

**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?**

**Locations**

- Schools- Jefferson Middle School  
Adams Elementary School  
Willard Elementary School  
(maintain some green space to go with it)
- Southwest corner of intersection of Maxwell and North Park
- Near natural areas (Diana's Pond), schools, walkable
- Bruner Dryer property on east side of River Road (great area for historic park)
- Razor Park Mixed Use Center sites  
On arterial, underdeveloped, slated as a MUC, near river and bike path.
- On the fringe of the established neighborhoods; size similar to nearby structures, i.e., Tate Condominiums
- Downtown Core (i.e., Broadway development areas)
- Along arterials at the edge of existing neighborhoods
- Between commercial complexes and established neighborhoods
- Mixed Use Centers identified in TransPlan
- Courthouse District
- Franklin Corridor
- Avoid areas near UGB unless there is a commercial area nearby
- Union Pacific property near River Road
- Westmoreland Housing land
- Light-Medium industrial land in Bethel
- Land adjacent to big box developments/Turn into mixed-use node areas
- Expansion areas in north and west Eugene (compact housing instead of McMansions)
- Sites within walking distance of downtown (i.e., riverfront areas)
- In areas with existing dense housing, services and public transportation
- Old ODOT property north of E. 15th Ave, near EmX
- Coburg Road area
- Railroad Yard
- Vacant site at W. 15th between Olive and Charnelton; Map17033143 TL1000
- North Gilham area (out of "rush hour" part of town)
- 13th and Chambers Marine/Naval Reserve center
- Former lodge at 13th and Chambers
- Civic Stadium
- Remainder of EWEB site
- Around new federal courthouse
- Property of Southwood/Fairway Loop near Reed and Cross
- Eugene Planning Mill District
- Peace Health clinic downtown (former Eugene Clinic site)
- West 11th beyond Chambers
- Spread throughout city/Each neighborhood identify several
- Temple Beth Israel site
- 23 sites within 25<sup>th</sup> and Olive, suitable for single family infill, five are for duplex.
- Madison Meadow (22nd and Madison)
- 11th and Chambers intersection/13th and Chambers intersection
- Areas where existing housing has been allowed to deteriorate/upgrade declining areas with infill.
- Focus public assistance on areas in need of improvement
- Micro locations close to urban services
- Upgrade declining areas
- Between 8th and 12th and Almaden and Hayes
- Between Willamette and Amazon Park 25th to 34th
- Areas served by BRT now or in the future

**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?**

- Height/Mass/Scale
- Landscaped buffers
- Sidewalks
- Parking
- Street Trees
- Driveways
- Lights respecting night sky
- Architectural design is more important to some neighborhoods than others. Everything does not have to look like a "pretend" craftsman home.
- Scale and density compatible with existing development
- Cookie cutter design
- Lots too small
- Too much concrete
- Lack of natural drainage in new development/River Road in particular
- Think of this as if it happening in your own neighborhood, or next door
- Traffic congestion and noise, parking
- Need mix of owner occupant and rental in infill
- Training for landlords on how to be good neighbors
- Options for housing without parking/commitment to no car, shared vehicle arrangements
- Contextual fit
- Never use to redevelop existing neighborhoods
- Noise in student-oriented multiplexes in single family neighborhoods
- Architectural design/good design can address views (back yard look-over)
- Blend with/preserve neighborhood character (historical)
- Real open space-West University neighborhood
- Opportunities for owner occupancies
- Alternative transit amenities (bike paths and sidewalks)
- Massing and solar issues for multi-family housing more difficult in single family neighborhood
- Visual privacy to existing neighborhood yards
- Buffers
- Sustainability/allow variations in design to achieve Green Building practices
- Common meeting ground/park
- Parking is not important
- Flexible architectural design rules
- Location and scale in comparison to existing homes
- Connectivity between denser housing and existing street and pedestrian routes
- Allow height mass and scale to vary from surrounding development
- The denser housing should offer a different housing option (dwelling, building type)
- Avoid use of terms like "buffers"; landscaping should be attractive and not meant to screen the new housing from existing neighborhoods. In contrast it should add to the unique characteristics of the neighborhood.

- Minimize impacts of parking; access from alley where possible/allow on-street parking/reduce requirement for off-street parking.
- Integrate all the design features into site-specific design
- First, protection of investment, then quality of life.
- To avoid "NIMBYist tract" , increase buy-in and targeted incentives for development in certain areas (i.e., nodes)
- Reasonable density for the surroundings
- See CAFHN standards; they would vary by neighborhood
- Design is most important
- Will local market demand accommodate high rise development? If densities are to increase in relation to surrounding context, then design can lead the way. Development segue from lower to higher density in "model fashion".
- Wide sidewalks
- Emotionally, almost everyone wants the density somewhere else.
- Perceived loss of pocket park (where new structures are built)
- Good design can mitigate problems, but builders or their clients are more concerned with profit than with negative impact on neighbors.
- Loss of privacy and felling hemmed-in
- Just have to accept height, mass, scale, parking, noise that go with high density.
- Neither the City or especially the neighborhood should be involved in "Architectural design" issues.
- Solar access
- Don't attract drug dealers as tenants
- Include owned and rented units
- Neighborhood groups and residents to determine compatibility; however, to be successful, opportunity sites should pencil out.
- Minimize financial, procedural and other incentives; developers leery of incentives.
- "Fit" of scale and character; avoid areas surrounded by single family dwellings.
- Higher density can fit into single family dwelling areas if mass of the units is broken down to appropriate scale and parking is handled sensitively.
- High quality construction methods
- Shouldn't look like "something new"
- Compatibility cannot be broken down into easily regulated standards.
- Housing that encourages owner-occupancy should be encouraged in neighborhoods with high existing owner-occupants.
- Consider "forward compatibility" in addition to "backward compatibility" (in time). New buildings should be compatible with what might not be built for another 50 years.
- Very hard to legislate architecture
- Densification will not happen to any appreciable degree if a precondition is that all residents must approve it.
- Privacy concerns/window and balcony placement
- Limit on number of cars owner can have
- Property upkeep on rentals
- Location / good on busier streets larger scale is more acceptable on busy street corners
- Good site planning: doorway, window, outdoor private and public space, pedestrian & vehicle access placement is crucial.
- Focus on performance rather than prescriptive measures;
- Have a broad set of policy statements and objectives regarding issues of importance to 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.

## Question 4b: What types of compatibility criteria should be incorporated into the process for opportunity siting?

- Additional communication with neighborhood associations?
- Additional regulatory criteria or design standards?
- Design review by a body such as the Planning Commission?
- Communication with and approval by neighborhood associations should be incorporated into the process.
  - Involve neighbors and neighborhood leaders in developing a process.
  - Either local neighborhood design review boards or a mechanism for local input to a city-wide design review board.
- Design review by a commission composed partly of neighborhood residents.
- Design review by the Planning Commission when there are differences of opinion.
- Neighborhood associations should have the ability to establish compatibility criteria to the design and nature of the neighborhood; the Planning Commission should not be involved in design review.
- Neighborhood associations should be involved with pre-development consultations.
- Implement design review in regard to size, proximity to services, adequate infrastructure.
- Work with neighborhoods on a case by case basis to improve urban design quality with regulations or design review
- Require approval of the neighborhood association/community in order for an application to be approved by the Planning Commission.
- Establish a reasonable limit to neighborhood involvement.
- Projects can become derailed with multiple, diverse, conflicting public involvement.
- Communication with neighborhoods is important but can become too lengthy
- Timing is essential to get a project moving
- Involve true neighbors not just neighborhood activists.
- Recognize that the developer of a project may also be one of the neighbors with legitimate input.
- The City is perhaps setting up unreasonable expectations that people other than the property owner can dictate the ability to develop a site despite existing zoning and allowed uses.
- These developing policies are likely to encourage legal challenges.
- Consider an appointed design review group, including neighborhood members, to rate a project according to a point system.
- Consider a review body that includes volunteer designers, engineers, architects.
- Consider developing a Eugene Development Commission modeled after the “best” of what the Portland Development Commission has accomplished.
- The City should not be involved in regulating design; require preliminary neighborhood meetings and support with an appeal avenue to a community-wide body.
- Upon direction from Planning Commission and City Council, Planning staff should administer neighborhood involvement in regard to identifying opportunity sites within respective neighborhood boundaries and specification of development standards on a site specific basis.
- Establish process for neighborhood review and suggestion, but final decisions should be at City staff/Planning Commission level.
- Design review should be by both the Planning Commission and neighborhood organizations.
- Design review should be at staff level or a subcommittee of the Planning Commission with a member of ARB.
- If citizen review body, include at least two design professionals and at least one member with experience in the construction field.

- Establish a means of documenting and reporting results of review body meetings and decisions.
- Use collaborative approaches to prevent paralysis due to conflict.
- Encourage cooperative, collaborative approach in the process but especially between developers and neighborhood associations.
- Add criteria and design standards for each neighborhood based on an area's type, density, style, height, etc.
- Additional planting requirements (trees, scrubs, landscape) can offset effect of increased density.
- Important design standards:
  - Window and balcony placement
  - Solar shadow
  - Building siting
  - Placement of noise sources
- Develop neighborhood compatibility ratios such that proposed development had a similar ratio of height, landscaping, setback, etc, as adjoining properties.
- Design standards and review are critical.
- Develop policies to allow for flexibility in regard to existing land use code and development criteria; develop performance criteria instead of design or development regulations.
- Establish flexibility to craft design standards that will be tailored to site specific needs and constraints.
- Design review should provide an alternate path that allows the developer to present development plans to a public body and would allow for more flexibility than a prescriptive path and create more accountability for maintaining neighborhood compatibility.
- Design standards should address green building and sustainability concepts.
- Set performance goals, but limit regulatory requirements.
- Use performance related design standards for site planning
- Site (landscape), architecture, and building architecture should be the focus. Do not focus on prescriptive measures and requirements
- Look at elements of other codes and communities, including smaller communities like Ashland.
- Site Review is helpful; although, it may be an impediment to take everything to the Planning Commission.
- When considering criteria, take into account how timelines affect financial viability of projects.
- Design standards should not be prescriptive in a way that encourages development that just mimics existing development in surrounding area.
- Establish flexibility in the land use code to allow professionals to design projects that work.
- Incentive based criteria are better than restrictions:
  - Concept behind urban renewal districts could be applied to desirable criteria rather than desirable area.
  - Give points for neighborhood support
- Proximity to public transportation
- Affordability
- Sustainability
- To high scoring projects:
  - Tax breaks
  - Subsidize infrastructure improvements, perhaps offset SDCs
- Implement 'existing' code regulations, such as outdoor lighting standards.
- Eliminate or modify current design standards.
- Reward or provide incentives for quality design; avoid additional required steps or costs to process.

**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?**

**Barriers:**

- Public Acceptance (inadequate public transit) (people want more, not less space (insufficiently dispersed commercial areas))
- Political
- Acceptance
- Willing developers
- Available sites
- There aren't tremendous barriers
- Developers perception of the market
- Fear of change by neighborhood residents
- Lack of courage on the city council
- NIMBY
- Design and location
- Market barriers
- Code
- 2001 "update" moved us further from a modern, useful land use code
- Developers and neighborhood
- Need a structure and process
- Regulations
- Market response to cost of developing mid-rise residential tested (need all stakeholders involved)
- By true citizen involvement
- Real, hands-on participation
- Parking requirements, site plan review process
- Respond quickly to market trends
- Timely construction schedule
- Complex, lengthy processes for amending adopted plans and zoning map to increase the supply
- 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
- Over-regulate
- Cost for land
- Availability of cheap land at the urban fringe
- Zoning regulation
- Rubber stamp
- Disagreement at the city council level
- City policy makers and some planners
- Minimum of regulatory obstacles
- Dense housing in the downtown area is extremely expensive
- The market in Eugene yields higher returns for quality lower density development than for "high density" development
- Force the higher density development via regulatory fiat is to reduce quality, encourage sites to remain undeveloped/underdeveloped
- Construction costs in Eugene meet or exceed the costs in Portland
- Financing gap
- Infill standards
- 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
- HIGH unnecessary systems development fees
- Incentive for smaller projects
- Uncertainty of approval then have it turned down because it is "not compatible"
- Compatibility is a very hard target to hit or tie down
- 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
- Market barriers exist but seem to be easing
- No meaningful City incentives to do infill
- Scaling down of requirements (such as parking area landscape buffering) in recognition of effect on developing small lots
- I don't necessarily believe that regulations in general are a barrier outside downtown
- Construction costs on buildings over three stories (more land available for SFD's)
- Available only to the upper tiers on the socio-economic scale
- Tenant screening
- Code requirements that create a cost
- Cultural barriers
- Property size
- Land use code is very limiting
- Cost of professionals
- Cost of stormwater management
- Cost of regulation
- Development "soft" costs
- Increase carrying costs and reduce internal rates of return

**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.**

- Procedural incentives for developers to gain public input
- Better bus system
- Land swapping, more trade-offs
- Dangle carrots to get thoughtful design and construction
- Property tax abatement
- SDC waiver
- Public infrastructure
- Deeply discounted property
- Marketing and promotional assistance
- Energy assistance
- Financial incentive for building that satisfies design review AND builds at some percentage greater than the minimum for a zone
- (Neighbor) inclusion in problem solving this sensitive issue
- Education, so that there is less fear (by neighbors)
- Clear pathway to approval (that includes the neighborhood association)
- Parking hurdle is huge for dense housing
- Availability of adjacent structured parking
- City contributions toward public amenities
- Parks, recreation centers, dedicated bike paths, and community centers
- Developers need to be asked - What would motivate them to serve the common good besides their pocketbook
- Obtain financing for a demonstration project
- Partner with agencies and foundations supporting green design and innovative building
- Relax the set backs, parking, landscape requirements
- 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 count towards meeting minimum
- Allow automatic rezoning to the appropriate City zoning classification following annexation based on the Metro Plan designation
- 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
- The City should assist in paying for some of the infrastructure costs
- 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, they should pay for it
- Incentives that encourage adoption of better-than-code energy efficiency
- (To create trust in) neighborhoods, design and develop the first ones for maximum success before branching out with others
- Definitely NO SUBSIDIES!!!
- Land cost

- (Community agreement) on density
- Get examples of what good density looks like
- Strong leadership in government promoting density
- In designated areas, waiving real estate taxes for 10 years should be automatic, not a protracted city council debate
- Increasing the height of wood frame construction could help significantly (building code)
- Assistance with some combination of land acquisition costs
- Demolition costs
- Hazardous material removal
- Market rate developers are willing to operate in Eugene 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
- Decreasing the requirements for off-street parking in areas served by mass transit
- 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 time of police and fire services, longer commutes and traffic congestion, greater air pollution, etc. - make costs personal
- Do not impose any system development fees
- Allow the developer to design his own project to provide a return on investment for the developer. Why else would he want to do it
- Low interest loans on specific areas
- Streamline the development project so that a developer could submit a general design and density lay out 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

- Make the process easier for the small owner and developer
- Use SDCs to encourage/discourage development where services are already available/unavailable
- Financial incentives such as low-interest loans, property tax breaks
- Low-income ownership programs
- Access to these financial programs for small, single-lot developers as well as larger companies
- Accurate information for the public about the benefits of density
- Realistically, incentives need to be kept to a minimum
- The key is to create a good balance between desired community benefits and more dense housing
- Is the community willing to reduce setbacks, 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
- Well-designed solutions
- Regulatory safe-guards
- Property tax breaks
- (Expand) MUPTI program
- If there was a plan for where the dense housing might best be suited
- SDC waivers or discounts

- Streamline land use and building permit approvals
- Incentive criteria
- Get State of Oregon support for creating "urban renewal districts"
- Cover property "carrying costs" during the entire approval process timeframe
- SDC's applied with some recognition of difference between 10,000 sq ft house on big lot in south
- Eugene, versus an 800 sq ft infill apartment
- 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
- Fast tracking project (that meets established criteria) through planning and permit process
- Affordable construction insurance for condos
- Most developers I have worked with want to build good projects, and almost always want

to give the city what they want. There is also a lot of insecurity in not knowing what is going to come up during the process so they tend to be conservative

- Less of the unknown for the developers
- Financial rewards (i.e., tax breaks tied to density levels - higher density (more floors) leads to greater tax incentives
- Market studies establishing demand
- Empowered, single "in-house staff" project advocate (for each project) that facilitates rapid, coordinated, and stable responses from staff in both the planning and the permitting phases
- We also need to recognize where and when financial incentives are no longer necessary
- Fee consultation with City staff, expedited plan review, ongoing help by staff with issues as they come up
- Marketing the plan to the public

**Question 6: Please use this space to comment on anything we may have missed, or to describe any concerns you may have about Opportunity Siting.**

**Other Comments:**

- Loss of green space and wildlife habitat loss
- Keeping downtown alive starts with the "donut neighborhoods" like the Friendly Area Neighbors and Amazon Neighbors
- Sidewalks
- Don't repeat the mistake made in 2000 or 2001, when zoning changes were implemented to encourage infill BEFORE effective guidelines were in place
- A lot of damage has been done
- Create incentive. Make it attractive to developers to participate
- 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
- Expanding the Urban Growth Boundary
- The quick and easy solution
- Here we value the farmers who still eke out a living on this land (outside the UGB)
- When the code was revised to make R2 into R3, R3 into R4, and R4 even more dense
- West University is disproportionately targeted for density without additional services - water, sewer, parking, and OPEN SPACE!!! We still have one very small park this fall, providing something like 1/4 acre for over 5000 people. This is grossly inadequate.
- I'm all for opportunity siting - but I'd like to see more park space in West University sited opportunity first
- Current land use code does not insure compatible infill
- If you look at R-1, it appears that there are no restrictions on number of bedrooms for a "single family dwelling"
- It appears to me that someone could build 12 bedrooms in R-1 and still comply with code
- 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 (make existing nodes more pedestrian friendly and add adjacent dense housing)
- The reality is that big box developments ARE commercial nodes. Why not include dense housing and parks adjacent to the commercial area and actually make these areas mixed use nodes
- In developing future surveys, investigate whether text screen readers can use them
- Create a blue print or vision for the future that is grounded in and starts with the existing homes and buildings
- Increase access to planning commission for consultation in regard to zoning changes
- Be focused on quality, not quantity - THAT should be the goal
- It seems that "opportunity siting" may be seen as "spot zoning"
- My main concern is (developers who) don't live in the neighborhoods affected, and thus have less of a stake in the outcome re: community.
- Concern is that the dissemination of inaccurate information to neighborhood residents will lead to nothing being built

- Opportunity siting is probably a good idea if it can be made to work
- In the end, it is not the city or neighborhood associations that will develop the sites that may be identified for opportunity siting - it is the private sector
- Sacrifice 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
- Part of the problem with the strategy being presented is that it makes everyone feel like a target
- Opportunity siting is both exciting and scary. Will it be an engine for desirable inward growth or a bureaucratic nightmare
- Someone needs to make it clear to 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
- Pushing development to the urban fringe and beyond, is also not desirable
- 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"
- 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
- I'm concerned that quality, compatible, medium-density neighborhood infill in established neighborhoods is going to be prohibited in favor of large scale, high-density development at the edge of neighborhoods
- We should find ways to do it ways that enhance rather than reduce neighborhood character
- 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 have) having a sincere desire to see this program succeed, and deep beliefs that this process is headed in a very good direction.