medium density districts allow single family detached houses, but the minimum lot sizes might prevent tiny houses from being a practicable option. High density districts allow single family attached but not single family detached, and thus such zoning would typically prevent the partitioning off of a backyard of an older historic home for a small tiny house lot.

It does not seem that it would be difficult or time consuming to draft language for single family detached tiny house development. (An ADU does not fit the bill; it does not allow a young family to benefit from the appreciation of value provided by independent home ownership.) For example, a

“Detached Tiny House” building type, including maximum lot size to ensure the maintenance of density, could be added to Chapter 17.20. Then the chapters describing the above-mentioned zones, or at least some of them, could be correspondingly amended to describe outright or circumstantial use of detached tiny houses.


Item 1.



High Street Mixed-Use Corridor: Potential ADU Locations

- | | |
|----------------------|----------------------|
| 1. 205 High St. | 7. 319 High St. |
| 2. 210 Bluff St. | 8. 406 Promenade St. |
| 3. 302 Bluff St. | 9. 408 Promenade St. |
| 4. 306 Promenade St. | 10. 509 High St. |
| 5. 301 High St. | 11. 515 High St. |
| 6. 311 High St. | 12. 524 High St. |

Black rectangles indicate potential new ADU footprint.



Christina Robertson-Gardiner

From: Christina Robertson-Gardiner
Sent: Monday, January 9, 2023 3:58 PM
To: Kay Neumann
Subject: FW: GLUA 22-0002/LEG-22-0001- HB 2001 Housing Choice Code Update
Attachments: Study Area.png; High Street Mixed Use Corridor Potential ADU Locations.pdf

From: James Nicita <james.nicita@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 9, 2023 3:54 PM
To: Dirk Schlagenhauser <dschlagenhauser@orccity.org>; Karla Laws <karla.laws@gmail.com>; Daphne Wuest <dwuest@orccity.org>; pespe@ci.oswego.or.us; Gregory Stoll <gstoll@orccity.org>; Bob La Salle <blasalle@orccity.org>; cstagg@orccity.org
Cc: Christina Robertson-Gardiner <crobertson@orccity.org>; Jakob Wiley <jwiley@orccity.org>
Subject: GLUA 22-0002/LEG-22-0001- HB 2001 Housing Choice Code Update

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello Again:

Here is another comment I made last year, at the City Commission level. The hypothetical ADU blackfootprints I drew in will also give a sense of how tiny house infill housing could be established in a very small area of Oregon City. If you can imagine each of these tiny houses being on their own "tiny lots" carved out of the parent lot, it will give you a sense of what I was trying to communicate in my last email.

Jakob, if it would be possible to project these two images on the screen tonight, I would be grateful.

Thanks,

Jim Nicita
 Oregon City

----- Forwarded message -----

From: James Nicita <james.nicita@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, May 3, 2022 at 2:39 AM
Subject: GLUA 22-0002/LEG 22-00001 Housing Choices Update Follow Up Public Comment
To: Denyse McGriff <dmcgriff@orccity.org>, Rocky Smith, Jr. <rsmith@orccity.org>, Adam Marl <amarl@orccity.org>, Frank O'Donnell <fodonnell@orccity.org>
Cc: Oregon City Planning <ocplanning@orccity.org>

Madame President and Commissioners:

I write to submit follow-up comments on the above-referenced file, based on the Commission's discussion on April 20, 2022.

This email responds to President McGriff's concerns expressed beginning at roughly minute 57:00 of the of the April 20 meeting, regarding the proposed addition of ADUs as a permitted use in the Mixed-Use Corridor (MUC) zones.

I have prepared the attached graphical representations of how ADUs might be placed on lots with grandfathered single-family detached homes in one sample area with the much more vast MUC zone: namely, the stretch of the west side of High Street running from Second Street to Sixth Street.

I have identified at least 12 hypothetical ADU scenarios in this four-block stretch, as represented by black squares on a modified Sanborn map.

Many of these homes face the McLoughlin Promenade, with the rears of the homes facing High Street. This creates an urban design problem because much of High Street does not have a well-defined building wall. New ADUs could help establish a well-defined High Street building wall and pedestrian interaction with High Street.

Regarding affordable housing, people in ADUs in this stretch would not need to own cars. This stretch of High Street is served by Oregon City's highest-capacity transit service: the Trimet Route # 33 bus line. Recreation would be immediately accessible on the McLoughlin Promenade. Furthermore, ADU residents would be within walking distance to stores like the Capitol Mart and the corner of Third and High, the OC library, the lower 7th Street corridor, and downtown via the OC Elevator.

If around 12 ADUs could theoretically fit in this short stretch of the MUC zone, then very many affordable housing ADUs could fit in the MUC zone as a whole.

Planning Commission Chair Schlagenhauser's comments that the Planning Commission recommended adding ADUs as permitted uses in the MUC zone in part out of basic fairness are well taken. An examination of all the single family zoning districts that border the MUC zone will highlight that the current situation is not fair. These single family districts allow families in single family homes to have ADUs; however, a family that is right across the street, alley, or even lot line that lives in a grandfathered single family home in the adjacent MUC district currently cannot have an ADU. The Planning Commission's recommendations will cure that basic unfairness.

Thank you for considering these comments.

James Nicita
Oregon City

Gentle Infill Slide Show

VT. DEPT. OF HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT | JULY 2020

Users can adapt and customize this slideshow for local presentations and use.

- Homes in walkable neighborhoods close to jobs, daily destinations and recreational amenities are in high demand.
- Convenient homes also help meet many shared priorities around health, energy, economic development, and sustainable public services.
- This sample, customizable file can help local planners visualize ways to support infill housing through incremental changes to zoning and land use regulation.

Gentle Infill Slide Show

Discussion Questions

- Does your community's zoning allow neighborhood homes like these?
- What could new lots, units, and neighborhood businesses mean for your community for things like:
 - School enrollment
 - Energy consumption
 - Transportation choice
 - Health
 - Aging in place
 - Retirement planning
 - Affordability
 - Efficient economies for public services (like students per bus stop or customers per linear foot of sewer line)

7 NEW LOTS | >24 NEW UNITS | 1 NEW BUSINESS

Item 1.



Small Home: Barre, VT




Small Lot 4-plex: Winooski, VT



Mixed Use: Groton, VT



Mixed Use: Fairfax, VT



Reduced Setbacks: Williston, VT



Flag Lot: Barre, VT



Detached ADU: Burlington, VT



Attached ADU: Corinth, VT



Cottage Infill: S. Burlington, VT



Duplex: Shelburne, VT



Adaptive Re-Use: Putney VT

Christina Robertson-Gardiner

From: James Nicita <james.nicita@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 19, 2023 4:14 PM
To: Christina Robertson-Gardiner
Subject: Cottage Infill
Attachments: CPR-Gentle-Infill.pdf

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Christina,

I found online the attached 3-slide summary of “gentle infill.” It seems to be from Vermont.

At bottom center of the aerial, there is an example of an infill cottage on its own lot of 1/8 acre.

Cheers,

Jim