



## Roseburg Middle Housing Code Update Advisory Committee Meeting #3 February 3, 2021

---

### Duplexes

Our first task for the middle housing code updates is to permit duplexes on all lots where single-family detached dwellings (SFDDs) are permitted, including within all master plan areas, under the same terms. Code updates were drafted to comply with House Bill 2001 and the provisions of Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 660-046, Middle Housing in Medium and Large Cities. These code amendments, which span multiple sections, will be packaged and adopted by the City prior to the June 30, 2021 deadline, separately from the other middle housing code amendments under consideration. The code amendments are included as **Attachment A** to this memo.

### Overview of Duplex Code Changes

- Revise “two family dwelling” to “duplex” in all references
- Amend “duplex” definition to allow attached or detached configurations, including manufactured homes
- Allow duplexes with the same requirements as SFDDs in the R10, R7.5, R6, MR14, MR18 and MR29 zones
- Allow duplexes on the same size lots as SFDDs and removing separate, larger minimum lot sizes for duplexes
- Revise parking requirement to one per dwelling unit, two per duplex
- Amend ADU standards to remove any parking requirements

### Details and Discussion Items for Duplex Code Changes

#### *12.02: Definitions*

- Proposed edits to the ADU definition clarify that both site-built and manufactured dwellings can be used as ADUs, provided they meet the ADU standards, similar to how manufactured dwellings are permitted as SFDDs. This is the most prudent interpretation of state statutes, per DLCD advice, and allows for some prefabricated units to be placed as ADUs that may be lower in cost; the alternative would be to remain silent on which construction types are permitted and implicitly permit both.

#### *12.04: Zoning Districts and Overlays*

- Consider whether to prohibit new SFDDs in the MR29 zone. As a high-density residential zone, SFDDs are incompatible with the intended density and range of housing types, particularly as we introduce more middle housing uses in the zone. Existing SFDDs can remain permitted uses, without becoming nonconforming uses.

- Reductions to the minimum lot sizes for SFDDs in the R and MR zones are recommended, which would translate into reductions for duplex lot sizes and some carry-over effects for triplexes and quadplexes as well. Recommended minimum lot size changes are shown below with minimum lot widths. For the R zones, the minimum lot sizes are based on a 15-20% reduction. The proposed MR lot sizes are based on parity with the lot area per dwelling unit required for multifamily, to allow similar densities to be achieved through SFDD and duplex development compared to multifamily to ensure land is used efficiently.
- Minimum lot width is proposed as a new development standard in Table 2-5 in order to regulate as a dimensional standard calibrated for each zone (and the proposed minimum lot sizes), rather than the current requirement for a 60-foot minimum width for all lots regulated in the subdivision chapter. In this first batch of code updates, the 60-foot width is retained as a policy-neutral update, and proposed minimum lot widths will be considered in the second batch of code updates to align with the proposed minimum lot sizes.

DISTRICTS	R10	R7.5	R6	MR14	MR18	MR29	MR40
<b>Minimum Lot Area</b> (sq. ft.)							
Single-Family and Duplex Dwelling: <i>existing</i>	10,000	7,500	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	-
Single-Family and Duplex Dwelling: <i>proposed</i>	<i>8,000</i>	<i>6,500</i>	<i>5,000</i>	<i>3,000</i>	<i>3,000</i>	<i>3,000</i>	-
Multifamily Dwelling (Min. Lot Area/Lot Area per dwelling unit) <i>existing, for comparison</i>	-	-	-	10,000/ 3,000	10,000/ 2,350	10,000/ 1,500	30,000/ 800
<b>Minimum Lot Width</b> (feet): <i>proposed</i>	<i>60</i>	<i>50</i>	<i>40</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>30</i>	

- Changing the minimum lot sizes for the R zones would likely trigger renaming the R districts, as the names are currently tied to the lot sizes. Options could be to rename R10 to R8, for an 8,000 SF lot, or switch to a more flexible system of R1, R2 and R3 that are not tied to specific lot sizes.

#### 12.10.010: Nonconforming Uses

- In the case of existing SFDDs that are nonconforming uses, that is, are not permitted in the commercial or industrial districts where they are located, consider whether to expand provisions to allow conversion to duplexes. This would exceed the requirements of HB 2001 but align with the spirit to permit SFDDs and duplexes interchangeably. Should such a conversion be permitted outright, or require a discretionary review like a Conditional Use Permit?

#### Triplexes, Quadplexes, Townhouses and Cottage Clusters

The second round of code updates will include provisions to permit triplexes, quadplexes, townhouses and cottage clusters in all residential zones, consistent with the adopted state requirements. The updates can be divided into *siting* and *design* standards. The *siting* standards are the more numerical standards for minimum lot sizes, setbacks, and required minimum parking, among others. These are relatively straightforward.

The primary opportunity for discretionary implementation at the city level comes with the *design* standards for these housing types. The Roseburg Development Code includes limited design standards for middle housing types other than duplexes. There are existing standards for townhouses in RDC 12.04.030(E), which are very similar to the Model Code design standards for townhouses (see pages 21-27 of the Model Code). Triplexes and quadplexes are currently subject to RDC 12.04.030(F), though these are largely scaled for larger apartment development and are not particularly comparable to the proposed triplex and quadplex-scale design standards. Roseburg, like most other cities in Oregon, does not currently have design standards for cottage cluster developments.

Our proposal is to adopt the Model Code design standards for each of the middle housing types in full, subject to advisory committee's commentary and revisions. Any changes to the Model Code sections would need to be either less restrictive than the Model Code, or to eliminate a Model Code standard. RDC Section 12.04.030(E) and (F), along with the Model Code for Large Cities, are included as **Attachment B** to this memo to support a discussion of design standards Roseburg should require with triplexes, quadplexes, townhouses and cottage clusters.