



MEMORANDUM

**Revised Memorandum #5: Development Code and Comprehensive
Plan Amendments
Keizer Revitalization Plan**

DATE March 27, 2019
TO Nate Brown and Shane Witham, City of Keizer
FROM Kate Rogers, Shayna Rehberg, and Matt Hastie, Angelo Planning Group
CC Li Alligood, Otak, Inc.; David Helton, ODOT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of contents 1
1. Introduction 2
2. Implementation Mechanism..... 4
3. Corridor-Wide Code Amendments..... 4
 3.1 Geography 4
 3.2 Rezoning..... 6
 3.3 Land Uses 9
 3.4 Efficiency Measures 11
 2.5 Urban Design Standards..... 19
 3.6 Access..... 20
4. Code Amendments for Centers..... 23
 4.1 Geography 23
 4.2. Master Plan Provision 24
 4.3. Uses..... 26
 4.4. Efficiency Measures 27
 4.5. Urban Design Standards..... 29
Appendix A – Proposed Keizer Development Code Amendments: River-Cherry Overlay District 38
Appendix B – Other Proposed Keizer Development Code Amendments 39

Appendix C – Proposed Zoning Map Amendments	40
Appendix D – Proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendments.....	41

1. INTRODUCTION

This document lays out concepts for potential development code amendments to implement the Keizer Revitalization Plan (KRP). The memorandum builds off of the Gap Analysis, which identified impediments to implementing KRP project goals and objectives, as well as potential implementation measures for addressing those impediments. This memo focuses on the regulatory implementation measures that were previously identified, and proposes a number of potential amendments to the Keizer Development Code (KDC or “code”), to the zoning map, and to the Keizer Comprehensive Plan.

Some of the proposed amendments are more detailed while others are more conceptual. Specific numeric standards are recommended in some places, whereas a range of standards or list of options are suggested in other instances. Still other recommendations are more conceptual and will be more defined in a revised version of this memo, based on discussion with City staff, the Planning Commission, City Council, and the Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC).

The memo is organized into the following sections:


- Implementation Mechanism
- Corridor-Wide Code Amendments
- Code Amendments for Centers

Throughout the document, “Commentary” subsections are used to explain the rationale for proposed code changes. Some sections also include “Implementation Notes” indicating needed changes to the KDC and/or Comprehensive Plan.

Figure 1 depicts the current zoning districts within the KRP study area for reference.

Update: This memorandum has been revised to reflect direction received through public review of the document. Each section of the memorandum includes a summary (in red italic text) of revised recommendations based on input received from the CAC, stakeholders, Planning Commission, City Council, and City staff.

Figure 1. Keizer Zoning Map



2. IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM

The code amendments recommended in this memorandum could be implemented using one of a number of mechanisms – a new zone, a new overlay zone, or a new set of location-specific standards within existing zones. Adding location-specific standards to an existing zone is not infeasible but tends to be less advisable because it can make existing zoning sections more complicated and potentially difficult to navigate, and the standards would have to be added to multiple existing zones. Creating a new zone would be feasible but it is generally not recommended. This approach would exacerbate what is already a long list of base zones. However, it could be preferable if it is necessary to create a full set of new use, development, and design standards. For the most part, code amendments recommended in this memorandum lend themselves to being either additional standards to, or targeted replacement standards for, standards in existing zones.

Therefore, our preliminary recommendation is that these amendments be packaged as a *River Road/Cherry Avenue Corridor Overlay Zone* (tentative title) with subsections for:

- (1) corridor-wide standards – differentiated by standards for the Mixed Use (MU) zone, Medium Density Residential (RM) zone, and Single Family Residential (RS) zone; and
- (2) standards specific to centers.

Update following CAC Meeting, Stakeholder Meetings, Open House, and Consultation with City:

- *An overlay zone will be the mechanism for implementing development code recommendations in this memorandum.*
- *A draft of the new overlay zone – the River-Cherry Overlay District (RCOD) – will be referred to throughout the memorandum and is attached to the memorandum as Appendix A.*
- *Adopting a new overlay district involves adding it to a list of overlay districts in the KDC and creating references to it in the base zones (MU, RM, and RS zones). Those additional draft KDC amendments are attached to this memorandum as Appendix B.*

3. CORRIDOR-WIDE CODE AMENDMENTS


3.1 Geography

The corridor-wide geography is based on the scope of the Keizer Revitalization Plan itself. While the “corridor” has been referred to and illustrated more generally up to this point in the planning process, a more precise definition of the corridor geography is needed in order to implement recommended code, zoning map, and Comprehensive Plan amendments. The recommended boundary for the (tentatively titled) River Road/Cherry Avenue Corridor Overlay Zone generally corresponds to the geography originally identified as the study area for the KRP project. The study area – as outlined in the Existing Conditions memo and depicted in Figure 2 – includes commercial, mixed use, and multi-family properties along River Road and Cherry Avenue as well as a 500-foot buffer around those properties (the majority of the buffer area is single-family). The proposed

overlay boundary would roughly follow the 500-foot buffer, but would be adjusted to follow tax lot boundaries and be based on zoning or other underlying conditions. The boundary will be refined and modified as needed, with input from the City, CAC, and community members, in a revised version of this memo and later phases of the project.

Within the larger corridor geography, some of the proposed standards will apply only to certain base zones or other targeted areas, as described in the following sections.

Figure 2. Proposed River Road/Cherry Avenue Overlay Zone Boundary (approximate)



Update following CAC Meeting, Stakeholder Meetings, Open House, and Consultation with City:

- *The overlay zone boundaries will generally follow the study area boundary that that has been drawn roughly 500 feet around the River Road and Cherry Avenue corridors, with the added specification that the boundary be modified to follow parcel boundaries.*

- *A map of the overlay zone is included in the draft of the overlay zone attached to the memorandum as Appendix A.*

3.2 Rezoning

Rezone Commercial Zones to Mixed Use


Mixed use zoning is desired in the corridor in order to allow for the full range of uses that the City would like to see developed and to provide more flexibility for property owners and future developers. In addition, uniformity in this zoning is desired for consistent direction and application of development requirements. While the KDC establishes multiple mixed-use zones, including the MU zone and Commercial Mixed Use (CM) zone, the existing MU zone allows for a wider range of uses and possesses the added advantage of including additional development requirements regarding pedestrian and vehicle circulation and building design that are consistent with the objectives of this plan and the corridor. Therefore, it is recommended that properties that are currently zoned commercial in the corridor be rezoned MU, as shown in Figure 3.

Targeted Rezoning of Residential Zones

In the “upzoning” scenario described in the Gap Analysis memo (Scenario 3), certain properties within the RS and RM zones were assigned different zoning designations (“upzoned”) to allow higher-intensity development and to increase development viability. The process included selecting certain properties within these zones that had the potential or capacity for development. For example, several RM properties with low intensity developments were rezoned to MU; also, certain RS properties near arterials and collectors were rezoned to RM, assuming they could potentially be consolidated and redeveloped with multi-family buildings.

The project team recommends that some of the properties identified in the scenario modeling be similarly rezoned, where appropriate. Figure 4 shows the properties which were identified in the scenario analysis as having the potential to be rezoned. These properties will be further assessed in

Figure 3. Proposed Rezoning to Mixed Use



the next draft of this memo. In identifying parcels to be rezoned, we will consider the following factors, among others:


- **Size and development capacity.** Individual parcels or contiguous groups of parcels should be large enough to allow for development of a meaningful number of additional housing units or businesses.
- **Character of surrounding uses.** Impacts on adjacent or surrounding lower intensity uses should be considered.
- **Access.** Parcels should have adequate access to adjacent transportation facilities to accommodate potential transportation needs associated with redevelopment.

Initial recommendations should be refined through the process of preparing the revised draft of this memo and/or through further discussion of this strategy with the project team and advisory committee. The project team recognizes that rezoning individual properties can be very controversial and can be a sensitive subject for property owners. As such, it will be critical to receive detailed input from the City, CAC, and community members before finalizing recommendations for rezoning.

Update following CAC Meeting, Stakeholder Meetings, Open House, and Consultation with City:

- *Rezoning from Commercial to MU is proposed generally as shown in Figure 3. Proposed zone changes are mapped and attached to this memorandum as Appendix C. Corresponding changes will need to be made to the Comprehensive Plan Map, as noted in Appendix D.*
- *Rezoning from RM to MU is proposed for three areas of existing RM zoning based on direction from CAC members and City staff. Proposed zone changes from RM to MU are mapped and attached to this memorandum as Appendix C. Corresponding changes will need to be made to the Comprehensive Plan Map, as noted in Appendix D.*
- *Rezoning of selected parcels from RS to RM or MU will be a general recommendation in the Keizer Revitalization Plan, with implementation to be part of a future project or future phase of this project.*
- *The following criteria are proposed for residentially zoned properties in the overlay zone where uses allowed in the MU zone would be permitted in order to encourage more mixed-use development in the corridor:*
 - *property is adjacent to MU-zoned property;*
 - *uses allowed in the MU zone would be permitted;*
 - *replacement housing must be provided for any displaced housing units; and*
 - *buffering must be provided between adjacent residential zones.*

Figure 4. Potential Rezoning Modeled in Scenario 3



Note: This map shows the “upzoning scenario” from the Gap Analysis memo, and identifies properties with the potential for development, should they be rezoned or should their development standards be adjusted. This map is merely a placeholder and does not identify properties that the project team recommends for rezoning. A new map will be developed for the next version of this memo.

3.3 Land Uses

Broaden and Simplify Standards for Allowed Land Uses

Proposed Code Change:

Establish use categories and standards in the corridor (outlined in the table below) that supersede the use standards in what will be the underlying Mixed Use (MU) zone.

P = Permitted outright
S = Permitted subject to Special Use provisions
C = Permitted conditionally

USE CATEGORY	PERMITTED	NOTES
Residential		
Household Living	P/S	Such as buildings with one or more dwelling units. Special Use provisions apply to shared housing facilities (KDC Section 2.403), zero side yard dwelling units (Section 2.404), cottage clusters (Section 2.432), and home occupations (Section 2.407).
Group living	P/S	Such as residential homes and facilities. Special Use provisions apply to nursing and personal care facilities (Section 2.431).
Commercial		
Commercial Lodging	P/S	Such as hotels and motels. Special Use provisions apply to bed and breakfast establishments (Section 2.408).
Commercial Recreation	P	Such as athletic clubs.
Commercial Parking	P	Only parking structures.
Durable Goods Sales	P	Such as home improvement, home furnishing, and appliance stores.
Eating and Drinking Establishments	P	
Health Care Offices	P	
Marijuana Facilities	P	Such as medical marijuana facilities and marijuana retailers. Special Use provisions apply (Section 2.433).
Offices	P/S	Such as finance, legal, and other professional businesses. Special use provisions apply to veterinary services (Section 2.414)
Retail Sales and Services	P/S	Such as food, apparel, hardware, and auto supply stores. Special Use provisions apply to used merchandise stores (Section 2.417), mobile food vendors (Section 2.434), funeral services (Section 2.415), and adult entertainment businesses (Section 2.418).
Quick Vehicle Servicing	C	Such as gasoline service stations.

USE CATEGORY	PERMITTED	NOTES
		Service stations consistent with Section 2.110.04.C are Conditional Uses.
Industrial		
Light Manufacturing	C	Craft industries are Conditional Uses subject to the provisions in Section 2.421.
Institutional		
Assembly Facilities	P/S	Such as social and civic organizations. Special Use provisions apply to places of worship (Section 2.423).
Community Services	P	Such as public administration buildings.
Medical Centers	P	Such as clusters of health care offices (not a hospital).
Infrastructure/ Utilities		
Parks and Open Space	P	Such as parks, plazas, playgrounds, and community clubs.
Public Safety Facilities	P/C	Such as police stations. Fire and ambulance stations are Conditional Uses subject to general Conditional Use criteria in Section 3.103.03.
Transportation Facilities	S/C	Special Use provisions apply to transit facilities (stops) (Section 2.305). Transit stations (centers) are Conditional Uses subject to the provisions in Section 2.429.
Wireless Communications Facilities	S	Special Use provisions apply (Section 2.427).

Establish the following prohibited uses:

- Farm uses
- Rendering, processing, and/or cleaning of food products for wholesale use
- Outdoor storage or display unless consistent with the provisions in Section 2.107.05.B.7
- Camping and overnight parking in parking lots
- Hospitals
- Vehicle dealers and sales
- Recreational vehicle and boat storage
- Recreational vehicle parks
- Public utility structures and uses such as pump stations, substations, and material storage yards
- Gasoline service stations not consistent with Section 2.110.04.C
- Vehicle repair
- Drive-through windows associated with eating and drinking establishments adjacent to street

COMMENTARY:

A simpler and more accommodating set of use standards is proposed for the corridor, to make the standards easier for both the City and applicants to navigate and use. It is recommended that the use standards generally be presented more broadly and in tabular format. Proposed permitted uses are consistent with uses currently permitted as outright uses, special uses, and conditional uses in the MU and CM zones, yet with broader use categories and use groups to allow for more flexibility in interpreting which uses are permitted and to reduce the need for subsequent exceptions, variances, or other clarifications.

A specific list of prohibited uses balances the list of more generally permitted uses. Proposed prohibited uses include those currently prohibited in the CM and MU zones as well as uses that have been identified as incompatible with the pedestrian orientation that is an objective of this planning process. An alternative to the uses proposed to be prohibited corridor-wide is to allow some of those uses corridor-wide and prohibit those uses within the centers in the corridor.

The new format of use standards is a departure from the KDC's current Standard Industrial Classification (SIC)-based use lists. However, the new use standards attempt to bridge the gap by providing examples of uses (uses identified after "such as") drawn from existing use lists. This connection to existing use lists should allow for other parts of the code that refer to these lists (e.g., off-street parking requirements in KDC 2.303) to still be valid and usable.

IMPLEMENTATION NOTES:

- The switch to category-based use standards would apply only to the River Road / Cherry Avenue corridor, and the existing use classification system would continue to apply elsewhere in the city. If the system works well in the corridor, the City could later decide to apply it more broadly in Keizer.
- The amendments would be dependent on adopting very specific standards to ensure that the corridor's use categories would work with the existing use classification system.
- If the City and other reviewers support this approach, we will use this table as a base for use standards in centers in the corridor as well as create short tables for the RM and RS zones in the corridor.

Update following CAC Meeting, Stakeholder Meetings, Open House, and Consultation with City:

- *Support was expressed for simplified use regulations that have been incorporated into the overlay zone (Appendix A).*
- *New definitions are provided in additional KDC amendments (Appendix B) for use categories that are not used or defined in existing KDC provisions.*
- *Some of the auto-oriented uses that were originally proposed to be prohibited in the overlay zone will be permitted (e.g., vehicle repair and drive-through windows), subject to specific development standards discussed in Section 4.3 of this memorandum.*

3.4 Efficiency Measures

The following set of recommendations for the corridor are based on the "efficiency measures" explored in the scenario modeling that was described in the Gap Analysis memo. These measures

are geared toward allowing for more growth within the same space than would currently be permitted by the existing code. The intent is to remove impediments to development, to increase the feasibility of a wider range of development and housing types, and to realizing the project goals of promoting compact and pedestrian-oriented development.

Minimum Landscaping / Maximum Lot Coverage

Proposed Code Change:

Reduce minimum landscaping requirements for uses within the MU, RM, and RS zones in the corridor as recommended below.

Min. Landscaping / Max. Lot Coverage		
Zone	Current Standards	Recommended Standards
MU	Commercial: 15%/85% Mixed Use: 20%/80% Residential: 25%/75%	Commercial: 10%/90% Mixed Use: 15%/85% Residential: 15%/85%
RM	25%/75%	15%/85%
RS	30%/70%	15%/85%

COMMENTARY:

In the scenario modeling that was described in the Gap Analysis memo, reducing the minimum landscaping standard was one of the efficiency measures that appeared to have a significant effect on the scenario outcomes in terms of the amount and type of development that could occur. (Note: per the KDC, the percentages for a site's minimum landscaping and maximum lot coverage add up to 100%). In combination with the other efficiency measures, reducing minimum landscaping allowed sites to be developed at a higher intensity and allowed certain building types to pencil out financially that otherwise would not.

While a drastic reduction in minimum landscaping requirements (and corresponding increase in maximum lot coverage) may not be appropriate corridor-wide, some reduction is advisable. Larger reductions are recommended in the corridor's centers (see Section 3.4.) The Transportation and Growth Management program's Model Development Code for Small Cities, 3rd Edition ("Model Code") provides guidance in determining a reasonable reduction of the landscaping requirement. The Model Code recommends minimum landscaping of 10% for single- and multi-family residential zones, 5-15% for commercial zones, and 5-10% mixed-use zones. The recommended requirements move in that direction.

Amending existing landscaping standards to strengthen other qualities of landscaping can be important when reducing the minimum amount of required landscaping. Enhancing landscape standards is addressed in Section 2.5. Even if landscaping standards are adjusted, developments

currently are required to devote a significant portion of their sites to parking in order to meet minimum parking requirements. Therefore, while lower landscaping requirements will improve redevelopment potential, it will not necessarily result in a more urban and pedestrian-oriented environment in the corridor. As discussed later in this section, changes to off-street parking requirements can help achieve that objective.

Update following CAC Meeting, Stakeholder Meetings, Open House, and Consultation with City:

- *Landscaping and lot coverage standards are included in the RCOD (Appendix A) as proposed in the original version of this memorandum, with comments from the City that the standards be intensified in Centers along with enhanced standards for landscaping.*
- *In response to a question that came up at the CAC meeting, the project team looked into whether reduced minimum landscape requirements would violate the City's stormwater permit. The result was that landscaping amendments should not be a concern; rather, the permit has more to do with the City's stormwater regulations.*

Minimum Setback Standards

Proposed Code Change:

Reduce minimum front and rear yard setbacks as outlined in the tables below.

Minimum Front Yard Setback		
Zone	Current Standards	Proposed Standards
MU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-residential: 10' • Residential: 10' (Cherry Ave – 5' min., 10' max.) 	0'

Minimum Rear Yard Setback		
Zone	Current Standards	Proposed Standards
MU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-residential: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 0' adjacent to non-residential ○ Adjacent to residential: match adjacent rear setback; could be up to 20' • Residential: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 14' for 1-story building; 20' for 2-story building 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-residential: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 0' adjacent to non-residential ○ 10' adjacent to residential • Residential: 10'
RM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-residential: 20' • Residential: 14'-20' (1-story or 2-story) 	10'
RS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 14'-20' (1-story or 2-story building) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Structure over 24' in height: [10'-15']

Minimum Rear Yard Setback		
Zone	Current Standards	Proposed Standards
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Structure 12-24 ft in height: 10' Structure less than 12' in height: [5'-10']

Note: Standards provided in brackets indicate that a numeric range is proposed, or that the standard is merely a suggestion and should be adjusted as appropriate.

COMMENTARY:

Like landscaping standards, lower minimum setbacks allow for higher intensity and financial viability of development. In the case of front yard setbacks, a small setback or no setback also helps create a more urban and pedestrian-oriented environment.

Setbacks assumed in the “Efficiency Measures” land use scenario (Scenario 2) were generally 5 feet for multi-family development and 0 feet for mixed-use development. Zero minimum front yard setbacks are proposed for the MU zone corridor-wide. The largest rear setbacks recommended in the Model Code are 10-15 feet in residential zones (depending on building height) and either 0 feet or 10 feet in commercial and mixed-use zones (if adjacent to low-density residential zoning).

The proposed standards for the RS zone base the minimum rear setback on structure height rather than the number of building stories (as recommended in the Model Code). This accounts for a wider variety of circumstances, including 3-story homes, for which larger setbacks may be appropriate, and smaller structures such as sheds or backyard studios, which may not necessitate the same rear setback as the primary structure. For the RM zone, the proposed minimum rear setback standard of 10 feet applies to structures of all sizes; the smaller setback is more appropriate for a higher-density environment. It should also be noted that minimum buffering and screening is required when multi-family development abuts lower density residential uses (per KDC 2.309), so smaller setbacks would have less impact on any adjacent single-family homes.

By definition, minimum setbacks do not set the upper limit of what setbacks will be provided and low or zero minimum setbacks do not guarantee that buildings will be placed close to lot lines. However, they do **allow** for that possibility.

Maximum setbacks are explored as part of recommended code changes for centers in the River Road/Cherry Avenue Corridor. See Section 3.4.

IMPLEMENTATION NOTES:

- To ensure an attractive street frontage, reductions to minimum front setback requirements could be paired with firm standards for street improvements that incorporate separated sidewalks, street trees, lighting, right-of-way dimensions, etc. As currently written in the Public Works Street Design Standards, these are merely suggestions or recommendations.
- Reductions to minimum side and rear setback standards could also be paired with enhanced

landscape screening and buffering standards between higher-intensity and lower-intensity uses.

- It may be necessary to revisit transition standards for multi-family development when adjacent to single-family districts (per KDC 2.315.06.G), which regulates dimensions and setbacks of building planes from shared property lines.
- It also may be necessary to revisit infill standards (per KDC 2.316), which regulate building height and mitigation for infill development via subdivisions/partitions within established neighborhoods.

Update following CAC Meeting, Stakeholder Meetings, Open House, and Consultation with City:

- *It was determined that existing setback standards do not limit development and that modifications of standards would be most appropriate in Centers. Therefore, amendments to front and rear setbacks are not proposed corridor-wide in the overlay zone.*

Minimum Parking Requirements

<p>Proposed Code Changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce minimum parking requirements for the following uses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Recreation facility from 1 space/200 sf to 1 space/300 sf ○ General offices from 1 space/350 sf to 1 space/500 sf ○ Personal services from 1 space/350 sf to 1 space/400 sf ○ Retail from 1 space/300 sf to 1 space/400 sf ○ Eating/drinking establishment from 1 space/125 sf to 1 space/200 sf ○ Single-family and duplex: Reduce minimum off-street parking requirements from 2 spaces per dwelling unit to 1 space per unit. ○ Multi-family: Reduce minimum off-street parking requirements as outlined below: 		
Unit Types	Existing	Proposed
1 bedroom and studios	1 space per unit + 1 additional space for every 10 units	1 space per unit (no additional spaces)
2 bedroom	1.5 spaces per unit + 1 additional space for every 10 units	1.25 spaces per unit (no additional spaces)
3 or more bedroom	(same as 2 bedroom)	1.5 spaces per unit (no additional spaces)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not require changes of use from one permitted use to another permitted use to provide additional parking. 		

COMMENTARY:

As referred to in the discussion of minimum landscaping standards, reducing minimum required off-street parking can help achieve more marketable, compact, and efficient development modeled in project land use scenarios. The thinking is that basic parking reductions should be established corridor-wide and then special provisions for further reductions in parking should be established for centers (see Section 3.4). Reductions in minimum off-street parking standards recommended corridor-wide are largely based on Model Code language.

Regarding residential uses, KDC 2.303 currently requires single-family and duplex dwellings to provide a minimum of 2 parking spaces per dwelling unit. It requires multi-family housing to provide parking based on the number of bedrooms, plus additional spaces based on the total number of units.

For single-family and duplex dwellings, the proposed standard follows the Model recommendation of 1 parking space per unit. While two parking spaces may not be challenging to accommodate on a standard single-family lot, the minimum parking requirement may be a barrier to developing the alternative housing types discussed in the “Allow Small-Scale Housing” section below. For these housing types (such as townhomes and ADUs), space is often more constrained, and providing two spaces per unit may render the developments infeasible. On-street parking should be considered a valid option for helping meeting parking needs in single-family areas and the code could specify that those areas can be included in the calculation of parking supply if the City ultimately decides to retain a higher standard.

For multi-family housing, the Model Code simply recommends 1 parking space per dwelling unit. The proposed standards are a compromise between this lower minimum requirement and the KDC’s current requirements. The standards are still scaled based on the number of bedrooms, but are reduced from the current standards, particularly by eliminating the requirement of additional spaces for every 10 units. The intent is to limit the amount of space in multi-family developments that is devoted to surface parking, thereby allowing more efficient use of development space and increasing the financial feasibility of developing more multi-family housing types (as modeled in Scenario 2).

Another code change that can reduce barriers to redevelopment is to eliminate the requirement that changes of use may need to provide additional parking (e.g., if the proposed use has a higher minimum off-street parking requirement than the existing use). This provision could be instituted just in the River Road/Cherry Avenue Corridor until it is determined whether it may be appropriate for use outside the corridor.

Update following CAC Meeting, Stakeholder Meetings, Open House, and Consultation with City:

- *Reduced parking requirements were supported for their potential to encourage development and redevelopment.*
- *Reduced parking requirements are included in the overlay zone (Appendix A) consistent with the requirements recommended in this section.*

Residential Density and Lot Size

Proposed Code Changes:

The following changes to residential density and lot size are proposed within the corridor:

- **RS Zone:**
 - Increase the maximum permitted density in the RS zone from 8 units per acre to 10 units per acre.
 - Reduce the minimum lot size in the RS zone from 5,000 square feet to 4,000 square feet.
 - If the City chooses to allow narrow lot development, as discussed in the next section, the minimum lot size would need to be further reduced to 2,500 square feet (and the minimum lot width would also need to be reduced).
- **RM Zone:**
 - Increase the maximum permitted density in the RM zone from 22 units per acre to 24 units per acre.
 - Eliminate the minimum lot size standard for multi-family development in this zone and use density only.
- **MU Zone:**
 - Increase the maximum permitted residential density in the MU zone from 24 units per acre to 28 units per acre.
 - Eliminate the minimum lot size standard for multi-family development in this zone.

COMMENTARY:

The Gap Analysis memorandum identified maximum density and minimum lot size standards in the RS and RM zones as potential impediments to achieving compact, efficient development and to providing a variety of housing options in these zones. In the scenario modeling, Scenario 2 included higher densities for both zones than would be permitted today. Increasing the permitted density, when combined with the other efficiency measures proposed in this memorandum, should increase the development capacity in residential areas. This has a number of benefits to Keizer: it can help increase the housing supply, thereby keeping down housing costs for Keizer residents; it allows a wider variety of housing types to suit various residents' needs; and it potentially increases the number of people living within walking or biking distance of the River Road/Cherry Avenue Corridor, thereby increasing activity levels and vitality in the study area.

For the RM zone, the existing density standard is based on Comprehensive Plan designations. Properties designated Medium Density in the RM zone have a minimum density of 6 units per acre and a maximum density of 10 units per acre. Properties designated Medium-High Density in the RM

zone have a minimum density of 8 units per acre and a maximum density of 22 units per acre. Nearly all of the properties with the RM zoning designation have a Comprehensive Plan designation of Medium-High Density. Therefore, the higher density standards (8-22 units per acre) apply. The proposed code change would increase the maximum allowed density to 24 units per acre, which is the maximum residential density currently permitted in the MU zone.

The proposed amendments would also modify maximum density in the MU zone to 28 units per acre, thereby scaling the allowed density according to the development intensity desired for each zone. Removing the minimum lot size requirement for multi-family development in the RM and MU zones would allow more options for multi-unit housing types—particularly for smaller-scale developments. Retaining the minimum lot sizes in these zones can result in unintended consequences and fewer options in terms of development forms, lot coverage, and other outcomes.

IMPLEMENTATION NOTES:

- Amend KDC 2.102 to modify the maximum density for subdivisions to 10 du/ac. Modify the minimum lot size standards to allow a lot size of 4,000 square feet for all lots in the RS zone. Currently, newly created lots less than 5,000 square feet are limited to zero lot line dwellings.
- Amend KDC 2.104 to modify the maximum density for multi-family development to 24 du/ac. Remove the minimum lot size requirements
- Amend the Keizer Comprehensive Plan to modify the maximum density for the Low-Density and Medium-High Density Residential designations.

Update following CAC Meeting, Stakeholder Meetings, Open House, and Consultation with City:

- *Minimum lot size and maximum density provisions have been included in the new overlay zone (Appendix A) consistent with recommendations in this section.*
- *Minimum density provisions have also been included in the overlay zone.*

Allow Small-Scale Housing

Proposed Code Change:

- Allow 25-foot lot width in the RS, RM, and MU zones.
- Set 5,000 square feet as the minimum lot size for corner duplexes (2,500 square feet per unit) in the RS zone and 4,000 square feet in the RM and MU zones.
- Accessory Residential Housing standards:
 - Allow two accessory residential housing units (one interior and one exterior).
 - Do not require additional off-street parking for accessory units.
 - Do not require the accessory residential housing unit to be detached.

COMMENTARY:

Allowing for more small-scale, compact housing in the River Road/Cherry Avenue Corridor provides more development and redevelopment opportunities in the corridor, including the provision of potentially more affordable housing options.

Existing lot widths of 40 or more feet do not allow for narrow-lot housing development whether for attached or detached housing units. The proposed narrower lot width reflects lot width recommendations made in the Model Code as well as in TGM's Housing Choices Guide Book.

Existing minimum lot standards of 4,000 square feet for all lots in the RS zone and 6,000 square feet for duplex lots in the RM zone do not allow for smaller duplexes that could be accommodated on corner lots in particular. The recommendation for a smaller minimum lot standard for corner duplexes is based on research presented in the Housing Choices Guide Book.

Last, accessory dwelling units – called Accessory Residential Housing in the KDC – are currently permitted in Keizer. However, the KDC includes requirements for these units that the state considers to be barriers to their development, as identified in the “Character-Compatible, Space-Efficient Housing Options for Single-Dwelling Neighborhoods” report prepared for the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, Oregon Department of Transportation, and Department of Land Conservation and Development in May 2016. Those requirements are: only allowing one ADU per lot, requiring owner occupancy, and requiring an additional parking space.

Accordingly, it is recommended that the units in the corridor be allowed to be two per lot, attached and detached to the primary dwelling unit and not be required to provide additional off-street parking, provided other development requirements can be met.

Update following CAC Meeting, Stakeholder Meetings, Open House, and Consultation with City:

- *Minimum lot size, minimum lot width, and accessory housing unit standards are included in the next overlay zone (Appendix A) consistent with the requirements recommended in this section.*

2.5 Urban Design Standards

Enhance Landscaping Design Standards

Proposed Code Changes:

- Establish landscaping standards for street-facing facades that do not have zero front yard setbacks.
 - All street-facing facades shall have landscaping along their foundation.
 - The landscaped area shall be at least three (3) feet wide.
 - An evergreen shrub having a mature height of at least two (2) feet shall be planted for every three lineal feet of foundation.
 - Groundcover shall be planted in the remainder of the landscaped area.
 - plants approved by the Zoning Administrator shall be used.

- This requirement would not apply to parts of the façade that provide pedestrian access or other pedestrian amenities (e.g., plaza, seating).
- Adopt landscaping standards regarding plant types, amounts, size, and spacing.
 - Trees – One (1) tree shall be planted for every 500 square feet of required landscape area. Evergreen trees shall have a minimum height of six feet and deciduous trees shall have a minimum caliper of 1.5 inches at the time of planting, trees adjacent to pedestrian access shall be a minimum caliper of 2 inches.
 - Shrubs – One (1) evergreen shrub having a minimum mature height of four (4) feet shall be provided for every 75 square feet of required landscape area.
 - Ground cover – Ground cover consisting of low plants and grasses shall be planted in the landscaped area not occupied by required trees or shrubs.
 - Plants approved by the Zoning Administrator shall be used.
 - Rock, bark, or similar landscape cover materials may be used for up to 25% of the required landscape area. Hardscape treatments may be substituted upon approval of the Zoning Administrator.

COMMENTARY:

In order to offset reductions in required minimum landscaping, additional standards for landscaping are recommended. The recommended standards address landscaping along street-facing building facades in order to foster a more attractive environment for everyone who is traveling through and stopping in the corridor. In addition to standards specifically for street-facing facades, overall standards to guarantee minimum amounts and sizes of trees, shrubs, and groundcover will help ensure the quality of landscaping even when smaller amounts of landscaping are required.

Update following CAC Meeting, Stakeholder Meetings, Open House, and Consultation with City:

- *Enhanced landscaping standards are included in the proposed overlay zone (Appendix A), differentiating standards that apply to landscaping in street-facing yards as opposed to landscaping on other parts of a site.*

3.6 Access**Sharing Access****Proposed Code Change:**

Modify existing code language about access options to specify when alley/lane access, shared access, individual access, access closure, and access consolidation is required.

COMMENTARY:

Limiting the number of access points onto public streets – particularly arterials – reduces conflicts between users of the transportation system (i.e., increases safety) and creates a more welcoming pedestrian environment. The City adopted code language representing a hierarchy of access options in conjunction with adopting its 2009 Transportation System Plan (TSP).

Existing code language (KDC 2.302.03.N.3) describes access options that include:

- access from an alley or lane (rather than direct access to a public street);
- a driveway that is shared between adjoining properties and that has direct access to a public street; and
- direct access to a public street for an individual property, which may involve closing or consolidating existing access points.


However, existing access provisions are written as options and not requirements. In order to more consistently regulate access, including allowing for the type of access consolidation shown in Figure 5 (from the City’s TSP), the code language can be modified to specify when each “option” applies.

Figure 5. Access Consolidation Process

For example, if a property already has access to an alley or side street off of River Road or Cherry Avenue, it must continue to take access from points not on those two arterials. If a property wants to redevelop and currently has access onto one of those arterials, substandard spacing between its driveway and driveways to the north or south could be the basis for requiring shared access, access closure, and access consolidation. This language could be made to apply just in the corridor or citywide.

IMPLEMENTATION NOTES:

Provisions could be located in the overlay text, so they only apply to the corridor, or could be in KDC 2.302.03.N.3 and apply citywide.



Update following CAC Meeting, Stakeholder Meetings, Open House, and Consultation with City:

- Access requirements are included in the proposed overlay zone (Appendix A).
- The proposed requirements address access management on a single property as compared to consolidation between properties alluded to in this section of the memorandum.
- The City will need additional resources in order to compensate property owners for more aggressive access management and consolidation of access points.


4. CODE AMENDMENTS FOR CENTERS

The concept of focusing development around centers of activity along the River Road/Cherry Avenue Corridor was developed as part of the *River Road Renaissance Plan*, adopted in 2003. That plan envisioned several distinct districts along the corridor, each with a higher-density development center at its heart. Development centers emphasize higher densities; mixed land uses; human-scaled design; transportation options; neighborhood cohesiveness and convenience; and livability. These concepts have been carried forward into the goals and objectives for the Keizer Revitalization Plan. The project team proposes a special set of code amendments targeted to centers along the River Road/Cherry Avenue Corridor, in order to help realize the community's goals for the corridor dating back to the time that the Renaissance Plan was adopted.

4.1 Geography

The recommended geography for the centers code amendments aligns with three of the development centers identified in the Renaissance Plan. The proposed centers are focused around the intersections of River Road and Lockhaven Drive, River Road and Chemawa Road, and the confluence of River Road and Cherry Avenue (see Figure 6). The recommended boundaries for each center typically include all of the parcels zoned for commercial and mixed-use, and in some places, include some additional multi-family lots, and single-family parcels where they are proposed to be rezoned to multi-family.

Figure 6. Proposed Centers



Update following CAC Meeting, Stakeholder Meetings, Open House, and Consultation with City:

- *The proposed Centers were generally supported.*
- *Some modifications have been made to the mapping of the Centers to make their boundaries slightly tighter. See a map of the proposed Centers in the overlay zone (Appendix A).*

4.2. Master Plan Provision


Proposed Code Change:

Apply special Master Planning provisions to development in the Lockhaven Center, with guidelines or standards that could address elements such as required mix of uses; minimum residential density; minimum open space and open spaces; and pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation.

COMMENTARY:

The proposed center at Lockhaven Drive provides significant opportunity for new development, due to the existence of several large, undeveloped parcels in that area. The project team recommends that special Master Planning provisions apply to this area. This would be a modification to the Activity Center Overlay designation already applied to this area. As depicted in Keizer's Comprehensive Plan Map (a clip of which is shown in Figure 7), the McNary Activity Center overlaps with a large portion of the proposed Lockhaven Center. Per KDC 2.125, developments within the McNary Activity Center Overlay must comply with the McNary Activity Center Design Plan (adopted in 1991). Developments are required to submit a Master Plan showing the location of land uses, open spaces, and pedestrian and vehicular circulation, and a written explanation showing how these features achieve the purpose of the design plan. (Similar provisions apply within the Keizer Station Plan area.)

Figure 7. McNary Activity Center (dotted red outline)



Because the McNary plan is nearly 30 years old and much of the area around Staats Lake and Inland Shores Way has already been developed, the project team recommends that the McNary Activity Center be dissolved and replaced by a new Master Planning requirement for properties larger than a certain size (e.g., 2-5 acres) within the Lockhaven Center. This would ensure that development within this area meets certain performance targets (such as a mix of uses, connectivity, open space, etc.), while allowing flexibility within the large development sites. This will help foster the goal of

creating a more complete neighborhood in this area where residents also have easy access to retail, commercial and other services.

The proposed Master Plan review process would be a discretionary Type III procedure, in keeping with existing Master Plan provisions in the KDC. Inspiration for some of the new guidelines or standards that apply within the Lockhaven Center could come from the McNary Activity Center Design Plan, the list of possible conditions of approval for Activity Centers in KDC 2.125.07, and the Planned Unit Development (PUD) standards in KDC 2.311. These could include:

- Focus on pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation
- Minimum vehicle access spacing along arterials and collectors
- Orienting buildings and facilities toward transit services
- Encouraging shared parking
- Continuity and/or compatibility of landscaping, circulation, access, public facilities, and other improvements
- Requirement for a mix of uses (similar to the existing requirement for MU-zoned properties fronting on Cherry Avenue south of Manbrin Drive, which are required to devote at least 35%, but no more than 65%, of building floor area to residential uses)
- Minimum residential density
- Minimum common open space and open space standards
- Environmentally sensitive design along Claggett Creek

IMPLEMENTATION NOTES:

- Amend the Comp Plan to repeal (dissolve?) the McNary Activity Center Overlay and Design Plan
- Amend the Comp Plan Map to remove the McNary Activity Center Overlay

Update following CAC Meeting, Stakeholder Meetings, Open House, and Consultation with City:

- *Master Plan provisions are proposed for the Lockhaven Center in the overlay zone (Appendix A) that establish applicability; review procedures; development standards; development guidelines; and conditions of approval.*
- *Proposed development standards address a mix of uses and housing types and minimum residential density. Proposed development guidelines address encouraged shared access and open space.*
- *Proposed Comprehensive Plan text and map changes are presented in Appendix D. They include removing references to the McNary Activity Center, adding references to the KRP and RCOD, and removing mapped designations for the McNary Activity Center.*

4.3. Uses

Limit Auto-Oriented Uses

Proposed Code Change:


Restrict auto-oriented uses within centers.

COMMENTARY:

Auto-oriented uses tend to detract from the pedestrian-oriented, human-scale environment that is desired for centers along the River Road/Cherry Avenue Corridor. Uses such as drive-through restaurants, gas stations, and car repair shops tend to create environments that are both unappealing to pedestrians—with little activity at the sidewalk to draw their interest—and can often create safety hazards when cars frequently pull in and out of driveways and traverse the sidewalk. As such, the project team recommends restricting auto-oriented uses within centers.

Figure 8). The recommendation would be to apply similar restrictions to properties fronting River Road or Lockhaven Road in the Lockhaven Center, and fronting River Road or Cherry Avenue in the River/Cherry Center. As with the existing

Figure 8. Existing Use Restriction Area (blue outline)



The KDC already prohibits most auto-oriented uses for properties near the intersection of River Road and Chemawa Road. Per KDC 2.109.05 and 2.110.05, the Commercial Mixed Use (CM) and Commercial Retail (CR) zoning chapters prohibit these auto-oriented uses for properties with frontage on River Road or Chemawa Road within the “use restriction area” (see KDC provisions, existing businesses with drive-through facilities would be exempt.

As an alternative to full prohibition, the auto-oriented uses could be permitted subject to obtaining a Conditional Use Permit and meeting special standards. Special standards could include limiting applicable uses to a certain size and meeting all the new urban design standards for centers (as discussed in Section 3.5). Or auto-oriented uses could be permitted when separated or significantly screened from the street, and when the desired pedestrian and streetscape facilities are provided.

IMPLEMENTATION NOTES:

- These provisions could be included in a use categories table for centers that is similar to what is proposed corridor-wide (as described in Section 2.3).

Update following CAC Meeting, Stakeholder Meetings, Open House, and Consultation with City:

- *The proposed code amendments include requiring that developers of auto-oriented uses obtain a conditional use permit and demonstrate how the use limits or mitigates impacts to the pedestrian environment (Appendix A).*

4.4. Efficiency Measures**Minimum Landscaping / Maximum Lot Coverage****Proposed Code Change:**

Reduce minimum landscaping requirements in centers, beyond the reduction recommended corridor-wide, as recommended in the table below.

	Min. Landscaping / Max. Lot Coverage	
Zone	Current Standards	Recommended Standards¹
MU	Commercial: 15%/85% Mixed-Use: 20%/80% Residential: 25%/75%	Commercial: 5%/95% Mixed-Use: 10%/90% Residential: 10%/90%
RM	25%/75%	10%/90%
RS*	30%/70%	10%/90%
*Note: Reductions in the RS zone would only apply if RS-zoned properties are included within centers.		

COMMENTARY:

As discussed regarding landscaping standards in the corridor (Section 2.4), reducing the minimum landscaping standard was one of the efficiency measures that appeared to have a significant effect on the scenario outcomes, in terms of the amount and type of development that could occur. In combination with the other efficiency measures, reducing minimum landscaping allowed sites to be developed to a higher intensity and allowed certain building types to pencil out financially that otherwise would not. While a drastic reduction in minimum landscaping requirements (and

¹ The Model Code recommends minimum landscaping of 10% for single- and multi-family residential development and 5-10% for commercial and mixed-use zones

corresponding increase in maximum lot coverage) may not be appropriate corridor-wide, it may be desirable to allow a relatively high level of development intensity within centers by adjusting these standards.

As discussed in Section 2.5, the team recommends enhanced landscape design standards corridor-wide to ensure that while total landscaping may be reduced, attractive plantings are still provided. In terms of site aesthetics, the reduced landscaping requirement in centers will also be balanced by enhanced building and site design standards, as discussed in Section 3.5.

Update following CAC Meeting, Stakeholder Meetings, Open House, and Consultation with City:

- *Landscaping and lot coverage standards are proposed for Centers in the overlay zone (Appendix A) consistent with the recommendations in this section of the memorandum.*

Minimum Off-Street Parking

Proposed Code Change:

Allow reductions to minimum parking in centers by [10-25]% if development meets certain criteria, as described below.

COMMENTARY:

Like minimum landscaping, minimum off-street parking was one of the efficiency measures explored in the scenario modeling that facilitated more development in Scenarios 2 and 3 (the “Efficiency Measures” and “Upzoning” scenarios). Reduced parking ratios helped achieve more marketable, compact and efficient development in these scenarios. Centers are the most appropriate place to reduce minimum parking ratios, because they are envisioned as being highly walkable and well-served by transit. The idea is that as the River Road/Cherry Avenue Corridor becomes more desirable for development and attracts more housing, restaurants, and retail uses, the increased density in will allow those living in and around centers to walk to various destinations, while allowing others to either arrive by transit or to park once and accomplish multiple errands on foot.

Per KDC 2.303, parking ratios are determined by use, with eating and drinking establishments, for example, requiring a higher minimum ratio than retail or office uses. Ratios for multi-family housing is based on the number of bedrooms for each unit. The code already contains a provision permitting a 10% reduction in required parking spaces if the site is served by transit and the development provides transit related amenities such as transit stops, pull-outs, shelters, or park and ride lots. In the Mixed Use zone, parking requirements may be reduced through a parking impact study, through which applicants must demonstrate estimated peak use; easy pedestrian accessibility; availability of transit service or likelihood of car pool use; and adjacent on-street parking. The project team recommends a similar approach that allows a percentage reduction in parking in centers along the River Road/Cherry Avenue Corridor. The difference would be that the

recommended code would state what the allowable parking reductions were and what the applicant needed to demonstrate, in order to make the process more consistent and predictable.

The project team recommends a reduction to minimum parking by [10-25]% if the applicant can demonstrate the following:

- Use of shared parking strategies or development of a mix of uses that will allow for consolidation and sharing of spaces (e.g., spaces used by daytime visitors can be used by residents at night); or
- Adequate transit facilities and services or a TDM plan is in place that will demonstrably reduce parking demand; or
- Residential uses are targeted to populations with demonstrably lower parking needs (e.g., low income households, seniors, etc.)

IMPLEMENTATION NOTES:

- Parking reduction options could apply only to MU-zoned properties in centers, or to both MU and RM-zoned properties.
- Larger reductions to minimum parking standards beyond the proposed range of 10-25% may be appropriate to achieve the pedestrian-friendly vision for these areas. This will be an important point of discussion for the CAC, staff, and Planning Commission.

Update following CAC Meeting, Stakeholder Meetings, Open House, and Consultation with City:

- *Parking reductions are proposed in for centers in the overlay zone (Appendix A) in cases involving transit; shared parking; Transportation Demand Management plans; low-trip-generating uses; increased bicycle parking; and parking for vanpools/carpools and other non-single-occupant-vehicle alternatives.*

4.5. Urban Design Standards

In order to establish centers along the River Road/Cherry Avenue Corridor that are vibrant, energetic, and walkable, the project team recommends a set of specialized urban design standards that work together to create a pedestrian-friendly environment. Pedestrian-oriented places provide visual interest at eye-level, feel safe and comfortable for people walking, contain a variety of activities and services, are easy to navigate on foot, and provide open areas and amenities for gathering and resting.

The following section identifies strategies for site and building design that are intended to create development in centers that engages pedestrians and passersby. Several of the recommended strategies in this section also reinforce other project objectives, including promoting more compact forms of development and maximizing development opportunities.

Site Design

Setbacks

Proposed Code Change:

Establish the following setback and frontage occupancy standards in centers for properties fronting River Road, Lockhaven Drive, Chemawa Road, and Cherry Avenue:

- Minimum front setback: 0 feet
- Maximum front setback: 10 feet unless public amenity requires additional space.
- Require at least 50% of a site frontage to be occupied by a building that meets the maximum setback. Allow the percentage to be reduced to [40%] if a plaza or other pedestrian open space is provided.
 - *Alternative:* Instead of regulating building frontage occupancy, the code could simply limit vehicle parking and circulation areas to 50% of a site frontage.

These proposed standards would apply to both residential and non-residential uses (or mixed uses).

COMMENTARY:

Buildings placed close to the sidewalk provide an engaging experience for pedestrians. They allow passersby to interact with building interiors, both physically—through direct access to entrances—and visually—by seeing through windows and other openings. They also help establish a sense of enclosure that creates more comfortable spaces for walking. The existing front setback requirement in the MU zone is a minimum of 10 feet. There is a provision in KDC 2.107 for a small cluster of MU properties fronting Cherry Avenue south of Manbrin Drive, where the minimum is 5 feet and the maximum is 10 feet. The proposed maximum setback for centers matches this standard. As described in Section 2.4, zero front setbacks are proposed to be allowed in the MU zone corridor-wide, and are also proposed in any zone in centers for properties facing major streets.

Frontage occupancy—sometimes known as “build-to percentage” or “front property line coverage”—is the percent of a property’s street frontage that is occupied by a building, and works closely with setback standards. Maximum setbacks and frontage occupancy should work together to establish a consistent street frontage in centers.

While buildings should be allowed to occupy the full site frontage, there should also be some allowance for open areas that serve to extend the sidewalk and provide places for gathering and resting. The idea of creating more gathering spaces in the area has received strong support from participants in the planning process to date. The project team recommends allowing the minimum frontage occupancy requirement to be reduced if the applicant proposes providing a plaza or other usable open space with pedestrian amenities. Refer to the Pedestrian Open Space section below for additional recommendations.

Update following CAC Meeting, Stakeholder Meetings, Open House, and Consultation with City:

- *Minimum and maximum front setback provisions for Centers are included in the overlay zone (Appendix A) consistent with the recommendations in this section.*

- *Frontage occupancy requirements were not strongly supported and, thus, are not included in the proposed overlay zone.*

Parking Location

Proposed Code Change:

Prohibit vehicle parking or circulation areas between the front of buildings subject to maximum setback standards and the street.

COMMENTARY:

Buildings set back from the street with parking next to the sidewalk are less interesting and less comfortable for pedestrians. To promote a safe, comfortable, and vibrant pedestrian environment, it is best to limit surface parking adjacent to sidewalks. The project team recommends allowing surface parking and vehicular circulation areas behind buildings, or to the side of buildings, as long as the minimum 50% frontage occupancy standard is met. As noted in the Setbacks section above, an alternative standard to 50% frontage occupancy would be limiting parking and circulation areas to 50% of a site frontage. As noted in the Landscaping section below, modified parking lot perimeter landscaping standards are also recommended.

Update following CAC Meeting, Stakeholder Meetings, Open House, and Consultation with City:

- *The proposed overlay zone (Appendix A) limits parking and vehicle circulation areas in yards fronting arterial roads consistent with the recommendations in this section.*

Building Entries

Proposed Code Change:

Require the following entry orientation and design standards for all buildings in centers:

- **Orientation** – All buildings must have at least one primary entry facing the street.
- **Walkway** – All primary entries to a building must be connected to the sidewalk by a direct and continuous walkway.
- **Entry Design** – The primary building entries must be architecturally emphasized through the use of one or more of the following features: recessed doorway; overhangs or canopies; transom windows; ornamental light fixtures; larger, transparent or more prominent doors; or pilasters or columns that frame the doorway.

COMMENTARY:

Orienting buildings and entrances to the street helps promote an active and engaging street frontage. Building entries are important in making buildings accessible and interesting for

pedestrians, and help break down the scale of the building. The proposed standards will ensure that primary entrances are highly visible and accessible to pedestrians.

Update following CAC Meeting, Stakeholder Meetings, Open House, and Consultation with City:

- *The proposed overlay zone (Appendix A) establishes regulations for building orientation, primary entrances, and entry design consistent with the recommendations in this section.*

Landscaping

Proposed Code Change:

Require perimeter landscaping with a minimum width of 5 feet where surface parking or vehicular circulation areas are located adjacent to the right-of-way. Landscaping must include trees spaced not more than 30 feet on center, and a mix of shrubs and ground cover.

Waive existing buffering and screening standards for parking areas, except when abutting residential zones.

COMMENTARY:

Landscaping can soften the edges and provide screening for vehicle parking and circulation areas. This will provide a more comfortable experience for pedestrians where parking is adjacent to the sidewalk, and will reduce the impact of large paved areas. The existing KDC Chapter 2.303 establishes standards for interior parking lot landscaping, and Chapter 2.309 requires screening and buffering for loading areas, as well as for multi-family parking lots with 20 or more vehicles and commercial or industrial parking lots for 30 or more vehicles. Three buffer width options are provided—15 feet, 10 feet, and 5 feet—and the narrower buffer widths are associated with heightened screening requirements. Meeting these buffering standards for parking lots could require a significant amount of site area, and may not be compatible with the more urban, compact development that is sought in centers. As such, the project team recommends waiving the buffering and screening standards for parking areas in centers, except where parking areas for commercial, multi-family, or industrial uses abut a residential zone.

Update following CAC Meeting, Stakeholder Meetings, Open House, and Consultation with City:

- *The proposed overlay zone (Appendix A) includes perimeter landscaping provisions consistent with the recommendations in this section.*

Pedestrian Open Space

Proposed Code Change:

Allow the minimum frontage occupancy requirement to be reduced to [40%] if a plaza or other pedestrian open space is provided between the building and the

sidewalk. The pedestrian open space must include at least two of the following pedestrian amenities: benches, tables and chairs, seat walls, fountains, or public art. Pedestrian open space may be partially or entirely paved, and may include pocket parks, pedestrian walkways, landscaping, or stormwater planters as long as pedestrian amenities are also provided.

COMMENTARY:

Providing community gathering spaces along the River Road/Cherry Avenue Corridor was identified as one of the Keizer Revitalization Plan's key objectives. Centers are the most appropriate places for such gathering spaces, as they are envisioned as hubs of community activity and highly pedestrian-friendly places. Well-used plazas and outdoor seating areas create a sense of vitality along the street and can enhance the sense of community in an urban area. Encouraging the creation of gathering spaces as part of private development by relaxing the frontage occupancy standards to allow them is just one way to meet this need. The initial suggestion is to reduce the frontage occupancy standard to 40%, but a larger reduction (or potentially waiving the maximum setback requirement) could be appropriate if more space is needed for pedestrian amenities.

Update following CAC Meeting, Stakeholder Meetings, Open House, and Consultation with City:

- *Pedestrian open space standards are established for Centers in the proposed overlay zone (Appendix A) that allow for setback increases in exchange for pedestrian spaces; offer options for pedestrian amenities that must be provided; and offer options in terms of the surfacing of the space.*

Building Design

Window Coverage

Proposed Code Changes:

Require minimum window coverage for street-facing facades:

- **Non-residential or mixed-use buildings:** Require windows, display areas, or glass doorways to cover at least [50-60%] of the ground floor wall area and at least 20% of the wall area of upper stories (if more than one story).
- **Multi-family residential buildings:** Require windows, display areas, or glass doorways to cover at least [20-25%] of the ground floor wall area and at least 20% of upper stories (if more than one story).
- All required windows must have a have a Visible Transmittance (VT) of 0.6 or higher.

COMMENTARY:

Window area or “glazing” at the ground floor ensures that buildings provide views of activity, people, and merchandise, and engages the interest of passersby. Ground floor windows also enhance the safety of public spaces by providing direct visibility to the street. Higher levels of glazing at the ground floor are appropriate for commercial and other non-residential uses, whereas privacy is more of a concern for residential uses. Windows at upper stories provide variation and interest for building facades.

The existing development standards in KDC 2.315 require street-facing elevations in the MU, CM, and CR zones to provide windows covering a minimum of 50% of ground floor wall area. The proposed glazing standards for centers build on these existing standards by increasing the minimum ground floor glazing, requiring upper-floor windows, and differentiating standards for residential and non-residential uses.

Update following CAC Meeting, Stakeholder Meetings, Open House, and Consultation with City:

- *Window coverage requirements are established for Centers in the proposed overlay zone (Appendix A) that address lower upper floor and ground floor areas of residential and non-residential buildings consistent with the recommendations in this section.*

Articulation and Detailing**Proposed Code Changes:**

- **Façade Articulation** – Clarify façade articulation standards and expand the design treatment options for providing articulation. Require a break in the façade at least every 30 feet. A “break” is a change in wall plane of not less than [12 inches] in depth. Potential treatment options could include: variation in building material, building off-set, projection (such as porch or balcony), recess, window reveal, pilaster, column, marquee, or similar architectural feature. Require at least two articulation treatments for each street-facing façade.
- **Roofline Articulation** – Require roofline articulation every 30 feet, in a manner that corresponds with the facade articulation. Potential roofline treatment options: gables, dormers, offsets in ridgeline, stepped parapets, cornice lines, or changes in roofline elevation.
- **Distinct base, middle and top** – Require buildings with more than 2 stories to have a distinct base, middle and top to break up the vertical mass of buildings. Buildings should utilize horizontal bands and/or changes in color, material, form and/or pattern to differentiate the base and middle. Roof lines shall establish a distinctive top to a building. Sloped roofs must have a minimum slope of [4:12] and eaves with a minimum overhang of [12 inches]. Flat roofs must either provide a cornice or a parapet (both with minimum dimensions).
- **Corner Entrances** – Encourage buildings on corner lots to have corner entrances. Where a corner entrance is not provided, the building plan should provide an

architectural element or detailing (e.g., tower, beveled corner, art, special trim, etc.) that accentuates the corner location.

COMMENTARY:

Articulation describes variation in architectural features that break up larger building fronts into smaller planes and masses. Articulation is key to creating visual interest, establishing a rhythm for pedestrians, and maintaining a human scale. Features that create articulation include windows, balconies, recesses, projections, roofline offsets, canopies, or changes in building material.

The existing development standards in KDC 2.315 require variation in street-facing building facades in the MU, CM, and CR zones. Variation in the form of building materials, an off-set of at least 2 feet, or projection must be provided every 30 feet. The proposed standards for centers build off these existing standards with the intent of providing a heightened level of articulation and more clarity and detail, in order to enhance the experience for pedestrians in these areas. In addition, the proposed corner entrance/design treatment standard is intended to help activate and add visual interest and focal points to corner sites, which are typically the most visible sites on a block.

Update following CAC Meeting, Stakeholder Meetings, Open House, and Consultation with City:

- *The proposed overlay zone (Appendix A) establishes standards for articulation and detailing consistent with the recommendations in this section.*
- *In addition, weather protection is addressed.*

Building Materials

Proposed Code Changes:

- Prohibit the following exterior materials or finishes in centers:
 - Vinyl siding
 - T-111 or similar sheet materials
 - Plain concrete block (not including split faced, colored, or other block designs that mimic stone, brick, or other masonry); foundation material may be skim-coated concrete block where the foundation material is not revealed for more than 3 feet.
- Require each street-facing building façade to include a minimum of two types of exterior materials, each with an area of at least 20% of the façade. Allow masonry (except CMU) to be used singly and applied to the entirety of the façade.

COMMENTARY:

The intent of the proposed building materials standards is to evoke a sense of permanence and durability for new buildings in centers. Existing façade standards in KDC 2.315 for the MU, CM, and CR zones provide lists of both permitted and prohibited materials. The proposed standards simplify the approach by only prohibiting those standards that are undesirable, rather than attempting to

list all the materials that would be acceptable in centers. The proposed added requirement for two or more materials is intended to establish variety in textures, colors, and/or patterns.

Update following CAC Meeting, Stakeholder Meetings, Open House, and Consultation with City:

- *The proposed overlay zone (Appendix A) regulates building materials in Centers consistent with the recommendations in this section.*

Screening of Mechanical Equipment

Proposed Code Changes:

- **Building Walls** – Require screening for mechanical equipment, such as utility vaults, air compressors, generators, antennae, satellite dishes, or similar equipment mounted to street-facing building walls. Standpipes, meters, vaults, and similar equipment need not be screened but shall not be placed on a front elevation when other feasible alternatives exist; such equipment shall be placed on a side or rear elevation where feasible.
- **Rooftops** – Rooftop mechanical units shall be set back or screened behind a parapet wall so that they are not visible from any public right-of-way. Allow exemptions for solar panels.
- **Ground-Mounted Mechanical Equipment** – Ground-mounted equipment, such as generators, air compressors, trash compactors, and similar equipment, shall be limited to side or rear yards and screened with fences or walls constructed of materials similar to those on adjacent buildings. Hedges, trellises, and similar plantings may also be used as screens where there is adequate air circulation and sunlight, and irrigation is provided.

COMMENTARY:

KDC 2.315 requires screening for roof-mounted equipment in the CM, CR, CO, and MU zones, and for mechanical devices (considered “accessory structures”) at the ground level in all zones. The proposed standards provide more detail and clarity for screening standards, and also include wall-mounted equipment.

IMPLEMENTATION NOTES FOR SITE AND BUILDING DESIGN STANDARDS:

- Include graphics and/or example photos to illustrate site and building design standards wherever feasible. This will make standards easier to interpret. Establish rules for when these standards apply. For example, the standards apply to all new development, and to expansions and alterations to existing buildings of over [500 square feet].
- Add language in the Development Standards chapter (KDC 2.315) indicating that the special standards for River Road/Cherry Avenue centers override any conflicting standards in that chapter.

Update following CAC Meeting, Stakeholder Meetings, Open House, and Consultation with City:

- *The proposed overlay zone (Appendix A) establishes mechanical equipment screening standards consistent with the recommendations in this section.*
- *A reference to RCOD development standards is proposed for addition to KDC Section 2.315. (See Appendix B.)*

**APPENDIX A – PROPOSED KEIZER DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS:
RIVER-CHERRY OVERLAY DISTRICT**

APPENDIX B – OTHER PROPOSED KEIZER DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS

APPENDIX C – PROPOSED ZONING MAP AMENDMENTS

APPENDIX D – PROPOSED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS
