

From: [Wyss, Darren](#)
To: [Wyss, Darren](#)
Cc: [Schroder, Lynn](#); ["Alex Dupey"](#); [Sou Garner](#)
Subject: FW: City of West Linn 2022 Working Group Meeting #3 Materials - March 30, 2022
Date: Wednesday, March 30, 2022 12:31:00 PM

Working Group Members,

Please find below additional comments from member Shannen Knight. Staff and the consultant team will discuss at the meeting this afternoon. Another comment email will follow that was received today. Let me know if you have questions.

From: A Sight for Sport Eyes

Sent: Friday, March 25, 2022 9:26 AM

To: Wyss, Darren <dwyss@westlinnoregon.gov>

Subject: RE: City of West Linn 2022 Working Group Meeting #3 Materials - March 30, 2022

Ok here you go.

- My question on Single family home. I understand that HB-2001 requires the building requirements to be the same for duplexes, etc. to be the same as a SF zoning, but there is still going to be such a thing as a single home on a single parcel/lot right? So why does the definition have to say a SFH is also a duplex, triplex, or quadplex, etc. Including that SFH also means duplex, etc could have issues where this definition is used in a way not related to building. Think of the home occupation we just had. If we start allowing outdoor use, for example, would we be able to limit it to a SFH or require that if outside use in a duplex/tri/quad require the consent of all the units? Something like that would be useful to have a true definition of SFH. This isn't affecting the SF zoning as I understand the zoning for SF is the same for all middle housing types. But one home on a lot is not the same as a duplex. If you define duplex/tri/quad all separately, why can't you also define a SFH as a single home on a lot and not include the other definitions? Can we call it something else like a single home or single dwelling unit so the times we need something to apply (outside of HB2001 rules) to a single home we have a truer definition for it? And while we are at it, it is actually a fair housing violation to refer to "family" in real estate transactions. Should we be removing "family" from definitions and zoning? Those not related as "roommates", not married, etc. are sort of discriminated by this continued use of the word "family". While I know the CDC defines "family" as not having to be related but then also has limited to 5 people? What if you have an unmarried couple with 3 kids each living together? Perhaps there was a time and place for this language but in this day and age, we may want to consider the use of the word "family". Maybe for a different code update but thought I'd throw it out there.
- For the setbacks, I don't understand the comment of "division rules". Does this have to do with dividing the lot? I understand with a townhouse that the lot for ownership will be essentially divided for each unit. But I don't understand why that means that the setbacks for front and rear and side (from another property) have to be different? Basically, I'm thinking that everything should match. Let's say a

townhouse complex gets sandwiched in between two SFH. I would want all the front yards to look the same so the setbacks would be similar. I would also not want the first unit of the townhouse to be any closer to the “fence line” than if another SFH was built there. I wouldn’t want the back wall of the townhouses to be any closer to the fence than a SFH would be. Basically I would like that anything that is developed to be the same as it would be setback wise to what a SFH would have to do. At least in those lower density zones. In the higher density zones, I’m more flexible on setbacks.

- For the cottage cluster setback, I understand the answer to 10 feet. But since it says “perimeter” this tells me all the sides. Clever attorneys will interpret this to include the neighboring home. So R-15 for example has 20 foot rear setback. But if it says 10’ perimeter for cottage clusters, couldn’t that be interpreted to mean a cottage cluster only has to have a 10’ rear setback? That is my concern. It is not clear with this language. I did see something else in the code that says cottage cluster is 10’ from each other but I would just like to see clearer more concise code without having to search the rest of the code to find out that this means between the units.
- For my chapter 55 question, basically what, if any, would trigger a Chapter 55 review for middle housing? Just if they are building a road or something? Maybe I just don’t understand what 55 is really for. So I guess that is my bigger question. The verbiage that is middle housing is exempt from it confuses me as it seems like it would never be triggered. Which it may never. Just trying to understand why that language is there. Just thinking about loopholes again.
- FAR: I would vote for removing or at least increasing FAR for Townhomes, R2.1, R3. Slight increase in FAR for R4.5 and R5. No increase on R7 and R10.

Thanks!

Shannen

A Sight for Sport Eyes

1553 11th St.

West Linn, OR 97068

