COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE - Summary Minutes

Library, North Eugene High School, 200 Silver Lane

January 15, 2019, 6:00-8:00 pm

CAC Members Present: Jon Belcher, Carl Below, Mary Leontovich, Louisa de Heer, Ann Vaughn, Rick Duncan, Louie Vidmar

Regrets: Luke Callahan, Cameron Ewing, Ed McMahon, Michele O’Leary, Kate Perle

Staff Present: Eric Brown, Audrey Stuart, Ben Weber (SERA Architects)

Outcomes:
1. Feedback on early findings from economic and demographic analysis
2. CAC participants for Corridor Study
3. Plan and timeline for revising draft policies
4. Input on community event planning

Agenda items
1. Introductions and Agenda Review
2. Public Comments
   a. Carleen Reilly asked outreach volunteers to return their clipboards
3. Presentation: River Road Corridor Economics and Demographics
   a. Ben Weber provided background on the River Road Corridor Study. The presentation is included as Appendix A.
   b. Discussion of using the same CAC members for the Corridor Study as the Neighborhood Plan. Key points included:
      i. Whether the CAC had agreed to serve as the CAC for the Corridor Study
      ii. The importance of involving people who live and work along the corridor
      iii. The CAC decided to form a sub-committee to focus on the Corridor Study. The Corridor Study sub-committee will also include some working group members to get more participants who live and work along the corridor. The sub-committee will primarily be responsible for review work products and providing input to the project management team. The Neighborhood Plan CAC will remain the recommending body for any policies and code revisions resulting from the study, a subcomponent of the Neighborhood Plan.
   c. There was discussion of coordinating with the MovingAhead project.
   d. There was a discussion of how the Corridor Study will impact Santa Clara.
i. The Neighborhood Plan could recommend adopting code developed through the Corridor Study in Santa Clara.

e. Becky Hewitt of ECONorthwest joined via video call to present the initial findings of the economic and demographic analysis.
   i. The presentation is included in Appendix A.
   ii. Questions and discussion included:
      a. Clarification that the economic analysis will include a market feasibility analysis for desired forms of development

2. The bulk of the economic assessment will be done by mid-to-late March.

4. CAC Role and Responsibilities in Corridor Study
   a. There was a discussion of the Corridor Study workshop on February 11-13th. This included discussion of CAC and working group member participation in workshop beyond attending open houses.
   b. Further discussion of corridor study sub-committee:
      i. There was concern that the CAC members who were not present being volunteered in absentia.
      ii. The goal is that serving on the Corridor Study CAC will not require additional meetings.

5. Policy Development
   a. There was discussion about not losing the intention of policies as they get edited.
   b. There was a question about how to connect back with working group members.
      i. Suggestions included keeping all the goals within a Topic Area connected.
      ii. CAC goal leaders will email their working group members with a process update
   c. Policies do not need to be finalized by the next community event; further input will be received at the event.

6. Integrating TAC and TBL Feedback
   a. The Land Use, Community, and Transportation goals will be sent to Technical Advisory Committee members before Jan 18th. The Economic Development and Parks and Natural Resources goals have already been sent to the Technical Advisory Committee members.
   b. CAC members will review the feedback that TAC members and the TBL Sounding Board provide and incorporate it.

7. Update on Community Event Planning
   a. An update was provided on the next community event. Key points included:
      i. Discussion of event scheduling and publicity.
      ii. Making the event welcoming to both newcomers and those who have previously been involved.
   b. Suggestions included ways to incorporate local art and ways to meaningfully present the results in real-time.
c. Mary, Ann, and Jon volunteered to provide input on the event planning. The CAC members who were not present will be asked via email if they would like to volunteer.

8. Discussion of CAC Tenure
   a. The CAC discussed the increasing time commitment and the perspectives that were lost as a result of resignations.
   b. There will be a recruitment for a new member from River Road.

9. Adjourn

Action Items

- Staff will gather more information on the connection between the Neighborhood Plan and the MovingAhead project, including the design element of MovingAhead.
- Staff will gather information on whether forming a subcommittee of the CAC to serve as the Corridor Study CAC would require the Eugene Planning Commission to appoint them.
- Staff will write a job description of the Corridor Study CAC that can be used to recruit working group members.
- CAC goal leaders will email their working group members with a process update. Staff will create a document for CAC members to use as a template that includes a timeline of the policy revision phase.
- Staff will send calendar invites for upcoming CAC meetings.

Appendix

- Appendix A: Presentation slides (includes Corridor Study information presented by Ben Weber and economic and demographic analysis assessment information presented by Becky Hewitt)
Introductions

Project basics

Timelines

Study context
  ○ The Neighborhood Plan
  ○ Area plans and projects
  ○ History and culture

Study So Far
  ○ Physical Assessment
  ○ Economic Assessment
  ○ Code

Next Steps

CAC role

Other

Appendix A: Corridor Study Presentation Slides
The River Road Santa Clara Neighborhood Plan is charting a vision for the future of the neighborhoods. A key goal of the Plan is to improve River Road, the major street that runs from Santa Clara, through River Road, and connects to central Eugene.

The Neighborhood Plan draft vision includes “thriving, vibrant and active mixed neighborhood centers along the River Road corridor” and “a transportation system that is safe, accessible, affordable, environmentally responsible and transitions to zero carbon.”
As a next step to implement the vision, the Corridor Study integrates knowledge about who lives and works in River Road, how people get around, where they shop and live, what they do, and how the corridor looks and feels. The Study will help implement the community vision by creating physical plans, development studies, code, and ways to improve transit connections to better serve people in the area.
1. Data-supported study of physical and economic opportunities

2. Evaluation of multiple concepts to test feasibility and community support

3. Strategies to craft vibrant, neighborhood-serving transit-supportive development and places

4. Code and capital investment plan for implementation

5. CAC-recommended concept - alignment with *Neighborhood Plan*

6. Adoption as part of the *Neighborhood Plan*
October 30

- Project Team and Staff Kickoff Meeting
- Community Member lunch and River Road tour

December 5-6

- Attended *Neighborhood Plan* Policy Roundup
- City/LTD Staff existing conditions and projects review
- SCCO Meeting to review Santa Clara Station concepts
- Community stakeholder existing conditions review
- Public Involvement Plan review

Overall

- Interviews with business owners and developers
THE THINGS WE’VE HEARD SO FAR
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- Strong community desire for gathering spaces, local businesses, more open space and access to nature, and compatible housing and commercial growth
- Need for fact/analysis-driven concept development and ground-truthing of neighborhood goals and potential
- Narrowing down to four Station Areas that feel like cohesive corridor centers and provide “20 minute neighborhood” qualities
- Respect the agriculture, local, and informal roots of the River Road economy
A FEW ASSUMPTIONS

Community Advisory Committee (CAC) will remain the same through both the Neighborhood Plan and Corridor Study

Corridor Study outcomes to be documented primarily within the Neighborhood Plan

Corridor Study uses three primary geographies
  - ¼ Mile Station Areas - physical planning and typologies; code
  - ¼ Mile Corridor Buffer - zone of influence on River Road; code
  - ½ Mile Study Area - Economic and transit influence area
COMMUNITY ADVISORY CMTE.

Neighborhood Plan CAC
- Continuity with N.P.
- Review body
- Co-creation of concepts in workshops
- Vetting of Evaluation Criteria
- Liaison to broader public
- Review and recommend to elected/appointed bodies
- CAC Subgroup?

TECHNICAL ADVISORY CMTE.

City and LTD Staff
- Technical review/input
- Compliance and alignment with plans and policies
- Project Management

CONSULTANTS

SERA Architects
  Project Management
  Urban Design

ECONorthwest
  Economic/Market Study

Cogito Partners
  Community Engagement

Raimi + Associates
  Code and Policy

Toole Design Group
  Transportation / Access
NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN
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IS NOT: TWO SEPARATE PLANS

NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN

CORRIDOR STUDY
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11. Support development that is well designed and economically, socially and environmentally sustainable.

12. Ensure that future housing addresses the needs of the community.

13. Support a thriving, vibrant and active River Road corridor.

14. Promote land use and development that protects and enhances neighborhood character.

2.1.3 Vibrancy - Based on [redevelop-able property] map and residential density projections, target locations for mixed-use development that includes live/work spaces, apartments above retail, and co-work environment.

11.2.1 River Road / Santa Clara Land Use Provisions - Utilize a special area zone(s) or an overlay zone(s) to implement land use for the River Road and Santa Clara Neighborhood that possess distinctive characteristics that have significance for the community.

12.1 Compatible Infill - Allow for residential infill development at compatible scales using a variety of housing types for appropriate density to lower costs and provide needed housing.
1. Improve the **neighborhood economy** and empower local residents by encouraging the **growth and creation of local businesses**.

2. Promote redevelopment that enhances the character of our neighborhood while **increasing access to daily needs**.

3. Promote living **wage employment and business ownership** opportunities within the neighborhood.

2.2 **Market Analysis** - Conduct market analysis to identify needed **commercial development** and opportunities for **local small business owners**
7. Ensure that natural areas are healthy, thriving spaces that provide habitat for native species and function as natural infrastructure.

8. Provide neighborhood access to recreational opportunities, parks, and community centers.

9. Ensure the Willamette River is a vital and accessible part of the neighborhoods.

10. Preserve agricultural land and open spaces within and around our neighborhood boundaries.
4. Promote **connected and efficient multi-modal transportation** options that support economic opportunities, environmental stewardship and social equity within River Road and Santa Clara.

5. Support a **transportation** system that is **affordable, environmentally responsible** and transitions to **zero carbon**.

6. Promote safe, accessible and efficient **transportation for all**.

4.5 Support actions that **create affordable bus rapid transit** from the River Road corridor to the rest of Eugene.

4.7 Support **safe and convenient active transportation** access to commercial entities that include community gathering areas.
15. Ensure our community is **welcoming and inclusive**.

16. Foster **collaborative relationships** to build a stronger and more resilient community.

17. Provide comprehensive **public services** responsive to the needs of the community.

18. Increase **resilience** in local food, water, and disaster preparedness systems necessary for human health and wellbeing.
AGRICULTURAL BEGINNINGS
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General Land Office (GLO) map from 1933 showing information recorded in 1852. What was to become River Road is pointed out and visible next to the Willamette River in the upper right quadrant.

Alps' Dairy farm on River Road, c. 1910. Photo courtesy of Lane County Historical Museum (GN7003)

River Road in 1920. Photo courtesy of Clara Yockey.
A RURAL, EVOLVING COMMUNITY
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Park Avenue plat of 1925.

View of Woodruff Nursery circa 1930. Photo from City files.
RELATIONSHIP WITH THE RIVER
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POST-WAR GROWTH AND PUBLIC FACILITIES
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River Road Hardware in December 1965 at 675 River Road. It was torn down in the mid-1980s during the widening of River Road. Photo from the 1965-66 North Eugene High School yearbook.
McKay’s Market at 1015 River Road in the 1950s. Photo from City files.

The former McKay’s Market is today a Goodwill store. Photo by City in 2005.
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"SOUTH GATEWAY" STATION AREA
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NOTE: Arrows depict general directions
NOTE: Map subject to change
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“SOUTH GATEWAY” STATION AREA

**Opportunities**

- **A** Opportunity to connect Commercial Zone to Riverfront path.
- **B** Affordable housing and/or commercial development opportunity.
- **C** Opportunity to improve arrival experience @ intersection area.

**Existing Projects**

- **1** Lombard Apartments

---

**Legend**

- Multi-Family Housing
- Affordable Housing
- C-1 Neighborhood Commercial
- C-2 Community Commercial
- R-2 Medium Density Residential
- R-2 Medium Density Residential
- Landbank Site
- Rapid Flash Beacon Crossing
- Informal East/West River Connectic
- Existing Bicycle Lane
- Existing Shared Roadway/ Popular Bicycle Route
- Existing Shared Use Path
- Potential Enhanced Transit Stop (Moving Ahead)
- Connection Opportunity
- Station Study Area
- Greenway
- Pathway
- Bike Lane
- Accessway
- Sidewalk
At McLure Lane near Hilliard
Opportunities

A. Opportunity for connection from neighborhood to the River Trail.

B. Opportunity to enhance commercial cluster near transit stop.

C. New-ish, medium-density, small-lot single family housing example.

D. Improve River Trail access/amenities at trailhead locations.

E. Use scale transitions between residential and commercial areas.

F. Improve Hilliard as key connection to River Road Elementary and commercial cluster.

Existing Projects

1. ECCO Apartments

Legend

- Multi-Family Housing
- Affordable Housing
- C-1 Neighborhood Commercial
- C-2 Community Commercial
- R-2 Medium Density Residential
- R-2 Medium Density Residential
- Landbank Site
- Rapid Flash Beacon Crossing
- Informal East/West River Connector
- Existing Bicycle Lane
- Existing Shared Roadway/Popular Bicycle Route
- Existing Shared Use Path
- Potential Enhanced Transit Stop (Moving Ahead)
- Connection Opportunity
- Station Study Area
- Greenway
- Pathway
- Bike Lane
- Accessway
- Sidewalk
NOTE: Arrows depict general directions
NOTE: Map subject to change
Big box near Silver Lane

Vacating transit center
Opportunities

A. Opportunity for local commercial and retail development - “Gateway”.

B. Medium-scale residential to commercial transition opportunity.

C. Connection improvement opps to NEHS along Silver Lane and through commercial areas.

Existing Projects

1. Development application for 30+ townhomes, 30 Owosso Drive

2. In-progress 8-cottage housing development, 1711 River Road.


Legend

- Multi-Family Housing
- Affordable Housing
- C-1 Neighborhood Commercial
- C-2 Community Commercial
- R-2 Medium Density Residential
- Landbank Site
- Rapid Flash Beacon Crossing
- Informal East/West River Connect
- Existing Bicycle Lane
- Existing Shared Roadway/ Popular Bicycle Route
- Existing Shared Use Path
- Potential Enhanced Transit Stop (Moving Ahead)
- Connection Opportunity
- Station Study Area
- Greenway
- Pathway
- Bike Lane
- Accessway
- Sidewalk
- TSP Projects- within 20 years
Big box at Santa Clara Square

Future LTD transit hub and development site
“NORTH GATEWAY” STATION AREA

Opportunities

A. Opportunity for local commercial and retail development - “Gateway”.

B. Opportunity to improve connection and safety for walking and biking under the Beltline overpass.

C. Vacant Site

D. Opportunity to orient future businesses to the street edge and create a more walkable cluster

Existing Projects

1. Santa Clara Square commercial center

2. Beltline Improvement Projects, see ODOT Beltline Facility Plan, Volume 1.

Legend

- Multi-Family Housing
- Affordable Housing
- C-1 Neighborhood Commercial
- C-2 Community Commercial
- R-2 Medium Density Residential
- R-2 Medium Density Residential
- Landbank Site
- Rapid Flash Beacon Crossing
- Informal East/West River Connectic
- Existing Shared Use Path
- Potential Enhanced Transit Stop (Moving Ahead)
- Connection Opportunity
- Station Study Area
- Greenway
- Pathway
- Bike Lane
- Accessway
- Sidewalk
Geography:

Census Tracts / River Road & Santa Clara Neighborhoods

City of Eugene

Eugene-Springfield region

Source: usboundary.com

Source: socialexplorer.com
HOUSING MIX, RIVER ROAD AND COMPARISON REGIONS, 2013-2017

Source: Census Bureau, 2013-2017 ACS Table B25024

- River Road: 10% Single-family detached, 6% Single-family attached, 84% Multifamily
- Eugene: 6% Single-family detached, 36% Single-family attached, 58% Multifamily
- Eugene-Springfield CCD: 6% Single-family detached, 6% Single-family attached, 64% Multifamily
STUDY AREA DEMOGRAPHICS
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HOMEOWNERSHIP RATE, 2017
Source: Census Bureau, ACS 2013-2017

69%
River Road Study Area

48%
Eugene

53%
Eugene - Springfield CCD

HOUSING TYPE BY TENURE, RIVER ROAD STUDY AREA, 2017
Source: Census Bureau, 2013-2017 ACS Table B25033

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>Owner Occupied</th>
<th>Renter Occupied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single family detached or attached</td>
<td>21,689</td>
<td>8,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily (2-4 units)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily (5 or more units)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (mobile home, boat, RV, etc.)</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STUDY AREA DEMOGRAPHICS
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POPULATION UNDER AGE 18 AND OVER AGE 65 AND AGE DISTRIBUTION OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD BY TENURE 2017
Source: Census Bureau, ACS 2013-2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>River Road</th>
<th>Eugene</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 65</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the Census Bureau's ACS data from 2013-2017, the population distribution in the study area shows:

- Among those under 18, 22% are in River Road, 18% in Eugene, and 19% in the Eugene-Springfield CCD.
- Among those over 65, 17% are in River Road, 15% in Eugene, and 15% in the Eugene-Springfield CCD.

Here is a breakdown of the age distribution in River Road:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Homeowners</th>
<th>Renters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85 and over</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 to 84</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 to 74</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>1,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 64</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>2,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 54</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>1,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 44</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>1,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>1,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 24</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HOUSEHOLDS WITH CHILDREN UNDER 18, 2017
Source: Census Bureau, ACS 2013-2017

- 29% of households in River Road have children under 18.
- 24% of households in Eugene have children under 18.
- 25% of households in the Eugene-Springfield CCD have children under 18.

The bar chart illustrates the comparison of owner and renter households with children under 18 and without children under 18.
Illustration of Cost Burden: If all of the Study Area’s Households were 100 Residents

- 45 homeowners earn more than $50,000
  - 5 of them are cost-burdened
- 24 homeowners earn less than $50,000
  - 14 of them are cost-burdened

- 69 Homeowners

- 31 Renters
  - 11 renters earn more than $35,000
    - 1 of them is cost-burdened
  - 20 renters earn less than $35,000
    - 14 of them are cost-burdened
AFFORDABLE MONTHLY RENT AT 30% OF INCOME FOR EXISTING RENTER HOUSEHOLDS IN RIVER ROAD 2017

Source: ECONorthwest analysis of Census Bureau, ACS 2013-2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly Rent</th>
<th>Number of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,875</td>
<td>847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$875</td>
<td>2,284</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of existing renter households that can afford this rent (at or below 30% of income)

- HH income > $100,000
- HH income $75,000 - $99,999
- HH income $50,000 - $74,999
- HH income $35,000 - $49,000
Multifamily Rent

River Road Effective Rent Per SF

Eugene Effective Rent Per SF
### MARKET RATE UNIT CHARACTERISTICS AND RENTS, EUGENE

Source: City of Eugene, Market Rate (excluding student housing) complexes, December 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit size range</th>
<th>Rent range</th>
<th>Rent per sqft range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 bedroom 488 sqft - 985 sqft</td>
<td>$1,035 - $1,595</td>
<td>$1.23 - $3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bedroom 760 sqft - 1040 sqft</td>
<td>$1,202 - $2,200</td>
<td>$1.48 - $2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bedroom 1105 sqft - 1985 sqft</td>
<td>$1,800 - $2,400</td>
<td>$1.20 - $1.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Retail Vacancy

- River Road Vacant Percent % Total
- Eugene Vacant Percent % Total

River Road vacancy rate: 1.5%
Other lines of inquiry
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning Type</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Parcels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture (AG)</td>
<td>47 acres</td>
<td>161 parcels (mostly single-family homes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Office (GO)</td>
<td>17 acres</td>
<td>41 parcels (~27 built as single-family homes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Commercial (C-2)</td>
<td>133 acres</td>
<td>152 parcels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Commercial (C-1)</td>
<td>12 acres</td>
<td>36 parcels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Density Residential (R-1)</td>
<td>935 acres</td>
<td>3474 parcels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowhouse (R-1.5)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium-Density Residential (R-2)</td>
<td>119 acres</td>
<td>282 parcels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light-Medium Industrial (I-2)</td>
<td>20 acres</td>
<td>30 parcels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Land (PL)</td>
<td>177 acres</td>
<td>44 parcels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agriculture (AG) zone

- Outdated, includes partial parcels and non-conformance with AG rules

General Office (GO) zone

- Most parcels built as single-family homes
CODE CONTEXT

KEY DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

HEIGHTS
- Neighborhood Commercial (C-1): 35 ft height limit too restrictive for mixed-use, limits buildings to 3 story max
- Community Commercial (C-2): 120 ft height limit is excessive

FLOOR-AREA RATIO (FAR) REQUIREMENTS
- FAR not regulated in base Commercial zones - risk of too low density

RESIDENTIAL DENSITY
- R-1: up to 14 dwellings/acre
- R-2: 13-29 dwellings/acre
- Commercial zones: no density limits
- Changes: increase base zone density?
KEY DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

BARRIERS TO MIDDLE HOUSING IN R-1
- Duplex/Triplex/Fourplex are restricted to new subdivisions
- Rowhouse (R-1.5, currently not present in study area) cannot exceed 8 units and may not be located within 500 ft of other rowhouses

TRANSITIONS TO RESIDENTIAL ZONES
- First 50 ft of adjacent parcel requires transition in height

PARKING REGULATIONS
- Good site design standards for surface parking - no parking allowed between ROW and buildings
CODE - POSSIBLE HYBRID FORM-BASED

ESTABLISH DISTRICTS
● Broad and flexible land use regulations
● Basic form controls (height, bulk, etc.)

CONTROLS
● Regulate form based on street-type adjacency (arterial vs. local) - setbacks, parking locations, ground floor uses, facade design
● Site planning, building design, streets, landscape, and signage

MAKE SURE TO...
● Match zone districts with intentions for a place
● Review all zone rules for intended outcomes
● Not over-regulate by use
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATION CRITERIA (DRAFT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appendix A: Corridor Study Presentation Slides</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| LIVABILITY | Development compatible with neighborhood character (quantify growth in types, qualify compatibility) |
| Housing type mix (quantify housing growth blend) |
| Housing units within distance (¼-½ mile) of transit and commercial clusters |
| Affordability for housing and businesses - gentrification and displacement (cost and rent impacts, turnover rates, local ownership) |
| Bulk and built form transitions between districts (measurable standards resulting in compatibility) |

| ECONOMIC | Quantity of and access to jobs (jobs per sq of commercial space) |
| Property value and tax revenue increases from new development |
| Development feasibility (likelihood of development types and locations) |
| Housing affordability across income ranges and household compositions |

| ENVIRONMENT | Transit mode-share increase (measurable estimates) |
| Access to natural and open spaces (quantify open space amounts and evaluate safe connections) |
| Amount of shift towards lower-impact multifamily housing |
| Development abutting or within Greenway “zone” |

| SOCIAL | Public amenities and gathering spaces (measure quantity and proximity, evaluate quality) |
| Local ownership and employment of businesses (measure of ownership, quantify potential incentive/subsidy impacts) |
| Housing type mix, size, and affordability (measurable) |
| Access to schools and community destinations (evaluation of connectivity) |

<p>| RIDERSHIP | Neighborhood “last mile” connections to transit - street connectivity and safety |
| Housing/jobs growth and balance - trip generators and destinations (quantify) |
| Cost and supply of parking in development (measure parking quantities and costs, track reduced need based on transit access) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FEBRUARY 11</th>
<th>FEBRUARY 12</th>
<th>FEBRUARY 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>THEME</strong></td>
<td>Getting Started: Reflecting the Neighborhood Vision and Priorities</td>
<td>Developing Concepts: Exploring the multiple ways the vision can take shape on the ground along the corridor</td>
<td>Establishing Criteria: evaluating options and establishing criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIRST THING</strong></td>
<td>Project Management Team (PMT) check-in</td>
<td>Project Management Team (PMT) check-in</td>
<td>Project Management Team (PMT) check-in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **MORNING**    | Team work time: Review the neighborhood vision, goals and policies to establish the design parameters | ● Team work time: In-depth concept creation, exploration of differences, and review with community and technical groups  
● Team / Staff focus meetings (or afternoon) | Team work time: Concept refinement and early evaluation                      |
| **LUNCH**      |                                                                              | Technical Advisory Committee review                                           |                                                                              |
| **AFTERNOON**  | ● Team work time  
● Open house preparation, or  
● Community open house? | ● Team work time, and  
● Team / Staff focus meetings, or  
● Community open house? | ● Team work time  
● Open house and presentation preparation |
| **DINNER**     |                                                                              |                                                                              |                                                                              |
| **EVENING**    | ● RRCO Meeting attendees  
● Community open house | ● Community open house, or  
● Team work time | Community open house and presentation: Seek to come out with the range of concepts to carry forward for more study |
Next Steps

- Next CAC meeting (during Workshop #1 in February 2019)
- Ongoing Neighborhood Physical/Economic/Code Assessment - finalization est. late March 2019 to support Neighborhood Plan Action Planning
- Evaluation Criteria development (CAC review during Workshop #1)
- Workshop #1 prep
- Plan writing to N.P. Plan document - see outline (primarily to Chapter 5. Community Policies)
Ben Weber, SERA Architects
benw@seradesign.com

Becky Hewitt, ECONorthwest
hewitt@econw.com