



CITY OF SILVERTON

AFFORDABLE HOUSING TASK FORCE MEETING

Tuesday, May 18, 2021 – 8:30 a.m.

Americans with Disabilities Act – *The City of Silverton intends to comply with the A.D.A. The meeting location is accessible to individuals needing special accommodations such as a sign language interpreter, headphones, or other special accommodations for the hearing impaired. To participate, please contact the City at 503-874-2216 at least 48 hours prior to the meeting.*

A copy of the full packet is available on the City's website at www.silverton.or.us/agendacenter. In accordance with House Bill 4212 the meeting will be held electronically using the Zoom web conference platform. Please submit written comments to aspeier@silverton.or.us by 4:00 p.m. on Monday, May 17, 2021. Comments received will be shared with the Affordable Housing Task Force before the meeting and included in the record.

Zoom Meeting Link:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/85387297759?pwd=R281Y09wZWZMNEQvd1hCb1hTQkQ4QT09>

Webinar ID: 853 8729 7759

Passcode: 755164

Dial in: 1 (253) 215-8782

AGENDA

- I. Call to Order, Pledge of Allegiance and Roll Call**
- II. Approval of Minutes** – Minutes from the meeting held on Tuesday, April 20, 2021
- III. Public Comment** – Items not on this Agenda
- IV. Discussion**
 - 4.1 Continued discussion on System Development Charges**
 - 4.2 Continued discussion on criteria and characteristics of properties prioritized to up zone**
 - 4.3 Update on Development Code updates**
- V. Adjournment**

1 CITY OF SILVERTON
2 **AFFORDABLE HOUSING TASK FORCE MINUTES**

3 **Zoom Web Conference Platform**

4
5 **April 20, 2021, 8:30 a.m.**

6
7 **I. CALL TO ORDER**

8
9 Chair Palmer called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. The task force members and staff were present
10 through the virtual meeting platform Zoom consistent with House Bill 4212.

11
12

Present	Excused	
X		Kyle Palmer
X		Dana Smith
X		Jason Freilinger
X		Sarah DeSantis (<i>arrived at 8:39 am and departed at 9:45 am</i>)
	X	Hilary Dumitrescu
	X	Kari Johnsen
	X	Bonnie Logan
X		Laurie Chadwick
X		Sarah White (<i>departed at 8:58 am</i>)
X		Rebecca Delmar
X		Gene Oster
X		Terry Caster
		Vacancy

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 Staff Present: Community Development Director, Jason Gottgetreu and Assistant to the City
30 Manager/City Clerk, Angela Speier

31
32 **II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

33
34 Member Smith made a motion to approve the minutes from the meeting held on March 16, 2021. Member
35 Freilinger seconded the motion. There was no discussion and the motion passed unanimously (8-0).

36
37 **III. PUBLIC COMMENT**

38
39 Chair Palmer noted the Task Force received a piece of written testimony from Karen Trucke that was
40 shared with the members prior to the meeting (attachment 1). There were no other public comments.

41
42 **IV. DISCUSSION/ACTION**

43
44 **4.1 Presentation on System Development Charges**

45 Community Development Director Jason Gottgetreu reviewed the current structure of the City's System
46 Development Charges (SDCs). SDCs are one-time fees imposed on new development or expansion of
47 existing development in order to recover a proportionate share of the cost of existing and planned/future
48 capital facilities that will serve the developing property. Currently, the City charges water, wastewater,
49 stormwater, transportation and parks SDCs and to build a single family home the total SDC cost is
50 \$23,815 plus additional permit fees totaling about \$30,000.

51
52 Director Gottgetreu said there has been interest from the Task Force to look at basing SDCs on the scale
53 of the home. In 2017, the City of Newport restructured how their SDCs were calculated and now they are
54 based on three different home sizes. A small home (1,700 SF) is \$5,189; a standard home (2,500 SF) is

1 \$9,800; and a large home (4,200 SF) is \$15,100. Newport used occupancy assumptions related to the
2 home size. For example the City assumes on average out of 100 small homes, 96 are occupied by one
3 person and four are occupied by two people. Their SDCs are based on the assumption smaller homes
4 have lower occupancy levels. Member Smith noted the occupancy demographics in Newport might be
5 skewed due to the rental market, meaning there could be a number of short-term rentals that do not have
6 any permanent occupants counted.
7

8 Director Gottgetreu imported water usage from the August 2020 billing into the City's GIS mapping
9 system and reviewed his findings with the Task Force. The data shows a trend that homes with larger
10 square footage use more water. The average water usage is 1,600 cubic feet per month and noted on
11 average houses over 2,000 square feet had above average water usage and homes at 500 square feet
12 used about half the average water. He then used a portion of the 2019 new home builds to show how the
13 City could use the water usage data to adjust the water and wastewater SDCs based on the square
14 footage of the new home. Under this scenario new homes 1,800 square feet and smaller would pay less
15 in SDCs and homes above 1,850 would pay higher SDCs. The overall revenue generated from this SDC
16 structure would have given the City an additional \$9,033 in water and wastewater SDCs. He explained
17 there are system improvements that are not necessarily related to usage, such as fire flows that might
18 need to be taken into account. Member White said based on this data scaling SDCs to the size of a home
19 is equitable and would increase revenue for the City. Director Gottgetreu said under this methodology that
20 would be correct.
21

22 Member Freilinger asked if staff has thought about potential methodology that could be used for the other
23 SDC's such as parks, stormwater and transportation. Director Gottgetreu explained stormwater is based
24 on the average impervious surface of a single family home which created a known cost per square foot,
25 so that would be easy to calculate. An updated methodology for transportation and parks SDCs would be
26 more challenging. Member Freilinger asked if the City has to show a methodology in order to justify the
27 rates or could the City just incentivize the building of smaller homes through a reduction in SDCs. Director
28 Gottgetreu would need to do further research, but assumes the rates would have to be based on data,
29 research, and analysis.
30

31 The members discussed the possible breakdown of square footage size and how Newport charges their
32 water and sewer SDCs. In addition, possible changes to the transportation methodology were discussed
33 and the differences between system deficiencies that need to be addressed to meet current need not
34 future capacity. Member Oster explained the lack of buildable lots in Silverton also plays into the need to
35 build bigger homes in order to maximize profits. Member Caster said SDCs should be graduated, not one
36 size fits all. He also noted the difference in SDCs when building a duplex verses a single family home.
37 Member Chadwick asked about the minimum lot size discussion and Member Caster noted it would not
38 pencil out to build a smaller retirement home on a 7,000 square foot lot.
39

40 Chair Palmer left the meeting at 9:30 a.m. and returned at 9:35 a.m.
41

42 **4.2 Presentation on criteria and characteristics of properties prioritized to up zone**

43 Director Gottgetreu reviewed a map of properties that have the potential to support a different zoning
44 category other than R-1 residential. The map showed all the properties in Silverton that are at least
45 20,000 square feet and also have a building improvement to land value ratio of one or less where the land
46 is worth more than the structure located on it. In addition, the map also shows properties that do not have
47 a building located on it. He asked the members to think about goals and objectives when identifying
48 and/or incentivizing properties to potentially up zone.
49

50 Member Freilinger would like to ensure the infrastructure to the property is already available. He said a
51 number of the properties on the map are located on the fringe of town and he would not want to
52 encourage isolated communities of multifamily homes, because it would be very costly to expand
53 sidewalks and potentially other infrastructure. Member Smith noted a lot of this discussion depends on
54 who the property owner is. She suggested the City quantify the need for sidewalks along arterial streets
55 so that the homes built behind it are paying for more than 30 percent. She asked if the City recognizes it
56 does not want to create island communities that are not accessible by sidewalks and/or bike paths and

1 there is not a need in the area until a development occurs that creates the need. Could the City identify
2 these as new transportation needs and assign it to the island community? Director Gottgetreu said
3 possibly, but it would need to be documented.
4

5 Member Oster said the most attractive sites for up zoning to multifamily seem like they are on the
6 outskirts of town, but no one wants to develop a large multifamily structure so there will need to be
7 smaller incremental developments throughout Silverton. The main focus should be in areas where
8 services to support multifamily development are available. He asked if the City could up zone property
9 without the property owners consent and what other cities have used as incentives to up zone. Director
10 Gottgetreu said in 2006 the City changed the zoning of all commercial properties in the City limits. The
11 City maintains the Comprehensive Plan map and the zoning map. The only thing cities cannot do is
12 change the zoning to restrict property owners from being able to do something on their property without
13 Measure 49 implications. Up zoning would expand the amount of allowed uses on the piece of property.
14 Discussion ensued on minimum density standards and the need to develop within those standards if a
15 piece of property was up zoned. Member Oster said that could be a potential problem with the property
16 owner.
17

18 Member Caster asked about using Bancroft Bonds for building sidewalks where the individuals who
19 benefit from the need pay for it. It is a tool that could be used, because SDCs are not the answer to
20 everything. Member Freilinger said this is an important topic that needs to be revisited. He would also like
21 to know more about Bancroft Bonds. The City and the property owners need to be on the same page and
22 suggested an approach where the City Council approves a plan for up zoning identified properties that
23 includes directing staff to waive the fees associated with a zone change and to expedite the process for
24 the identified properties.
25

26 **4.3 Update on Development Code updates**

27 Director Gottgetreu reviewed the potential development code updates to allow duplexes on single family
28 lots. The Planning Commission will be reviewing these changes during a public hearing on May 11, 2021
29 and it will go before City Council on June 7, 2021. Member Smith voiced her concern over the change to
30 include garages or carports for off-street parking.
31

32 **V. ADJOURNMENT**

33
34 Member Freilinger made a motion to adjourn. Member Smith seconded the motion and Chair Palmer
35 adjourned the meeting at 10:00 a.m.
36

37 Respectfully submitted by:

38
39
40 /s/Angela Speier, Assistant to the City Manager/City Clerk

Attachment 1

From: [Karen Trucke](#)
To: [Angela Speier](#)
Subject: Comments
Date: Thursday, April 15, 2021 4:19:24 PM


**** This email is from an EXTERNAL sender. Exercise caution when opening attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email. ****

To: The City of Silverton Affordable Housing Task Force
April 15, 2021

Just to point out a couple of items of interest in the discussion on the ‘garage/carport requirement’ and density changes that concerned me when I read minutes from past meetings:

1. Sometime in the recent past (that I was unaware of) the city decided to “remove the requirement that private homes have a garage or carport”, thus, it was mentioned that it cannot be a requirement for multi-housing. This would mean that people need to park on the street. So, are you going to, or have you already, removed any Ordinances that do not allow parking on the street for an extended period of time, like continually?
2. After the wildfires this past year, (and other years whenever a forest fire occurred the media always reiterates information on protecting your home. The one that concerns us here is that a firebreak should be maintained between the house and other buildings and the environment. Some documentation says this should be lawn. None of the information suggests what the size of the firebreak needs to be. At any rate, some lots are so narrow or shallow that this may be a concern to keep in mind when addressing density.

Thank you for listening,

Karen Trucke

Silverton, Oregon