

**PRE25-00041 / NEW MIXED-USE BUILDING
8/12/25 PREDEVELOPMENT MEETING
PLANNING NOTES**

Responses to Planning Questions (provided in red font):

1. Please note: Below are several questions that we have regarding the project. We organized them by department but please know that there may be some overlap. The proposed project is on several parcels with two main portions separated by an alley. The property east of the alley is zoned CMU-3 and the property to the west of the alley is zoned RS-12 in the University Neighborhoods Overlay. The proposed building will be on the CMU-3 portion and the RS-12 portion will remain a surface lot with bike and car parking. Therefore, these questions are related to the proposed building on the CMU-3 portion rather than the RS-12 portion.
2. Under SB 1537 Section 38(4)(g)(E), qualifying residential developments may increase the maximum building height by 20%. For this project, the base height in CMU-3 with the 18-foot bonus (per Section 4.9.100) is 123 feet, allowing an increase to 148 feet. Do you agree with this maximum building height calculation under the state's mandatory adjustment provisions?

Not entirely. The outright-permitted maximum building height within the CMU-3 zone is 105'. A height bonus of 18' may be granted for a mixed-use building in accordance with LDC 4.9.100. The mixed-use building height bonus is also permitted outright, bringing the total outright-permitted maximum building height allowance to 123'. Any height above 123' would require a land use process.

The City has implemented SB 1537 through the incorporation of a Housing Land Use Adjustment (HLUA) process; see LDC 2.12.40. This involves a land use application, fee and process (including public notice) that must be completed separate from the building permit process (typically prior to submitting building permit applications). See Section 2.12.40 for more information regarding the process. The current HLUA application fee is \$3,338.00. The HLUA application form (which outlines additional submittal requirements, permissible adjustments, review criteria, etc.) is available online at: <https://apps.corvallisoregon.gov/webdocs/showdoc.aspx?docID=4887077>.

LDC Section 2.12.40.02.i allows a maximum building height increase through the HLUA process as follows:

- i. For Development other than Cottage Cluster, an increase in Maximum Structure Height that is:
 1. in addition to existing applicable height bonuses, (if any - see Section 4.9.100 for eligibility); and
 2. not more than an increase of the greater of:
 - a) one story; or
 - b) a 20 percent increase to the Zone's Maximum Structure Height

The maximum building height within the CMU-3 zone is 105'. An increase by 20% results in 21' feet of additional building height allowance. As per i-1 and i-2 above, if the building qualifies for a Mixed Use Building Incentive under LDC 4.9.100 (+18') and also receives HLUA approval for a 20% increase to the maximum zone height (+21'), the resultant maximum building height is 144'.

3. This height is measured from the reference datum (highest adjoining sidewalk or ground surface within 5 feet horizontal of the exterior wall when such sidewalk or ground surface is not more than 10 feet above lowest grade) to the top of the parapet (assuming a flat roof). Equipment screening, elevators, and stairs are allowed to project above this height. Does the city agree with this building height measurement approach?

No. See LDC 4.9.50.01, which specifies that building projections are subject to the height limitations of the underlying zone.

4. In the CMU-3 zone, the maximum building height is 148 feet (inclusive of the bonus and 20% increase). There is a requirement that the maximum building height within 20 ft. of an abutting residential zone (RS-12/ University Neighborhoods Overlay) the maximum height within the CMU zone must not exceed the maximum height of the abutting residential zone. Since there is a 14-foot-wide alley between the CMU-3 & RS-12 parcels, our assumption is that the property abuts the alley and not the RS-12 parcels thus this will not apply. Alternatively, the 20-foot distance is measured from the RS-12 property line and includes the 14-foot width of the alley. Does the city agree with one of the suggested approaches?

There are no residentially-zoned properties abutting the CMU-3 site (see LDC Chapter 1.6 definition for “Abutting Properties”). See staff response to Question #2 above regarding maximum building height.

5. In the CMU-3 zone, there are no minimum Front Yard, Exterior Side Yard, or Rear Yard abutting a street setback requirement. It is our understanding that the alley is considered a street, and no setback is required. Does the city agree with this approach?

An alley is not considered a street. Regardless, there is no CMU-3 zone setback requirement along an alley. See LDC 4.0.60.j for additional alley considerations (including minimum garage setbacks). Also note that building projections into alley right-of-way are prohibited.

6. Per Section 4.0.60.j.2.d, garages adjacent to one-way alleys angled zero degrees to 45 degrees from the alley may be located along the outside boundaries of the alleys with no setback required. It is our understanding that a 90-degree turn into a parking structure is not allowed at the project site. If we can demonstrate that the maneuver into the parking garage functions adequately, would this be acceptable to the city? Or, will a direct entry for the parking garage off of SW Western Blvd or Pacific Hwy W be allowed?

This question will need to be addressed by Site Engineering and Public Works.

7. Per Section 4.0.60.j.3.d it's noted that alleys providing access to one or more properties, and 15 or more vehicle parking spaces must be a minimum of 20 feet wide. Can you confirm this will not be required for the proposed project?

Minimum alley width will be determined by Public Works and the Fire Department.

8. The loading, trash, and garage entry are being located off the alley. Does the city agree with this approach?

No Planning concerns, subject to Public Works and Republic Services approval.

9. In accordance with SB 1537 Section 38(4)(g)(A), the project is requesting a reduction in minimum bicycle parking to 0.5 spaces per residential unit. This is a mandatory adjustment under state law. Can you confirm that this provision applies to our project?

See staff response to Question #2 above regarding HLUA process. The referenced reduction to minimum bicycle parking is an adjustment that requires review and approval of a HLUA application. See LDC Section 2.12.40.02.g for applicable adjustment. Note that approval of an additional adjustment would be required in order to provide bicycle parking required for the CMU-3 site on the RS-12 site (see LDC Section 2.12.40.02.h).

10. The Bike Parking is currently planned to be accessed from the alley. Does the city agree with this approach?

No Planning concerns assuming compliance with LDC 4.1.50 and applicable Site Development Design Standards.

11. Are there any specific bicycle rack styles that are not allowed in Corvallis for use on projects?

Bike racks must comply with City specifications; see Standard Details 503 and 503A in the [Site Development Design Standards document](#) (pages 61-62 of the PDF). Any deviation from City Site Development Design Standards requires approval of a “Request for Modification” form (see pages 27-28 of the PDF document). Along with the completed form you would need to include details demonstrating that the proposed rack type equals or exceeds the City-standard rack in terms of usability, accessibility and long-term maintenance. Your request would be reviewed administratively by City staff.

12. Can required bicycle parking spaces be provided within apartment units and count toward the minimum bicycle parking requirement?

In-unit spaces typically require review and approval of a Site Development Design Standards “Request for Modification” (see response to Question #11 above).

13. There appear to be a few large trees in the public right of way that overhang the property line, and may conflict with construction of a project. Are there any issues with these trees being replaced?

City Urban Forester’s starting position is that existing mature street trees should be preserved and protected during development. Prior to formal determination, Urban Forester would need more information regarding extent of excavation needed from building front towards street, existing curb / gutter / sidewalk impacts, extent of tree canopy impacts and underground utilities. City Urban Forester Erin Hatch can be reached at erin.hatch@corvallisoregon.gov.

14. Does the first floor plan shown in the attached PDF meet the requirements of Section 4.9.100 Mixed Use Building Incentives for bonus height, including the requirement that cumulative upper-floor residential gross floor area is at least 100% of the first floor gross floor area? Please refer to the area chart on the last page of the PDF.

Need further clarification regarding:

- Leasing office. Typically a leasing office serving an on-site residential use is considered a Residential accessory use, rather than a stand-alone Commercial use.**
- Common Area. What is this? Doesn’t appear to be shown on the floor plan. Note that the “Lobby” is counted separately in the table but also matches the floor area identified for “Common Area”. Does not appear that the Lobby relates to the Retail space.**

15. For the SB 1537 adjustments, what process will the city use to implement the required provisions?

See response to Question #2 above.

Additional General Planning Comments:

- **Work with [Planning Division](#) regarding any required land use approvals (HPP, replat / lot consolidation, etc.)**
- **Existing stand-alone parking lot on RS-12 site is a nonconforming use and cannot be expanded in any way. Use may continue within its existing footprint. See LDC Section 1.4.40 for additional guidance regarding nonconforming uses.**
- **Compliance with all applicable LDC standards will be confirmed through the building permit review process.**
- **Overhead utilities along Western Blvd. appear to be very close to where proposed building would be.**
- **ODOT (Duane Liner) was unable to attend the 8/12/25 Pre-Dev meeting but has provided written comments via email, which can be forwarded separately.**