TO: Hood River Development Code Update Project Management Team

FROM: Carrie Brennecke, Katie Vickers, and Matt Hastie, MIG, Inc.

RE: Hood River Development Code Update – Final Code Audit Report (Task 2.6)

DATE: August 12, 2024

Introduction

The purpose of the Hood River Development Code Audit is to identify inconsistencies with State land use law and existing City Comprehensive Plan policies, internal conflicts, as well as to develop a framework to amend development code provisions that need improvement or clarification. A primary goal is to make the development code more workable, clear, and objective. While not focused exclusively on housing, it is anticipated that this audit will lead to amendments that help the City ensure consistency with several recent State strategies and requirements to increase housing availability and affordability to:

- Facilitate shorter and less costly review of land use applications of residential land uses.
- Ensure compliance with applicable State statutes and Administrative Rules, including:
  - Oregon State Statute (ORS) 197A.400, which requires that local governments adopt and apply only **clear and objective standards, conditions, and procedures** to the development of housing, which is provided in Part 1 of this memo.
  - **Other housing-related legislation**, which is provided in Part 2 of this memo.
- Address internal conflicts and omissions, as well as to develop a framework to amend development code provisions that need improvement or clarification.
  - **Other City-identified Code Topics and Areas**, that are problematic, inconsistent, contain gaps or omissions or conflicts with other code sections, which are provided in Part 3 of this memo.
  - **Other Code Topics and Areas Identified Through Interested Party Meetings –** through a series of interviews and focus groups with users of the code, interested parties, and city officials, various common problems and barriers in the code were identified, which are summarized in Part 3 of this memo.

This project will meet the stated purpose by ensuring clear and objective standards for housing; removing potential development code barriers to housing; and improving policy equity, consistency, and simplicity. In addition, opportunities will be considered to improve consistency across Titles 16 (Subdivisions) and 17 (Zoning) of the Hood River Municipal Code (HRMC) which combine to make the City's Development Code (also referred to as the "Code").

The first step is an audit of the Code that identifies areas of potential concern. This code audit report identifies key areas of the HRMC where amendments may be needed to meet the objectives listed above.

The Hood River Development Code Update is funded in part by a grant from the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) as part of its Housing Planning Assistance Program.

Part 1: Initial Findings – Clear and Objective Standards and Procedures and General Code Consistency and Usability

MIG conducted a detailed review of multiple sections of the Hood River Development Code. The table below provides an overview of key findings and initial recommendations for those sections. Not all sections of the Code are listed in the summary. In most cases, those sections of the Code in which no (or only minor) issues were identified are not included. This review of standards and procedures is focused almost exclusively on the development of housing and is not a complete audit for clear and objective standards in all areas of the code. Additional code issues may be identified and incorporated in subsequent reports prepared during this Code Audit process based on further consultation with City staff as we continue to review and refine the code audit findings through review with City staff and community members. More specific edits and amendments will be further defined in the Phase 2 Code Update project as well.

Note: "Clear and objective" is abbreviated in this summary as "C&O."

CHAPTER & SECTION	KEY FINDINGS AND NOTES
CHAPTER 16 – SUBDIVISIONS	
16.04.020 GENERAL TERMS AND DEFINITIONS 16.08 APPROVAL PROCESS 16.12 GENERAL DESIGN AND IMPROVEMENT STANDARDS	• There are differences in the opening paragraph between 16.04.020 Definitions, 17.01.060 Definitions, and 17.25.010 Middle Housing Definitions as well as inconsistencies across definitions between the three sections. **Example:** Parking Space has different definitions in each code section. • Definitions for middle housing are located separately in 17.25.010 and are inconsistent the 16.04 and 17.01. • Due to the overlap in development application processing, consider creating a single set of definitions for Chapter 16.04 (Subdivisions) and Chapter 17.01 (Zoning) and including the Middle Housing definitions. The two chapters together are the City's 'Development Code. It will eliminate inconsistencies since the definitions are applicable to both chapters of the Code. • The approval processes for land divisions as specified in 16.08.010.A.2 reference Administrative Actions Review Process 17.09.030, Quasi-Judicial Actions in the Review Procedures 17.09.040, and Ministerial Decision 17.09.020 for the application processes. Application approval processes are being reviewed for C&O procedures in Chapter 17.09. For consistency, if the application processes are revised in Chapter 17.09, they must also be revised in 16.08. • Add Legal Lot of Record Threshold and Dates Determination (when partitions and subdivisions trigger these evaluations). • 16.12.040 Landscape Conservation (Significant Tree Preservation) and 16.12.050 Street Trees sections contain

CHAPTER & SECTION	KEY FINDINGS AND NOTES
	several non-C&O standards which can affect the approvability of housing applications. Landscape and Street Tree standards are not cross-referenced between Chapter 16 and Chapter 17. It is not clear when the standards are applicable.
TITLE 17 – ZONING	
17.01.060 DEFINITIONS	• Consider combining all definition sections throughout the Code into 17.01 as it is not C&O to have definitions in more than one section of the code. Particularly 16.04.020 Definitions, 17.01.060 Definitions, 17.22.010(B), and 17.25.010 Middle Housing Definitions. • Definitions for housing types are inconsistent across the Code. All definitions of housing types should be revised to comply with HB 2001 Middle Housing ORS 197.016 and ORS 197.758. Consider revising all housing type definitions and adding graphics. • Middle Housing related definitions are inconsistent in 17.01 and 17.25. • The definition of townhouses, where they are permitted, and associated development standards are inconsistent in the Code. They also fall under the definition of multi-family dwellings and two/three/four dwelling unit configurations in 17.25. • Definition of Housing types are not C&O or in compliance with ORS 90.112 due to references to familial relationships. **Examples:** "single-family dwelling", "family" and "group residential." • Consider revisions and additions of definitions related to housing and shelters that are required to comply with recent state statutes outlined in Part 2. **Examples:** "emergency shelter," "single room occupancy," "prefabricated dwelling," and "manufactured dwelling park" (see Part 2 of this Memo for further discussion). • Some terms should be included to aid in C&O standards in the review process as used in residential standards. **Examples:** adjacent, abutting, street-facing, primary building entrance, visible. • Add/Relocate definition of 'Lot coverage' consistent with 17.04.120 • Add/Revise/relocate definition and graphic for Building Height as it has been identified as problematic, incomplete, inconsistent and not C&O. A separate definition for building height is located in the Middle Housing standards 17.25.070.J. and could be applied more broadly if it addresses these issues.

CHAPTER & SECTION	KEY FINDINGS AND NOTES
	• Add/relocate definition for 'Floor Area' from 17.25 • Consider adding definition for "mixed use structure" per ORS definition • Condominium unit has a separate definition from multifamily dwelling based on ownership and includes areas for parking (airspace). It is not a C&O housing type. Condo plats are reviewed under the state process and not a city process. • Refer to Part 2 of this memo for discussion on affordable housing for suggested additions to definitions. • Clarify 'change in use" and "change of user." • Childcare center definitions need to match state rules.
17.03 LAND USE ZONES	• Consider an addition of a "Land Uses and Development Types Permitted" table that shows permitted land uses and building types for all zones in one location of the code to improve clarity and usability. • For clarity and consistency, consider the addition of a "Site Development Requirements Table" for all residential uses in residential zones (including C-1) and include middle housing types compliant with HB 2001 and the table in 17.25.070. The middle housing development standards located separately from the other housing development standards impacts usability of the Code. • Consider putting all parking standards in a table in 17.20 Transportation Circulation and Access Management or a separate parking chapter. • Add Duplex as an allowable use to R-1 zone (to be consistent with HB 2001). • Consider revising 'mobile home park' to 'manufactured dwelling park' in all zones. The manufactured dwelling definition is inclusive of mobile homes. The definition should be updated to include prefabricated dwellings. • For C&O, in R-1, R-2, R-3 and C-1 Townhouses have two-three sets of conflicting development standards (17.19 Townhouse developments, 17.16 Site Plan Review for developments of more than 4 townhouses, and 17.25 Middle Housing Development Standards). Consider reconciling these conflicts by providing one set of applicable standards or providing additional clarity on when each set of standards is applicable. Also consider adopting the standards for HB 2001 Townhouses for Middle Housing similar to the Model Code for to aid developers as it would make townhouse development in

CHAPTER & SECTION	KEY FINDINGS AND NOTES
	Hood River consistent with other jurisdictions and potentially reduce barriers to developing this form of housing. • Refer to Part 2 of this memo for discussion on affordable housing for 17.03 suggested revisions. • A single mixed use development type is identified in C-1 zone as a Conditional Use. Consider expanding the zones and types of mixed use developments allowed, and providing C&O standards for mixed use development in order to remove barriers to the housing type. • 17.03.010 Urban low density residential zone (R-1) – for C&0, consider expanding the middle housing section to call out the housing types; for C&O add conflict clause that 17.25.070 Middle Housing development standards apply to middle housing types. • 17.03.020 Urban standard density residential zone (R-2) – Duplex and Townhomes are identified as permitted uses but the development standards for the housing types are inconsistent within the Code as the housing types can also be developed under 17.25 Middle Housing Development Standards. For C&O, consider providing one definition and one set of standards for each housing type located within the same code sections or add code provisions that better clarify where and how different forms of these housing types may be developed. • 17.03.030 Urban high density residential zone (R-3) - Duplex, Triplexes and Townhomes are identified as permitted uses but the development standards for the housing types are inconsistent within the Code as the housing types can also be developed under 17.25 Middle Housing Development Standards. For C&O, consider one definition and one set of standards for each housing type located within the same code sections or add code provisions that better clarify where and how different forms of these housing types may be developed. • 17.03.040 Office/residential zone (C-1) - Duplex, Triplexes and Townhomes are identified as permitted uses but the development standards for the housing types are inconsistent within the Code. Code as the housing types can also be developed under 17.25 Middle Housing Development Standards. For C&O, consider one definition and one set of standards for each housing type located within the same code sections or add code provisions that better clarify where and how different forms of these housing types may be developed.

CHAPTER & SECTION	KEY FINDINGS AND NOTES
	• Development standards for housing in the C-2 must be C&O. Some residential and mixed uses are Conditional Uses in the C-2 zone with discretionary standards and review process. • LI, I, OS/PF Review of these sections was limited to provisions for affordable housing, as required by ORS 197A.445. No concerns were identified, but in reference to affordable housing state mandates refer to Part 2 of this memo for discussion on affordable housing for 17.03 suggested revisions.
17.04 SUPPLEMENTARY PROVISIONS	• 17.040.120 Maximum lot coverage – Relocate definitions of lot coverage and main building lot coverage to 17.01.060 Definitions. To improve clarity and usability consider relocating lot coverage standards to the development standards of each zone or the recommended "Site Development Requirements Table." • 17.04.130 General requirements for parking lots - consider relocating to 17.20 Transportation and Circulation and Access Management to combine parking lot standards in section of the Code. Standards for parking lot design need updating to be C&O, as they apply to residential development. • Home Occupations – criteria are not C&O although permitted through a material process.
17.05 NON-CONFORMING USES AND STRUCTURES	• See discussion in Part 2 for SB 1537 Limited Land Use Decisions for review of non-conforming uses and structures. • The statutory requirement for C&O standards applies to the "development of housing." Section 17.05 provides for replacement of an existing nonconforming use, which, if a residential use, could be considered "development of housing." If that's the case, there may need to be a C&O carve-out for residential replacements.
17.06 CONDITIONAL USES	• The approval processes for Conditional Uses references Quasi-Judicial Actions 17.09.040 application processes. Application approval processes are being reviewed for C&O procedures in Chapter 17.09. For consistency, if the application processes are revised in Chapter 17.09 they must also be revised in 17.06. • The process and criteria for changes to an approved conditional use (17.06.010.4) are not well defined.

17.09 REVIEW PROCEDURES	• For clarity to applicants and ease of implementation, consider a change in review processes to:
	  ○ Type I (Ministerial actions)
	  ○ Type II (Administrative actions)

CHAPTER & SECTION	KEY FINDINGS AND NOTES
	○ Type III (Quasi-judicial actions) ○ Type IV (Legislative actions) • This is standard in many jurisdictions in Oregon. The process can be modified for Hood River from Oregon's Model Code provisions. • Consider adding submittal requirements for land use applications and standardized materials. • 17.09.020 Ministerial Actions may not represent a C&O process for all residential uses. It contains language regarding discretion by the Director (approve with conditions) and appeals by the applicant, and appeal periods. A decision on the application could have a hearing and decision by the Planning Commission. If application for the development of housing, in particular middle housing, are processed as Ministerial actions the process should be entirely C&O. • It is unclear if applications for the development of housing (that don't require Site Plan Review) have an identified review process. • Middle Housing land divisions are not adequately addressed in Ministerial actions or Title 16 Subdivisions, see Part 2 of this Memo for further discussion • 17.09.040 Quasi-judicial actions - See discussion in Part 2 from SB 1537 Limited Land Use Decisions for reviews of non-conforming uses and structures. In some cases, review of non-conforming uses can't be processed under quasi-judicial process. • 17.09.080 Resubmittal – the time period and process for resubmittal after denial (including Ministerial actions) is not C&O. • 17.09.130 Neighborhood meeting requirement – 17.09.130.B.3 The requirement for when a mandatory neighborhood meeting is required for applications is not C&O. The standard uses discretionary language like 'as determined by the Planning Director.'
17.12 MANUFACTURED HOMES AND MOBILE HOME PARK PROVISIONS	• See state requirements from HB 4064 (Part 2 of this memo). • Mobile homes and manufactured homes are regulated as manufactured dwellings by the ORS. Consider eliminating mobile home definitions and replacing all references in the code with manufactured dwelling (revised definition consistent with HB 4064). • Section 17.12.010 applies individual lot placement standards to manufactured dwellings that do not apply to single

CHAPTER & SECTION	KEY FINDINGS AND NOTES
	detached dwellings – these standards are precluded by statute and are not C&O. Two standards need to be removed. • Section 17.12.020 contains additional criteria to manufactured homes in the R-1 zone that that do not apply to single detached dwellings. All standards need not be removed. • The definition of 'manufactured dwelling park' should be updated to include prefabricated structures/ dwellings, consistent with statute. • Section 17.12.030 refers to mobile/manufactured dwelling park, consider removing mobile home term form the section. The approval process for mobile/manufactured dwelling parks is inconsistent in the Code. The approval process is identified by zoning district, however, some districts allow manufactured homes as a permitted use and others allow it as a permitted use subject to 17.12. • 17.12.060 General standards for mobile home park development – the parking requirement of 2 spaces per unit and guest parking could be seen as a barrier to the development of housing.
17.16 SITE PLAN REVIEW	• 17.16.010 Applicability – review for clarity – contains inconsistencies and internal conflicts. • 17.16.010 Applicability –Consider consolidating and clarifying the approval process for Townhomes. Given that townhouses are a separate housing type but also considered multifamily (for 4 or more), and the process is identified in several chapters (17.03, 17.16, 17.19, 17.25), it is difficult to follow for development applicants. • See discussion of SROs and 'group residential' in Part 2 for applicability of Site Design Review to 'group residential.' • The applicability of site plan review for Manufactured Dwelling Parks is not consistent in the Code. They are NOT called out in applicability section for requiring site plan review. However, Chapter 17.12 provides a Site Plan review process for Manufactured Dwelling Parks. • 17.16.020 Application Procedure. The application procedure is not C&O and is inconsistent with 17.09 Review Procedures. • Consider an addition of a table listing the development types showing if Site Plan Review is required by administrative, quasi-judicial action, or if is exempt; consider referencing 17.09 Review Procedures and referencing applicable decision criteria.

CHAPTER & SECTION	KEY FINDINGS AND NOTES
	• 17.16.040 Decision criteria – Not applicable to housing, but most standards are not C&O as applied to other types of development. • 17.16.050 Multi-family and group residential decision criteria – These standards apply to the development of housing. Consider an overall update to the decision criteria for multi-family housing to ensure they are C&O. • 17.16.050.A Natural Features and 17.16.050.E-F Screening are not C&O. The design standards in 17.16.050.G require additional specificity to be C&O, 17.16.050.H-I uses the language 'whenever physically possible' which is not C&O. • 17.16.053 Townhouse project decision criteria – the section itself is C&O but can only be applicable to more than 4 townhomes according to HB 2001.
17.17 LANDSCAPING AND DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS	• 17.17.010. Scope – would be clearer if labeled "Applicability." The applicability and language in 17.17.010.B should be revised to be clearer. For example, language such as "For sites that do not conform to these requirements" is unclear. 17.17.101.B describes the applicability of the landscape standards to building and/or parking lot expansions. • 17.17.020 Procedure – procedure is not C&O. Consider making compliance with 17.17 criteria part of a requirement of Site Plan Review. • 17.17.030 Contents of landscaping plan – not C&O, consider expanding the requirements. • 17.17.040 General landscaping standards – Several standards are not C&O and require revision. Parking lot landscaping is not C&O • Street Tree requirements are provided in Title 16 Subdivisions, 16.12.050. They appear to not be applicable to development applications that are not also processing a subdivision application as they are referenced in the Title 17 development standards. However, specific standards for street trees are located in 17.17.050. Consider relocating the street tree requirement and standards to 17.17 Landscape and Development Standards and providing revised applicability of the street tree standards.
17.18 VARIANCES	• The procedure for Variances is not clearly defined. Considering revising to state all variances shall be processed and approved as Quasi-judicial actions subject to 17.09.040. Housing land use adjustments required under Senate Bill 1537 likely will be incorporated in a separate section of the development code with separate criteria for their application.

CHAPTER & SECTION	KEY FINDINGS AND NOTES
	This issue will require more evaluation as part of the Phase 2 Code Update process.
17.19 TOWNHOUSE PROJECTS	• Overall, the standards for Townhouse development or projects are unclear and inconsistent in the Code. Townhouses have their own definition but can also be considered multi-family dwellings or two/three/four dwelling developments in 17.25 Middle Housing Development Standards. Additional clarification of these requirements is recommended as noted elsewhere in this report. • Consider removing all standards for townhouse development under 5 units to improve internal consistency and clarity within the code and to reduce potential confusion or conflicting code provisions. All townhouse development 4 units or less are subject to 17.25 Middle Housing Development Standards in all zones where allowed except for C-2 where townhouses are a Conditional Use. • 17.19.020 Standards – The townhouse standards vary greatly by zone and number of units proposed, adding complexity within the code and creating potential confusion for code users. This can be a barrier to the development of housing. The parking standards for townhouses may be seen as a barrier to development, particularly in comparison to standards applied in other jurisdictions and in terms of the ability to accommodate required parking spaces on a typical townhouse site. • 17.19.030 Townhouse process – the application and approval process for the "a townhouse" is not clearly defined. Processing townhouse development as a partition application pursuant to Title 16 is unclear and inconsistent with sections of Title 17 stating they are processed under 17.16 Site Plan Review or 17.25 Middle Housing Development Standards
17.20 **TRANSPORTATION** CIRCULATION AND ACCESS MANAGEMENT	• The applicability of 17.20.030 access management standards is unclear. It states the standards apply to all development on arterial and collectors and all development that abuts these roadways as part of a site plan review process (Chapter 17.16), as well as locals streets within the Interchange Area Management Plan Overlay Zone's "Access Management Blocks." However, not all developments that abut these roads are otherwise subject to Site Plan Review under 17.16. The review process for development that does not require Site Design Review is unclear. • The access management criteria in 17.20.030.B and standards in 17.20.030.C are not C&O and are required to be C&O as they impact the development of housing.

CHAPTER & SECTION	KEY FINDINGS AND NOTES
	• There are criteria and standards in 17.20 as well as criteria and standards that reference other code sections (Chapter 13.28) and the City's TSP which has the potential for inconsistencies. There are also access standards in 16.12 Subdivisions that could conflict with the standards in 17.20 • Some standards are discretionary as they allow the City Engineer to waive or modify standards at their discretion and without citing C&O standards or criteria for waiving or modifying such standards. • 17.20.040 Bicycle parking – the residential use categories are inconsistent with residential uses within the Code and not C&O. **Example**: use of 'dormitory' and 'group living', location of bike parking "near building entry' is not C&O. The Exemptions should be expanded to include all Middle Housing types. • Vehicle parking is not addressed in 17.20. It is addressed throughout the code. To improve clarity and to ensure consistency, consider adding minimum vehicle parking standards to 17.20. • Consider relocating 17.04.130 General requirements for parking lots to 17.20 Transportation and Circulation and Access Management to combine parking lot and circulation standards in section of the Code.
17.23 ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS	• Consider exception to 800 sf limit for ADU conversions (not applicable to expansion of buildings for ADUs). • Revise housing types in 17.23 if revised in Definitions.
17.25 MIDDLE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS	• If retained, consider adding a purpose statement to this section identifying the purpose is to facilitate the development of smaller homes under 1,200 sf to address the Hood River's housing goals and strategies. Add that the application of 17.25 is optional. • It appears this section was added to address the 2015 Housing Strategy and to create an alternative pathway to develop smaller middle housing units as noted above. Although there is a conflict clause, consider addressing Middle Housing development standards in the criteria in the base zones (17.03 Land Use Zones), specific standards for middle housing in 17.04 Supplementary Provisions, and the review and approval process in 17.09 Review Procedures. This would reduce the number of conflicts and inconsistencies and would improve usability for the applicant. The term 'Middle Housing' evokes the housing types and associated standards required in larger Oregon communities under HB 2001. 17.25

CHAPTER & SECTION	KEY FINDINGS AND NOTES
	contains very different standards by comparison and may create confusion for developers working in other communities across the state. Hood River is not subject to the majority of state standards related to middle housing and should continue to implement standards that reflect the specific needs of the community. At the same time, the City also should update its code to improve consistency and conflicts within the code and reduce confusion with definitions and standards used elsewhere to the extent reasonably possible. • There is no defined approval process/action for applications for the development of Middle Housing. It is assumed is a Ministerial action, but it is not stated. • 17.25.010 Definitions – relocate to 17.01.060 Definition Section to ensure consistency. Consider revising definitions of middle housing types to be consistent with HB 2001 and OAR 660-046 to improve usability of the Code for developers who are familiar with developing middle housing in Oregon according to HB 2001 standards. • The standards and approval process for Townhouses are inconsistent and unclear throughout Chapter 17. Townhouses could be two/three/four-unit configurations in Middle Housing. • 17.25.070 Development Standards – Overall the standards appear to be C&O but several standards for middle housing types are greater than standards for single-family detached dwellings which could be a barrier to the development of housing. o 17.25.070. A – Required Site Area Table, the relationship between the minimum building site area and minimum lot size is unclear. o Single-family detached housing in the Code do not have minimum landscape area standards, the detailed minimum landscape area and specific planting standards for middle housing could be seen as a barrier to housing and may not be consistent with HB 2001 o o 17.25.070. H – For clarity and consistency Building Height measurement should have one method consistent throughout the code and located in the definitions. o 17.25.070. K – Required Architecture is C&O, but the standards are greater than standards that apply to single-family detached dwellings and could be seen as a barrier to the development of housing.

Part 2: Initial Findings - Legislative Compliance

The following table provides a summary of the housing-related state statutes and legislation that were considered as part of this Code Audit (besides clear and objective requirements) and identifies the extent to which Titles 16 and 17 of the HRMC are consistent with these regulations. Note: Some of the statutory requirements apply in Hood River regardless of whether the City chooses to incorporate them into the HRMC. If not added to the Code, the City would be required to apply the statutes directly to any applicable permit or land use application.

Topic	Status	Comments
Occupancy Limits House Bill 2583 (2021); ORS 90.112 Prohibits jurisdictions from establishing or enforcing occupancy limits for dwelling units that are based on the familial or nonfamilial relationships among any occupants.	Not in compliance, Section 17.01.010 Definitions should be updated and terms for housing types amended throughout Chapter 17	• Chapter 17 contains definition of "family" based on familial and non-familiar relationships. Deletion is required to comply. • Definitions for single-family dwelling, single-family detached dwelling, multi-family all use the definition of family. Suggest replacing "family" with 'dwelling unit' • Definition of "group residential' based on non-familial relationship • Definition of 'triplex' is based on familial relationships • Consider the addition of a definition a "dwelling unit" in Title 17 that simply refers to "one or more persons," thereby avoiding occupancy limits related to familial status.
Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) SB 1051, Section 6 (2017); HB 2001, Section 7 (2019); ORS 197A.425 Requires cities with populations over 2,500 to allow at least one ADU for each single detached dwelling, in areas zoned for single detached dwellings. Allows "reasonable local regulations relating to siting and design." HB 2001 clarified that "reasonable local regulations" do not include off-street parking or owner-occupancy requirements.	Appears to comply	• Section 17.23.010 Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) complies. • Other discussion of ADU standards in Section17.23.010 is provided in Part 1 of this memo.

Manufactured and Prefabricated Dwellings House Bill 4064 (2022); ORS 197A.015, 197.478 & 197.485 HB 4064 updated certain definitions and regulations related to manufactured housing, prefabricated structures, and manufactured dwelling parks. Local governments must: • Allow the siting of manufactured homes and prefabricated dwellings on land zoned to allow single detached dwellings (ORS 197.478). • Not apply siting or design standards to manufactured homes or prefabricated dwellings sited on individual to siting or design standards that do not also apply to site-built dwellings (with the exception of protections related to statewide land use planning goals regulations related to thermal envelope performance) (ORS 197.478(4)). • Allow placement of prefabricated dwellings in manufactured dwelling parks (ORS 197.485).	Not in compliance, Chapter 17.12 Manufactured Homes and Mobile Home Parks and Section 17.01.010 Definitions should be updated.	• City defines 'manufactured home' consistent with ORS, but 'manufactured dwelling' is the term used in ORS. • City definition of a 'mobile home' is different than manufactured home. • Mobile homes and manufactured homes are regulated as manufactured dwellings by the ORS. Consider eliminating mobile home definitions and replacing all references in the code with manufactured dwelling • All zones that allow single family detached dwellings allow manufactured homes. • Section 17.12.010 applies individual lot placement standards to manufactured dwellings that do not apply to single detached dwellings – these standards are precluded by statute. Two standards need to be removed. • Section 17.12.020 contains additional criteria to manufactured homes in the R-1 zone that that do not apply to single detached dwellings. Several standards need to be removed. • The definition of 'manufactured dwelling park' should be updated to include prefabricated structures/ dwellings, consistent with statute. • Recommend adding a definition for prefabricated structure/dwelling and including it in the single detached dwelling definition. • Section 17.12.030 refers to Mobile/manufactured dwelling

		park, consider removing mobile home term form the section.
Substantially Complete Infrastructure House Bill 2306 (2019); ORS 455.175 Prohibits any local government from denying a building permit for a residential dwelling in a residential subdivision in which the infrastructure is "substantially complete." Specifically, building permits cannot be denied for failing to satisfy conditions of a development IF an acceptable financial guarantee has been secured AND the following systems meet applicable standards, unless agreed otherwise: water, fire hydrants, sewage, storm drainage, curbs, and streets and street-signs for emergency response purposes. Jurisdictions retain their authority to deny occupancy permits.	Section 16.08.030B and 16.12.060.A. Appears to comply.	• The Code allows a final plat to be approved with a guarantee for completion of public improvements and allows for development to occur (building) with guarantee for completion of public improvements.

Mandatory Adjustments and UGB Amendments and Additions to Limited Land Use Decisions Senate Bill 1537 (2024) sec 8-9, 44-47, 48-60, ORS 215.427 (amended) <u>Opting In to Amended Housing Regulations (Sections 8– 9)</u> Allows applicants for permits, limited land use decisions, and zone changes for the development of housing to request their application be reviewed using standards and criteria that become operative while their application is pending. Restarts application timelines. <u>Limited Land Use Decisions (Sections 44–47)</u> Includes approval or denial of applications for replats, property line adjustments, and extension alterations or expansions of a nonconforming use in the definition of "limited land use decision." Directs cities to only apply procedures specified in ORS 197.195 to limited land use decisions. <u>One-Time Site Additions to Urban Growth Boundaries (Sections 48– 60)</u> Allows cities outside Metro to add sites to their urban growth boundary (UGB), and cities within Metro to petition Metro to add a site within the Metro UGB, in specified conditions for the purposes of building housing of specified types and affordability. Limits these additions to 50 net residential acres for cities with populations under 25,000 (Hood River). Requires cities to demonstrate need for the UGB amendment using specified criteria, provide public notice and opportunity for public participation, and adopt a conceptual plan subject to the specified requirements. Allows cities to perform a land exchange in lieu of a UGB amendment, in which case the residential site being added to the UGB replaces a residential site roughly equivalent in size that is being removed from the UGB.	For Sections 44-47 (Limited Land Use decisions), Titles 16 and 17 partially comply, Sections 89 and 88-60 are not addressed in HRMC	• The city is not obligated to update its code but would need to review all applications against these statutes when applicable. • 17.09 Review Procedures code section could be revised to address the option for applicants to opt in to amended housing regulations. • 16.08 complies with the limited land use decision for replats and property line adjustments • In 17.09.040 Non-conforming uses are Quasi-judicial actions therefore not in compliance with SB 1537. • Due to the sunset of the one-time UGB additions in 2033, the City could consider processing any applicable UGB expansions by the process outlined in the Senate Bill and not amending the Zoning Ordinance, specifically 17.08 Plan Amendments to conform with one-time Site Additions to the UGB criteria and approval process.

Single Room Occupancy House Bill 3395, Sections 1-2 (2023); ORS 197A.430 Requires local governments to allow "single room occupancies" in residential zoning districts. Single room occupancy (SRO) is a form of housing in which the units share bathroom or kitchen facilities with other units on the floor or in the building. SRO housing with just a few units could look similar to a house with individually rented bedrooms. Larger SRO developments (say, with more than six single room units) would be more akin to a dormitory with shared kitchens and potentially shared bathrooms. ORS 197A.430 defines "single room occupancy" as follows: A residential development with no fewer than four attached units that are independently rented and lockable and provide living and sleeping space for the exclusive use of an occupant, but require that the occupant share sanitary or food preparation facilities with other units in the occupancy. The statute requires local governments to allow single room occupancies: • In single-family zones, with up to six single room units on each lot; and • In multifamily zones, consistent with maximum density requirements.	Not directly addressed in HRMC, recommend update of Definitions, Permitted uses in residential districts.	• The city is not obligated to update its code but would need to review all applications against this statute when applicable. • The code does not have a definition for SRO nor is it allowed in any residential zones. • The code has a definition for "group residential" for occupancy of dwelling units by 5 or more non-related persons and "rooming house' building where the non-transient rental of lodging without meals, is provided to over five (5) people. The definitions are not identical to SRO and based on familial relationships which requires revision per the ORS. • 'Group residential' or 'rooming house' are not permitted in all residential zones. • 'Group Residential' are allowed in some residential zones but have minimum and maximum number of residents. However, 197A.430 requires the City to allow SROs with up to six units in all zones that allow single detached dwellings. • Consider defining SROs separately from group residential and listing them separately in Permitted Use in the residential zoning districts. Allowing up to six units on each lot in R-1 and R-2 and no limit in R-3 and C-1. • Also consider applying multifamily standards to larger SRO developments as they are applied to 'group residential'. This should include

		development and design standards in 17.16.050
Affordable Housing with Density/Height Bonus Senate Bill 8 (2021); ORS 197A.445**,** HB 3151 (2023) Requires local governments to allow affordable housing, which meets a specific definition and criteria, on a wide range of sites. • Affordable housing meeting certain property ownership criteria must be allowed in any zone. Initially, the criteria were limited to ownership by a public body or religious nonprofit; however, the criteria were expanded via HB 3151 in 2023 to include ownership by a nonprofit organization focused on affordable housing, housing authority, and manufactured dwelling park nonprofit cooperative. • Affordable housing that is owned by other types of organizations must be allowed on property zoned for commercial uses, religious institutions, public lands, or industrial lands except those specifically for "heavy industrial." • ORS 197A.445 provides height and density bonuses in areas zoned for residential uses. However, it does not specify any densities for those zones that do not otherwise allow housing.	Not addressed in HRMC, recommend Affordable Housing Ordinance and code updates	• The city is not obligated to update its code but would need to review all applications against this statute when applicable. • Hood River adopted an Affordable Housing Strategy in 2002. One strategy addressed the development of an affordable housing ordinance. No ordinances relating to affordable housing have been adopted. • The code does not have a definition of 'affordable housing' or address the use in any zoning districts. • The code does not address height or density bonuses of affordable housing. • Consider creating and adopting an affordable housing ordinance (consistent with the Affordable Housing Strategy and SB 8 & HB 3151 & HB 3395). This requires amending 17.01 Definitions, the permitted uses in all zoning districts, and addition of a height and density bonus subsection to 17.04 Supplementary Provisions. In addition, expedited affordable housing review process could be part of the code revisions as outlined in Hood River's affordable housing strategies.
Affordable Housing on Commercial Lands House Bill 3395, Sections 16-19 (2023); ORS 197A.460	Not addressed in HRMC	• The city is not obligated to update its code but would need to review all applications against this statute when applicable.

Requires approval of affordable housing on land zoned for commercial (but not industrial) use, as well as moderate-income housing that is part of a mixed-use structure. The housing must be subject to the clear and objective development standards in the "residential zone that is most comparable in density to the allowed commercial uses in the subject zone." These provisions do not apply to certain constrained land, vacant land, or land that was added to the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) within the last 15 years. This overlaps with ORS 197A.445 (SB 8), but has somewhat different criteria and restrictions. The main differences are that HB 3395 applies only to commercial land on which industrial uses are not allowed (whereas SB 8 has broader applicability); HB 3395 has different affordability requirements for mixed-use residential development; and SB 8 includes density and height bonuses, whereas HB 3395 does not.		• Overlaps with ORS 197A.445 (SB 8), addressed above. • The city could address compliance with revisions suggested for compliance with SB 8 and the City's Affordable Housing Ordinance. The main differences are that HB 3395 applies only to commercial land on which industrial uses are not allowed and the definition of affordability is slightly different.
Affordable Housing Owned by a Religious Nonprofit House Bill 2008 (2021); ORS 197A.470(5)-(6) Requires local governments to allow the development of affordable housing on property that is owned by a religious nonprofit organization and not zoned for housing, provided the property is contiguous to a zone that does allow housing and is not zoned for industrial uses. Density is based on standards for the contiguous zone that allows housing.	Not addressed in HRMC	• The City is not obligated to update its code, but this could be added to the overall Affordable Housing Ordinance and code updates discussed above. • The City is required to review all applications against this statute when applicable.
Hotel/Motel Conversion to Shelter or Housing House Bill 3261 (2021); ORS 197.748 Requires local governments to allow the conversion of a hotel or motel to an emergency shelter or affordable housing when certain criteria and standards are met. HB 3261 provides another specific definition of "affordable housing.".	Not addressed in HRMC	• The City is not obligated to update its code, but this could be added to the overall Affordable Housing Ordinance and code updates discussed above. • The City is required to review all applications against this statute when applicable.

Emergency Shelters Allowed Outright HB2006 (2021) HB 3395 (2023), Sections 6-7 Requires local governments to approve an application for an emergency shelter, regardless of state or local land use laws, if the application meets specific approval criteria outlined in the bill. An "emergency shelter" provides "shelter on a temporary basis for individuals and families who lack permanent housing." Any emergency shelter use or activity specifically authorized below may not be put to any other use without securing the necessary land use approval as required by state law or local jurisdiction. The sections of HB 3395 related to emergency shelters are in effect as long as a specific state-wide measure of homelessness is above a certain threshold. "Super Siting" is an expedited review and approval process for emergency shelters authorized by state law (HB 3395). Emergency shelters sited using HB 3395 are not required to comply with local land use laws.	Not addressed in HRMC	• The City is not obligated to update its code but could revise the code to comply with ORS for ease of implementation. • The City is required to review all applications against this statute when applicable. • The code does not have a definition for 'emergency shelter'. The City could revise 17.01.060 definitions to include a definition for emergency shelter consistent with the ORS and allow emergency shelters in all city zones through ministerial review reviewed with criteria outlined in HB 3395.

Part 3: Initial Findings – City-Identified Code Topics and Areas

MIG conducted a review of multiple sections of the Hood River Development Code to flag City-identified areas that are problematic, inconsistent, contain gaps or omissions or conflicts with other code sections. The table below provides an overview of key findings and initial recommendations for these sections. This is not inclusive of all issues but identifies issues and areas for which the City provided background documents or discussion.

Required Parking and Access	
CODE OR SECTION	KEY FINDINGS AND NOTES
16.12.020.J.1	• See 17.04.020 • Review for Clear and Objective. • 16.12.020.J.1 refers to an "Urbanizing Area as shown in Local Street Connectivity standards of the Transportation System Plan" – assuming this is referring to Figure 7 of the TSP there is no Urbanizing Area delineated. If "Urbanizing Area" is the area being developed, that needs to be made clear and not capitalized.
17.01	• 17.01.060 Parking Space definition includes dimensions, precluding compact spaces from counting toward parking requirements.
17.03	• Consider putting parking standards in a table. • When specifying the number of required spaces the number is spelled out: One space, two spaces, etc. Sometimes the spelled-out number is followed by (1), sometimes not. One and one-half spaces is also sometimes followed by (1 ½), one and one quarter spaces was followed by (1.25). • Sometimes "parking spaces" is used, sometimes "parking" sometimes "spaces" – is this the inconsistency mentioned by staff? • Confirm C-1 parking requirements for residential development in Central Business District (1.25 spaces, rounded up, except none for upper story listed historic buildings?). • Confirm C-2 parking requirements for residential development in Central Business District (1.25 spaces, rounded up, except none for upper story listed historic buildings?). • 17.03.110.D.2: Lot Coverage should be in definitions. • 17.03.110.J.1: Conflicting standards • 17.03.130.E.7: This section contains Parking Standards for Commercial and Recreation Uses in the Light Industrial Zone but only if in the Waterfront Overlay Zone. Please

	review for C&O. Additional parking standards for Waterfront Overlay zone: 17.03.130.F.8 • No current requirements for drive-throughs and queuing. • Add internal circulation requirements for pedestrians, vehicles, fire apparatus/vehicles. • Statement that no compact spaces allowed as required parking.
17.04.130	• Parking area vs. Parking lot – use consistent and clear terms. • "Maintained adequately," "sufficient width" are not C&O or adequately defined. • 17.04.130.5 (should be "E" not 5) = need to reference parking lot landscaping standards
17.20.30.C.3	• Points to Chapter 13.28 Access Spacing, Driveways and Curb Cuts • 13.28.010 – Service driveway definition – should be in definition chapter. • Table 13.28-A – driveway spacing – should be made consistent with Table 16.12-A (i.e., measurement of straight curb rather than centerline to centerline).
17.20.040	• Define short term vs. long term parking. Must all long-term bicycle parking be sheltered? And what are the sheltering standards? • Lighting standards need to be C&O
Landscaping Tree Preservation	
16.12.040 16.12.060.B.6.1 17.16.040.A 17.16.050.A 17.17	• The standards should be updated to be Clear and Objective. • Several terms need to be defined, including: ○ Significant Tree ○ Significant Shrub ○ Native Vegetation ○ Mature Vegetation/Landscaping ○ Diameter at Breast Height ○ Breast Height ○ Protection Area ○ Drip line ○ Significant vegetation area ○ Dead, Diseased and Hazardous Vegetation. ○ Vegetation ○ Landscape tree

	• This chapter needs to be reviewed for correct referencing:17.07.090.A.5.c.3.X.a – missing number. Check numbering for A.5.c.3.X.c.i – Roman numerals aren't used elsewhere in the Code that we have seen.
	• Site Plan Review: 17.16.040.A and 17.16.050.A :
	  • These standards are identical and need to be C&O. Break up criteria that address more than one thing (i.e. Significant Natural Features, Vegetative buffers, building impacts, etc.)
	  • What are "Significant Natural Features?" Many codes have a list of what is considered significant and must be protected.

Multi-family housing use in the R-3 and C-1 zones	
17.03.030 Urban high density residential zone (R-3)	• See findings and notes in Parts 1 and 2 above • Further guidance from the City forthcoming.
17.03.040 Office/residential zone (C-1)	• See findings and notes in Parts 1 and 2 above • Further guidance from the City forthcoming.
Non-Conforming Structures and Uses	
17.05.010 17.05.040	• The Purpose references "certain" residential uses but .040 doesn't differentiate. • Further guidance from the City forthcoming. • Clarify process for review of non-conforming structures and non-conforming uses, including C&O for residential (see also 17.09.040(B.5)).
Building Height and Measurement	
17.04.040 General Exceptions to Building Height Limitations	• This section could be incorporated into the definition. • Per APG: The reference datum criteria are somewhat unclear. • See Daniel Kearns (City Attorney) documentation.
Process/Procedures for Review and Approval	
16.08.020.C.1.a 17.09 17.01.040.B and C 17.03.130.B 17.07.030 17.23.010.C	• See findings and notes in Part 1 above • Consider extensive code wide process and procedures update. • Condominium plats are reviewed under the state process and not a city process; however City is asked to sign off. The code should define this process. • Identify when project is vested.
Residential Density Calculation	
17.03 17.04.070	

17.07.020.C	• General exceptions to lot area requirements. These are discretionary and possibly contradict the non-conforming chapter. • 17.07.020.C – Standards shouldn't be in an asterisk. Table needs a title. • Further guidance from the City forthcoming.
Setbacks and Permitted Obstructions	
16.04.020	• No definition for setback, structure.
17.03	• Should reference 17.030.A – or all zone standards could be in a table and this could be a footnote.
17.04.030.A	• Reviewed for C&O standards in terms of how the standards are applied. • Define Projections. • A non-business accessory structure is the permitted obstruction. • Add permitted encroachments or obstructions into yard areas. Walkway, Air conditioning units, fences under 6', and fences under 4 feet when within 10' of a public street (not an alley).
Other City-Identified Code Sections/Topics	
17.01.060 Childcare facilities	• Definitions needed • Further guidance from the City forthcoming.
17.02 ESTABLISHMENT OF LAND USE ZONES	• Clarify if Environmental Hazard Zone is a zoning district and its applicability to housing. 17.03.090 describes it as an overlay zone. Not currently depicted on the GIS Zoning Map layer ("Geographic Zones & Hazards" layer includes Environmental Protection, Floodplain, and Geologic Hazard). • Process for interpretation of zone boundaries, 17.02.030(2), includes no criteria and is not C&O. • 17.02.040 does not reference same zones in 17.02.010.
17.03 ZONING	• Consider C&O outdoor lighting standards in the C-1 and C-2 Zones. E.g., see 17.03.040(H) and 17.03.050(I) - "…shall not be unnecessarily bright….shall be dimmed as much as possible after losing without compromising safety and security." • Clarify if 17.03.050(A) permitted residential uses are allowed outright if there is no existing residential use on a site (see also 17.03.050(C.1 and C.2)). • Front Yard requirements for residential (% landscape requirement vs. parking area).
17.040.050 Fencing and Walls	• See Building Height measurements. • Procedures/regulations for fences over 6 feet not addressed. • Consider adding standards for fences. • Further guidance from the City forthcoming.

17.040.060 Retaining Walls	• See 17.040.050 above. • Procedures/regulations for retaining walls over 4 feet not addressed. • Consider adding standards for retaining walls. • Further guidance from the City forthcoming.
17.04.070 General exceptions to lot area requirements	• Not C&O.
17.04.100 Home Based Occupations	• Process not C&O (Type II). • Review for Clear and Objective standards (Subsections 1,2, 5 and 6 in particular).
17.04.110 Bed and breakfast facilities	• Process not C&O (states permitted outright as accessory use but processed Type II).
17.06.030 Conditional Use Decision Criteria	• From APG: many of the criteria in this chapter may be challenging for applicants to demonstrate whether the criterion is met. Likewise, staff may also experience difficulty interpreting whether development proposal items comply with applicable criteria. Significant revisions are likely needed to improve usability and effective and consistent application of these criteria.
17.07 Planned Developments	• From APG: In general, we found the standards within this section to generally be clear and objective. We noted that several standards include the phrase “to the maximum extent possible." For example, "[mechanical equipment] shall be located away from res areas, schools… to the maximum extent practicable." This phrase is not particularly C&O and can present challenges in determining whether a standard has been met. Where this phrase is used, it would be helpful to replace it with a specific measurement or more objective criterion wherever possible. • Tables in this section – and possibly throughout the code – need to be labelled. There are standards in the asterisk under the table. • Define “Qualified Building.” • Consider editing the section to replace “PUD” with “PD.”
17.08 Zone Change	• 17.08.010 includes process. • Needs to be reviewed for C&O standards including very clear decision criteria and clear sections titles. • “The hearing body shall consider factors” is not a criterion.
17.10.020 Severability/Penalties	• Points to Chapter 1.12 of the Municipal Code which has been repealed. • Review for C&O
17.12 Manufactured Homes and Mobile Home Park Provisions	• Review numbering of sections – there are some missing “letter” levels. • Needs to be reviewed for C&O. • Specific terms should be added to definitions (skirting, etc.)
17.14 Historic preservation	• Consider update to 17.14.100(C) provisions for minor alterations, and 17.14.100(D) exemptions from review, to

	address process, criteria and standards for repair or addition of egress for residential uses.
17.15 Annexations	• Review for C&O standards. Refrain from subjective terms such as "taken into consideration" and "reasonably needed." • Consider update of 17.15 Annexation policy evaluation criteria to reduce barriers to housing development. • What documentation is needed to show that urban services are being met?
17.16.040 Site Plan Decision Criteria	• There are no C&O standards.
17.24 In-LIEU PARKING FEE	• Check vs.17.03.040(G.2) and 17.03.050(H.2) to ensure C&O provisions for residential uses.
Variances and Adjustments	
17.18.010	• Where physical difficulties, unnecessary hardship, and results inconsistent with the general purpose of this Title may result from the strict applications of certain provisions thereof, a variance may be granted as provided in this Chapter. • Review all of 17.18 for C&O Standards • Should be a reference to the two chapters below – or they should be combined. • Adjustments vs. Variance (SB 1537) requirements. • The submittal requirements and not clear, they appear to be the same as for a CU.
17.22.010.G	• Review for C&O standards – do these also need to be the standards of 17.18?
17.22.020.E	
17.22.030	• Needs Variance criteria.
Wireless Communication Facilities	
	• Not addressed in the Code. • Consider adding a subsection to 17.04 Supplementary Provisions to address standards for Wireless Communication Facilities and definitions for wireless facilities to 17.01 Definitions.
Temporary Uses	
	• Add standards and requirements for temporary uses. • Guidance from Staff on temporary uses to address forthcoming.
Outdoor Lighting	
	• No outdoor lighting standards for fixtures. • Add Photometric review threshold.

Key Issues Identified in Interested Party Interviews and Planning Commission and City Council Work Sessions

A number of recurring themes and comments occurred throughout the interested party interviews and work sessions with City officials. Below is an abbreviated summary of the common key issues. Full summaries are available as attachments to the Code Audit.

- The Development Code (Titles 16 and 17) is oftentimes inconsistent, contradictory, and unclear. There are several conflicts between the two titles and even between different code sections. Several specific code sections were noted as problematic (parking, access spacing, landscaping, public improvement requirements, tree preservation, allowable density, middle housing standards).
- The City should simplify the code structure and reduce cross-references to other sections of the code and Titles to increase the usability of the code.
- The code should be available in lay person language - the code is very difficult to understand to general citizens, The use of graphics, charts, tables, and other visuals also will be important to making the code easier to use and understand.
- The City should provide incentives and flexibility in development requirements to promote needed housing and development.
- There appears to be a history of systemic discrimination that is reflected in the code. The code should be examined to identify and address any potential remnants of this history.
- The code should be available in Spanish. At minimum, the basics for each zone (i.e., development standards) should be available in Spanish. In addition, it would be beneficial for the City to have a bi-lingual staff person who can help Spanish-speaking community members navigate the code and better understand its requirements.
- The City should establish and implement in the code a method to identify a consistent nexus/proportionality across developments including predictable public improvement requirements and reasonable costs (e.g., right-of-way improvements).
- Affordable housing must be directly addressed in the Code. Consider creating and incorporating an Affordable Housing Ordinance.
- There is a need to reduce barriers in the code to allow for greater mix of housing types including workforce/farmworker housing, multi-family housing and multi-generational housing,

Conclusion

Summary of Key Considerations for Potential Amendments

- Affordable Housing – Several recent Oregon legislation and statues contain requirements for development and processing of affordable housing (see Part 2) and the City has an adopted Affordable Housing Strategy (2022). Consider developing an affordable housing ordinance that addresses the state mandates and city goals holistically. The ordinance should contain the Code revisions that are needed to implement state requirements and local policies and strategies.
- Definitions – all definitions for Tile 16 & 17 (including those embedded in the code sections) and definitions needed to implement the Oregon legislation and statues should be combined in one area of the code. The inconsistent, missing and conflicting definitions greatly affect the usability of the code.
- Application Procedures, Process, Actions - For clarity to applicants and ease of implementation, consider a review process of Type I (Ministerial actions), Type II

(Administrative actions, Type III (Quasi-judicial actions), and Type IV (Legislative actions). This is standard in many jurisdictions in Oregon. The process can be modified for Hood River from Oregon's Model Code. Consider the addition of a table that shows the review process for each type of application. The process and approval required for some development applications is inconsistent, unclear, or missing in the current Code.

- Standards for the Development of Housing –The Middle Housing development standards were added to Title 17 to implement Hood River's 2015 Housing Strategy but did not include an overall set of amendments to other related development standards in the Code to ensure overall internal consistency within the code. For consideration for potential amendments, the City could consider addressing Middle Housing development standards in the base zones (17.03 Land Use Zones), the specific standards 17.04 Supplementary Provisions, and the review and approval process in 17.09 Review Procedures. Standards for some housing types are missing from the code such as terms for mixed-use development. Holistically addressing the standards for the development of housing would reduce the number of conflicts and consistencies and would improve usability for the applicant.
- Standards for the Development of Housing for Middle Housing – To provide clarity and improve usability of the Development Code, another consideration for potential amendments is to change the name of the Chapter 17.25 from 'Middle Housing Development Standards' to 'Small Housing Type Development Standards Option'. The term 'Middle Housing' evokes the housing types and associated standards required in larger Oregon communities under HB 2001. 17.25 Middle Housing Development Standards contains very different standards by comparison. Hood River's goals and policies to allow for smaller housing types have been developed to address conditions in Hood River. However, reducing confusion with terms and standards addressed by HB 2001 would improve the usability and clarity of the code for developers who work in communities both in Hood River and across Oregon. In addition, it also would helpful to clarify that the purpose of 17.25 is to provide an optional set of standards to those who want to develop smaller housing types. At the same time, it is important to the City to retain standards that promote development of small housing units, including the types of middle housing addressed in the Code.
- Standards for Parking, Access and Circulation – The standards are spread throughout Titles 16 and 17 and are inconsistent and often in conflict. Creating a single section where all the standards are addressed would improve the usability of the Code.
- Consolidated location for Permitted Land Uses for All Zones - Consider an addition of code section and a 'Land Uses and Development Types Permitted' table that shows permitted land uses and development for all zones in one location of the code to improve clarity and usability. The permitted uses are spread across several sections of the Code.
- Consolidated Development Standards for Residential Development - Consider the addition of one "Site Development Requirements Table" for all residential uses in all. The table could reference specific standards or code sections (examples: design review standards for townhomes or minimum parking requirements) when necessary.
- Plain Language – To the greatest extent possible revise language used throughout the code to make it more user friendly and understandable to general citizens. Consider creating "reference guides" for the code for common development types in English and Spanish. Providing easy references to specific code topics would be helpful for the public.