

MUD subgroup report

December 10, 2010

Envision Eugene
Community Resource Group
Mixed-Use (Re)Development (MUD) subgroup

Members and affiliations (alphabetically):

- Larry Banks, Principal, PIVOT Architecture
- Jon Belcher, Planning Commissioner and former member of the ECLA Community Advisory Committee
- Rob Bennett, Downtown business person
- Paul Conte, Jefferson Westside Neighbors (JWN) and former member of the ECLA Community Advisory Committee
- Jerry Finigan, Santa Clara Community Organization (SCCO) and former member of the Infill Compatibility Standards Task Team's Steering Committee
- Carolyn Jacobs, South University Neighborhood Association (SUNA) and former member of the ECLA Community Advisory Committee
- Barbara Mitchell, Cal Young Neighborhood Association (CYNA)
- Carleen Reilly, River Road Community Organization (RRCO)
- Tom Schwetz, LTD -- EmX Project Manager
- Ann Vaughn, Santa Clara Community Organization (SCCO) and former member of the Opportunity Siting Task Team
- Pat Walsh, Consultant with Lane County Home Builders Association

CRG member Don Kahle also observed part of the second MUD subgroup meeting and was CC'd on e-mails from the facilitators.

Facilitators:

- Paul Conte, pconte@picante-soft.com, 541.344.2552
- Carolyn Jacobs, Carolyn.I.Jacobs@gmail.com, 541.683.8556

Adopted MUD subgroup objective

Provide to the CRG:

- The MUD subgroup's recommendation(s) regarding the "THEM 15 [sic] MIXED-USE REDEVELOPMENT ALONG TRANSIT CORRIDORS" statement provided by Chadwick.
- Individual members' comments related to the "theme".

Process summary

MUD subgroup members held three well-attended meetings totaling approximately six hours of face-to-face discussions. The second and third meetings were recorded, and the audio file was made available to all members, including those who had been unable to attend. (This practice proved valuable in enabling members who were not at a meeting to get a complete, direct understanding of what transpired at a meeting.)

Members also used e-mail for distribution of materials from the facilitators, scheduling meetings and for members to submit items for consideration at an upcoming meeting. Limited discussion of substantive issues also occurred in e-mail exchanges. When a member was unable to attend a meeting, he or she was invited to vote or weigh in on meeting topics via e-mail.

At the first meeting, members:

- Elected facilitators
- Produced a draft work plan
- Held a preliminary round of discussion on substantive issues related to the theme
- Agreed to use the “MUD” theme received from Bob Chadwick (Attachment A) as the starting point, rather than starting from scratch

At the second meeting, members:

- Adopted a final work plan, including the objective, work product and key elements of the decision process
- Discussed members’ proposals for revisions to the original version of the theme.
- Agreed to use a rewritten theme proposed by one member as the foundation for a recommendation, along with other members’ proposed revisions

At the third meeting, members:

- Deliberated section-by-section through a “consolidated” version of the theme, which included the version from the second meeting and additional sections proposed by other members. Votes were taken on proposed revisions to, or deletion of, each section. With the exception of section 18, all decisions on individual sections were unanimous or near unanimous.
- Voting was then opened on the revised recommendation for the “MUD” theme. Members could choose to vote at the meeting or vote later by e-mail. Eight members voted in support at the meeting.

Following the final meeting, two members voted to support and one member voted to not support the recommendation. Attachment B provides the recommended theme, and Attachment D provides a cross reference from sections of the original theme to sections of the recommended theme.

Members then had the opportunity to submit individual comments related to the theme. These comments are attached to this report. (See Attachment E.) Comments were not edited or discussed formally among members.

Respectfully submitted by the facilitators,

Paul Conte

Carolyn Jacobs

Attachment A

THE "THEME" AS RECEIVED FROM BOB CHADWICK

THEM [sic] 15 - MIXED-USE REDEVELOPMENT ALONG TRANSIT CORRIDORS- DRAFT SYNTHESIS - 2010.09.14

(Developed, after group discussion, by Carolyn Weiss, Kevin Mathews, Sue Prichard.)

Plan a network of full-service* transit corridors for Eugene. Plan for gradual redevelopment to high-quality, economically viable mixed-use buildings and multiple use neighborhoods, in core commercial areas and within a quarter mile of key transit corridors (while protecting established residential neighborhoods).

Include areas, and focus attention, where success is most likely, using pilot programs when feasible to explore and demonstrate possibilities.

In these mixed-use buildings and neighborhoods, provide a variety of housing types and affordability adapted to evolving demographics and living trends in our community. Avoid gentrification. Develop with a texture of building types, sizes, and local character.

Educate, provide incentives, and reduce obstacles, so property owners will embrace the effort and be supported with the assistance and flexibility needed to be successful.

The WEC Vision for West Eugene provides a strong example, focused around West 11th Avenue, of a corridor plan that addresses the needs of that area.

Each transit corridor has unique characteristics and should be given localized consideration and treatment in planning, and, as necessary, in the land use code.

Improve walking and bicycling infrastructure to fill gaps and provide safe and convenient connections within and between neighborhoods, services, and transit corridors.

Other statements to be considered:

- An understanding that all buildings along the corridor do not have to be mixed use.
- Encourage the greater part of mixed use development closer to the core of the city.
- Explore the notion of extending the transit corridors and the mixed use areas outside the UGB and developing neighborhoods in "fingers" along these routes.
The possibility of industrial zoned areas that could be considered for mixed use development.

Attachment B

RECOMMENDED THEME

Mixed-Use, New- and Re-Development along Transit Corridors and in the Downtown Area

MUD subgroup member votes

Support (10): Banks, Belcher, Conte, Finigan, Jacobs, Mitchell, Reilley, Schwetz, Vaughn, Walsh

Do not support (1): Bennett

1. Plan a network of high-capacity, multi-modal transit corridors for Eugene. Create a list of the streets and their extents which are considered transit corridors desirable for mixed-use development. Include a process for adding or removing street segments from that list.
2. Plan for gradual development and redevelopment to create high-quality, economically-viable, multiple-use centers (including mixed-use buildings, where appropriate) within roughly one quarter to one half mile of identified transit corridors and within the downtown commercial area.
3. A primary purpose of this strategy is to achieve increased residential density while protecting and enhancing neighborhood livability. To that purpose, the development of multiple-use centers shall be consistent with the goals adopted by the Infill Compatibility Standards Task Team. (See Attachment C.)
4. These multiple-use centers should foster active, walkable community living by providing a mix of residential, commercial, retail, and public uses in close proximity to one another – in many cases within a single building. (This type of development is often referred to as “Transit-Oriented Development”.)
5. These multiple-use centers should be clustered in discrete locations along transit corridors to facilitate distinct neighborhood identity and to avoid creating long strip developments. Additionally, each corridor has unique characteristics and should be given localized consideration and treatment in planning and, as necessary, in the land use code.
6. Focus attention on areas where success is most likely.
7. Development should embrace the unique character of the encompassing area, and endeavor to enhance the quality and livability of existing and new neighborhoods. Where appropriate, create transition zones between mixed-use development areas and adjacent neighborhoods. Respect the character and scale of existing low-density neighborhoods.
8. These new multiple-use centers should provide ample, active open space and gathering areas for community interaction.
9. Develop with a texture of building types, sizes, and local character.

10. Mixed-use buildings can play a key role in adding vibrancy and density to multiple-use centers and in transitioning to lower-density residential areas.
11. Encourage a variety of housing types, sizes, configurations, and affordability to facilitate diverse ownership and rental options.
12. Expand and improve walking and bicycling infrastructure to fill gaps and provide safe and convenient connections within and between the transit corridor, the transit-oriented development, and the neighborhoods close to the corridor.
13. Consider parking and traffic implications of proposed development patterns.
14. Consider design standards to better define the public realm and promote quality. Development standards should allow for a range of development proposals, with density ranges set at reasonable levels to allow for flexible growth over the coming years without being overly prescriptive.
15. Mixed-use development projects are more likely to occur with public sector participation. One form of public sector participation is enhancing infrastructure to support mixed-use development (an example is to improve the pedestrian character of Willamette Street from 24th Avenue to 30th Avenue). Another form of public sector participation is to facilitate development via incentives for developers.
16. Educate, provide incentives, and reduce unnecessary obstacles, so developers will embrace this theme.
17. Continually evaluate previous multiple-use center efforts to inform us of lessons learned.
18. When adopting Metro Plan amendments, rely only on those assumptions for projected housing capacity that ensure this theme can be accomplished.

Attachment C

INFILL COMPATIBILITY STANDARDS TASK TEAM – PROJECT GOALS STATEMENT

Unanimously approved by the ICS Task Team

Create and adopt land use code standards and processes that:

- (a) Prevent residential infill that would significantly threaten or diminish the stability, quality, positive character, livability or natural resources of residential neighborhoods; and
- (b) Encourage residential infill that would enhance the stability, quality, positive character, livability or natural resources of residential neighborhoods; and
- (c) So long as the goal stated in (a) is met, allow for increased density, a variety of housing types, affordable housing, and mixed-use development; and
- (d) Improve the appearance of buildings and landscapes.

Attachment D

CROSS-REFERENCE FROM DRAFT THEME RECEIVED FROM BOB CHADWICK TO RECOMMENDED THEME

<p>Plan a network of full-service transit corridors for Eugene. Plan for gradual redevelopment to high-quality, economically viable mixed-use buildings and multiple use neighborhoods, in core commercial areas and within a quarter mile of key transit corridors (while protecting established residential neighborhoods).</p>	<p>Include areas, and focus attention, where success is most likely, using pilot programs when feasible to explore and demonstrate possibilities.</p>	<p>In these mixed-use buildings and neighborhoods, provide a variety of housing types and affordability adapted to evolving demographics and living trends in our community. Avoid gentrification. Develop with a texture of building types, sizes, and local character.</p>	<p>Educate, provide incentives, and reduce obstacles, so property owners will embrace the effort and be supported with the assistance and flexibility needed to be successful.</p>	<p>The WEC Vision for West Eugene provides a strong example, focused around West 11th Avenue, of a corridor plan that addresses the needs of that area.</p>	<p>Each transit corridor has unique characteristics and should be given localized consideration and treatment in planning, and, as necessary, in the land use code.</p>	<p>Improve walking and bicycling infrastructure to fill gaps and provide safe and convenient connections within and between neighborhoods, services, and transit corridors.</p>	<p>1. Plan a network of high-capacity, multi-modal transit corridors for Eugene. Create a list of the streets and their extents which are considered transit corridors desirable for mixed-use development. Include a process for adding or removing street segments from that list.</p>	<p>2. Plan for gradual development and redevelopment to create high-quality, economically-viable, multiple-use centers (including mixed-use buildings, where appropriate) within roughly one quarter to one half mile of identified transit corridors and within the downtown commercial area.</p>	<p>3. A primary purpose of this strategy is to achieve increased residential density while protecting and enhancing neighborhood livability. To that purpose, the development of multiple-use centers shall be consistent with the goals adopted by the Infill Compatibility Standards Task Team.</p>	<p>4. These multiple-use centers should foster active, walkable community living by providing a mix of residential, commercial, retail, and public uses in close proximity to one another – in many cases within a single building. (This type of development is often referred to as “Transit-Oriented Development”.)</p>	<p>5. These multiple-use centers should be clustered in discrete locations along transit corridors to facilitate distinct neighborhood identity and to avoid creating long strip developments. Additionally, each corridor has unique characteristics and should be given localized consideration and treatment in planning and, as necessary, in the land use code.</p>
---	---	---	--	---	---	---	--	--	---	--	--

6. Focus attention on areas where success is most likely.

7. Development should embrace the unique character of the encompassing area, and endeavor to enhance the quality and livability of existing and new neighborhoods. Where appropriate, create transition zones between mixed-use development areas and adjacent neighborhoods. Respect the character and scale of existing low-density neighborhoods.

8. These new multiple-use centers should provide ample, active open space and gathering areas for community interaction.

9. Develop with a texture of building types, sizes, and local character.

10. Mixed-use buildings can play a key role in adding vibrancy and density to multiple-use centers and in transitioning to lower-density residential areas.

11. Encourage a variety of housing types, sizes, configurations, and affordability to facilitate diverse ownership and rental options.

12. Expand and improve walking and bicycling infrastructure to fill gaps and provide safe and convenient connections within and between the transit corridor, the transit-oriented development, and the neighborhoods close to the corridor.

13. Consider parking and traffic implications of proposed development patterns.

14. Consider design standards to better define the public realm and promote quality. Development standards should allow for a range of development

		<p>proposals, with density ranges set at reasonable levels to allow for flexible growth over the coming years without being overly prescriptive.</p> <p>15. Mixed-use development projects are more likely to occur with public sector participation. One form of public sector participation is enhancing infrastructure to support mixed-use development (an example is to improve the pedestrian character of Willamette Street from 24th Avenue to 30th Avenue). Another form of public sector participation is to facilitate development via incentives for developers.</p> <p>Ⓐ 16. Educate, provide incentives, and reduce unnecessary obstacles, so developers will embrace this theme.</p> <p>17. Continually evaluate previous multiple-use center efforts to inform us of lessons learned.</p> <p>18. When adopting Metro Plan amendments, rely only on those assumptions for projected housing capacity that ensure this theme can be accomplished.</p>
--	--	---

Attachment E

MUD MEMBERS' COMMENTS

Comments from Larry Banks

These comments reflect the individual member's opinions and have not been edited or formally discussed by the MUD subgroup.

General:

As conversation and consideration evolved on the topic of "Multiple Use", I began to view two different types of development or zoning "categories" that may warrant different treatment within the overall umbrella of this "Multiple-Use theme". One would be land *currently* zoned as non-residential, where we would add residential or change to mixed-use designation. The other is land surrounding the mixed-use land which may be currently zoned as low-density residential but may warrant *change* to a higher-density residential to support the goals or enable market feasibility of the multiple-use center. It is my opinion that the mixed-use zoned land should be afforded fewer restrictions than the residentially zoned lands.

On section 13: *"Consider parking and traffic implications of proposed development patterns."*

After further consideration, section 13 appears somewhat vague, may not convey adequate direction or embody sufficient feasibility, or in fact may already be required by other code provisions. I believe that the intent is to consider and mitigate significant traffic or parking impacts on existing neighborhoods as a result of proposed development proposals.

On section 18: *"When adopting Metro Plan amendments, rely only on those assumptions for projected housing capacity that ensure this theme can be accomplished."*

My dissenting vote on this item was based on my feeling that this section was more of a general planning process statement, and that it was not completely germane to the vision of Mixed-Use Centers along Transit Corridors and a "creative solution fostering a best possible outcome". I think the intent of the section may be noble and there may be merit in a general sense, but in our limited time was not clear to me how it added to the vision of a mixed use center.

MUD MEMBERS' COMMENTS

Comments from John Belcher

These comments reflect the individual member's opinions and have not been edited or formally discussed by the MUD subgroup.

General:

All members of this group contributed to our proposal but our facilitators Paul Conte and Carolyn Jacobs did yeoman work and Larry Banks provided the base document that guided the rest of our work.

On section 3: *"A primary purpose of this strategy is to achieve increased residential density while protecting and enhancing neighborhood livability. To that purpose, the development of multiple-use centers shall be consistent with the goals adopted by the Infill Compatibility Standards Task Team."*

This section generated far more discussion than any other. For me to support the section I needed it to clarify that this is one purpose and therefore there are additional purposes to this strategy (and indeed Envision Eugene) than solely protecting and enhancing neighborhood livability. For me it is equally important to encourage economic vitality, to the degree practicable protect farm and forest land and finally to support social diversity in Eugene. All are important and the viability of our final recommendation should be measured by how we balance all of them.

On language related to VMT:

There was consideration at one point of including the phrase: "overall vehicle miles travelled (VMT) can be reduced if development emphasis is placed in areas closer to the downtown core."

I successfully moved to strike the phrase for the following reasons:

1. No evidence is presented to support that assertion.
2. These multiple use centers are the likely mechanism to develop 20 minute neighborhoods throughout the City. We shouldn't deny North Eugene, West Eugene and South Eugene the opportunity to have 20 minute neighborhoods by only allowing multiple use centers in the proximity of downtown.
3. Increased density along the length of transit corridors has synergistically improved transit use and improved transit options make living along transit corridors more desirable (as along the MAX corridor in Portland).
4. When we focus on one area as desirable for development, we a priori de-emphasize the rest. Multiple use centers appear to be the most acceptable way to accommodate our 34,000 projected new residents so why would we create impediments to their development by implying that some transit corridors are less desirable for development than others. The more people we accommodate in multiple use centers, the less we will have to expand the UGB which will have an even greater impact on VMT. And if we don't accommodate these

folks in Eugene, far more VMT will be generated by folks commuting to Eugene from Dexter, Harrisburg, Veneta and beyond.

On section 18: *“When adopting Metro Plan amendments, rely only on those assumptions for projected housing capacity that ensure this theme can be accomplished.”*

Section 18 is the only section not supported by either everyone on the committee or all minus one. In fact, this section passed by only one vote. I personally voted no because I don't understand what it means nor do I understand its implications.

Additionally it is the only section in the theme specifically intended for the entire Envision Eugene process rather than specifically for this theme. Therefore should be discussed by the entire CRG body and then we should decide whether we want to accept it as a general principle for our final document. If through that discussion I come to understand it better, I too may be able to support it.

Thanks again to everyone on the committee and I hope you give our thoughts serious consideration.

MUD MEMBERS' COMMENTS

Comments from Rob Bennett

These comments reflect the individual member's opinions and have not been edited or formally discussed by the MUD subgroup.

On section 3: *"A primary purpose of this strategy is to achieve increased residential density while protecting and enhancing neighborhood livability. To that purpose, the development of multiple-use centers shall be consistent with the goals adopted by the Infill Compatibility Standards Task Team."*

I feel like I was the most outspoken opponent of the second sentence in this section. My position is that the balance of neighborhood protections for mixed use development or redevelopment should be materially different from those afforded neighborhoods when the proposed development is within the low density primary neighborhood area. My understanding is that in most cases mixed use development in Eugene is projected to occur in what are now primarily commercial areas with the goal of adding housing, very different from the other way around.

Can you imagine even the most trustworthy, confident, and experienced development company risking the substantial initial capital required in the planning stage of a project trying to actually understand what some neighborhood group's or the public's subjective judgment of what "significantly threaten or diminish the stability, quality, positive character, livability..." really means and how a proposed project's basic scale and design would be judged?

My strong belief is that little or no development would occur and if this language prevailed we should not consider this type of housing initiative in our projections for added housing supply.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

MUD MEMBERS' COMMENTS

Comments from Paul Conte

These comments reflect the individual member's opinions and have not been edited or formally discussed by the MUD subgroup.

General:

The MUD subgroup comprised individuals with a wealth of knowledge and experience across a wide range of interests. Members included neighborhood leaders with decades of collective experience dealing with neighborhood issues related to development, a developer with many years experience in successful residential and commercial projects, a representative of the Home Builders Association of Lane County, a representative of Lane Transit District who's been on the "front-line" of the West Eugene Extension of EmX project, a LEED-certified principal in a prominent architecture firm, and a current Planning Commissioner who has served in that role during many of the years the City has grappled with growth issues.

As part of their work developing a recommended theme, this group tackled head-on one of the most important and challenging issues related to future growth – protecting neighborhood livability. Reaching consensus-minus-one agreement wasn't easy and at times seemed out of reach. However, the group finally found common ground by building on the "field-tested" foundations of the Infill Compatibility Standards process, which City Council initiated.

My personal thanks goes out to all eleven MUD subgroup members for their perseverance and patience.

On section 3: *"A primary purpose of this strategy is to achieve increased residential density while protecting and enhancing neighborhood livability. To that purpose, the development of multiple-use centers shall be consistent with the goals adopted by the Infill Compatibility Standards Task Team."*

This section elicited some of the deepest discussion among the MUD subgroup members. The language that was finally supported by all but one member directly connects the "multiple-use centers" strategy with the principles that are at the heart of the Infill Compatibility Standards (ICS) strategy that City Council initiated. These principles seek to meaningfully protect and enhance neighborhoods and to encourage increased residential density by creating well-designed housing in the right locations.

The ICS goals rest on the understanding that neighborhood livability and successful medium- and high-density housing are complementary, rather than conflicting, goals. They are not "tradeoffs" that need to be "balanced." In other words, to be broadly successful, the "multiple-use centers" strategy must occur in the context of healthy, attractive surrounding areas, or people won't choose to live in such developments. Conversely, well-planned multiple-use centers have enormous potential to increase the neighborhood commercial, social, educational and transportation resources available to nearby residents, thus enriching these neighborhoods and making them even more livable.

The MUD subgroup desired to connect the “multiple-use centers” strategy to an established city process, rather than craft new language; and therefore section 3 references the adopted ICS Task Team goals. However, the language of the ICS Task Team goals (see Attachment C) applies the core principles specifically to infill development, while section 3 of this theme applies to development in multiple-use centers. The appropriate application of section 3 can be understood most clearly by simply recasting the ICS goals statement, replacing “residential infill” with “development in multiple-use centers”:

Create and adopt land use code standards and processes that:

- (a) Prevent development in multiple-use centers that would significantly threaten or diminish the stability, quality, positive character, livability or natural resources of residential neighborhoods; and*
- (b) Encourage development in multiple-use centers that would enhance the stability, quality, positive character, livability or natural resources of residential neighborhoods; and*
- (c) So long as the goal stated in (a) is met, allow for increased density, a variety of housing types, affordable housing, and mixed-use development; and*
- (d) Improve the appearance of buildings and landscapes.*

On section 18: “When adopting Metro Plan amendments, rely only on those assumptions for projected housing capacity that ensure this theme can be accomplished.”

Section 18 was the only section about which MUD members ended up almost evenly divided on whether to include or not.

This section addresses a highly-technical, legal issue, that is nonetheless essential to enable agreed-upon themes to be implemented. However, from our subgroup’s discussion, my sense is that some MUD subgroup members were hesitant to support a recommendation without fully understanding the issue. As I’ve urged throughout ECLA and Envision Eugene, I think it’s very important for staff to explain the related implications of adopted Metro Plan amendments and findings. I hope staff will provide all CRG members with a clear explanation of this important connection.

I believe a majority of MUD subgroup members also felt this was a point that would apply across the board to all “themes” and accordingly would be better expressed in a more general context than in this specific theme. I believe the members who supported including this section would agree to it being removed from this theme, if it were incorporated in a more encompassing consensus statement by the CRG.

I heard the third main objection to including this section as a feeling that we should have faith that staff will take care of this issue in the normal course of their EE work. I hope this would be the case; and if it were, the section would simply be a reminder that might not be necessary. However, in the ECLA and EE work to date, there’s evidence that staff has not adequately considered the implications of capacity assumptions. As just one example, potential assumptions about increasing capacity in R-1 areas developed as “transition” areas could foreclose the possibility of appropriate development standards in some transition areas that are part of a “mixed-use center” strategy.

Thus, while no harm will result from including this section (either in this theme or in a more general context), there could be very significant problems as the result of overlooking the nexus between adopted assumptions about residential capacity and future development standards. Including this section helps ensure that mistake doesn't occur.

MUD MEMBERS' COMMENTS

Comments from Pat Walsh on behalf of the Home Builders Association of Lane County Oregon

These comments reflect the individual member's opinions and have not been edited or formally discussed by the MUD subgroup.

The Home Builders Association of Lane County Oregon are in principal in agreement with the recommendations suggested by CRG subcommittee assigned to review Multi-Use Development along transit corridors.

HBA is pleased that there was general agreement on most points discussed and with the subcommittee's overall commitment to functional, attractive multi-use developments along transit corridors that are most likely to be successful, and enhances the surrounding detached single-family and multi-family neighborhoods in the area.

However, we recognize that the recommendations agreed to by the subcommittee are a starting point for further discussion concerning refinement and implementation of the recommendations.

We believe the challenges ahead lie in the details and definitions for multi-use development along transit corridors and the appetite by financial institutions to loan money to developers for such projects, as well as the marketplaces acceptance as renters and owners of these high-density developments as feasible locations to live.