

# **AD HOC MIDDLE HOUSING CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

## **Meeting Minutes**

**November 4, 2020 6:00 PM**

**NEWBERG CITY HALL**

**Meeting held electronically due to COVID-19 pandemic**

*(This is for historical purposes as meetings are permanent retention documents and this will mark this period in our collective history)*

CDD Doug Rux called meeting to order at 6:01pm

### **ROLL CALL**

Members Present: Melisa Dailey, Chair  
Robert Bonner, Vice Chair  
Gabriel Skulec  
Dominic Seymour  
Leslie Murray  
Robert Moxley

Members Absent: Robert Bonner, excused  
Shy Montoya, excused  
Irma Vera

Staff Present: Doug Rux, Community Development Director

Consultants: Steve Faust, 3J Consulting  
Heather Austin, 3J Consulting  
Elizabeth Decker, JET Planning

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

|                                                                                                                                                         |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>MOTION:</b> Member Leslie Murray and Member Domenic Seymour moved to approve the October 14, 2020 Middle Housing Meeting Minutes, Motion carried 5/0 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

### **WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS:**

CDD Rux introduced himself as project manager. The Members introduced themselves followed by the Consultants from 3J Consulting and Jet Planning, each giving a brief introduction.

### **PROJECT OVERVIEW:**

Steve Faust, 3J Consulting gave the project objective considerations, which are to build on the momentum of the HNA, expand opportunities for middle housing options in the future and the main goal is to comply with House Bill 2001. He noted by population Newberg is a medium sized city (>10,000) as opposed to a large city (>25,000) it is right on the cusp. We will be not only looking at duplexes in Newberg but other middle housing opportunities.

Steve went over the project schedule and noted we have until June 15, 2021 to complete this project. He noted getting our work done on this project includes adopting some provisions around duplexes and other middle housing types. He noted there is a lot of content to this task, looking at the City's code and developing concepts. In December we'll begin drafting the actual code update and another round of meetings with this Committee and with the public. Based on comments from the Committee and the public we'll put together the final code update. We than can move into the adoption process.

## **DRAFT HOUSING CODE AUDIT AND CODE CONCEPTS:**

Elizabeth Decker, JET Planning started the presentation on housing code and concepts. She noted a bit of background with the direction that came out of the HNA in 2019. Starting with Housing Mix which is showing currently 71% single family detached which is Newberg's dominant housing type, 23% single family attached and 6 % multifamily. The new housing forecast is 60% single family detached, 8% single family attached and 32% multifamily. She noted there's opportunity to meet some of Newberg's future housing needs through a mix of middle housing types.

Elizabeth continued with the housing need and analysis 2020 to 2040. The City is looking at a little over 4,000 dwelling units expected in the next 20 years. There is already 40% not single family detached projected and we're looking to add some variety into that mix. The most substantial ways the City can encourage development of housing is through ensuring enough land is zoned for residential development, eliminating barriers to residential development where possible and providing infrastructure in a cost effective way. She noted we are focusing in on the zoning piece and eliminating barriers in codes.

Elizabeth noted HB 2001 was passed in 2019 by the Legislature and the two key provisions are that medium cities, with a population over 10,000 people, have to allow that duplexes can be constructed on all lots where single family detached dwellings are allowed. She noted they are using a new acronym SFDD for single family detached dwellings. Newberg needs to comply with this by June of 2021 so that is what is driving this schedule to have these provisions not only drafted but fully adopted by the Planning Commission and City Council. The second part is that large cities with a population over 25,000 have to allow triplexes, quadplexes, townhouses and cottage clusters in areas where SFDD are allowed. Newberg is in a unique position where the 2019 population was estimated at 24,045 and it's continuing to grow. The population projection is coming out in December of 2020 and the City could cross the 25,000 threshold. She noted the two part scope that the City laid out on this project was to adopt the duplex rules by June 2021 and comply with HB 2001. Second to develop draft middle housing rules and adopt those as a second phase after June 2021 which gives us a little bit more flexibility in terms of having more time to review our initial phase of work.

Elizabeth noted when you start thinking about the duplexes on all lots and other middle housing types in all area there are some exceptions that's been a part of the statewide discussion. There are some resource areas that are protected by other Statewide Planning Goals, so to avoid a conflict with other statewide planning requirements, historic landmarks, stream corridors, floodplains and greenways have some additional protections. A critical piece is were not looking at high density residential so the R-4 and non-residential zones are not included in this project. This project and HB 2001 is intended to focus on those neighborhoods where single family detached dwellings are the predominant dwelling type to increase the variety of housing allowed in those areas. There are some exceptions for infrastructure constrained areas, there is the short-term and long-term infrastructure constraints. The City has secured additional funds from DLCD to evaluate infrastructure and see if there are particular neighborhoods that have constraints and to identify ways of rectifying those to support the greater density that could come along with middle housing. There's a different exemption in HB 2001, the City's infrastructure constrained areas after going through that process and it just becomes clear that the constraint is a very long-term constraint then there's a different way to treat those areas. Primarily is for rural areas that have no water and are on septic and could create health hazard or other concerns. The other is working with Master planned communities and that middle housing gets treated differently in those areas.

Elizabeth continued with Paths to Compliance, model code and minimum compliance. She noted the DLCD staff with the Rulemaking Committee of people across the State, nonprofits, other agencies and stakeholders have all gotten together on the rulemaking process and has delivered two different pathways to satisfy HB 2001 requirements. The first is they put together a model code for how to allow all the different housing types into your communities and minimum compliance to better meet the City's specific needs.

Elizabeth noted in Newberg when you take into account all the different features of HB 2001 and the City's HNA, local priorities are the initial project focus and has shown us that we're going to be looking at the residential zones where single family detached dwellings are permitted. Were looking at R-1, R-2 and R-3 zones as well as the residential professional RP zone. Within those we are looking for ways to allow duplexes, triplexes, quadplexes, townhouses, cottage clusters and the objective standards and review processes. Uses will be permitted uses and any standards that apply to them can be reviewed through a simple Type I application.

Elizabeth noted on the zoning map of Newberg where we're contemplating adding these areas essentially which are shown in yellow and orange areas on the map.

Elizabeth continued with the duplex analysis. What we're looking at is making duplexes a permitted use in the R-1, R-2, R-3, RP and treating them the same as a single family detached dwelling. Specific text in HB 2001 is that duplexes are allowed on all of the same lot size as a single family detached dwelling which is a 5,000 square foot minimum lot size. The design standards are identical for duplexes and single family detached dwellings. Dimensional standards are things like height, setbacks and lot coverage, which complies with minimum compliance and the model code. There are some minimal design standards that apply to duplexes if you can apply clear an objective design standards just as long as you evaluate and they apply to single family detached dwellings as well as duplexes, you need to treat them identically.

Elizabeth noted every community has parking requirement issues. The City's code requires two parking spaces per unit and that would be a total of four spaces for a duplex lot. The State minimum compliance requirements are the highest number of parking spaces the City can require for duplexes is one space per unit. The model code encourages cities to go further and reduce that reducing required parking to 0 spaces so that it gives the builder flexibility to either add parking or no parking depending on the site configuration. Parking is one change we are recommending for compliance. The other concept is allowing the conversion of existing single family detached dwellings into duplexes without triggering any additional parking or design standards. The standard of two spaces for a duplex can't be applied to this conversion. When thinking about conversion and having two units on a lot we need to clarify the relationship to an accessory dwelling units. ADU's are typically a larger house with an ADU where a duplex is side by side and the same design.

Elizabeth noted the other concept we will be looking at is the duplex concepts whether we allow attached or detached duplex structure. The stacked and the side by side duplexes come from the model code. We will be looking at allowing detached duplexes. She noted looking at the diagrams of how we are going to start to overlap with ADU's quickly, particularly when we're talking about detached structures.

Elizabeth opened up for discussion on duplexes, attached or detached, parking standards and the number of parking spaces and the minimum lot size reductions for single family detached dwellings and duplexes.

Member Seymore noted his mother lives in a neighborhood with quadplexes and there is almost all on street parking. He also noted he is in his garage conversion and is currently working with the City Planning Department about parking. I have a driveway that fits two parking spaces but because it's not 20 feet setback from the street they consider it as one parking space. He noted we can adjust those codes to make things more livable.

Member Skulec suggested to choose the style that allows the maximum of daylight coming into those units. Rearranging units differently for sun exposure and how the sun travels around the unit so that people get better quality light.

Chair Dailey asked if Elizabeth could go over the definition of a duplex again.

Elizabeth noted the definition of a duplex is two dwelling units on a single lot. The option is whether an attached configuration or any configuration which allow attached or detached. It is an option of whether it's two separate structures or one. Cottage clusters are two cottages that are smaller, they don't have to face each other or share yard space between them but are supposed to be oriented towards each other differently. Cottages are going to pick up five units or more.

Chair Dailey noted garages seem to be used more for storage than for parking. She has observed over parking in driveways blocking the sidewalk and you can't walk continuously through the neighborhoods which is frustrating. Also noting back to the duplexes I think allowing as many types of housing, we want to be flexible and do as much as you can to allow as many housing types for owners and developers.

Member Seymour noted looking at the different designs from a contractor's standpoint and the cost of building separate units that they would go with side by side or the stacked duplex when it seems like with larger homes and it's less material cost.

Member Moxley agrees.

Elizabeth noted one thing just to underline in terms of our job in writing code is we don't have to predict which of these is going to be a winner. It's just about if we allow these detached duplexes to have more options and if people never use

them that's fine. I think you make a great point about construction economics, a lot of this middle housing discussion is focused on how we can produce smaller more affordable housing units.

Member Moxley noted the parking situation with the code might end up being a contentious issue throughout the neighborhood. If you have a single family dwelling that has two parking spots where they take one up on the street, the duplex has one parking spot where they will take up all the street parking. He feels this would cause conflict within the community of neighborhood.

Member Murray noted her concern is the parking as well. By living in Newberg you start thinking about all these neighborhoods that parking is an issue. She noted she lives in a cul-de-sac and there is no parking on the street because our driveways all butt up to each other. In all the downtown housing there's no parking and the street it's always full especially when you get closer to the college.

Elizabeth noted it's one of those codes where there's some specifics in the State code that we're going to have to meet. It might come down to making sure off street parking is required and usable. She noted we can look at some of those pieces and how it comes together. I'm not hearing any vocal support for eliminating all minimum parking at this point, would this be a fair assessment?

Member Moxley noted he agreed.

Chair Dailey agreed because some of the homes are being built more narrowly and there's barely one spot of parking in front of them.

Elizabeth noted when you think about a duplex coming in with only one parking there could be some overflow parking onto the street. The key context in which we should be considering is that in an infill situation where it's one duplex coming in or being built we want to do our best to make duplexes a feasible development option. The estimates for how many of these are going to be built in one neighborhood are relatively low at 5% duplexes in 10 years. We are projected closer to 1% to 3%. So even if there are some on street parking impacts that result from some duplexes, hopefully they will be spread out enough that it will be an impact similar to how we've seen ADU production in the past.

Member Seymour asked with these new rules are people with current ADU's, or building them are they going to be able to sell them and sell a portion of their land or is it that going to open up a new window of issues, especially if the parking doesn't have to be changed if the ADU is already existing.

Elizabeth noted none of these rules change the land division standards. Right now the options to sell an ADU would require a condo, you would have to do a condo for the main house to sell the ADU separately or if the lot was large enough to do a partition.

Elizabeth continued noting if there is any interest in taking a look at those minimum lot sizes and considering any further reductions that would apply across the board for single family detached dwellings and duplexes.

CDD Rux noted there is 3,000 square feet in R-2 and 5,000 square feet in R-1, and there are 1,500 square feet per unit in R-3.

Elizabeth noted those are fairly reasonable minimum lot size for those zones. She asked if there's any interest in reducing them further.

Member Moxley responded not now, we already made concessions in the R-1 zone. Lot size is getting pretty skinny for multifamily. He doesn't feel we would need to reduce any further because it would cause issues and is not doable. Noting if you're looking at 1,500 or 3,000 square foot lot and putting a multifamily you have no parking, no backyard and no front yard. The structure of the building is going to be a skinny house straight up in the air. There is just no room on such a small lot.

CDD Rux noted back in 2010 the City went through a process and reduced the lot sizes. In R-1 went from 7,500 square feet down to 5,000 square feet and in R-2 went from 5,000 square feet to 3,000 square feet. It was done at that time because we were not meeting our target densities of 4.4 dwelling units per acre in R-1 and 9 dwelling units per acre in R-2. The City staff at that time looked at using the land more efficiently than what it had been used historically and reduced those lot sizes.

Chair Dailey asked if we are meeting our minimums.

CDD Rux noted we're doing some updates right now to our HNA and buildable land and the numbers are coming in. In R-1 we are coming in at about 4.9 dwelling units per acre which is above the target and in R-2 we are coming in at 7.9 dwelling units per acre. In R-2 zone it allows single family and multifamily which is market driven about what a developer wants to do with a particular parcel of land.

Member Moxley noted he was thinking before HB 2001 he believed duplexes had to have a 20,000 square foot lot.

CDD Rux noted the way the code is written is that to do a duplex in R-1 you would have to have a 10,000 square foot lot and to do a duplex in R-2 you would have to have a 6,000 square foot lot. We have not seen any duplex development because the developers have shared that if they have a 10,000 square foot lot instead of a duplex they'll just do two detached single family homes.

Member Moxley noted doesn't HB 2001 change that and it's exactly the same minimum lot size that apply to single family detached and duplexes.

Elizabeth noted it's a 5,000 square foot lot for both in R-1 zone right now. The question is there an option to reducing that lot size any further and if so, it would affect single family detached dwellings and duplexes now that there is no differentiation between the lot sizes. Not hearing any support, she noted we're not recommending it at this time and it isn't required by the model code or minimum compliance but is just an option.

Elizabeth continued with triplex and quadplex analysis. The City is being proactive in addressing this now. With triplexes and quadplexes there might be a few lots where triplex and quadplexes can be permitted if they're in certain areas or if there's infrastructure constraints. We're generally looking at the model code and minimum compliance which is looking at ways to allow those in single family neighborhoods. When we start from that goal and requirement and review the current code, we see that triplexes and quadplexes right now fall under the broader multifamily definition which triggers a host of other development design standards that are really tailored to bring in more multifamily development. What would be necessary to allow an apartment building is different than what is needed for a triplex or quadplex. Historically in Newberg you don't see many triplexes and quadplexes. Triplex and quadplex as a part of multifamily dwelling would be a conditional use in the R-1 zone. It would be permitted in R-2, R-3 and RP but the minimum lot sizes are based on the number of units. Under the current standards for a duplex you have twice as large a lot and to build a quadplex you have to have four times as large a lot which is not practical or an economical use of land. Currently the way the code is written the triplex and quadplex are multifamily and would trigger the multifamily design and open space standards. The parking standards for multifamily range from 1 to 2 parking spaces per unit which depends on the size of the unit based on how many bedrooms.

Elizabeth continued with the concepts of triplex and quadplexes. We're thinking about how we will treat triplexes and quadplexes going forward. We are looking to create a new use category for each with the definition so that triplexes and quadplexes get removed from the multifamily category. They will have their own use type that allows the triplex and quadplex to be allowed an use in R-1, R-2, R-3 and RP zones. The minimum lot size will get a makeover which is intended to be the same as a single family duplex, single family detached dwelling. Elizabeth noted the minimum lot sizes 5,000 square foot lot for triplexes and 7,000 square foot lot for quadplexes. She noted those are optional and doesn't mean you have to require 7,000 you could also allow a quadplex on a 5,000 square foot lot, you could require up to a 7,000 square foot minimum lot size for that because there are additional units. You could keep it as 4,000 square foot lot for triplex and 7,000 square foot lot for quadplex or you can bring it down. You don't have to set a different minimum lot size for quadplexes it is just that you are allowed to.

Elizabeth continued with the design standard objectives. There needs to be a clear and objective design standards if the City wants to require any for triplexes and quadplexes, the model code is very specific. There is entryway, window coverage, garage location and driveway approach standards. If you want any of those to apply to triplexes and quadplexes you can add that to the code and there isn't a lot of flexibility to add design standards that address different aspects of design. She noted the weight of what is written is parking standards for triplexes and quadplexes. The City is allowed to require up to one parking space per unit. Rather than those per bedroom fluctuations it could be reduced further. She noted looking at ways to add some flexibility on how parking is treated and try to get out of that parking lot design. If we're

thinking of these as infill or integrated neighborhoods of single family detached, adding a parking lot in the middle does not add to the neighborhood characteristic and takes up too much land.

Elizabeth noted the last piece we are looking at adding to the code is allowing the conversion of a single family detached dwelling into a triplex and quadplex and exempt from adding any additional parking or design standards beyond what was applied initially to that dwelling. She noted the building code changes on these conversions. The residential building code applies to individual one or two unit structures and the commercial building code kicks in at three units or more. Converting a single family detached dwelling built under the residential building code to a triplex would now be under the commercial building code which is being reviewed now under the State code.

Elizabeth noted the design standard options which are entry way, 15% minimum window coverage, garage, off street parking location and driveway approach. She noted the Model Code has more diagrams that are in your packet.

Elizabeth continued with triplex and quadplex concepts whether attached or detached configurations. Noting the different diagrams and graphics that came up within the model code to help start thinking about what attached verses detached structures might look like. Follow up on our discussion about the spectrum of housing choices, the detached quadplex example starts to look similar to a cottage cluster. The only distinction is the number of units if you allow detached quadplexes. Essentially a four unit cottage cluster would be interesting for the right site and has more flexibility.

Elizabeth opened for discussion on triplex and quadplex issues. What is the level of interest in allowing the detached configuration in addition to attached for these plex units. Attached is the baseline, but there could be additional flexibility added with the detached option.

Chair Dailey noted she is fine with the flexibility. The only thing noticed is the one that's the two on the bottom and two on the top, some design standards could be called for there to have some articulation so it doesn't just look like a box.

Elizabeth asked for any thoughts about parking standards and how is it the same or different from duplexes in your opinion.

Member Moxley noted as far as the parking he feels it could be a problem unless the lot is big enough. Detached units would be a problem for parking and it's going to cause a diversion in the neighborhood. To separate the units wouldn't be a problem as long as we have a very large lot for parking. He noted he doubts there will be much desire to build detached units.

Member Seymour noted he was worried when he saw single family dwelling conversion to a quadplex without making any additional parking requirements. Which means a house with two parking spaces can now have four homes on it. He noted the free market will determine.

Elizabeth noted it is an interesting provision that they added to the State requirements about allowing those conversion and it will be interesting to see how it plays out.

Chair Dailey wonders if something can come into play if you're closer to the downtown area the fewer parking spots allowed. A lot of people that live close enough to walk do, but they still have to park their car somewhere.

Elizabeth responded that differentiating parking requirements based on distance is definitely something we could do. There is a tool for parking requirements that parking demand will scale in distance to destinations. The only thing is we have a compressed scale. We could work between 0 and 1 parking spaces. If you're within a quarter mile you could have 2 parking spaces for a quadplex, but we can't go any higher than 1 for any dwelling.

Member Seymour noted there are some jurisdictions in California that allow you to put a bike rack and count it as a parking space, which is a function of how far away you are, for example a bus stop. He feels like those kind of rules are kind of a work around and they don't end up being used and you still end up with cars flooding the street. From what he is hearing it sounds like parking is the number one issue and is not a fan with the minimum requirement going down to zero parking.

Member Skulec noted that corner lots allow plenty of parking.

Elizabeth responded that some jurisdictions use on street parking credits, where you have 20 to 25 feet frontage along your lot you can count that as one of your spaces and if you have a corner lot you're going to have more than one space. It might make sense to contemplate that as a way of meeting the parking demands and recognizing the additional frontage. She noted philosophically the tricky thing about on street parking credits is there's always people that think that parking space in front of my house is mine and therefore if a triplex moved in next door and they're taking their space and allowing on street parking credits fuel that sense of ownership. She noted it could be written in a way that is more specific to corner lots.

Member Moxley noted not everyone wants the 1976 international four wheel drive rusted out pickup parked in front of their house.

Elizabeth noted another area is to look at the dimensional standards, particularly on lot coverage and setbacks. When we have the smaller lots and if they're capped at a certain lot coverage, you can easily fit a 2,000 or 3,000 square foot home on and only take up half the lot but you are balancing for feasibility. She also noted there are multiple issues to consider. If you build four 1,000 square foot units then that would be 4,000 square feet on a 5,000 square foot lot which would be 80% coverage which is higher than what is allowed in code now. There are two ways of thinking about this, one supports development feasibility to actually get these plexes built, and there can be concerns about compatibility within the neighborhoods if the scale of these plexes are larger than some of the other residential structures in the neighborhood.

Chair Dailey asked what the lot coverage is for a single family lot.

CDD Rux responded in our R-1 zone for the house and driveway is 60% and is the same in R-2. There is some subset to that, R-1 a one story house can be 50% and a two story house can be 40%. Most of our developments that are occurring now are the typical detached single family home is under the 60%, but they're kind of pushing that 40% - 50% window of that 60% max.

Member Seymour noted the storm water implications when you get into the larger coverage you have to worry about providing room for storm water and that this is something to consider.

Member Moxley noted were going to have to make concessions for the duplexes and triplexes in regards to utilizing as much of the lot as possible. If we're going to make this happen in regards to promoting affordable housing we're going to have to do something and make concessions here. I would be all for utilizing as much of the lot as possible to incentivize middle row housing. He noted most tenants have no desire to maintain a yard and there are a lot of parks in Newberg. We need to come up with options to incentivize middle row housing.

Elizabeth noted the other middle housing topic is townhouses which the City of Newberg already permits single family attached dwellings. They require a special use permit in the R-1, R-2, R-3 and RP zones. They require a higher level of review as a Type 2 rather than Type 1 which you can take a little more time for review. The minimum lot size is the same as single family detached dwelling. If you think about it you probably want a smaller lot size for a townhouse to make it more feasible. They require two parking spaces per unit and you cannot use any on street parking credits.

Elizabeth continued with the townhouse concepts. We're looking first to make them outright permitted use in the four residential zones. The minimum compliance from the State minimum lot size is 1,500 square feet, minimum lot width cannot be greater than 20 feet. There are some changes to the setbacks in the dimensional standards, allowing a reduced front setback which is 10 feet and increasing the building height to 35 feet in order to allow full three stories of construction and a garage. The reduced parking standard is one space per unit.

Elizabeth talked about design standards. The entryway orientation is to bring the front door closer and more visible to the street. There is some unit definition where we pick up these articulation concepts such as bay windows and trim options. You can allow 15% minimum window coverage. The driveway access and parking layouts seems to be one of the trickiest with townhouse design. You want to prevent a solid row of garage doors and driveways especially when we're talking about 20 foot wide lots. There are different standards that require either shared driveways or rear ally or shared access to parking.

Elizabeth continued with opening the discussion. First how many attached units do you want a permit as part of a townhouse project. Should that be differentiated by the difference zones? The minimum requirement from the State is at

least four attached units have to be permitted in any zone. In most cities that have a limit I've seen as high as 8 units which is the highest. You could consider 4 units in R-1 and 8 units in R-2 and R-3 and there is some flexibility. Design standards in the Newberg code map well with the model code design standards so we could keep them with some small modifications.

Member Seymour noted he has no problem with allowing as many units as possible because it saves cost. Issues might be with utilities bringing into all the separate units. Window standards marked at 15% minimum I don't see any need to have minimum there, I think the market is going to decide how many windows are needed.

Member Skulec noted designs are more sensitive to needs to be aesthetic and in sync with the environment where the townhouses will be built.

Elizabeth noted back to the HNA that there is definitely forecasted growth for demand for townhouses in Newberg.

Member Moxley noted he agrees with member Seymour's comments.

Elizabeth continued with cottage cluster types and there are no existing standards yet. She noted the Newberg code doesn't have anything on this subject. Cottage clusters is a new use and most cities don't have anything to address this yet, which is the whole purpose of HB 2001. What we're looking to do with this new cottage cluster concept is to define and permit it in zones R-1, R-2, R-3 and RP. A cottage cluster is a collection of detached units that's 5 to 8 units or more. No unit limit at all can add flexibility for different sized lots. The concept is to allow more smaller homes that are not necessarily facing the street like you see in a traditional subdivision layout, it would be clustered around a common open space. She noted there is very specific requirement in HB 2001. A cottage is limited to a 900 square foot footprint and cities have no discretion to increase that. The building area can be capped at 900 square feet for a one story house, up to 1800 square feet if it is two stories. There is some flexibility in the total size of the cottages but the footprint of 900 square feet cannot be changed. The tradeoff is you get more smaller units because there's effectively no maximum density that gets applied to cottage clusters. You can fit five or more units on a lot of 7,000 square feet or more. She noted some of the analysis she read show it is hard to fit 5 detached units of 900 square footprints onto a 7,000 square foot lot, especially when you add in parking, the perimeter setbacks and the open space that needs to be in the middle. A more reasonable minimum lot size estimate is needed.

Elizabeth showed an example of how the cottage cluster might play out. There are smaller individual detached homes clustered around a common courtyard with some internal pedestrian walkways. They have the same front, rear and perimeter setbacks as any other development in the R zones. In the example shown the parking is clustered in a parking lot pod rather than being individual garages associated with the cottages.

Elizabeth noted she feels that if Newberg is interested there are ways that we could increase the feasibility of cottage clusters over and above the model code and still meet the minimum compliance but would exceed the model code.

Elizabeth showed a layout example by Hayden Homes and their take on something similar to the Cottage code and the Cottage Cluster concept. It is smaller individual homes on a larger lot, there not all facing the street, but instead arranged around a courtyard with greenspace spread throughout the development. There is parking throughout the site so that each unit has little parking lots more proximate to the individual units and easier to access. She noted right now Newberg couldn't build this layout under the current model code. Newberg could consider adding more flexibility to the courtyard orientation standard and how the parking is arranged.

Elizabeth showed another example of Hayden Homes Cottage Cluster which achieved similar objectives. These were done for fee simple ownership. They created individual lots for all of the Cottage Clusters but at a much smaller scale at 1,500 square feet. There is green space throughout and the option for individual garages for each of the cottages. In the model code right now you couldn't do this because of the orientation requirements and because the building footprint is capped at 900 square feet and you can't spend 400 square feet of that on a garage. So the model code is still needing some final revisions. There has definitely been some movement to add some square footage to allow garages, an additional 200 square feet would make this a little bit more feasible. She noted this example and the other get us more towards the traditional cottage code that the model code is built around. There is more latitude here depending on where you want to take it.



Elizabeth opened up to the discussion points. How many units could be allowed per cluster? She noted another point that Newberg could choose to exceed the model code, is that the cottage cluster is all about detached cottages and some cities have experimented with allowing attached units in the same cluster configuration, which there is some cost savings of having attached units. Duplex cluster is one thing that the City could consider, another one is like the second Hayden Homes example. Whether to create a path through the subdivision code to allow for cottage projects to create these individual lots and require some flexibility about lot frontage requirements, utility and other easement issues. Other item is parking spaces, how are they arranged and making it feasible to add the individual garages to cottages which would require some changes to the model code.

Member Seymour was wondering how ownership and maintenance of those Cottage Clusters usually work. Is there an HOA or renters paying into a larger entity or people getting ownership of these homes?

Elizabeth noted the cottage clusters she is familiar with were done as condos, so people were able to buy their individual cottages and also there is an HOA to take care of the common spaces. She noted an important choice is allowing the subdivision option, the condo option runs into a lot of condo defect liability legislation that can make a lot of developers shy away from condos. So having the subdivision option would allow more feasible ownership and there probably would be an HOA.

Member Moxley noted there are some similar builds in Newberg that are attached cottage clusters over by Newberg High School. There are 8 of them, they have a common area, no garages, affordable and are on 20,000 square foot lots.

Member Seymour noted parking is important no matter which cottage you go with and keeping the one space minimum.

Steve Faust suggested a survey to get extra feedback on the master plan before the next meeting on November 18, 2020.

Elizabeth continued with the master planned communities. There are 4 different master planned areas, five including the Airport, Springbrook District, Northwest Newberg, Springbrook Oaks and the Riverfront District. Together these total about 50% of the buildable land and nearly all the vacant land. There's some partially vacant land within the City limits, Springbrook up in the north, Airport residential district, Northwest Newberg in the northwest, Springbrook Oaks east of Newberg and the Riverfront Subdistrict in the south. These highlighted areas can be treated differently under HB 2001. We will need to go in and amend the specific plans and different agreements and codes that apply in each of these areas to allow duplexes on every lot, because that is a requirement. The other middle housing types, the State is cognizant of the fact that when communities master plan areas they served a vision for infrastructure and the size to meet the number of units that are being expected. In areas that have master plans at X density and all of a sudden they quadruple their potential production by allowing quadplexes, that could undermine a lot of the long range planning that communities have done across the State through these master plans. For these master plans that were approved prior to this process, which Newberg has five approved, middle housing types can be limited and permitted. If there isn't interest to do this in these areas, those housing types can be limited for initial build out only, provided that the master plans allow density of 8 units per acre as a minimum. You can average that if there are different pockets of density throughout the master plan, provided that subsequent redevelopment of middle housing is permitted.

Elizabeth opened discussion, should other middle housing types be limited in master plan areas, or permitted similar to residential zones.

Member Moxley noted he would permit them in all zones and incentivize affordable housing and middle housing. He noted that would be enough to open the floodgates.

Member Murray said allow it if they want to do it.

Chair Dailey noted she is trying to understand the master plan areas that have been mapped out for development. By saying that we open the floodgates then the builder isn't required to do that, they just have the option.

Member Moxley noted some residents in nice developments might be a little upset which might be a concern.

## **NEXT STEPS:**

Elizabeth noted we do have time reserved for a second meeting on November 18<sup>th</sup>. The idea is that we could get some written comments or survey specific questions and feedback from the Committee. She asked the group if they would be

interested in a survey with some of these questions and to provide some thoughts, written comments, or questions before the next meeting.

Member Moxley noted he would be okay with the survey, anything he can do to help and wants to make a difference.

Elizabeth noted maybe we could split up the questions and send out an email with 5 to 10 questions to help you all focus your feedback. She noted they would have to send comments individually to CDD Rux rather than as a group.

Steve noted he will send out the PowerPoint and some targeted questions, members can send thoughts or questions to CDD Rux or wait for the November 18<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Elizabeth noted they will keep working through these issues and then our next meeting we will give a road map of the next step. We will use all your feedback to get to the open house in December and then on to drafting some code.

#### **ADJOURNMENT:**

Chair Dailey adjourned meeting at 8:02pm

**APPROVED BY THE AD HOC MIDDLE HOUSING CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE this  
November 18, 2020**



Melisa Dailey, Middle Housing Chair



Doug Rux, Recording Secretary