

Strategy 1: Remove land use code barriers

Option	Explanation
1. Revise land use code to encourage Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) in all single-family zones.	<i>No new information based on straw poll</i>
2. Revise land use code to allow Single-Room Occupancy (SROs) by-right in all residential zones.	SRO's are defined as a building with individual bedrooms that share bath and kitchen facilities. SRO's are currently only allowed outright in R-3, R-4, C-2 and C-3 zones. Eugene has seen very limited demand for this housing type in the past and what has been built is primarily group homes for elderly individuals or for homeless veterans.
3. Revise land use code to allow for development of more diverse "missing middle" housing types.	<i>No new information based on straw poll</i>
3-A. Enable by-right housing options, including duplexes, triplexes, cottage clusters, and smaller homes on smaller lot sizes in all single-family zones.	<i>No new information based on straw poll</i>
3-B: Enable by-right housing options along key corridors.	<p>Envision Eugene calls for increased development along six key corridors (shown on the Comprehensive Plan map in the Glossary). As an incremental step toward full implementation of the community vision that was established in Envision Eugene, Eugene could allow missing middle housing types on portions of key corridors currently zoned for single family housing, for example on Coburg Road and River Road.</p> <p>Option 11 would make a more complete change to implement the full community vision established in Envision Eugene but will require more steps to implement.</p>
3-C: Enable more missing middle in green fields or large subdivisions.	Missing middle housing types could be allowed in newly developing areas (greenfields—undeveloped/vacant land). These types could also be allowed on development sites over a certain size, such as two acres.
4. Revise land use code to ease development standards for adaptive re-use (converting an existing non-residential building—such as a church—into residential).	<p><i>Minimal new information based on straw poll</i></p> <p>Allow existing non-residential buildings, such as churches, in residential areas to be remodeled into housing units more easily. This would require changing the land use code to remove special permit requirements like adjustment review, which adds cost and process time to a housing project and allows for appeals.</p>

Strategy 1: Remove land use code barriers

Option	Explanation
4-A. Improve the adjustment review process for adaptive re-use.	
5. Enable more multi-family development along key corridors. (See glossary for a map of Eugene’s key corridors.)	<i>No new information based on straw poll</i>
5-A: Create a ‘key corridor overlay’ (with design standards), which allows multi-family development on all key corridors.	<p><i>Minimal new information based on straw poll</i></p> <p>A medium-impact way to implement the community vision established in Envision Eugene along corridors. This option would enable multi-family development in areas currently zoned for single-family use along portions of Coburg and River Road, for example. Relates to Option 3b, which would allow only missing middle housing types along these corridor segments. Relates to Option 11, which would enable development envisioned across the community by changing zoning to match the Comprehensive Plan map (see map in Glossary).</p>
5-B: Reduce parking requirements for certain multi-family housing types along key corridors	A way to reduce development requirements and costs for housing that is envisioned along the key corridors.
6. Replace current code with a form-based code.	For a more complete explanation of form-based code see https://formbasedcodes.org/definition/
6-A: Create a city-wide form-based code, which would replace the current land use code.	Rewriting the entire land use code as a form-based code (focused on the design, shape and size of the buildings, rather than the uses inside them) would be a very large undertaking, involving extensive public involvement, legal review, and a formal adoption process. Impact on housing availability and diversity would be long term and limited because the form-based code would only apply as redevelopment or new development occurs.
6-B: Create form-based codes in certain areas.	Form-based codes could also be used for specific areas of the city. Codes that include form-based standards already exist in the Franklin Boulevard/Walnut Street area, and at the Downtown Riverfront. These codes are typically developed to implement a visioning and master planning process for special areas of the city.
7. Remove neighborhood-specific zoning.	<i>No new information based on straw poll</i>
7-A: Review, evaluate, and adjust neighborhood-specific zoning.	Several areas of the city include zoning that was developed to apply to only a small portion of the city. Over time, the land use code has grown in size and complexity as more neighborhood-specific or special-area zones were completed. In some cases, these zones include barriers to housing

Strategy 1: Remove land use code barriers

Option	Explanation
	production, such as more specific design and density requirements, that don't exist citywide. A review of these zones, through a code audit, could uncover barriers that would be worthwhile to consider removing. See Option 9.
8. Activate "Opportunity Siting" Program.	Opportunity Siting was originally proposed as a way to proactively identify good sites for multi-family housing in exchange for incentives such as SDC reductions or density increases. Although agreement was not reached about acceptable process and incentives, this approach is folded into ongoing Envision Eugene work, which envisions increasing density and offering incentives along corridors, or in other places identified through a neighborhood planning process.
9. Complete land use code audit of regulatory barriers to housing.	<i>No new information based on straw poll</i>
10. Scrap the zoning code.	<i>No new information based on straw poll</i>
10-A: Re-write the zoning code.	It would be a monumental undertaking to re-write the entire zoning code. The end outcome could be as minor as changes to the code suggested as options throughout Strategy 1 or as comprehensive as changing to a citywide form-based code (Option 6)
11. Align Zoning map with Comprehensive Plan map (currently <i>Metro Plan's</i> Plan Diagram).	<p>The Comprehensive Plan map documents Eugene's long-term plan for using land within the UGB. The Zoning map does not completely align with the Comprehensive Plan map—typically the Comprehensive Plan map allows higher densities than the Zoning map. Property owners can apply to have the zone changed if it doesn't match the Comprehensive Plan map, but it is a lengthy administrative process that adds cost, time, and uncertainty.</p> <p>Some cities, including Bend, have aligned their Plan map and their Zoning map, effectively handling zone changes for property owners to remove time and cost barriers to development envisioned by the city.</p> <p>This option is the most impactful of a range of options that would implement the Envision Eugene community vision more incrementally (Options 3b, 5a). Aligning the two maps would impact land all over the city, not just on corridors, but would be an extensive and time-consuming process.</p>
50: Add pre-approved ADU plans.	ADUs can be built in a variety of styles and shapes to fit different lots in Eugene. A set of building plans for different styles could be developed and pre-approved by the City, reducing time and cost for individual property owners who would like to build an ADU. This option would likely have a small impact on the overall housing need, but would be a likely benefit to some individuals who want to build an ADU.

Strategy 1: Remove land use code barriers

Option	Explanation
52: Allow for additional housing units on major streets.	This is similar to Options 3a, 3b, and 5a, but would expand housing options on major streets that are not key corridors, for example Hilyard, 24 th , Irvington, or Harlow. The additional housing types allowed could be duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, rowhouses, cottage clusters, small apartments, or any subset of these options.
53: Revisit/revise land use code to allow for more tiny homes/tiny communities.	Collections of tiny homes such as Emerald Village are restricted in where they may be placed, and must go through an appealable land use process such as a Planned Unit Development (PUD). A tiny home ordinance could be created that allows tiny homes or tiny home communities (typically under 400 square feet) in more places and with less process. As single-family detached units, tiny homes consume more land per unit than multi-story dwelling units and require individual water and sewer connections, which can be costly.

Strategy 2: Reduce cost and time burden for development of housing

Option	Explanation
12. Adjust System Development Charges (SDCs) program to reduce development costs for market-rate housing that are smaller and lower cost.	Strategic Economics will provide a discussion of SDCs at Meeting 4 on November 28.
12-A: Delay the collection of SDCs until a property is ready to receive its certificate of occupancy.	
12-B: Reduce SDCs for multi-family developments in the downtown and along key corridors.	
12-C: Reduce SDCs for ADUs.	
12-D: Reduce SDCs for all “missing middle” housing types.	
12-E: Place a cap on the SDC waiver.	NEW
12-F: Scale SDCs to the size and impact of what’s built.	NEW
13. Revise the land use appeal process, with shared costs for recovery of legal fees by the prevailing party.	The cost and process of land use appeals varies depending on the type of land use application and the appealing party. There is no straightforward formula.
14. Revise the Multi-Unit Property Tax Exemption (MUPTE) program for market-rate housing.	The MUPTE program exempts new multi-family housing developments from property taxes of the construction value for up to 10 years (taxes are still due on the land). The exemption lowers the operating costs for new developments in the early years of operation and can help shift a new development from <i>not</i> financially feasible to feasible. The program is currently active in the downtown and it could be extended to other parts of the City, especially to encourage development along major roads.
14-A. Extend the MUPTE boundary to include key corridors (see glossary).	
14-B. Simplify the criteria that must be met to receive an exemption.	

Strategy 2: Reduce cost and time burden for development of housing

Option	Explanation
	required analysis, and meets the criteria, yet can have the application rejected by City Council.
15. Improve the Clear and Objective standards.	<i>No new information based on straw poll</i>
16. Streamline/speed up the permitting process. Prioritize staff dedicated to the building and land use permitting processes for certain housing types.	<i>No new information based on straw poll</i>
17. Advocate to change Oregon law to reduce liability requirements for condominium projects.	At present, development of condominiums (owner-occupied apartments) is limited due to the high risk of lawsuits for construction defects. The City could support legislation at the state level that would create more reasonable limits on developer liability.
18. Complete land use code audit of <i>process</i> barriers to housing production.	Option 9 is also a land use code audit. The option is repeated here because the audit fits under both strategies 1 and 2 (i.e., it will examine land use <i>code</i> barriers, as well as <i>process (relating to cost and time)</i> barriers to production of housing.
19. Provide funding assistance to connect infrastructure to residential land identified in Eugene’s Buildable Lands Inventory.	<p>Undeveloped lands within the UGB often lack essential infrastructure, such as water and sewer, to develop, especially around the perimeter of the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). Developers have reported that the cost of extending infrastructure to these sites is so costly that it makes it not financially feasible to construct housing.</p> <p>Publicly constructed infrastructure to serve undeveloped land is traditionally funded by a combination of SDCs and assessments. SDC credits are currently offered to offset the cost of privately constructed infrastructure to undeveloped lands. Assessments are levied on each property that benefits from the project in accordance with City Code. Other sources of public funds would need to be acquired to provide additional financial assistance and incentive.</p>
51: Change state law regarding SUPTE	Single Unit Property Tax Exemption. A property tax exemption for new single-family development, similar to MUPTE, Option 14. State laws allow the City to enact a property tax exemption for multi-family housing; it does not allow an exemption for single-family housing.

Strategy 3: Increase inventory of and access to Affordable Housing units

Option	Explanation
20. Identify new Revenue sources for Affordable housing units.	<p>Working group support the idea of Option 20 but did not have definitive support for any of the listed ways to actually do this. For ALL sub-options- Consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Variations in flexibility (what \$ could be used for) • Volume/scale of impact (revenue generated) • Impact on development feasibility • Trade-offs (\$\$ from the general fund)
20* Implement top idea first then, depending on outcome, implement next most supported item.	NEW: Council will ultimately have to decide where to begin with these options. Phasing favorable options in over time is already a likely outcome
20-A. Shift money from the City's General Fund, which would shift funding from other City services, to support Affordable Housing.	Straw polling suggest this is unpopular given trade-offs to cuts in other services.
20-B. Charge a construction excise tax (CET) to raise resources for Affordable housing developments.	See additional document/presentation regarding CETs. CET revenue may be used for a wide range of capital costs as well as housing programs including down-payment assistance, and other housing support. Staff analysis estimated that a 1% Residential CET would generate about \$1 million per year and a 1% Commercial CET would generate about \$2 million per year. The CET is applied to the value of the improvement only and not to the land value.
20-C. Use local government bonds to fund the construction of Affordable housing developments.	<p>Local government bonds may now be used to fund the construction and/or preservation costs of Affordable housing development.</p> <p>To use a bond, a City's voters must approve a bond (for some dollar amount and specific purpose) and the City borrows that dollar amount. The City's taxpayers pay off the bond through property taxes.</p> <p>The impact a bond could have on Affordable housing depends on the size of the bond, which can vary widely. For example, in 2018, School District 4J voters approved a \$319 million bond; in 2012 Willamalane Parks District voters approved a \$20 million bond. The cost to individual property owners will vary based on their property's taxable value and the size of the bond.</p>
20-D. Charge an Affordable housing impact fee.	There is not a clearly legal mechanism to do this with Oregon's current state law.
20-E: Charge a CET on a sliding scale by the size of the development (especially	NEW- See Option 20-B. Establish a CET structure that charged a higher percentage of larger homes and a smaller percentage of smaller homes.

Strategy 3: Increase inventory of and access to Affordable Housing units

Option	Explanation
residential) (<i>variation on 20-B</i>)	
20-F: Create a working group to study this option in depth and include sensible recommendations.	NEW- Depending on this (current) Working Group’s recommendation, Council could decide that this option needs more study and could convene a new working group to examine this specific option in more depth. Council directed the Housing Policy Board to develop a recommendation on CETs. Their work concluded in April of 2018.
21. Increase density bonus for qualified Affordable housing	<i>No new information based on straw poll</i>
22. Inclusionary Zoning (IZ).	<i>No new information based on straw poll</i>
22-A: Mandatory IZ—Under state law, this could apply to any buildings with 20 or more units. State law requires that mandatory IZ include incentives (Ex: density bonus).	<i>No new information based on straw poll</i>
22-B: Voluntary IZ—Make IZ optional but create incentives (Ex: SDC waivers, density bonus) to encourage market-rate developers to include Affordable units.	Explain with reference to incentives- SDC or otherwise and related costs/drawbacks. City incentives for affordable housing are already available to market-rate developers who wish to include affordable rental or homeownership units in their developments. Additional study would be needed to determine if additional incentives would be effective.
23. Require that housing meets needs identified by specific populations.	<i>No new information based on straw poll</i>
24. Help low and moderate-income households purchase a home, such as navigators to support the purchase process and down-payment assistance, (help people move up the housing ladder).	Minimal new information based on straw poll- The City used to provide down-payment assistance with HUD (federal) funds but increasing housing costs and declining federal funds reduced the number of households the City could help. The program’s administrative costs per household increased, and the City redirected the funds to other programs that could be more impactful.
25. Help low and moderate-income households keep their homes safe or stay in their home, such as emergency home repair and foreclosure assistance (homeowner assistance).	<i>No new information based on straw poll</i>

Strategy 3: Increase inventory of and access to Affordable Housing units

Option	Explanation
26. Establish a community fund to help new renters.	Many renters lack the resources necessary to pay the upfront costs necessary to move into an apartment even if they have enough monthly income to pay the rent. Estimated assistance needed per household is \$2,000 (\$100,000 would support 50 households) plus the cost of program administration.
27. Expand Eugene’s land banking program for Affordable housing. Identify more flexible funding sources.	<i>No new information based on straw poll</i>
28: Create a community land trust as a tool to provide Affordable, ownership housing.	<i>No new information based on straw poll</i>
29. Advocate to the State to change laws regarding residential prevailing wage rates for Affordable housing with ground floor commercial uses (allow for split determination from BOLI).	The City could advocate to elected state officials to change applicable laws. The success of the efforts depends on the political opposition to such a change. The change would apply to Affordable projects with ground-floor commercial uses, which are likely to be those located in city centers.
30. Loan guarantees-use City funds as backing for loans to help fund Affordable housing developments.	City of Eugene already provides loans for housing rehabilitation, acquisition, and development using our federal funds. It is unclear if loan guarantees are a form of financing that affordable housing developers need.
31. Waive System Development Charges (SDCs) entirely for qualifying Affordable units.	Eugene provides a limited pool of SDC exemptions for affordable housing however this pool is no longer sufficient to support the typical multifamily affordable housing project. Exemptions do not increase costs to other projects but decrease the funds available for City uses for SDCs funds.