

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 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.