

City of Eugene Opportunity Siting Survey

Survey Monkey; 6-12-07 Results
(reformatted with spelling corrected only)

How would you characterize yourself? Check all that apply.

answered question 68

skipped question 0

Neighborhood Resident 76.5% 52

Property Owner 64.7% 44

Developer 19.1% 13

Financial Professional 1.5% 1

Design Professional 33.8% 23

Land Use Interest Group 17.7% 12

Other (please specify) 29.4% 20

What aspects of LOCATION are MOST important when considering a new opportunity site?

answered question 56

skipped question 12

Close to the city center/downtown 35.7% 20

Distributed throughout the city 44.6% 25

In a Mixed Use Center 46.4% 26

On an arterial or collector street 39.3% 22

In or adjacent to
commercial/industrial/transition area 17.9% 10

On a bus line 46.4% 26

Other (please specify) (see below) 26.8% 15

What SITE-SPECIFIC ATTRIBUTES are MOST important when considering opportunity sites?

answered question 56

skipped question 12

Over 1 acre in size 8.9% 5

Infrastructure available 75.0% 42

Lack of existing structures on the site 8.9% 5

Types of adjacent land uses 80.4% 45

Proximity of parks and schools 37.5% 21

Proximity of neighborhood
commercial services 53.6% 30

Other (please specify) 16.1% 9

Question 3c: What ideas do you have for specific locations that could potentially work as opportunity sites? Please list and describe them below. What makes them suitable?

Survey Results:

answered question 32

skipped question 36

1. Will have to visit specific areas to get approx. addresses. Mon, 5/28/07 3:51 PM

2. #2 cont. supports families would be lost. Maybe a Retirement Home would better fit that site. To me it is a balance - what is loss and what is gained. Jefferson Middle School area - would support families better than Adams School because of the green space, parks area, shops near by and the Boys and Girls Club being right there. Willard School area is a fantastic place for high end townhouses or affordable retirement housing - it has everything!! Cutting the large lots in the area between East Tyler and Jefferson between 18th-29th Aves would also remove most of the large trees, natural drainage and gardens in that area - maybe home enlargement projects would work best here or if several lots were put together a duplex or 4 plex could be built into the area. We need more affordable housing all over the City of Eugene - the wages and the cost of homes is not matching up very well these days. Parking and Sidewalks are both BIG issues and need to be addressed everywhere. Where ever there has been green space used by the public - honor that use and need. If affordable housing family was built at Jefferson, Adams or Willard Schools then play grounds should be kept in that area too. If Retirement housing is built then maybe community gardens would be more useful with a tree and bench area for the whole neighborhood to share. If any school space is sold - the City of Eugene needs to honor/recognize that use and keep something open for the public in the area. Wed, 5/23/07 6:28 PM

3. There is a great large area in the River Road area on Maxwell and North Park. It is close to schools, stores, has infrastructure already in large parking lot with a used restaurant supply store there and a coffee kiosk. Mon, 5/21/07 10:11 PM

4. The southwest corner of N. Park Ave. and Maxwell. Already paved. Great access. Possible area for school, park, or more businesses. Brunner Dryer property on east side of River Road. Great area for a historic park. Many sites along River Road, now included in the Razor Park MUC. Existing infrastructure, paving, small businesses. Develop for River Road residents so they don't have to go downtown for so many services. A grocery store, bakery/coffee shop, open space, farmer's market. Tue, 5/15/07 10:17 AM

5. The recently completed Tate condominiums, at 14th and Olive, are a good example (former parking lot, commercial on three sides, central to services nearby, little residential adjacent, with most heavily impacted neighbors, by its size and scale, being a tall church and other commercial buildings. It is on fringe of an established neighborhood, NOT IN THE CORE, where it would be highly inappropriate!). Other sites in the downtown core would be appropriate, or along any arterial that is at the edge of a neighborhood, and near transportation and commercial sites. Tue, 5/15/07 9:52 AM

6. Maxwell and N. Park MUC site. This area is on an arterial, underdeveloped, near Diana's Pond, natural areas, schools, and walkable neighborhood In Razor MUC Study Area, central community commercial area. This area is on an arterial, currently underdeveloped, slated for MUC, and near River and bike path Sat, 5/12/07 7:20 PM

7. Mixed Use Centers identified in TransPlan. Anywhere Downtown. Courthouse District. Franklin Corridor. Fri, 5/11/07 5:40 PM

8. I personally think there are plenty - the key is design standards that get a degree of compatibility that MOST people will be comfortable. (Some people just won't ever get comfortable with change.) Thu, 5/10/07 7:13 PM
9. •On arterials as transition between commercial complexes and single family housing. This would give close services so as to reduce trip miles from multiple-family developments and make a nice segue and buffer for family houses with yards. Thu, 5/10/07 3:44 PM
10. Areas where redevelopment would provide additional benefits and services to a neighborhood. Areas that provide a transition from residential to commercial areas. Avoid areas near the Urban Growth Boundary, unless they are adjacent to a large commercial area. Examples: Union Pacific property adjacent to River Road neighborhood, Westmoreland housing complex land, properties that are currently zoned light/medium industrial in Bethel or lower River Road. Vacant land adjacent to big box developments...try to turn the big box areas that currently exist into mixed use nodes. Tue, 5/8/07 8:04 PM
11. Infill sites without a lot of restrictions , secondary dwellings need to be allowed to be larger and taller and not Owner occupied. Tue, 5/8/07 3:08 PM
12. As North and West Eugene and other outskirts areas are developed, plan for dense housing rather than McMansions and other upscale development. The infrastructure already is in place for multiple dwellings. Mon, 5/7/07 3:33 PM
13. Various areas within walking distance of downtown might be suitable. Development plans for downtown and the river front should include dense housing. In addition, the city needs to designate mixed use nodes in other areas that include dense housing, services, and public transportation to minimize new auto traffic. Identification of these sites needs to be part of an area land use and transportation planning effort. Fri, 5/4/07 4:59 PM
14. The old ODOT property north of E. 15th Ave, East of Walnut St. It is relatively large and near the EmX Walnut station. Fri, 5/4/07 2:01 AM
15. downtown, Coburg Road area Wed, 5/2/07 4:44 PM
16. Railroad yard (if still being abandoned) Wed, 5/2/07 8:56 AM
17. Vacant site downtown TL 17033143 1000 W 15 th between Olive/Charnelton . Tue, 5/1/07 4:58 PM
18. People that we work with do not want to be in the rush hour part of town, but close enough to get to things they need. Therefore some of the North Gilham areas are very suitable. These areas offer reasonable access to town, but still let the individual feel relaxed when the are home. Tue, 5/1/07 9:56 AM
19. Each individual parcel of land would need to be evaluated for its best potential use. Sun, 4/29/07 4:46 PM
20. Use lot size numbers (ala CAFHN standards) to determine what and how big can be accommodated. Different neighborhoods would possibly have different standards. Sun, 4/29/07 12:02 PM
21. Marine/naval reserve center at 13th/Chambers - proximity to school, open space, shopping, etc make it a suitable location. Likewise, former lodge site across street on 13th/Chambers. Civic stadium site (if 4J

declares this site eligible for sale). Broadway redevelopment areas downtown. Remainder of EWEB site (i.e, outside of admin bldg area). Acreage around new federal courthouse. Property off Southwood/Fairway Loop near Reed & Cross. Possible properties in Eugene Planing Mill district. Fri, 4/27/07 4:42 PM

22. Area surrounding the Federal Courthouse West Broadway Former Eugene Clinic site, now Peace Health downtown All of the above are close to city center which is my top priority for location. We need people downtown. Fri, 4/27/07 4:37 PM

23. Around West 11th beyond Chambers; much traffic and air remediation needed, much better pedestrian/biker accommodation and- trees. The location has a wealth of commercial amenities. Thu, 4/26/07 9:44 PM

24. These sites should be spread through out the city and through the various city neighborhoods, not centralized in any particular neighborhood or area. Being relatively close to downtown is nice but not essential. Eugene is not so big that people are not able to walk, bike, or bus to the services they need. The opportunity to include neighborhood commercial in the development would be nice but not critical. There is no one specific locations which would be best. But you need to allow the opportunity for people to take advantage of the possibility to do higher density. Given the currently Neighborhood groups goal to eliminate higher density development in "their" neighborhood, i.e. the typical "not in my back yard" or I have mine now I don't want anyone else to have theirs" concept I honestly doubt that this concept will work. If you allow neighborhoods to have the say on how and what is developed in their area then it won't happen either because of the time delays, cost delays, or impracticability of accomplishing what the "neighborhood" requires. If you're going to allow development then you need to set up some general guidelines and then let the professionals who do this type of development do what they do best without interference. Obviously this is not the history in Eugene and this is why this type of development is not normally attempted by developers. Its just not worth the time, the money or the head ache, to either have to fight with the City planners or the neighborhood "planners" Just in case you think I'm just ranting. I am not I have done several nice infill projects and the head ache and costs associated with them, causes me not to want to attempt any more. Sincerely, Boyd Iverson Thu, 4/26/07 10:51 AM

25. Too numerous to list. There are 23 sites within a 3 block radius of my home at 25th and Olive. Five suitable for duplexes and one for an apartment building-the Temple Beth Israel site, which is already getting inquiries from developers. Many sites are there for those who look closely. Block by block searching with a large scale plot line map will reveal many hidden opportunities. Thu, 4/26/07 10:34 AM

26. Unknown Wed, 4/25/07 9:21 AM

27. Madison Meadow - 23rd? near Monroe. Great opportunity for small clustered homes. 15th near Lincoln? Vacant parcels begging for rowhouses. 11th and Chambers and 13th and Chambers - anything near those intersections. Tue, 4/24/07 3:12 PM

28. 1) Transitions between commercial & residential uses and areas where existing housing has been allowed to deteriorate. A large-scale example might be the west edge of the Westside Neighborhood (from 1 - 2 blocks east of Chambers St. west to Garfield between 8th and 18th. 2) Micro-locations close to urban services or city core. The vacant 1/2-block on 15th Ave. between Lincoln and Lawrence (possibly most of the block N. to 14th). Another example could be the "Walnut Mixed Use" areas along Franklin Blvd. Their suitability is proximity to transportation and services with least damage to existing neighborhoods that are "working". Tue, 4/24/07 2:58 PM

29. Too big a topic for quick answer, but I have advocated for long time that every neighborhood group should be asked to identify at least 10 (or x number) of sites in their 'hoods that they could support infill, more dense housing. Otherwise we have "density ghettos". Everyone likes to give lip service to infill and densification as part of solution to sprawl, but generally that means anywhere but my neighborhood.

Tue, 4/24/07 2:51 PM

30. I feel that we are going to find very few nice empty lots in good places. What should be considered is redevelopment of under used areas. This will work best in areas that are poorly developed/run down, but have lots of other assets due to the location. Specifically, I guess my neighborhood would work. The area between Willamette & Amazon park 25th all the way up to about 34th? This is suitable because infrastructure is in place, parkland is near, diverse commercial area is close and the public transportation system is great. Tue, 4/24/07 1:04 PM

31. Areas served (or to be served) by the existing (or future) BRT routes. Use the process to "fix" or assist the worst areas before leaping to the "best" or easiest or most appealing opportunity areas. The open market will take care of the best or the easiest. Also, the best and easiest areas do not require or deserve public assistance (or at least the same levels of public assistance) as the areas with more challenging issues and conditions. For instance, if opportunity siting decides on a downtown focus work on the worst areas of the downtown core before working on the Cannery and EWEB riverside areas. Mon, 4/23/07 5:13 PM

32. Eugene Planing Mill area (just west of Skinners Butte); area west of Chambers Street, and between 7th Avenue and 11th Avenue; downtown area; emerging courthouse district (old Agripac site, etc.) Mon, 4/23/07 12:55 PM

Question 4a: What are the most important compatibility issues when new dense housing is planned and constructed in or adjacent to an existing neighborhood? Building height, mass, and scale? Parking? Architectural design? Setbacks/Landscaped buffers? Noise? Others?

Survey Results:

answered question 52

skipped question 16

1. All of the above Tue, 6/5/07 11:55 AM

2. Building height, mass and scale AND the proposed building's compatibility, as considered by neighbors in affected area, for it to fit into neighborhood and not degrade said neighborhood. Mon, 5/28/07 3:54 PM

3. #1 I'd put Height, Mass and Scale all together. Pleassee, No more towers just plopped into a neighborhood!! #2 Safety built into the design with Setbacks/ Landscaped buffers/Sidewalks/Parking/Street Trees/Driveways/lights that respect the night sky/eyc #3 Architectural design is more important in some neighborhoods than others. Here, we have blocks of cheap pre-WW2 homes, homes without foundations and moldy old buses parked in the side yards of some homes and lived in - Do we have to follow that sort of design - I think NOT!! The new and "green" designs have a whole lot to offer between Jefferson and Tyler - everything doesn't need to look like a "pretend" craftsman home. I keep thinking of the Trans-American Building in San Francisco and how everyone hated it at first. Now,

it is a popular site on the skyline of San Francisco and a major feature of that fair city. Wed, 5/23/07 6:53 PM

4. Building height; parking; setbacks and buffering that is compatible with existing development; scale; density Fri, 5/18/07 3:50 PM

5. Poor architectural cookie-cutter design, lots too small, too much concrete, no natural stormwater drainage when the rest of River Road in particular, has natural drainage, mass and scale is incompatible with established neighborhood. Tue, 5/15/07 10:33 AM

6. All of the above. I think this issue would be advanced if you all, and any other planners and developers, were to think as if this were to happen in your own neighborhoods or, better yet, right next door to you. I acknowledge that we all have differing views of what is appropriate or tolerable, but I believe if we operate as if this is happening next door, there will be much more sensitivity to existing neighbors and their concerns. Infill and Opportunity Siting sound great from afar, but take on new meaning when it happens next door. This ain't rocket science!! Height, mass, scale, parking and related traffic congestion and noise, design, setbacks, landscape buffers, general noise, overdone hard surfaces (and attendant loss of soft landscape) are all OBVIOUSLY important. Equally important is the purpose for which any new sites are developed. The City claims to desire a mix of housing types and uses, but virtually ALL infill and redevelopment that I see is for rental use, with absentee landlords and/or management. We badly need balance here, and training for landlords about how to be good neighbors (we are landlords, and are much more invested in the well-being of our own tenants, the immediate neighbors, and the neighborhood as a whole, than most other landlords that have properties near our home). Tue, 5/15/07 10:08 AM

7. All of the above compatibility criteria are important. I would like to see more housing units without parking, and for residents who commit to having no car, or shared vehicle arrangements. Sat, 5/12/07 7:22 PM

8. Neighborhood acceptance. Contextual fit. Fri, 5/11/07 5:47 PM

9. Sites should be adjacent to existing neighborhoods, or in transitional areas, and should never, ever be envisioned as way to "re-develop" existing healthy neighborhoods. Building height, mass, scale, design, parking & landscaping are all importance elements of compatibility. Parking is a serious issue in older neighborhoods that have pre-existing parking problems. Most older homes have small or no garage with off-street parking for only one car. Noise is an important consideration as part of what might be called a "lifestyle" (for want of a better word) compatibility consideration. In our neighborhood we've had student-oriented multi-plexes plopped down in the middle single-family home areas. The partying, lack of consideration or concern for neighbors, and neglect of the property all lead to conflicts and frays the fabric of the neighborhood. Fri, 5/11/07 11:10 AM

10. Architectural design. Relationship to neighboring structures (distance, backyard look-over, etc). Building height - mass and scale less important because those can be mitigated with good design. Let's have Design Review like so many civilized places do. Thu, 5/10/07 7:15 PM

11. • Existing neighborhoods reflect a character that was sought for housing in given historical periods. People often buy houses to capture this ambiance. Thus, if large yards and single level housing is threatened by subdivisions of larger lots and by multiple story buildings, it destabilizes many existing neighborhood environments. Thu, 5/10/07 3:55 PM

12. setbacks, noise reduction, architectural design. Wed, 5/9/07 10:44 PM

13. All of the items you've listed - compatibility with existing structures in design and definitely parking. Real open space is also something I'd want in West University, since the park is minuscule. Something that provides an opportunity for owner occupancy would be very high on my 'desirable' list. Wed, 5/9/07 9:39 PM

14. Parking is the big one. A "looser" requirement would allow more units per acre. Locating development in a mixed-use area is clearly easier to navigate than in a strictly residential area when trying to solve building massing and solar shading issues. Wed, 5/9/07 5:16 PM

15. Yes, all of those things are important. Must be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. High quality design can mitigate building height/mass/scale. Another important factor is available open space to provide residents with the ability to garden/exercise/play, as well as alternative transit amenities such as bike paths and sidewalks. Finally, try to locate dense housing next to commercial areas so residents are less dependent on cars. Tue, 5/8/07 8:04 PM

16. All of these. The character of existing neighborhoods should be respected and preserved. People moved into their respective neighborhoods because they were the way they were. They didn't move in with the expectation that they would change. Increased density is a political goal. In my experience, it is NEVER a neighborhood goal. Tue, 5/8/07 8:02 PM

17. Provide similar visual privacy to existing neighborhood yards as exists before opportunity development (something that can be achieved through architectural design) Tue, 5/8/07 5:32 PM

18. Scale and building type. Reduced parking. Tue, 5/8/07 3:10 PM

19. Setbacks and buffers, sustainability, re-use of water, and collaborative efforts with current residents is key. Developers figuring out what enough means in terms of profit. Mon, 5/7/07 3:39 PM

20. Certainly all of the above are important. Location on major traffic arteries would facilitate provision of local services to residents, and this should be encouraged. Medical services, schools, grocery and other shops, entertainments, dining facilities, and such would also provide local employment to residents. Public transportation along major traffic arteries would also serve residents. Fri, 5/4/07 5:09 PM

21. Architectural compatibility with existing neighborhood, traffic flow design, landscaped buffers, setbacks, common meeting ground -- a park, for example. Fri, 5/4/07 2:06 AM

22. Location and scale in comparison to the existing homes. Parking is not important. Architectural design is, but the rules need to be very flexible. Wed, 5/2/07 4:50 PM

23. Context- allowing the new development to reflect changes in market trends and provide a new housing choice while also trying to compliment the unique history and attributes of the neighborhood. Connectivity- creating positive links between the new, denser housing and the existing street and pedestrian circulation routes. It is important that the new housing integrate and become a part of the neighborhood. Building Form- allow height, massing, and scale to vary from existing surrounding development. The denser housing should offer a different housing option, not simply replicate more of what is already available in the neighborhood. Allow variation in building materials and design to achieve more sustainable Green Building practices to reduce environmental impacts, etc. Landscaping- avoid use of terms like "buffers"- landscaping should be attractive and not meant to "screen" the new housing from existing neighborhoods. In contrast, the landscaping could add to the unique characteristics of the neighborhood, provide seasonal variation, etc. Higher density housing should never need to be "screened"

from lower density housing or vice versa. Parking- minimize the impacts of parking to the greatest degree practicable. If alley system exists or is possible it should be used to access off-street parking. Always allow on-street parking and avoid or reduce requiring off-street parking to extent possible. Parking on the street reducing need for parking lots, slows the traffic and actually fosters more social interactions as people come and go - instead of pulling in and out of front loaded garages. Wed, 5/2/07 9:09 AM

24. All of above need to be integrated into site-specific design. Tue, 5/1/07 5:03 PM

25. Architectural compatibility with existing buildings Tue, 5/1/07 12:39 PM

26. All of the above. In the upper end market we work in all of these things are an issue. First is protection of investment and then quality of life. Tue, 5/1/07 9:58 AM

27. Aversion to higher density can take a NIMBYist track; as a city, we need to anticipate and pre-empt this resistance by increasing the buy-in (and targeted incentives) for development in certain areas (e.g., the "nodes" of times past). Mon, 4/30/07 3:13 PM

28. Compatibility = reasonable density (number of residents in the housing affects livability through parking, noise and service issues). Building must be compatible with surrounding buildings through height, mass and scale. Mon, 4/30/07 8:59 AM

29. We believe you are on the right track here. Sun, 4/29/07 5:06 PM

30. Look at CAFHN standards for an example of appropriate compatibilities. They would vary with each neighborhood. Sun, 4/29/07 12:06 PM

31. surrounding buildings and land usage traffic Fri, 4/27/07 5:36 PM

32. Design is most important. A well-designed site and structures can effectively address a number of compatibility issues concerning height, mass, scale, etc. Second most important concerns density. If the intent is to create truly high density development, then you're talking about some form of high-rise development. This raises issues as to whether the local market demands and/or can accommodate such development and its attendant higher costs. If, however, the thought is to increase densities in a manner that is sensitive to the surrounding context, then design can lead the way, provide higher densities (though perhaps not as high as a proscribed, predetermined number), and allow development to segue effectively from lower to higher density development in a model fashion. I'd hope the city pursues this latter approach, as it will better respond to community desires, market demands, and support/strengthen existing neighborhoods and their character. Fri, 4/27/07 4:52 PM

33. Adjacency to existing single family residential neighborhoods is toughest issue for compatibility. Better to mix with commercial or transition zones between neighborhoods and commercial. Federal Courthouse area is near RR which is a noise issue. Fri, 4/27/07 4:47 PM

34. Noise, more traffic, parked cars on street and in front of snout houses, safety on residential roads issues. Place-suitable setbacks, yes. Design, scale shouldn't stick out like a sore thumb. How about planning generously-wide sidewalks to accommodate varieties of unhurried pedestrian traffic. Thu, 4/26/07 9:55 PM

35. building height, mass, scale, architectural design and setbacks and landscape buffers. Thu, 4/26/07 2:02 PM

36. Intellectually, most people agree that it is prudent to encourage density. Emotionally, almost everyone wants the density somewhere else. In order to minimize disputes, the developer should solicit opinions from the neighborhood prior to presentation of the final design to allow for input, incorporating suggestions that may be appropriate into the final design. In a global sense, everyone needs to recognize that increased density inconveniences the current residents. It does so by removing a perceived pocket park. It increases the traffic on the streets. It increases the neighborhood noise level. It increases the pressure on local parks and it may increase class sizes at the local schools. None of the choices shown for this category really address the political issues associated with these problems. Thu, 4/26/07 1:48 PM

37. Good design can help mitigate differences in scale but many builders or their clients are more concerned with profit or what they can get for themselves rather than the negative impact their project may have on their neighbors. Numerous examples of this mitigation can be seen in periodicals like "Fine Homebuilding". Parking is a real issue that is difficult to deal with in our auto dependent culture unless dense development is strongly encouraged along mass transit lines and near mixed use developments. Noise is a minor issue. Loss of a sense of privacy and feeling hemmed-in (encroached upon) are probably the feelings that need to be addressed by what ever method, many site specific. Thu, 4/26/07 11:17 AM

38. All of these issues are important but they are also issues which can not be solved because, high density but its own definition is "high density". There has to be building height, mass and scale, increased parking, increased traffic, more people etc. You can't get away from these issues you just have to accept them if you truly want to provide the housing that is needed and in short supply in the Eugene area. Neither the City or especially the neighborhood should be involved in "Architectural design" issues. This is not what they've been trained to do. Thu, 4/26/07 11:03 AM

39. good design Wed, 4/25/07 9:21 PM

40. - Architectural design (both ugliness and privacy) - Solar access for nearby lots (particularly north of the new structures) - Landowners who will commit to choosing tenants who are compatible with the neighborhood - for example in my own neighborhood my preference would be that landowners do exclude drug dealers and don't exclude poor people. I think choice of tenants is frequently an issue that underlies folks' concerns about infill, and by addressing it we may allay fears. - Developments should include a combination of owned and rented units. Wed, 4/25/07 8:56 PM

41. Compatibility issues are best determined by neighborhood groups and residents. However, if opportunity siting is to be successful, the projects have to pencil out. Financial, procedural and other incentives should be minimized. Many developers are leery of putting their money into projects that are dependent upon incentives to work. Wed, 4/25/07 9:31 AM

42. The most important issue is fit. To me, that means scale from a physical perspective and respectfulness of existing neighborhood character, from a functional perspective. The best solution avoids massiveness of appearance and is not located in a place that is surrounded by single family dwellings. Look for opportunities in areas where rental properties (housing that isn't owner occupied) or apartment complexes already exist. Higher density but smaller scale developments might be able to fit into single family dwelling areas if parking is handled sensitively and the mass of the units can be broken down to an appropriate scale. I don't think it is the presence of people that most neighborhood residence object to. I think it's the appearance of a development that dwarfs what was already there. Landscape buffers and high-quality construction methods can help mediate the sound issues. Wed, 4/25/07 9:10 AM

43. Something new shouldn't look like "something new". It should blend into the existing character of a neighborhood. It should enhance/strengthen the community into which it is positioned. All issues are relevant: height, accessibility, noise, mass, scale, design, buffers. Tue, 4/24/07 9:21 PM

44. Parking design and availability, and opportunity for flexibility. Building height, proximity to existing neighbors. Quality of construction. Quality of design. Ownership or rental? And if rental, what income level. Tue, 4/24/07 5:40 PM

45. Design is most important - I don't believe compatibility can be broken down into easily regulated standards. For example, two different buildings each with the same height, mass and scale can have very different compatibility impacts. Similarly, a compatible building in one place may not be compatible in another, even if the characteristics of the surrounding area are much the same (e.g. corner lot on a collector surrounded by single family detached housing). Ultimately, how a building is designed relative to the surroundings will determine its compatibility. Tue, 4/24/07 3:12 PM

46. Building height, mass, and scale are certainly high on the list. Anticipated occupancy-type is a delicate but important element. Housing that encourages owner-occupancy should be encouraged in neighborhoods with high existing owner-occupants and doesn't matter as much where there is already high degree of rental housing. A good example might be the difference between east and west campus areas. What would be a good infill on one side of campus would be a disaster on the other. Tue, 4/24/07 3:10 PM

47. So far we seem to be solely looking at backward compatibility. I look at and respond to that, but am also mindful that buildings I am responsible for will be there over 100 years, and should also be "forward compatible" with buildings that won't happen for 50 years. Generally, the City is densifying, property values rising steeply, and buildings will increase in storey height. I think architectural quality is important, but is very hard to legislate architecture - current City efforts are pretty bad. Keep in mind that people live in three dimensional space - the Chambers area design standards reduced the volumetric capacity of sites by a very large percentage, yet proponents like to claim that no reduction in capacity for new units results. Horse pucky. There seems to be some idea that infill can be done in a way that will be completely acceptable to neighbors - don't count on it. Human nature being what it is, the "I'm here, now shut the door" impulse is strong, and allied with our innate natures. No matter how much one tries to sugar coat it, densifying neighborhoods will not happen to any appreciable degree if a precondition is that all residents must approve it. The harder we make it to do infill and densification, the more we are fostering sprawl to outlying City's. Tue, 4/24/07 3:05 PM

48. 1. Parking 2. Privacy Concerns a. Building Height b. Window, balcony placement 3. Traffic 4. Architectural 5. Solar Access Tue, 4/24/07 2:14 PM

49. Parking. I hate looking at all the extra cars and added traffic. I think there is an opportunity to possibly create a zoning that allow greater density but with a limit on cars the owner can have. Another problem is rentals and upkeep of the property (owner occupy tends to help). In order; cars upkeep bulk design landscape Tue, 4/24/07 1:13 PM

50. Where in the block the site is located. Larger scale/density is more accepting busier street corners. If within the block then building mass and compatible design are likely important. Tue, 4/24/07 12:02 PM

51. It should begin with good site planning, site (landscape) architecture, and conscientious building architecture on a planning and a site/project scale. Window, doorway, outdoor private and public space, and pedestrian and vehicular access placement are crucial. And, it should be remembered that plantings (prescribed) don't mitigate poor building design. In looking at standards it may be wise this time (as opposed to the recent code update) to focus more on performance and less on prescriptive measures. I think it's important to have a broad set of policy statements and objectives regarding issues of importance from the neighborhoods but not necessarily a high level of neighborhood involvement on a project by

project basis. A neighborhood representative might be one member of a Design Review Board (see answer to next question). Don't succumb to thinking the Chamber of Commerce and the Lane County Home Builders are the only voices of business and development. Mon, 4/23/07 5:17 PM

52. Yes to all those items you list above. Neighborhood character. Mon, 4/23/07 12:58 PM

Question 4b: What types of compatibility criteria should be incorporated into the process for opportunity siting? Some ideas include additional communication with neighborhood associations, additional regulatory criteria or design standards, or design review by a body such as the Planning Commission.

Survey Results:

answered question 50

skipped question 18

1. all of the above Tue, 6/5/07 11:55 AM

2. Communication with and APPROVAL by neighborhood associations; add criteria to design standards for each neighborhood based on that area's types, density, style, height, etc.; approval of proposed building design and attributes by a commission composed partly of neighborhood residents. Mon, 5/28/07 3:54 PM

3. All of the above have their part in the process. I have watched Mel Bankoff and his group tack a whole lot of flack for a few folks on their project. Mel, et al have come to our neighborhood meetings and talked with us several times = the same few just can't accept his plan while those same few are not themselves living up to their own standards within their own homes. Additional regulatory criteria and design standards on a neighborhood area by neighborhood acres sounds good to me. Last, but not lease, if there is a big deal problem between the neighbors and the builder turning to the Planning Commission is a good idea. Wed, 5/23/07 6:53 PM

4. design review at the staff level Fri, 5/18/07 3:50 PM

5. All of the above. Design standards and design review are the most important in my opinion. From the vast majority of infill that has occurred in my River Road neighborhood, poor design, bad siting, incompatible mass and scale with existing neighborhoods are the most glaring criteria needed. I don't see how infill like what occurred on Kourt Street, off River Road even happened. Tue, 5/15/07 10:33 AM

6. Any and all of these ideas. You're on the right track. I think you know what ought to be done. Generate the political and institutional will to just do it right! Definitely, absolutely involve the neighbors and neighborhood leaders in developing a process. Neighbors may seem like an impediment to developers and planners, but we have to live with the results. We want our neighborhood to be vibrant and thrive. We understand the need to densify. The issue is how we do it. Do it poorly, and we have numerous neighborhoods that become just like the west university area, with 2% owner-occupancy vs. 98% rentals, high crime rates and, just for fun, the occasional riot. Do it well, and we will have active, vibrant neighborhoods that people want to live in, and that existing residents don't feel the urge to flee. Tue, 5/15/07 10:08 AM

7. All of the above are important. I would like to see either local neighborhood design review boards, or a mechanism for local input to a city-wide design review board. Sat, 5/12/07 7:22 PM

8. There's plenty of regulation. Existing land use code provides plenty site development criteria. If anything provide flexibility - perhaps performance criteria instead of design or development regulations. Fri, 5/11/07 5:47 PM

9. I am concerned with how this question is asked. Neighborhood associations shouldn't just be "communicated with". They should have the ability to establish compatibility criteria specific to the design and nature of the neighborhood. Additional regulatory criteria AND design standards will certainly have to be established. The Planning Commission should not be involved in design review. The reviews should be done by people who live in the areas near to the proposed development. Several members of the Planning Commission have demonstrated their opposition to protecting traditional neighborhoods, so I would doubt their ability to review proposals and adequately represent neighborhood concerns. Fri, 5/11/07 11:10 AM

10. Ah, I answer question 5 and now I see Q6 suggests design review. Absolutely! Neighborhood Associations should definitely be involved with pre-development consultation - but they should have a voice, not a veto. Thu, 5/10/07 7:15 PM

11. •Neighborhoods Associations are good sources of information about specific neighborhoods within their jurisdictions. There are areas within the larger neighborhoods that are conducive to opportunity siting, and others that are established neighborhoods that would be threatened by incompatible development. Thus, neighborhood associations might be a prime resource for advice when in comes to infill. Thu, 5/10/07 3:55 PM

12. neighborhood input. Wed, 5/9/07 10:44 PM

13. Communication early with the neighborhood association; design standards; care taken to ensure that the infill is not detrimental to the neighborhood - probably with design review; size, proximity to services, adequate infrastructure. Wed, 5/9/07 9:39 PM

14. The process could include a set of criteria that both the City and neighborhood residents apply to specific proposed areas. Design review by both the planning commission and neighborhood organizations would be helpful. Tue, 5/8/07 8:04 PM

15. Eugene should have design review. The development code should have an alternative path in which a developer can make his/her case to a public body. The prescriptive path can never anticipate the nuances of specific sites and we need more flexibility as well as more accountability for maintaining neighborhood compatibility. Tue, 5/8/07 8:02 PM

16. Allowable density set on site non-negotiable, see #5 for primary compatibility criterion. Tue, 5/8/07 5:32 PM

17. Design standards should be more in keeping with green and sustainable concepts in mind. Tue, 5/8/07 3:10 PM

18. Collaboration is the most important thing you can do. Otherwise people will just spend all their time fighting it. Design standards should take into account light pollution. Additional regulatory standards also. Code is not enforced - education needed as to impact of people's use of property on people outside their property line. Mon, 5/7/07 3:39 PM

19. Neighborhood associations need to take responsibility for identifying opportunity sites within their boundaries, and for specifying development standards on a site-specific basis. This should be built into the planning process and administered by planning staff, according to direction from the Planning Commission, and ultimately per City Council. Fri, 5/4/07 5:09 PM
20. Yes, design cooperation, but specifically between developer and neighborhood association. The EPC is not the body through which to build trust and a working relationship with all parties. Fri, 5/4/07 2:06 AM
21. The scale and density of the existing neighborhood needs to be considered. It does not make sense to put in row homes in a well established single family residential. The integrity of neighborhoods needs to be considered. Don't destroy a great neighborhood. Look for areas that are in transition like the university, or that need direction. Wed, 5/2/07 4:50 PM
22. Reward or provide incentives for quality design. Avoid adding required steps or costs to the process. If design review is to be used, consider allowing either staff to conduct the review or a subcommittee of the Planning Commission that would include one member of the ARB. If a citizen design review body is used, consider requiring at least two design professionals and at least one member with experience in the construction field. This will help ensure that cost implications are considered. Wed, 5/2/07 9:09 AM
23. List all of criteria above and have an appointed design review group rate the project according to a point system. Design review group should include neighbors. Tue, 5/1/07 5:03 PM
24. Neighborhood Association interaction is critical Tue, 5/1/07 12:39 PM
25. This is a tough one. To develop property in this day and age is difficult enough. To have every neighbor start telling you how it should be done puts the project over the edge. Prime example is I own 10 acres of R2 property in the North Gilham area. The difficulties of the working with the City and the neighbors have made us decide to sell it rather than develop it. Tue, 5/1/07 9:58 AM
26. Toss out the current design standards or be prepared to greatly modify them. What works for a single project usually needs to be revamped to work for a project that will affect everything around it. Mon, 4/30/07 8:59 AM
27. Communication with neighborhoods is a great idea while it can often get too lengthy. So timing is still essential to get a project moving. Sun, 4/29/07 5:06 PM
28. The planning commission, and city council as well, needs to demand that planning staff communicate more with the public. The planning commission just forges ahead on their own pre-conceived goals. I don't trust them one iota!!!! Sun, 4/29/07 12:06 PM
29. availability of sites without too high a price tag. Fri, 4/27/07 5:36 PM
30. Early communication with the neighborhood association, and possible design review - particularly if the project will end up with high densities rather than a context-driven approach (as described above). There should be the ability to craft design standards that will be tailored to the site and its particular needs/constraints, etc. Fri, 4/27/07 4:52 PM
31. This is not a 10 minute question. Quick answer: You will not improve urban design quality with regulations or by design review from the planning commission. Better to work with neighborhoods on case by case basis. Fri, 4/27/07 4:47 PM

32. I like the design review body idea - a lot of learning could go on in public venues for this kind of dealing with what's on the table. Meetings should be appropriately located of course, with arrangements for thorough reportage made available. Thu, 4/26/07 9:55 PM

33. additional regulatory criteria or design standards and design review Thu, 4/26/07 2:02 PM

34. The current format for approval of development has plenty of restrictions that have been adopted as the community modus operandi. However, the political leadership has made these choices. The density emphasis may or may not be the preference of the community. As noted above, the local neighbors response to increased density may not reflect the larger community desire. In which case, significant resistance develops. An open discussion about the density issue for the entire community might prove helpful. The core question is whether the UGB is to be expanded. If not, then density is absolutely required. But for many people that means a redefinition of their local neighborhoods. I'm not convinced that all parts of Eugene fully understand the consequences of the density emphasis. Thu, 4/26/07 1:48 PM

35. All of the above though I'm not sure the Planning Commission is the right body to do design review. Perhaps a group of volunteer designers, engineers and architects. Thu, 4/26/07 11:17 AM

36. First given the various neighborhood groups general concepts on any increased density in "their neighborhood". The general requirement of "compatibility" simple will not work in practice, because no matter what you do with a higher density it will be considered "non compatible" by some or most in the neighborhood. Higher density affects the way that people live and they don't like it because they don't want to be affected so they fight against it. No one in the City or the Neighborhood groups have accepted the concept that "given the City Councils refusal to extend the Urban Services Boundary" that higher density is a given. So they continue to not allow the addition of land to the city so that people can have affordable land on which to build one and they refuse to allow reasonable higher density development within the City. So this is where we're at. The average working family coming to Eugene and trying to stay in Eugene has a very hard time finding affordable housing. The reason that there is a limited supply of affordable housing is caused by the City's refusal to allow additional land to be annexed, the neighborhoods refusal to allow high or higher density in "their neighborhoods, or their requirement that they be allowed to design the project, even though they are not the ones who have to pay the money to build it. If there is no economic viability the project will not be built. Why do you think Veneta, Junction City, Creswell, Cottage Grove, Harrisburg, etc are experiencing such a high level of growth. It because people cannot find affordable housing in Eugene, so they are moving to the out lying towns and commuting to Eugene to work. Thu, 4/26/07 11:03 AM

37. Explicit guidelines with voluntary compliance combined with clear and objective standards that are loose and permissible. In other words be clear about performance goals, but limit regulatory requirements. Wed, 4/25/07 9:21 PM

38. - Certainly additional regs and design standards. - Neighborhood association involvement is useful, but meetings that are open to residents in the neighborhood who aren't part of the neighborhood association clique would be even more productive. - Giving priority to developers who themselves live in the subject neighborhood might help a lot with compatibility issues. Wed, 4/25/07 8:56 PM

39. See comment under Question 5. When considering whether the criteria may hinder the financial viability of a project, the amount of time needed to complete the project needs to be taken into account. For developers, time really is equivalent to money. Wed, 4/25/07 9:31 AM

40. I think design standards and design review are essential, and I'm not sure that it is the Planning Commission that is best qualified to do this job. I also recommend that the design standards not be prescriptive in a way that encourages new developments to simply mimic what is in the surrounding area. We need to be more forward thinking than that. Again, I think the key is scale. Wed, 4/25/07 9:10 AM

41. It would be great if developers needed the approval of the neighborhood association/community in order for an application to be approved by the planning commission. Tue, 4/24/07 9:21 PM

42. Flexibility in land use code to allow professionals to design projects that work. And an open forum to discuss these potential successful designs. The land use code is restrictive, pre-emptive and limiting. It sometimes create problematic projects where there shouldn't be problems. I wish I could support the statements you have listed but apparently I have lived in Eugene too long and we already have TOO MUCH PROCESS and not enough action. I would not have any interest in seeing if a committee (s) could change compatibility criteria. Tue, 4/24/07 5:40 PM

43. I believe design review by an independent body (including a neighborhood rep?) with opportunity for public comment is the best option. Tue, 4/24/07 3:12 PM

44. To the degree possible, the city should stay out of regulating design. Requiring preliminary neighborhood meeting(s) and support would be good, but with an appeal avenue to a community-wide body to reduce NIMBY for NIMBY's sake. Incentive-based criteria are better than restrictions. The concept behind urban renewal districts could be applied to desirable criteria rather than desirable areas. Give points for neighborhood support, proximity to and encouragement of public transportation, affordability, sustainability, etc. Then give tax breaks, subsidize infrastructure improvements, etc. to high scoring projects. Tue, 4/24/07 3:10 PM

45. The City is setting up perhaps unreasonable expectations that people other than the owners of property can have veto power over the ability to develop property as they (and the marketplace) sees fit. Properties that have been zoned for denser housing for many years are now to be subject to approval by what - neighbors? Tenants? Anyone who shows up at a meeting? All of the City population. Perhaps we should retire the Zoning Ordinance, and just allow anyone to anything, as long as they can convince the entire City population to agree - any no vote constitutes a veto. City is sailing into shoal waters here - at some point these policies are likely to be challenged in court. I do believe, on a positive note, that a higher level of requirements for planting (particularly of canopy type trees) would be a useful tool in offsetting effect of denser dwellings. Tue, 4/24/07 3:05 PM

46. 1. Design Standards a. Window and balcony placement b. Solar Shadow c. building siting d. placement of noise sources 2. Conversations with neighbors and NA Tue, 4/24/07 2:14 PM

47. The city could develop neighborhood compatibility ratios such that proposed development had a similar ratio of height, landscaping, setback, etc. as the adjoining properties. Tue, 4/24/07 1:13 PM

48. Neighborhood group review and suggestion, but final decisions kept at the city staff/planning commission level. Tue, 4/24/07 12:02 PM

49. Smaller-scale, incremental sites should not be ignored for the allure of the larger-scale (easy fix) projects. Performance related design standards for site planning, site (landscape) architecture, and building architecture should be the focus...not prescriptive measures and requirements. Look at elements of other codes and communities (Transect by DPZ or Ashland's work) where what is "wanted" is emphasized instead of the version d'jour of "how" to do it. Don't be afraid or "too proud" to look at smaller communities for appropriate solutions and processes. Sometimes it seems we are always wanting

to look at what Portland rather than Ashland has done. We sometimes have "little city" envy rather than "large village" wisdom, understandings, and confidence. Require licensed Building and Landscape Architect's on larger projects. Use a selected Design Review Board or committee to review plans/projects not the Planning Commission. They seem too busy and too committed already and should work on larger scope issues. Consider creating the Eugene Development Commission modeled after the "best" of what the Portland Development Commission has accomplished. Mon, 4/23/07 5:17 PM

50. Communication with the neighborhood association is important. Site review is helpful, though it may be an impediment to make everything to the Planning Commission. Mon

Question 5a: What barriers currently exist to developing dense housing in Eugene? Please be specific. Are there significant market barriers? Regulatory barriers? Procedural, or political/public acceptance barriers? Others?

Survey Results:

answered question 46

skipped question 22

1. Public acceptance barriers are GROWING due to numerous and growing examples of badly planned, and cursorily reviewed and rubber stamped approval of poor, incompatible designs going up all over town. dense housing. It is important to add criteria and regulation so that the barrier of public acceptance is decreased, or there will be a growing demand for this type of housing to be banned. Ugly dense housing does NOT sell well when it is later put on the market, as evidenced by very slow sales of such ugly dwellings in my neighborhood (Crest Drive). Mon, 5/28/07 4:01 PM

2. The use of so many cars we can live anywhere in town and get to anywhere else in town. Every household seems to have several cars - either as a status symbol or because some are "junkers" or everyone in the family "needs" their own. Would better bus service help - YES, I think so. A bigger house with a bigger yard is a status symbol also. The bigger house will hold more "stuff" for the whole family. The lack of being interconnected with one's neighbors or a part of a group/club turns many folks inward and leaves them "connected" to their TV, Ipod, Computer, and Kitchen Frigerator. Most of today's toys are a whole lot bigger than they used to be - so we now need more storage space for out toys = bigger garages too. The idea of Nodes didn't catch on but it was a very real step in the right direction. Commercial space at the developing nodes in town needs to be enlarged as needed for shopping growth. Wed, 5/23/07 7:35 PM

3. I don't know, but I suspect political and public acceptance barriers float to the top. Tue, 5/15/07 10:36 AM

4. Planning, oversight and forward thinking on the part of City leaders and staff. Create a viable and healthy blue print, and it will happen. Engage the green building sector, and others who are focused on creating vibrant, healthy neighborhoods and lifestyles. Tue, 5/15/07 10:12 AM

5. Stronger design and quality and landscaping standards would help the public accept denser housing. Sat, 5/12/07 7:24 PM

6. Willing developers, available sites, neighbor acceptance. Fri, 5/11/07 5:47 PM

7. I would argue that there aren't tremendous barriers to dense housing as that seems to be primarily what is being built these days. Indeed, there seems to be such an emphasis on increasing density that some have lost sight of the fact that people actually have to WANT to live in a specific area. We aren't rats, we're humans. When poorly designed & sited incompatible developments overwhelm an existing neighborhood, those with the ability to do so, will go elsewhere. This doesn't "solve" sprawl -- it encourages it. Many of the awful developments that have been built in older neighborhoods give density a bad name. There has been plenty of emphasis on "re-educating" the public to "accept density". I believe there needs to be equal time spent on "political/public acceptance" of the wishes of those of us that don't want to live in high-rise condos. Fri, 5/11/07 11:11 AM

8. Developer perception of the market (I think they're often wrong). Fear of change by neighborhood residents. Lack of courage on the city council. Thu, 5/10/07 7:17 PM

9. • Public acceptance barriers apparently exists just about everywhere. This political reality may be mitigated only with communication with communities impacted. Only conflict would result if neighbors are not consulted and treated as a stakeholder when denser housing is planned. • People are very often concerned about transportation corridors -- some which are already showing some strain -- and the impact of more housing in many areas Thu, 5/10/07 4:04 PM

10. public acceptance. Wed, 5/9/07 10:48 PM

11. NIMBY, mostly. The housing market seems tight enough that the market should not be a large problem, as long as the design and location are done thoughtfully. Wed, 5/9/07 9:43 PM

12. 1. Cost There are huge market barriers to all new construction. 2. Code. The Eugene Development Code is a nightmare. The 2001 "update" is a disaster which actually moved us further from a modern, useful land use code. I have many examples both urban and suburban. We need to seriously amend it in the current two processes. Tue, 5/8/07 8:07 PM

13. The major barrier is the opposing interests of developers and neighborhood residents. Developers want to make money and residents don't want any change at all. Both interests need a structure and process to negotiate an acceptable solution that provides both affordable housing and high quality of life. Tue, 5/8/07 8:04 PM

14. Regulations seem to prohibit small scale infill in close in residential (R-1) neighborhoods. Market response to cost of developing mid-rise residential has not been tested in Eugene yet. I believe there will be a demand in coming years for close in mid-rise housing as 'baby-boom' generation retires. Tue, 5/8/07 5:36 PM

15. Developer greed is the main thing that keeps density from being built. City collaborates with the developers to make it really hard to make it happen. Design standards don't take traffic trips and cars into account - alley access looks great until you need a fire truck to pull in there. Neighborhood residents are snobby and ugly about having more people living in their spaces. Mon, 5/7/07 3:44 PM

16. Eugene has stated high level growth goals that will require prioritization and compromise to implement. The goals of preventing sprawl, protecting local agriculture, protecting neighborhood quality, and accommodating growth cannot be accomplished without guidance by Council, participation by all neighborhoods, and a determination to determine our own future rather than leaving it to commercial developers. Fri, 5/4/07 5:22 PM

17. There are no barriers that cannot be surmounted by true citizen involvement. I am talking about real, hands-on participation, which is not favored by bureaucrats. Fri, 5/4/07 2:10 AM

18. Parking requirements, site plan review process, not fitting with the existing neighborhood. Wed, 5/2/07 4:51 PM

19. One of the biggest challenges with designing and constructing dense housing is being able to respond quickly to market trends and being able to maintain a timely construction schedule. Another challenge includes inadequate sites for dense housing and complex, lengthy processes for amending adopted plans and the zoning map to increase the supply. Few projects try to integrate the new dense housing with the surrounding neighborhoods. Most apartment complexes are built with self-contained services, like fitness and laundry facilities and with landscaped screening or fencing surrounding the project. This actually discourages social interactions between the residents of the dense housing and the existing neighborhoods. It also decreases the market demand for nearby commercial services. In Crescent Village we are hoping the mix of retail and personal services offered on the ground floor of the apartment buildings will foster interactions between residents within the apartments, those living in nearby lower-density residential areas, and those working in nearby office/employment areas. Cities often over-regulate medium-high density housing to "protect" lower-density families. This entire concept should be reconsidered. The high-density residential projects can actually provide the demand for neighborhood services - providing the broader neighborhood residents greater ability to walk to attain life's daily necessities and more jobs nearby. Wed, 5/2/07 10:47 AM

20. public acceptance problems based on experience with poorly designed projects Tue, 5/1/07 5:04 PM

21. Largest barrier is previous poorly conceived and executed projects leading to a NIMBY attitude in much of the populace. Tue, 5/1/07 12:40 PM

22. All of the above again. The cost for land is the first barrier...R2 property is now selling over \$300,000 an acre. Then add all the regulatory issues with development costs and the cost for each unit is up dramatically. Tue, 5/1/07 10:02 AM

23. The availability of cheap land at the urban fringe makes infill and high density less appealing and financially viable. Mon, 4/30/07 3:13 PM

24. I don't know about market barriers. I do know that NIMBY will kick in quickly! For example, I like opportunity siting in theory. But the parcel of land next to me should not become an apartment building. My sweet neighborhood doesn't need that plopped in the middle of it. Mon, 4/30/07 9:19 AM

25. Zoning regulation is still the most difficult barrier at the moment. Sun, 4/29/07 5:06 PM

26. Developers are not building mixed use projects. Instead, they build suburbia, as witnessed in west Eugene. The planning staff approves these tracts with a rubber stamp. Sun, 4/29/07 12:09 PM

27. land costs Building costs Disagreement at the city council level as to how to proceed with downtown development Fri, 4/27/07 5:37 PM

28. Market/cost barriers. City policy makers and some planners seem intent upon urging higher density development regardless of its impacts on neighborhood character in an effort to "grow up and not out." But dense housing more often than not consists of inelegant, poorly designed, and out of place apartment-type developments that truly harm neighborhood character, livability, and housing values. Code allows and practices urged through the planning department encourage this type of development. Instead, the City should identify proper locations for true high density development, and allow it to occur with a minimum of regulatory obstacles. But where the city tries to shoehorn higher densities adjacent to lower

densities and/or in existing lower density neighborhoods, then the goal should be to reduce the intent and density minimums and/or find more suitable locations for true high density, high-rise construction. This could necessitate the need for subsidies to overcome market forces that militate against high rise development. But as it stands today, counter-intuitive to many planners and policy makers assumptions, the market in Eugene yields higher returns for quality lower density development than for "high density" development (eg, more than 20 du/ac). To force the higher density development via regulatory fiat is to reduce quality, encourage sites to remain undeveloped/underdeveloped, and otherwise reduce property values that could yield better returns financially and socially to the community. Fri, 4/27/07 4:58 PM

29. Key barrier is public acceptance, particularly from neighbors. Fri, 4/27/07 4:51 PM

30. same as above and can't think of others. Thu, 4/26/07 2:03 PM

31. Dense housing in the downtown area is extremely expensive to build. Having just worked through this process, it appears that construction costs in Eugene meet or exceed the costs in Portland. The rents are considerably less than Portland. That discrepancy creates a financing gap that is virtually impossible to overcome. Thu, 4/26/07 1:48 PM

32. Developing infill standards, with which the public is comfortable, will expedite small developments in existing neighborhoods as will providing an easy to understand handout for property owners who might be open to further developing their land if they were made aware of the process and financial rewards of doing so. Some code amendments need fixing in order to garner support from the public, such as those relating to second units and alley-access-only(aao)units. Aao units currently need street access in name only or on paper only and have no real street access. This should be changed to require real street access, thus establishing flag lots that are accessed by pedestrian walkways with defined construction parameters, as are our street sidewalks. This would facilitate acceptance of this type of construction and would also likely be more acceptable to the fire dept. Thu, 4/26/07 12:29 PM

33. HIGH Unnecessary systems development fees. No incentive for smaller projects to be built. Resistance by Neighborhood Groups. Requirements that the Neighborhood or the City Planners control the design of the infill units. Time delays and costs and uncertainty of approval. You can purchase the property, pay your fees, develop a plan for development and then have it turned down because it is "not compatible". Compatibility is a very hard target to hit or tie down. Thu, 4/26/07 11:15 AM

34. There are large number of land use code areas that are limiting, but political/public issues are a big concern here. Some of our code is written with a you can have your cake and eat it too logic. For instance the open space and landscape requirements conflict with density goals; others: parking requirements, setbacks, driveway depth requirements, etc. Wed, 4/25/07 9:27 PM

35. 1. Metro and Refinement Plan zoning. It's been suggested that in existing neighborhoods one R3 lot per block would provide the same density as several R2 lots, while being more compatible with neighborhood and community fabric. I think this is a brilliant idea, but it seems unlikely such zone changes would be approved under the current setup. Perhaps some opportunity sites could be very small? 2. Misinformation. We have a lot of trouble with this in the JWN, with large numbers of folks believing in some crazy rumors about planning and density issues. (For example, we get a lot of people believing that the zoning on their own lot has been changed without their permission.) People who have credited inaccurate information then find it hard to trust sources (especially the City) who contradict it. 3. Past history of insufficient tenant screening in multifamily housing. Wed, 4/25/07 8:57 PM

36. The code currently has many barriers to developing dense housing in Eugene. It is a balance of competing community values. After construction costs, developers receive profits from the property from

two principal bases - the number of housing units to be sold / rented and the value of the units. For example, while landscaping requirements in the code may provide additional value to the units (as well as provide benefits to the neighbors), as a general rule, the more extensive the landscaping requirements, the less units may be constructed. If the increased value of the units does not offset the lost revenue from the reduced number of units, the landscaping requirement becomes a barrier. There are a large number of code requirements that are intended to provide a public benefit (solar, parking, design, etc.) that create a cost / benefit analysis that can create barriers to developing denser housing. Wed, 4/25/07 9:48 AM

37. I don't know about economic barriers related to this issue. I think one of the main cultural barriers is that Eugene doesn't seem like and doesn't encourage perceptions of itself as an urban place. The nature-oriented constituency will always see higher density and more buildings as an evil until the advantages of opportunity siting as a green strategy have been demonstrated. Wed, 4/25/07 9:14 AM

38. Property size. Available land seems to come in smaller and smaller sizes. Land use code is very limiting (one size does not fit all) when it comes to smaller lot sizes. Past development is limiting as well as to the type of dense housing. West University neighborhood for example - who would build upscale condos there? So we continue to build the same quality and type of housing there which perpetuates the problems with that area. Dense housing further from the downtown / core is problematic because of the lack of available land. Cost of construction is always a concern, which when coupled with SDC's and cost of professionals, cost of building permits, cost of stormwater management tends to make some projects cost prohibitive. Some of this leads back to regulatory efficiency / cost of regulation / cost of regulators. It is more complicated than it needs to be. Tue, 4/24/07 5:50 PM

39. 1) Development "soft" costs (design, legal services, insurance, and land use actions). These costs are exacerbated by delays that dramatically increase carrying costs and reduce internal rates of return (i.e., PLEASE do not have the Planning Commission or any other molasses-based entity play an approval role!) 2) Infrastructure costs. Small infill projects are assessed both the SDC's AND upfront requirements to replace/upgrade inadequate or outdated sewers, water lines, etc. for the new development. These costs are often much too high for a small project to absorb. We are working on a project right now that might be limited to fewer than the city's ideal number of new residences for that area because adding even a few more units may trigger replacement of a sewer main, a major water line, and construction of a street that isn't even desired by city transportation folks. It's one thing to impose new infrastructure needs on new greenfields, but quite another to impose them entirely on infills within existing service areas. 3) Market barriers exist but seem to be easing. Eugeneans are not used to urban living (condos) and do not value that lifestyle enough to pay for the cost of that type of development. The Tate took far longer to market than similar projects in Portland. We shelved a potential condo infill project that would be viable at Portland numbers but not at the price point we believe Eugeneans would pay. But this, along with GREEN BUILDING demand is changing!!! Tue, 4/24/07 3:37 PM

40. Other than MUPTE, and despite Growth Management Policy statements to the contrary, there are no meaningful City incentives to do infill. Also, current Zoning Ordinance does not distinguish between small lot infill and multi acre greenfield development. In areas suitable for dense infill, every inch of land is important. There is no scaling down of requirements (such as parking area landscape buffering) in recognition of effect on developing small lots. I have advocated for some time a point system, or a means to allow some tradeoffs of credits so that - while one requirement might not be met, the project, taken in the whole, is sufficiently desirable as to waive or modify a few items without an onerous and time consuming Adjustment Review process. Tue, 4/24/07 3:17 PM

41. Barriers depend in part on where in the city one wants to develop "dense" housing (how is dense defined?). Market is certainly a barrier to developing new "multi-family" owner occupied housing (e.g. condos). Availability of land is a barrier for developing other higher density owner

occupied housing (e.g. rowhouses). In some neighborhoods, neighbor resistance is a barrier. I don't necessarily believe that regulations in general are a barrier outside the downtown core (though parking is always a challenge - note that parking is also a market issue). Tue, 4/24/07 3:14 PM

42. Zoning Regulations restricting dense development. Available of land permitting less dense development, construction costs on buildings over three stories (fire regulations; construction insurance costs for condos Tue, 4/24/07 2:22 PM

43. zoning obviously. market to some extent there isn't much bare ground to develop, and it would be difficult to make it work as a redevelopment project. Tue, 4/24/07 1:23 PM

44. Political barriers - NIMBY attitude towards density, especially in some of the downtown core neighborhoods where density is most appropriate. Market barriers - current land prices dictate inflated sale prices for finished units - available only to the upper tiers on the socio-economic scale. Tue, 4/24/07 12:08 PM

45. Yes. All of those mentioned in the questions... Nevertheless, there seem to be tremendous opportunities. It appears a number of larger-scale and a multitude of smaller more incremental-scale opportunities abound. Much like economic development it seems we need to provide both for a two-pronged approach (large-scale and small-scale). And, we still need to realize larger "yields" from our buildable lands inventory. It appears the business and development community has under developed areas in every single sector and the city has allowed it too happen. It seems to do little good for the City to say densities can be this high, and then allow project after project to come in below projected or allowed numbers, and then be asked by those who under-developed to increase acreage because there isn't enough land? Mon, 4/23/07 5:28 PM

46. Cost of a development is a barrier. The perception of a lack of appropriate sites by developers is a barrier. Neighborhood concerns is an obstacle in some areas. Lack of an established list of criteria for approval of "neighborhood compatibility" could be an issue.

Question 5b: What types of incentives could help overcome the barriers to developing dense housing in Eugene? Please describe any specific regulatory, procedural, financial, or other incentives that would help get projects off the ground.

Survey Responses:

answered question 41

skipped question 27

1. Add procedural incentives for developers to gain public input early in the process, so that their projects will fit into a neighborhood thereby gaining public approval; add regulatory hurdles to the development process that assure that proposed development is not ugly and an eyesore in a neighborhood. Mon, 5/28/07 4:01 PM

2. Have the schools develop drop off/pick up sites farther from the front doors of the school and have buses deliver to the front door. Build a better bus system that isn't so dependent on the hub system that we have now. Sell Cut Rate punch cards for bus riders. Build 3 sided bus stops that offer protection from the rain and wind and sun. Limit on street parking with more "one hour parking" or "Permit Parking only" places in town. Put in more motorcycle/scooter and bike parking spaces - locked cages. Bike Friday is a GREAT Program. Wed, 5/23/07 7:35 PM

3. I don't know. More land swapping, more trade-offs? Tue, 5/15/07 10:36 AM
4. Dangle carrots to get thoughtful design and construction as described in #7. Monetary incentives alone (low interest loans, tax breaks, etc.) will not attract the cream of the crop but, rather, will attract those driven primarily by profit motive. Profit motive alone is not going to build a better Eugene! Tue, 5/15/07 10:12 AM
5. Property tax abatement, SDC waiver, public infrastructure provided by the city, free or deeply discounted property. Marketing and promotional assistance, LEED or alternative energy assistance. Fri, 5/11/07 5:47 PM
6. Gee, how about asking Arlie & Co.?? They don't seem to be struggling too much with getting highly dense projects off the ground. Fri, 5/11/07 11:11 AM
7. Hate to sound like a broken record, but design review. Over time, can point to successful developments as good examples for people with fear. It'd never get an ok from the city council, but consider some financial incentive for building that satisfies design review AND builds at some percentage greater than the minimum for a zone. Thu, 5/10/07 7:17 PM
8. • The concept of multiple use and its potential for densification without destabilizing neighborhoods must be well-understood by communities, . If people understand that density will occur somehow, and are included in the decision of how it is done, many would welcome the inclusion in problem-solving this sensitive issue. Thu, 5/10/07 4:04 PM
9. Giving neighbors a say in making sure the design will work; education, so that there is less fear; a clear pathway to approval (that includes the neighborhood association) so that developers know what they need to do to have their development approved. Wed, 5/9/07 9:43 PM
10. Dense housing requires parking. Perhaps only 1 space per unit, but still the parking hurdle is huge for dense housing. Broadway Place and the Tiffany Building were only possible because of the availability of adjacent structured parking. "Dense" housing in suburbia isn't very dense because it includes surface parking of at least 1.25 to 1.5 spaces per unit. This takes up a lot of land. Tue, 5/8/07 8:07 PM
11. Incentives could include City contributions toward public amenities that would benefit both the neighborhood and a dense housing complex. Parks, recreation centers, dedicated bike paths, and community centers could all help ease the transition to a denser urban fabric. Tue, 5/8/07 8:04 PM
12. Developers need to be asked - the co-housing stuff has been shot down again and again. What do they need? What would motivate them to serve the common good besides their pocketbook? Mon, 5/7/07 3:44 PM
13. If Eugene believes that it can guide its own growth successfully, it might need to establish regulatory procedures that it would itself follow and obtain financing for a demonstration project. If that is financially successful, then other developers could be found for additional projects. Fri, 5/4/07 5:22 PM
14. Partner with agencies and foundations supporting green design and innovative building / recycling techniques. Fri, 5/4/07 2:10 AM
15. Relax the set backs, parking, landscape requirements. Wed, 5/2/07 4:51 PM

16. Lower SDC rate for mid-rise apartments that achieve sustainable building practices and promote decreased reliance on the car. Eliminate required off-street parking or at least allow on-street parking to count towards meeting minimum. Projects that want to provide on-street parking to create more walkable streets (parked cars actually help slow the speed of traffic and are safer for pedestrians since the cars create a barrier between the moving vehicles and the sidewalk) are currently penalized. There is a hidden cost to parking - allow the developer to do their own market analysis and provide parking accordingly. Dense housing projects going through a PUD process appear to be required to explicitly identify any requested modifications to standards at the time of tentative PUD approval. Any minor adjustments discovered during the Final PUD process appears to be triggering the need for a separate Adjustment Review application. Please consider allowing the Final PUD process to include changes to standards providing the project as a whole is still found substantially consistent with the tentative. Otherwise, great design ideas that emerge in the final PUD phase will be dropped since they would require an entirely new application. Allow automatic rezoning to the appropriate City zoning classification following annexation based on the Metro Plan designation. Currently a separate zone change application is being required even if the land is designated for the proposed use. Create a fast track review process for dense housing that also uses Green Building practices or where the developer is seeking LEED certification. Create a fast track review process if the neighborhood group supports the project or raises no objections within a certain time frame. Wed, 5/2/07 10:47 AM

17. The City should assist in paying for some of the infrastructure costs. The 10 acre piece I mentioned earlier...the City wants all storm water dealt with on site...This is the last of 200 acres to be developed in this area, and now they want this added. It makes no common sense that the last 5% of the land in that area should not just dump into the storm drain. If the City wants this, and it will save the City money in storm water treatment later, then they should pay for it. Tue, 5/1/07 10:02 AM

18. incentives that encourage adoption of better-than-code energy efficiency (that will result in lower life-cycle costs) Mon, 4/30/07 3:13 PM

19. If the first project(s) are thoughtful and integrated well into their neighborhoods, other neighborhoods will be more trusting. Design and develop the first ones for maximum success before branching out with others that, presumably, will also be thoughtful developments. Mon, 4/30/07 9:19 AM

20. Regulatory and procedural are the most difficult barriers. Sun, 4/29/07 5:06 PM

21. Definitely NO SUBSIDIES!!! The developers laugh all the way to the bank! Sun, 4/29/07 12:09 PM

22. land cost is probably the most important Fri, 4/27/07 5:37 PM

23. See above Fri, 4/27/07 4:58 PM

24. The community needs to agree on density. We do not agree now. In fact many community activists aggressively oppose increased density. This will only change as we get examples of what good density looks like and when there is strong leadership in government promoting density. Fri, 4/27/07 4:51 PM

25. No suggestions on this area. Thu, 4/26/07 2:03 PM

26. 1) In designated areas, waiving real estate taxes for 10 years should be automatic, not a protracted city council debate that leaves the developer uncertain at the outset whether the tax break is available or not. 2) Increasing the height of wood frame construction could help significantly. 3) It appears to me that

the community desire for outcomes (particularly in the downtown area) doesn't match market rate economic reality. Assistance with some combination of land acquisition costs, demolition cost and hazardous material removal should be considered to be likely contributions to expects from the city. 4) Market rate developers are willing to operate in Eugene. But all of us look at the most lucrative and prudent choices we can make for our efforts. If the community wants us to work on something less lucrative or riskier than other choices, the community should be prepared to compensate for the risk or the profit or both. Thu, 4/26/07 1:48 PM

27. Decreasing the requirements for off-street parking in areas served by mass transit and in mixed use developments. Allow for row houses where this is not incompatible with adjacent existing housing. Educate the public about the negative impacts that they will personally experience as a result of sprawl such as higher taxes, slower response times of police and fire services, longer commutes and traffic congestion, greater air pollution, etc.--make the costs personal. Thu, 4/26/07 12:29 PM

28. Do not impose any system development fees. Allow the developer to design his own project. He should be good at what he does and he knows that if what he designs doesn't work then he won't make any money, so typically projects are designed so that they do work and do provide a return on investment for the developer. Why else would he want to do it. Provide low interest loans in specific areas where the city feels it important to have higher density. Withhold property tax payment for the first 10 years of the project. Streamline the development project so that a developer could submit a general design and density lay out, showing general building placement, general building height, set back requirements, landscape and parking areas, that would be allowed to be developed without any further input from the city or the neighborhood as long as he meets the parking, set back, open space, and landscaping requirements shown in his original approved tentative submission. The City could remove all fees, if there is some agreement as to keeping rents at a lower than normal amount for a specified period of time. You also need to make the process easier for the small owner and or developer. The incentives are typically for large units and or are so complicated that only the large developers can afford to do the paper work involved in getting the approval America was built by the common working man but all of the requirements and regulations involved in development are stacked against him. Thu, 4/26/07 11:15 AM

29. Use SDC's to encourage/discourage development where services are already available/unavailable. Seems obvious. If you develop downtown, which has great infrastructure, you should not be paying SDCs for instance. Wed, 4/25/07 9:27 PM

30. 1. Financial incentives such as low-interest loans, property tax breaks, etc. -- some targeted for low-income housing and some not (we need both). Including also low-income ownership programs. 2. Access to these financial programs for small, single-lot developers as well as larger companies. 3. Accurate information for the public about the benefits of density such as sustainability, community feeling, continued affordability, preservation of the UGB, etc. Wed, 4/25/07 8:57 PM

31. Realistically, incentives need to be kept to a minimum. The message to developers is that if incentives are needed to build, then there must be significant local problems with getting projects approved. Unless the intent is merely to develop a few projects, the key to getting denser housing in any volume is to create a good balance between desired community benefits and more dense housing. Are there community benefits that the community is willing to sacrifice in exchange for denser housing? Is the community willing to reduce setback, landscaping, solar, parking standards, etc. to increase density? If not, then the community has to recognize that denser housing has a lesser value to the community than other values. If that is the case, accept that and realize that denser housing is less likely to occur because the community does not in fact place a high priority on it. Wed, 4/25/07 9:48 AM

32. Despite the high moral ground often taken by opponents of this type of development, well-designed solutions presented in combination with regulatory safe-guards and property tax breaks or something like that would probably change people's minds. Wed, 4/25/07 9:14 AM

33. The MUPTI program is a good start, however, the boundaries are limited. They could be expanded in the downtown area. Long range planning and identification of areas where this might take place. Putting projects in piece meal stirs up neighbors and causes un-necessary delays. If there was a plan for where the dense housing might best be suited . . SDC waivers or discounts would be helpful. Tue, 4/24/07 5:50 PM

34. 1) Streamline land use and building permit approvals. Long delays put marginal but desirable projects in the red. To the degree developers can design to incentive-criteria, developers can bring proposals for approval that ought not require as much time to process. 2) Get State of Oregon support for creating "urban renewal districts" that are criteria-based. Since many local issues are encouraged by the state (e.g., ODOT's transportation goals), the state should be willing to authorize incentives. 3) Cover property "carrying costs" during the entire approval process timeframe. This would help with marginal projects and provide an incentive for the City to get it done. 4) Combine infill goals with sustainability and other City goals and add appropriate incentives. Tue, 4/24/07 3:37 PM

35. SDC's applied with some recognition of difference between a 10,000 sq. ft. house on big lot in south Eugene, versus an 800 sq. ft. infill apartment. Current set up provides disincentives to build smaller infill projects, as they are burdened with a disproportionate amount of SDC's, despite their being desirable, from a City planning viewpoint. Tue, 4/24/07 3:17 PM

36. Financial incentives can obviously help overcome some of the barriers. That said, I ultimately believe the issue needs to be looked at on a much bigger scale. Because the market seems to be the biggest issue, economic stimulus resulting in higher paying jobs in the area would go a long way toward stimulating a higher quality, better designed, dense housing product. Tue, 4/24/07 3:14 PM

37. 1. Fast tracking project (that meets established criteria) through planning and permit process. 2. Affordable construction insurance for condos Tue, 4/24/07 2:22 PM

38. Financial The time to obtain land use approval and secure permits has about doubled in the last 8 years or so. A lot of money is lost in holding costs over this time. Most developers I have worked with want to build good projects, and almost always want to give the city what they want. There is a lot of insecurity in not knowing what it going to come up during the process so they tend to be conservative. I think we could get much more density type projects if there was less of the unknown for the developers. i.e. Tue, 4/24/07 1:23 PM

39. Financial rewards (i.e. tax breaks) tied to density levels - higher density, more floors leads to greater tax incentives. Tue, 4/24/07 12:08 PM

40. Market studies establishing demand (user/buyer desires) and financial incentives/assistance to offset the price-point differences. Expedited land-use and procedural methodologies to cut the time between project initiation and occupancy and revenue generation and debt retirement (i.e. local mandates to have land-use approvals faster than mandated by the state like Springfield). An empowered, single "in-house staff" project advocate (for each project) that facilitates rapid, coordinated, and stable (as opposed to waffling) responses from staff in both the planning and the permitting phases. A special projects staff person (or more as projects increase) for opportunity siting projects. We also need to recognize where and when financial incentives are no longer necessary. This is something Portland realized too late in their financial assistance in the Pearl District. Once the fire was lit they no longer heeded to keep squirting lighter fluid onto the fire. Mon, 4/23/07 5:28 PM

41. Some of the incentives provided by the City of Eugene Green Building Demonstration project program would be appropriate; fee consultation with City staff, expedited plan review, ongoing help by staff with issues as they come up; marketing of the program to the public. Waivers of fees would be good, though of course the question comes how to compensate for the lost revenue.

Question 6: Thank you for your input! Please use this space to comment on anything we may have missed, or to describe any concerns you may have about Opportunity Siting. Include your name and email or phone number if you would like to be contacted by staff.

Survey Results:

answered question 32

skipped question 36

1. I am generally an advocate of dense housing and will eventually transition to such a housing option in my later years. But I am appalled by some of the development I see going on, which completely disregards a neighborhood's character, existing housing styles, heights, type, etc. If the City wants this type of housing to be successful, then add a level of necessary community acceptance to such development. Mon, 5/28/07 4:03 PM

2. #1 The loss of green space and the wildlife habitat loss doesn't seem to be very high on the agenda here. #2 Keeping downtown alive starts with the "donut neighborhoods" like the Friendly Area Neighbors and Amazon Neighbors and building in from there. #3 The importance of the bus service to the City of Eugene. #4 Sidewalks installed for walking would help a whole lot too. Wed, 5/23/07 7:41 PM

3. Hopefully, what will come out of this process is a way to live closer together within the UGB with enhanced, accessible and attractive neighborhoods rather than ugly, mismatched, concrete-filled neighborhoods. Thanks for the opportunity. Julie Schaum Tue, 5/15/07 10:41 AM

4. I hope that you take the time to really involve all parties, with neighborhood residents in the first seat. Creating a dialogue, and taking the time to process this issue before unveiling new plans or policies, is essential. There are already many citizens plugged into this issue, and working hard on it. Make use of this resource! Don't repeat the mistake made in 2000 or 2001, when zoning changes were implemented to encourage infill BEFORE effective guidelines were in place to ensure that the City's expressed goals are met. Quite the opposite has happened, and a lot of damage has been done. Don't put the cart before the horse, please! Tue, 5/15/07 10:17 AM

5. Gotta create incentive. Make it attractive to developers to participate, Fri, 5/11/07 5:49 PM

6. We're losing opportunity sites every day. Don't let the perfect be the enemy of the good; sooner is better for launching a comprehensive site ID process - not just 1 or 2 demo sites and five years go by. Thank you for working on this project. Thu, 5/10/07 7:19 PM

7. The issue of densification will very often invoke the quick and easy solution of expanding the urban growth boundary. This is especially true here in Santa Clara where developers see expanses of open land on our northern border. Yet here we value the farmers who still eke out a living on this land; and whose presence plays a large part in our illusion of being rural. Thu, 5/10/07 4:08 PM

8. When the code was revised to make R2 into R3, R3 into R4, and R4 even more dense, it ended up putting the largest burden of density on relatively few neighborhoods. Making duplexes an outright

permitted use in R1 just creates 2 units instead of one. Turning R3 into R4 adds far, far more - and without infrastructure to support it. West University is disproportionately targeted for density without additional services - water, sewer, parking, and OPEN SPACE!! We will have one very small park this fall, providing something like 1/4 acre for over 5000 people. This is grossly inadequate. As new multi-story buildings come in with 5' of space on each side and 15' in front, there is simply no where to go for open space. A four-foot balcony is not equivalent to parkland. I'm all for opportunity siting - but I'd like to see more park space in West University sited opportunately first. Wed, 5/9/07 9:49 PM

9. The current land use code does not insure compatible infill. For example, if you look at R-1, it appears that there are no restrictions on number of bedrooms for a "single family dwelling". In my neighborhood, near the university, 5 and 6 bedrooms are sprouting. It appears to me that someone could build 12 bedrooms in R-1 and still comply with the code. Either I am wrong or this is nuts. Tue, 5/8/07 8:10 PM

10. In the past, mixed use nodes were located in areas where the community did not necessarily gather. Example: In River Road and Santa Clara, the REAL major node is Santa Clara square near Beltline. Why not try to make that area more pedestrian friendly - adding more adjacent dense housing as well as parks? Some of that has happened (elderly housing), but the element of maintaining high quality of life for residents in that area hasn't happened. Where are the pedestrian corridors and nearby urban pocket-parks for Santa Clara square? Same goes for the big box developments out Bethel. The reality is that big box developments ARE commercial nodes. If we are going to continue to support big box development, why not include dense housing and parks adjacent to the commercial area and actually make these areas mixed use nodes? Or opportunity sites? Or whatever you want to call them..... Tue, 5/8/07 8:04 PM

11. In developing future surveys, investigate whether text screen readers can use them. I'm discouraged about the collaborative process working because decisions are made and then collaboration is attempted after the fact. Mon, 5/7/07 3:47 PM

12. Please continue to notify me of developments in the process. Thanks. Charles Snyder chasnyder@yahoo.com Fri, 5/4/07 5:24 PM

13. Create a blue print or vision for the future that is grounded in and starts with the existing homes and buildings. It is not a blank slate. Create a vision that improves the community, not just a more dense city. Wed, 5/2/07 4:53 PM

14. Great set of questions. I provided my initial thoughts but will certainly be pondering some of them further. Teresa Bishow teresa@arlie.com 344-5500 Wed, 5/2/07 10:48 AM

15. Good luck..... Tue, 5/1/07 10:02 AM

16. Joshua Skov, 341-4663 (sorry I don't have time for the voluminous responses I prefer to give) Mon, 4/30/07 3:13 PM

17. Increase access to planning commission for consultation in regard to zoning changes. Greg Roberts greg@koalabuilt.com Sun, 4/29/07 5:08 PM

18. Terri, you are doing a good job and should be commended for it. I don't trust the Planning Commission!!! Sun, 4/29/07 12:10 PM

19. Be focused on quality, not on quantity - THAT should be the goal and the opportunity to be realized. - Philip Farrington 686-3828 912-9281 Fri, 4/27/07 4:59 PM

20. These are tough questions for a short survey. Eric Gunderson AIA PIVOT Architecture 541 342 7291 Fri, 4/27/07 4:51 PM

21. Greg Pitts Jennings Pitts Development LLC 488 E. 11th Ave Eugene, OR 97401 greg@jenningspitts.com Thu, 4/26/07 1:48 PM

22. For further information you may contact me: Carlos Barrera 344-5599 justphone@gmail.com Thu, 4/26/07 12:31 PM

23. Boyd Iverson 541-686-8275 1872 Willamette St. Eugene, Or. 97401 boydiverson@hotmail.com Thu, 4/26/07 11:17 AM

24. It seems that "opportunity siting" may be seen as "spot zoning." Isn't that a legal no-no? Wed, 4/25/07 9:29 PM

25. My main concern is that the sites chosen will be developed by large companies whose owners don't live in the neighborhoods affected, and thus have less of a stake in the outcome re: community. My second biggest concern is that the dissemination of inaccurate information to neighborhood residents will lead to nothing being built, and the end of the UGB. I have tried to be very brief throughout this survey (not sure what length of answers your software allows). If anything is unclear, feel free to contact me: Susannah Meininger, 221-0964, susannah [at] cyber-dyne.com. Thank you for your hard work! Wed, 4/25/07 9:06 PM

26. Opportunity siting is probably a good idea if it can be made to work. I am going to make the same comment here that I made several years ago about nodal development. In the end, it is not the city or the neighborhood associations that will develop the sites that may be identified for opportunity siting - it is the private sector. Essentially, the city and neighborhoods will have to decide how badly they want identified sites developed at greater densities (assuming the infrastructure can it) and what they are willing to sacrifice to make it happen. That sacrifice will not typically need to come in terms of throwing money at projects. It needs to come in terms of reducing the time and costs required by the code to complete the project, because that is where the savings are to make the project profitable. I would discourage a lot of neighborhood input on each project and instead encourage the city and neighborhood groups to come up with clear and objective standards that would be acceptable. If the developer can design a project that meets those standards that pencils out, then the developer knows that he / she is good to go. Roxie Cuellar Director of Government Affairs Home Builders Association of Lane County 302-1410 roxie@hbalanecounty.org Wed, 4/25/07 11:20 AM

27. Part of the problem with the strategy being presented is that it makes everyone feel like a target. If there was a sense of strong purposeful planning behind it, you could clarify more specifically what areas of the city would be best served by using this strategy so that the real issues can be clarified. Wed, 4/25/07 9:17 AM

28. Opportunity siting is both exciting and scary. Will it be an engine for desirable inward growth or a bureaucratic nightmare no one wants to touch? Or even worse, a "special favors" program for insiders who have the time and resources to play the game (the current politics and players will not always be the same). I am a supporter of the concept and look forward to the results of your work! Steve Gab sgab@rainbowvalleyinc.com (541) 342-4871 Tue, 4/24/07 3:41 PM

29. I have developed over 100 units of infill housing over the last 10 years, in and around the urban core area, (1 mile from downtown) and - for better or worse - am probably more familiar with many aspects of the Zoning Ordinance than most citizens, and maybe some City Planners! I intend to find time in the next several months to go through a detailed review, section by section, of the zoning ordinance in depth,

regarding sections that are counter productive to allowing or fostering infill and densification. I do not have a simplistic "fox in the henhouse" mentality. I want us to do better, I want the pain spread around town, I want to accomplish real densification, not just participate in happy talk that sounds great and does nothing real, or worse, does real harm. I am also available to give my two cents on the processes in play (adoption of evermore complex and effective barriers to "I & D") that are currently being contemplated; someone needs to make it clear to the Planners and City leadership that you can't please everyone all the time, and that I & D comes with a cost, and requires some vision to realize that birthing a new City vision is not a painless process. However, deflecting all infill under guise of Standards and Neighborhood Review, and thus pushing development to the urban fringe and beyond, is also not desirable, and also comes at a cost, to the City at large, and the region. In this arena, there are no easy solutions, no simple answers. Every action has a reaction, and it all plays out in the common soup of "the housing market", where every unit added (or stopped) affects every other one. Eugene is rushing headlong towards being another rich man's town, where people on lower and middle area of economic spectrum cannot afford to buy or rent here, and are forced to commute to outlying Cities to find reasonably priced housing. Gordon Anslow Anslow & DeGeneault, Inc. Portfolio Builders, LLC Mallard Properties, Inc. wk 484-0070 gordon@adhomes.com Tue, 4/24/07 3:32 PM

30. I'm concerned that quality, compatible, medium-density neighborhood infill in established neighborhoods is going to be prohibited in favor of larger scale, high density development at the edge of neighborhoods. While I (1) understand neighborhood group and individual neighbor concerns about incompatible development and (2) agree that there are numerous examples of "bad" infill, I don't believe that we should move away from a transition to higher density in established neighborhoods. Rather, we should find ways to do it ways that enhance rather than reduce neighborhood character. Tue, 4/24/07 3:18 PM

31. How are you going to control market forces that will drive prices land up once those parcels are designated as "opportunity sites"? How will you streamline the entitlement process for sites which require a variance or zone change? I would like to be included on an email or mailing list regarding upcoming planning commission meetings and opportunity siting meetings. Chip Radebaugh 2020 Garfield Street Eugene, OR 97405 (541) 359-5444 Tue, 4/24/07 12:13 PM

32. As a resident of an inner-city R2 neighborhood, and as a business owner....and at the risk of having potentially alienated or offended all involved but having a sincere desire to see this program succeed, and deep beliefs that this process is headed in a very good direction, I sign this as... Brian D. McCarthy cmgsbrian@qwest.net 541 485.7385