

ROUGHLY EDITED TRANSCRIPT
CITY OF EUGENE
WORK SESSION
SEPTEMBER 14, 2026
5:30 P.M.

Captioning Provided by:
LNS Captioning
www.LNSCaptioning.com
Phone: (503) 446-4555

* * *

This text, document, or file is based on live transcription. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART), captioning, and/or live transcription are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings. This is NOT the official record of the proceedings.

* * *

>> MAYOR KNUDSON: WELCOME TO THE
SEPTEMBER 14, 2026, CITY COUNCIL WORK
SESSION.

THANK YOU FOR JOINING US IN THIS HYBRID
MEETING SESSION.

THERE IS NO OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC
COMMENT.

THOSE WISHING TO ACCESS CAN WATCH

THE LIVE STREAM ON OUR WEBSITE, THE BROADCAST ON CHANNEL 21, OR CALLING IN TO ONE OF THE PHONE NUMBERS LISTED ON THE MATERIALS PAGE OF THE CITY OF EUGENE WEBSITE.

IN CASE OF A MEDICAL EMERGENCY, AN AUTOMATED EXTERNAL DEFIBRILLATOR IS LOCATED BEHIND STAFF ON THE LEFT OR WEST SIDE OF THIS ROOM.

IN CASE OF AN EMERGENCY EVACUATION, EMERGENCY EXITS ARE THROUGH THE DOUBLE DOORS LOCATED AT THE BACK OF THE ROOM AND THE DOORS TO THE PATIO CAN ALSO BE USED AS NEEDED.

THANK YOU AGAIN FOR JOINING US THIS EVENING.

I NOW CALL THE SEPTEMBER 14, 2026, WORK SESSION OF THE EUGENE CITY COUNCIL TO ORDER.

I'LL TURN IT OVER TO THE CITY MANAGER TO INTRODUCE OUR FIRST TOPIC, WHICH IS A WORK SESSION ON THE URBAN GROWTH STRATEGIES ADOPTION PACKAGE NUMBER ONE.

>> THANK YOU, MAYOR.

PLANNING STAFF WILL PROVIDE AN OVERVIEW OF THE URBAN GROWTH STRATEGIES ADOPTION PACKAGE NUMBER ONE, WHICH WAS ORIGINALLY DISCUSSED IN NOVEMBER OF 2025 AND APRIL OF 2026. THE PROPOSED CODE AMENDMENTS ARE INTENDED TO REMOVE BARRIERS TO JOBS -- EXCUSE ME, HOUSING AND JOB DEVELOPMENT, INCREASE HOUSING CHOICE, AND COMPLY WITH STATE LAW REQUIREMENTS.

THE PLANNING COMMISSION HELD A PUBLIC HEARING ON JUNE 23 AND VOTED TO RECOMMEND THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS ON JULY 28, 2026.

COUNCIL WILL HOLD THEIR OWN PUBLIC HEARING ON THESE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS ON OCTOBER 19, 2026, AND MUST TAKE ACTION BEFORE THE END OF THE YEAR.

WITH THAT, I'LL TURN IT OVER TO STAFF.

>> MAYOR KNUDSON: IS IT ON?

>> I'M NOT SURE IF IT'S WORKING.

WE'LL ASSUME THAT IS IT IS.

>> MUCH CLOSER.

>> THERE WE GO.

OK.

VERY, VERY CLOSE.

HELLO.

THANK YOU FOR HAVING US.

MY NAME IS REBECCA, A PRINCIPLE
PLANNING WITH COMMUNITY PLANNING AND
DESIGN.

I'M JOINED BY MY COLLEAGUES, HEATHER
O'DONNELL AND LEAH ROUSH, AND WE'RE
GOING TO SHARE WITH YOU TONIGHT OUR
FIRST ADOPTION PACKAGE FOR URBAN
GROWTH STRATEGIES.

IT IS A PACKAGE OF HOUSING AND JOBS
ACTIONS, WHICH IS A REQUIRED STEP IN
OUR URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY
PLANNING.

AND WE'RE EXCITED TO START TALKING
WITH YOU ABOUT IT TONIGHT.

WE WILL PROVIDE A QUICK OVERVIEW.
THEN SHARE MORE DETAILS ON THE
PROPOSED HOUSING AND JOBS ACTIONS
INCLUDED IN ADOPTION PACKAGE ONE.

WE'RE INTERESTED IN HEARING FROM YOU
ANY CLARIFYING QUESTIONS YOU MAY
HAVE AS WE PREPARE FOR YOUR PUBLIC
HEARING ON OCTOBER 19.

URBAN GROWTH STRATEGIES IS A STATE
AND COUNCIL DIRECTED SUITE OF WORK
THAT'S IDENTIFYING THE ACTIONS,
POLICIES, AND LAND NEEDED IN EUGENE
OVER THE NEXT 20 YEARS IN ORDER TO
SUPPORT LIVING WAGE JOBS AND HOUSING
THAT EVERYONE CAN AFFORD.

IT IDENTIFIES TOOLS THAT CAN HELP
EUGENE GROW MORE EFFICIENTLY.

AS YOU KNOW, WE HAVE AN IMMENSE
HOUSING NEED.

EUGENE NEEDS TO SUPPORT THE
PRODUCTION OF ALMOST 26,000 NEW
DWELLINGS OVER THE NEXT 20 YEARS.
INCLUDING AN URGENT NEED FOR HOUSING
THAT'S AFFORDABLE FOR THE LOWEST

INCOME HOUSEHOLDS.

UGS IS SPLIT INTO FOUR AREAS.

HOUSING AND JOBS ACTIONS AND LAND
SUPPLY STUDIES.

TONIGHT, WE'RE FOCUSING ON OUR FIRST
SET OF HOUSING AND JOBS ACTIONS,
WHICH ARE INTENDED TO REMOVE
BARRIERS TO HOUSING AND JOBS
DEVELOPMENT, INCREASE HOUSING
CHOICE, AND COMPLY WITH STATE LAW
REQUIREMENTS.

THE HOUSING AND JOBS ACTIONS THE CITY
COUNCIL WILL CONSIDER THIS YEAR AND
NEXT GENERALLY FALL INTO THE
FOLLOWING PRIORITY AREAS.

INCREASING OUR CAPACITY FOR HOUSING,
REDUCING REGULATORY BARRIERS FOR
BOTH HOUSING AND JOBS DEVELOPMENT,
AND ENCOURAGING COMPACT
DEVELOPMENT FOR BOTH JOBS AND
HOUSING IN AND AROUND KEY CORRIDORS
AND CENTERS.

IN RESPONSE TO OUR CITY'S IMMENSE
HOUSING NEED AND AS PART OF OUR

STATE DIRECTED PLANNING WORK, THE CITY COUNCIL WILL BE CONSIDERING ADOPTION OF AT LEAST FOUR PACKAGES OF PROPOSED ACTIONS OVER THE NEXT FOUR YEARS.

AND THEY ARE SUMMARIZED HERE.

TONIGHT'S FOCUS IS ON THE FIRST OF OUR TWO 2026 PACKAGES.

THIS FIRST PACKAGE PRIMARILY FOCUSES ON THE STATE REQUIRED HOUSING AND JOBS ACTIONS THAT HAVE END OF YEAR DEADLINES.

THE DETAILS ARE INCLUDED IN YOUR ATTACHMENTS A, B, AND C OF YOUR AREA.

THE ADOPTION PROCESS FOR THE SECOND PACKAGE WILL START WITH PLANNING COMMISSION MEETINGS NEXT MONTH.

IT WILL BE A JOINT CITY-COUNTY PROCESS, AND IT INCLUDES MORE HOUSING AND JOBS ACTIONS, PLUS FIVE NEW CHAPTERS OF OUR ENVISION EUGENE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND OUR EUGENE SPECIFIC LAND USE DESIGNATION MAP.

IN 2027, WE WILL BRING FORWARD TO BOTH

THE CITY AND COUNTY A LARGE PACKAGE FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE END OF THE YEAR.

WE ARE WORKING ON THESE COMPONENTS NOW, AND WE WILL SHARE PRELIMINARY INFORMATION WITH YOU IN DECEMBER.

THE ADOPTION OF OUR LAND SUPPLY STUDIES BY THE END OF 2027 IS A STATE DEADLINE, AND IT WILL ALLOW US TO MOVE INTO ANALYZING POTENTIAL UGB EXPANSION AREAS IF NEEDED BY 2030.

SO THE FIRST OF THIS BEGAN THIS SUMMER WITH THE EUGENE PLANNING COMMISSION. AFTER A WORK SESSION SIMILAR TO THIS ONE, THE PLANNING COMMISSION HELD A PUBLIC HEARING ON JUNE 23.

THEY RECEIVED A VARIETY OF WRITTEN AND VERBAL TESTIMONY FROM 38 MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.

THEN THE PLANNING COMMISSION HELD DELIBERATIONS IN JULY OVER TWO MEETINGS AND MADE A RECOMMENDATION TO CITY COUNCIL ON JULY 28.

THE PLANNING COMMISSION

RECOMMENDATION AS DESCRIBED IN YOUR AIS HAS BEEN INCORPORATED INTO THESE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS WE'RE GOING TO TALK ABOUT TONIGHT.

WITH THAT, WE'LL GET INTO THE DETAILS, AND I WILL HAND IT OVER TO LEAH.

>> OK.

THANKS FOR THAT.

GOOD EVENING, COUNCILLORS.

LEAH ROUSH, A SENIOR PLANNER IN THE PLANNING DIVISION.

ONE OF THE ITEMS IN THIS FIRST ADOPTION PACKAGE IS A SERIES OF LAND USE CODE CHANGES TO CREATE NEW DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS FOR MICRO VILLAGE HOUSING AND SINGLE ROOM OCCUPANCIES.

WE'VE BROUGHT THIS TOPIC TO YOU IN THE PAST.

YOU CAN REVIEW MORE DETAILS ON THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN ATTACHMENT B OF YOUR AGENDA PACKET BEGINNING ON PAGE 14.

BOTH SINGLE ROOM OCCUPANCIES WOULD HAVE AMENITIES PROVIDED IN A SHARED

BUILDING.

BOTH HOUSING TYPES COULD RESPOND TO OUR NEEDS IN EUGENE, ESPECIALLY FOR LOWER COST HOUSING UNITS AND SMALLER UNITS.

MICRO VILLAGE HOUSING SUNDAYS TO A NEED WE'VE HEARD FROM DEVELOPERS AND SHELTER PROVIDERS TO CREATE HOUSING THAT IS AFFORDABLE BY DESIGN AND CENTERS COMMUNITY LIVING.

IT'S MODELED ON AN APPROACH THAT'S ALREADY BEEN SUCCESSFUL IN A SHELTER SETTING, LIKE EVERYONE VILLAGE IN EUGENE, BUT ALSO VILLAGE STYLE AND COMMUNITY-MINDED MIDDLE HOUSING AND MULTIUNIT HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS.

MICRO VILLAGE HOUSING AS A NEW HOUSING TYPE IN OUR LAND USE CODE WOULD ALLOW VERY SMALL DWELLING UNITS WITH AN IN-UNIT BATHROOM AT UNDER 400 SQUARE FEET WITH A SIZE BONUS FOR ACCESSIBLE UNITS OR AFFORDABLE UNITS.

COMMON BUILDINGS WOULD PROVIDE

SHARED KITCHEN AND EATING FACILITIES FOR RESIDENTS AND OTHER SERVICES OR FACILITIES COULD BE OFFERED BASED ON THE NEEDS OF THE RESIDENTS, LIKE LAUNDRY, STORAGE, DAY CARE OR OTHER SERVICES.

THE HOPE IS THESE DWELLINGS ARE LESS EXPENSIVE TO DEVELOP.

WE HAVE HEARD THROUGH COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT THAT THE VILLAGE SETTING CAN PROVIDE BOTH INDEPENDENCE AND COMMUNITY SUPPORT AND DETACHED UNITS IN PARTICULAR CAN OFFER A SENSE OF SAFETY AND COMFORT FOR RESIDENTS WHO MAY HAVE PREVIOUSLY LIVED UNHOUSED.

IN ADDITION TO MICRO VILLAGE HOUSING, WE'RE PROPOSING DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS FOR SINGLE ROOM OCCUPANCIES, OR SRO'S.

STATE LAW NOW ALLOWS SRO'S AS DETACHED OR ATTACHED UNITS.

SINGLE ROOM OCCUPANCIES ARE MADE UP OF AT LEAST FOUR ATTACHED OR

DETACHED UNITS THAT PROVIDE LIVING AND SLEEPING SPACE AND THAT ARE INDEPENDENTLY RENTED.

EACH UNIT MUST SHARE EITHER BATHROOM OR KITCHEN FACILITIES WITH OTHER UNITS. UNDER STATE LAW 4-6 SRO UNITS WILL BE ALLOWED IN LOW DENSITY AREAS, AND THEN ANYWHERE THAT MULTI-UNIT HOUSING IS ALLOWED.

GENERALLY, PUBLIC TESTIMONY DURING THE PLANNING COMMISSION PROCESS WAS VERY POSITIVE ON THE MICRO VILLAGE HOUSING PROPOSAL.

WE HAD ONE COMMENTER WHO PROVIDED MORE SPECIFIC TESTIMONY ON THE DRAFT CODE, INCLUDING THE MINIMUM NUMBER OF DWELLING UNITS ON A SITE, THE LACK OF A MINIMUM LOT STANDARD, AND THE MINIMUM DIMENSIONS FOR INDOOR OPEN SPACE.

FOR A SINGLE ROOM OCCUPANCIES, PUBLIC COMMENT RELATED TO WHETHER THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS COMPLY WITH RECENT CHANGES TO STATE LAW, ALLOWING SRO'S ANYWHERE THAT A

SINGLE UNIT IS ALLOWED.

THROUGH DELIBERATIONS AND IN
RESPONSE TO TESTIMONY, THE
RECOMMENDATIONS INCLUDE SOME
PROVISIONS TO CLARIFY STATE LAW
COMPLIANCE AND ADJUSTMENT TO THE
OPEN SPACE MINIMUM DIMENSIONS TO
PROVIDE MORE DEVELOPER FLEXIBILITY.
AS WELL AS A FEW OTHER STAFF
RECOMMENDED CLEANUPS AND TO ENSURE
CLARITY AND CONSISTENCY.
WITH THAT, I WILL HAND IT OFF TO HEATHER
TO TALK ABOUT THE REST OF THE
PACKAGE.

>> GOOD EVENING, MAYOR AND
COUNCILLORS.

MY NAME IS HEATHER O'DONNELL, AND I'LL
GO OVER THE REMAINING PIECES OF
ADOPTION PACKAGE ONE, STARTING WITH
UPDATING THE MIDDLE HOUSING LAND USE
CODE.

BOTH CONCEPTS ARE IN ATTACHMENT C
STARTING ON AGENDA PAGE 17.

SO QUICK REFRESHER.

MIDDLE HOUSING TYPES INCLUDE DUPLEXES, TRIPLEXES, FOURPLEXES, TOWNHOUSES, AND COTTAGE CLUSTERS. AND IN 2022, IN RESPONSE TO STATE LEGISLATION, THE CITY AMENDED EUGENE'S LAND USE CODE TO END DECADES OF EXCLUSIONARY LAND USE REGULATIONS AND MADE MIDDLE HOUSING TYPES REALLY DIFFICULT TO BUILD. THE PROPOSED LAND USE CODE CHANGES ARE BASED ON NEW STATE REQUIREMENTS AND OTHER INPUT AS I'LL DISCUSS.

LAST YEAR, THE STATE PASSED MORE MIDDLE HOUSING LEGISLATION THAT CITIES MUST ADOPT BY THE END OF THIS YEAR. THE STATE ALSO ADOPTED A NEW MODEL HOUSING CODE FOR LARGE CITIES, WHICH THE STATE DEFINES AS CITIES OVER 25,000 PEOPLE.

AND WE RELIED HEAVILY ON THIS NEW CODE.

UNLIKE THE MIDDLE HOUSING CODE REFERENCED DURING THE 2022 MIDDLE HOUSING CODE UPDATE, THE NEW MODEL

HOUSING CODE IS NOT A BASELINE REQUIREMENT.

HOWEVER, IT DOES SHOW HOW THE STATE THINKS NEW STATE LAW AND STATE DIRECTION COULD BE IMPLEMENTED AND PROVIDES OPPORTUNITY FOR MORE CLARITY IN OUR OWN CODE.

THERE'S ALSO THE STATE'S NEW CLIMATE FRIENDLY WALKABLE DESIGN STANDARDS. FEEDBACK FROM STAFF AND HOUSING PROFESSIONALS ON HOW TO ADD DESIGN FLEXIBILITY, REDUCE PROCEDURE, AND ADD CLARITY, AND COMMUNITY FEEDBACK. WE HEARD SOME THINGS ARE WORKING WELL.

SOME THINGS CAN BE IMPROVED.

SO THESE PROPOSED CHANGES WOULD APPLY TO MIDDLE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT ACROSS THE ENTIRE CITY.

BASED ON THESE RESOURCES, ADOPTION PACKAGE ONE INCLUDES A PRETTY BIG VARIETY OF PROPOSED MIDDLE HOUSING CODE CHANGES.

ALTHOUGH THERE MAY ALSO BE ADDITIONAL CODE REFINEMENTS IN FUTURE

ADOPTION PACKAGES.

SOME OF THE KEY CONCEPTS IN THIS PACKAGE INCLUDE A VARIETY OF TECHNICAL FIXES THAT I WON'T GET INTO, BUT ARE INTENDED TO ADD CLARITY OR ALIGN WITH THE NEW MODEL HOUSING CODE, CREATING ADDITIONAL PLACES FOR PEOPLE TO LIVE LIKE INCREASING THE ALLOWED BUILDING HEIGHT, WHICH WE'LL TALK ABOUT LATER, AND ALLOWING LARGER COTTAGES, PROVIDING MORE DESIGN FLEXIBILITY LIKE ELIMINATING REQUIRED ARCHITECTURAL FEATURES FOR TOWNHOUSES AND RETAINING DESIGN FLEXIBILITY.

REDUCING POTENTIAL IMPACTS LIKE PROHIBITING TRASH AND RECYCLING COLLECTION AREAS IN SETBACKS.

AND SEVERAL CHANGES SPECIFICALLY TO IMPLEMENT NEW STATE LAW, INCLUDING MAKING IT EASIER TO ACCOMMODATE EXISTING SINGLE UNITS ACCESSORY DWELLINGS AND DUPLEXES THAT WILL BE RETAINED IN NEW MIDDLE HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS.

AND STATE LAW ALSO NOW REQUIRES A NEW BONUS UNIT FRAMEWORK THAT INCENTIVIZES MIDDLE HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS THAT CHOOSE TO PROVIDE AT LEAST ONE UNIT THAT IS FULLY ACCESSIBLE TO PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES, OR PROVIDE AT LEAST ONE HOMEOWNERSHIP UNIT THAT'S AFFORDABLE TO HOUSEHOLDS EARNING LESS THAN 120% OF THE AREA MEDIAN INCOME, WHICH IS ABOUT \$110,000 FOR A HOUSEHOLD OF FOUR.

THESE QUALIFYING PROJECTS CAN THEN ADD 1-2 ADDITIONAL BONUS UNITS.

THE FRAMEWORK MUST ALSO ALLOW INCREASES IN THE DEVELOPABLE AREA OF THE DEVELOPMENT SITE TO ACCOMMODATE THE BONUS UNITS.

SO THE PROPOSED CODE AMENDMENTS INCLUDE REDUCING SOME REGULATIONS SUCH AS ALLOWING 10 MORE FEET OR THE EQUIVALENT OF ONE STORY IN BUILDING HEIGHT.

REDUCING BUILDING SETBACKS.

AND INCREASING THE MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF LOT COVERAGE.

THE PROPOSED FRAMEWORK ALIGNS WITH THE MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS OF THE STATE.

DURING THE PLANNING COMMISSION PROCESS, TESTIMONY WAS RECEIVED GENERALLY SUPPORTING REMOVING BARRIERS TO HOUSING.

SOME TESTIMONY ALSO SUGGESTED SPECIFIC CHANGES, SUCH AS CONCERNS ABOUT INCREASED OPEN SPACE, WINDOW COVERAGE REGULATIONS, RETAIN COTTAGE CLUSTER PARKING, REQUESTING MORE FLEXIBILITY IN TOWNHOUSE ACCESS AND PARKING, AND SUGGESTING BROADENING THE APPLICABILITY OF THE BONUS UNIT FRAMEWORK.

ALSO SINCE THE INITIAL PUBLISHING OF THE PROPOSED CODE AMENDMENTS, THE STATE HAS AGAIN ISSUED NEW RULES, AND THESE ARE RELATED TO SOME OF THE PROPOSED COTTAGE CLUSTER CODE AMENDMENTS.

THE PLANNING COMMISSION'S FINAL RECOMMENDATION INCLUDED ALL OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES, PLUS UPDATING SOME DEFINITIONS, ADDING FLEXIBILITY FOR TOWNHOUSE ACCESS AND PARKING AREAS, AND UPDATING THE COTTAGE CLUSTER CODE AMENDMENTS TO ALIGN WITH THE NEW RULES.

INCREASING THE MAXIMUM ALLOWED BUILDING HEIGHT IN THE R1 RESIDENTIAL ZONE IS ANOTHER COMPONENT OF ADOPTION PACKAGE ONE AND THIS CODE CONCEPT IS IN ATTACHMENT A, STARTING ON AGENDA PAGE 13.

THE PROPOSED CODE AMENDMENTS WOULD INCREASE THE MAXIMUM HEIGHT FROM 30 FEET TO 35 FEET IN THE R-1 ZONE, WHICH UNDER THE CURRENT CODE WOULD ALSO ALLOW AN INCREASE TO 42 FEET IF USING A STEEPER PITCHED ROOF.

INCREASING THE MAXIMUM ALLOWED BUILDING HEIGHT BY FIVE FEET IS ONE OF THE MANY PROPOSED AMENDMENTS AIMED AT ALIGNING WITH THE STATE'S RECENTLY

ADOPTED MODEL HOUSING CODE.

WE'VE ALSO HEARD FROM DESIGN PROFESSIONALS THAT IT WOULD SUPPORT MORE LIVING AREA SUCH AS A THIRD STORY.

MOST OF THE TESTIMONY RECEIVED ON ADOPTION PACKAGE NUMBER ONE HAS BEEN DIRECTED AT THIS PROPOSED HEIGHT INCREASE, BOTH AGAINST AND IN SUPPORT. DURING THE PLANNING COMMISSION PROCESS, STAFF CONSIDERED REMOVING THE PROPOSAL FROM ADOPTION PACKAGE ONE AND BRINGING A NEW PROPOSAL BACK NEXT YEAR.

BASED ON ADDITIONAL RESEARCH AND CONSIDERATION OF THE DIFFERENT COMPOUNDING HEIGHT ADJUSTMENTS THAT ARE ALLOWED UNDER STATE LAW.

THE PLANNING COMMISSION'S FINAL RECOMMENDATION WAS TO CONTINUE WITH THE PROPOSAL TO INCREASE THE MAXIMUM OR ONE-BUILDING HEIGHT TO 35 FEET.

ADOPTION PACKAGE 1 INCLUDES SEVERAL OTHER PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO

REDUCE BARRIERS TO HOUSING AND JOBS
AND TO ADDRESS RECENT LEGISLATION.

THE PROPOSED CHANGES WOULD ALLOW
DAY CARE TYPE USES AND RESIDENTIAL
TREATMENT TYPE USES TO BE PERMITTED
OUTRIGHT IN MORE ZONES.

THESE CONCEPTS ARE IN ATTACHMENT A
STARTING ON AGENDA PAGE 10.

THE AMENDMENTS ALIGN WITH STATE LAW,
AND THERE'S LIMITED ROOM FOR LOCAL
POLICY DECISIONS.

THE RESULT IS THAT SMALLER USES LIKE
DAY CARE AND RESIDENTIAL CARE HOMES
WOULD BE ALLOWED WHERE SINGLE UNIT
HOUSING IS ALLOWED.

AND LARGER USES LIKE CARE CENTERS
AND RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITIES WOULD
BE ALLOWED WHERE MULTI-UNIT HOUSING
IS ALLOWED.

LIMITED TESTIMONY WAS RECEIVED ON
THESE TOPICS, INCLUDING NO SPECIFIC
CONCERNS WERE RAISED.

PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDED
THE PROPOSED CHANGES WITH A MINOR

UPDATE TO THE RESIDENTIAL CARE
DEFINITION.

AND THE PROPOSAL ALSO INCLUDES SOME
CHANGES TO LAND USE APPLICATIONS.

THESE ARE IN ATTACHMENT A STARTING ON
AGENDA PAGE 13.

STATE LAW NOW REQUIRES CITIES TO
STREAMLINE SOME RESIDENTIAL LAND USE
APPLICATIONS, INCLUDING ZONE CHANGES
TO HIGHER DENSITY, LAND UNIT
DEVELOPMENTS, VARIANCES TO
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS.
THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS IMPLEMENT
THESE REQUIREMENTS THROUGH A NEW
EXPEDITED LAND USE APPLICATION
PROCESS.

IN ADDITION, IN RESPONSE TO THE
HOUSING CRISIS AND TO SUPPORT
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, THE
AMENDMENTS ALSO INCLUDE TEMPORARILY
EXTENDING THE EXPIRATION DATE FOR
CERTAIN LAND USE APPROVALS FOR THREE
YEARS.

SPECIFICALLY THIS WOULD APPLY TO TYPE

2 AND TYPE 3 LAND USE APPROVAL.

SO THOSE ARE SUBDIVISIONS, PARTITIONS.

IT WOULD ALSO APPLY TO EXPEDITED LAND DIVISIONS AND MIDDLE HOUSING LAND DIVISIONS.

COUNCIL PREVIOUSLY APPROVED SUCH PROPOSALS.

THIS PARTICULAR PROPOSAL IS NOT A STATE MANDATE.

LIMITED COMMENTS WERE RECEIVED ON THESE TOPICS.

NO SPECIFIC CONCERNS WERE RAISED.

PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDED THE PROPOSED CHANGES WITH A MINOR UPDATE TO REDUCE THE NUMBER OF SITE PLANS REQUIRED TO BE SUBMITTED FOR THESE APPLICATIONS.

>> THANK YOU, HEATHER.

SO AFTER TONIGHT'S WORK SESSION, THERE WILL BE A PUBLIC HEARING ON THIS FIRST ADOPTION PACKAGE ON OCTOBER 19. THE CODE AMENDMENTS WILL BE AVAILABLE TO COUNCIL AND TO THE PUBLIC PRIOR TO THE PUBLIC HEARING.

FOLLOWING THAT, ON NOVEMBER 23 WILL BE DELIBERATIONS AND ADOPTION CONSIDERATION.

AND JUST A QUICK REMINDER THAT THE COMPONENTS OF THIS ADOPTION PACKAGE THAT OUR STATE MANDATED ARE REQUIRED FOR ACTION BY THE END OF THE YEAR.

SO WE THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME.

AND THAT'S THE END OF OUR PRESENTATION.

WE'LL OPEN IT UP TO QUESTIONS.

>> MAYOR KNUDSON: THANK YOU, STAFF, FOR THAT PRESENTATION.

I NOW OPEN THE FLOOR FOR COUNCIL QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION.

COUNSELOR GROVES AND THEN COUNCILOR KASHINSKY.

>> GROVES: THANK YOU, MAYOR, AND THANK YOU STAFF FOR THE PRESENTATION.

I JUST WANT TO CONFIRM, THE STATE BUILDING CODE -- I KNOW YOU TALKED ABOUT THE STATE AND SRO'S AND

BRINGING THOSE INTO THE FULL.

IS ALL OF THAT WORK DONE NOW, OR ARE THERE STILL PIECES THAT NEED TO BE COMPLETED?

>> THE STATE REQUIRED CHANGES TO SINGLE ROOM OCCUPANCIES ARE INCLUDED IN THIS PACKAGE.

SO THESE DRAFT CODE AMENDMENTS THAT WE'RE HOPING TO PASS BY THE END OF THE YEAR.

SO THAT IS ALLOWING SINGLE ROOM OCCUPANCIES IN MORE PLACES AROUND THE CITY AND ALLOWING DETACHED SRO'S, 4-6 UNITS AND SINGLE UNIT, AND THEN ADD A DENSITY RATIO IN MULTI-UNIT AREAS.

>> GROVES: THANK YOU.

THE STATE, HAVE THEY COMPLETED EVERYTHING THAT THEY NEED TO DO, SO THAT WHEN WE HOPEFULLY MOVE FORWARD WITH THIS -- BECAUSE I THINK SRO'S ARE A LEGITIMATE OPTION -- I DON'T THINK IT'S THE ANSWER FOR EVERYTHING, BUT I THINK THAT NEEDS TO BE ANOTHER

ARROW IN OUR QUIVER.

ARE WE GOING TO BE READY TO GO?

IS THE STATE GOING TO BE READY TO GO

SHOULD WE PASS THIS LATER?

>> YES.

SO THE STATE LEGISLATION HAS GONE

THROUGH.

THE DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION

AND DEVELOPMENT IS WORKING ON A

MODEL CODE FOR SINGLE ROOM

OCCUPANCIES THAT IS A PART -- THAT WILL

BE A PART OF THE HOUSING MODEL CODE

THAT HEATHER TALKED A LITTLE BIT ABOUT,

SO THAT DRAFT LANGUAGE IS OUT FOR

PUBLIC COMMENT RIGHT NOW.

I DON'T THINK THERE'S ANYTHING ELSE

WE'RE WAITING ON THE STATE FOR.

BUT WE DID REVIEW THEIR DRAFT MODEL

CODE JUST TO MAKE SURE WE WERE IN

ALIGNMENT WITH THAT.

>> GROVES: OK.

VERY GOOD.

THANK YOU.

ANOTHER QUESTION I HAVE, WHICH IS ALL PART OF US ACTUALLY DEVELOPING HOUSING, HAVE WE MADE ANY MOVEMENTS ON WETLAND MITIGATION?

I THINK OF MY WARD IN PARTICULAR.

AND PRETTY MUCH ALL THE FLAT, OPEN SPACES THAT YOU CAN BUILD ON ARE WETLANDS.

AND THAT'S KIND OF INCHING DOWN THE PIPELINE HERE.

>> THANK YOU FOR THE QUESTION.

PART OF THIS ANALYSIS DOESN'T GET INTO SPECIFIC SITE WETLAND ANALYSIS.

BUT WE WILL BE LOOKING AT WETLANDS WHEN WE DO OUR UGB EXPANSION.

WE KNOW WHICH ARE IDENTIFIED AS PROTECTED AND WHICH ARE IDENTIFIED AS ABLE TO MITIGATE OR BE DEVELOPED ON.

AND SO AT THAT POINT, WE'LL BE IDENTIFYING WHETHER WE NEED TO DO ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS, SITE SPECIFIC, AND WORK WITH THE CITY PARKS DEPARTMENT ON THEIR WETLAND MITIGATION BANKS AND

HOW MUCH LAND IS AVAILABLE THERE AND HOW WE MIGHT WORK WITH THE COMMUNITY ON ENSURING THAT THAT LAND THAT WE IDENTIFY AS DEVELOPABLE COULD REALLY BE DEVELOPED.

>> GROVES: I APPRECIATE THAT, AND I THINK THAT THIS IS NOT ALL FALLING IN YOUR DEPARTMENT. BUT YOU'RE IN FRONT OF US, SO I WANTED TO ASK THE QUESTION.

IN PARTICULAR, I'M THINKING ABOUT EVERYONE VILLAGE, WHICH IS A PROVEN MODEL THAT'S LIFTING PEOPLE FROM THE STREET INTO SELF-SUFFICIENCY AND INDEPENDENCE, WHICH I THINK WE NEED TO BE LOOKING AT.

AND THEY'VE GOT HALF OF THEIR -- THEIR 3.5 ACRE SITE THAT WAS DONATED, A GOOD PORTION OF THAT IS CONSIDERED WETLANDS.

AND IF WE CAN SOMEHOW GET THAT MITIGATED, THEY'LL BE ABLE TO ADD 80 MORE UNITS, WHICH THAT'S AT LEAST 80

MORE PEOPLE OFF THE STREET.

>> YEAH.

I DON'T HAVE A SPECIFIC UPDATE ON THE EVERYONE VILLAGE SITE.

I KNOW THAT THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIVISION IS WORKING CLOSELY WITH THEM TO SEE WHAT RESOURCES AND THE CITY CAN PROVIDE. AND SO I KNOW THEY ARE LOOKING INTO IT AND SEEING WHAT NEEDS TO HAPPEN.

THE WETLANDS ON THEIR SITE, I BELIEVE, ARE STATE WETLANDS BUT NOT LOCALLY PROTECTED WETLANDS.

SO JUST GOING THROUGH THE PROCESS WITH THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF WETLANDS.

>> GROVES: THANK YOU.

I'M VERY INTERESTED IN THAT.

IF ANYTHING DEVELOPS ON THAT, I'D APPRECIATE BEING INFORMED ON THAT.

THANK YOU.

THANK YOU, MAYOR.

>> MAYOR KNUDSON: COUNCILOR

KASHINSKY.

>> KASHINSKY: THANK YOU.

AND THANK YOU FOR ALL OF THE WORK ON THIS.

I HAVE A NUMBER OF DIFFERENT QUESTIONS.

I'M ALWAYS VERY APPRECIATIVE WHEN WE'RE REMOVING BARRIERS THAT MAKE IT HARD FOR PEOPLE TO BUILD HOUSING, SO SOME OF THESE ARE THINKING ABOUT WHAT THINGS ARE LIKE TWO YEARS FROM NOW.

WE'LL HAVE SOMEONE COME UP TO THE PERMANENT OFFICE AND SAY, WHY CAN'T I DO THIS THING THAT SEEMS TO MAKE SENSE, AND WE JUST LEFT A LINE IN THERE SOMEWHERE THAT LEFT THIS THING AS A BARRIER.

SO A COUPLE OF DIFFERENT QUESTIONS. THE CHANGE IN SIZE TO THE COTTAGES. IS THAT STATE LAW REQUIRED, THE COTTAGES?

>> YES.

SO, YES.

I'LL JUST STOP THERE.

>> KASHINSKY: OK.

I ASK BECAUSE IT FEELS LIKE, YOU KNOW,
WHEN YOU START TALKING ABOUT THAT, IT
STOPS FEELING LIKE A COTTAGE TO ME.

>> WE HAVE HAD THAT CONVERSATION AS
WELL.

BUT PART OF THE STATE RULES INCLUDE A
SPECIFIC DEFINITION FOR COTTAGE
CLUSTER DWELLINGS, WHICH ALSO NOW
INCLUDES THE SIZE MEASUREMENT.

>> KASHINSKY: OK.

>> SO WE'RE KIND OF STUCK WITH THAT.

>> KASHINSKY: ARE SRO'S IN THE MICRO
VILLAGES CONSIDERED MIDDLE HOUSING
AT ALL?

SO IF WE HAVE A PLACE IN OUR CODE THAT
SAYS, THESE STANDARDS DON'T APPLY IN
THIS AREA, THE MIDDLE HOUSING

STANDARDS APPLY, THE STANDARDS IN THAT SECTION WOULD STILL APPLY TO SRO'S OR THEY WOULDN'T?

>> SRO'S AND MICRO VILLAGE HOUSING ARE CONSIDERED THEIR OWN TYPES, SO THEY ARE NOT MIDDLE HOUSING. THEY ARE THEIR OWN THING.

>> KASHINSKY: OK.

AND I NOTICED WHEN SOME OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS WERE TO LOOK AT VERY SPECIFIC BEDROOM LIMITATIONS IN THE UNIVERSITY AREA.

AND I KNOW THAT SIMILAR BEDROOM LIMITATIONS EXIST IN SOME OF OUR SPECIAL AREA ZONES.

HAVE WE DONE ANY LOOKING TO SEE HOW THOSE BEDROOM LIMITATIONS MIGHT IMPACT THE SRO'S?

I'M NOT SURE THAT THEY WOULD.

BUT LIKE I CAN -- IT WAS HARD TO INTERPRET HOW THOSE BEDROOM LIMITATIONS WOULD APPLY TO THE SRO'S.

>> WE PROPOSED CHANGING THAT SO IT WOULDN'T APPLY TO SRO'S.

THAT'S I THINKING ABOUT EXTRA CLEAR AND EXTRA SAFE.

WE CAN LOOK INTO BEDROOM LIMITATIONS IN OTHER AREAS.

I DON'T KNOW OF THEM OFF THE TOP OF MY HEAD.

BUT WE CAN DOUBLE CHECK THAT.

I THINK IT WAS JUST MAKING SURE IT'S CRYSTAL CLEAR.

BUT I WOULD AGREE, THE BEDROOM LIMITATIONS SHOULDN'T BE APPLIED TO SINGLE ROOM OCCUPANCIES.

SO JUST MAKING SURE.

>> KASHINSKY: YEAH.

IT'S THE -- THE ONE I'M FAMILIAR WITH THE MOST IS THE JEFFERSON SPECIAL AREA ZONE, AND IT'S COMPLEX BECAUSE IT'S LIKE, IF YOU HAVE THIS NUMBER OF BEDROOMS, IT'S CONSIDERED THIS NUMBER OF UNITS AND DENSITY.

SO IT'S AN INTERESTING WAY TO REGULATE IT.

SO I JUST WASN'T ABLE TO PARSE OUT HOW THAT MIGHT OVERLAP WITH THE SRO'S. THE SRO SIZE IS LISTED AS -- THERE'S A MINIMUM TO LINE UP WITH THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT. IS THAT A STANDARD TO GET HUD FUNDING, OR IS THAT -- WHAT'S THE SORT OF STANDARD THERE?

>> I BELIEVE THAT STANDARD IS SPECIFIC TO USING ANY SORT OF LIKE HOUSING ASSISTANCE VOUCHERS. IT WOULD NEED TO MEET -- THE UNIT ITSELF NEEDS TO MEET SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS. BUT THAT REQUIREMENT IS ALSO IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE BUILDING CODE. SO IT SHOULDN'T BE AN ISSUE. JUST MAKING THAT VERY CLEARLY STATED.

>> KASHINSKY: OK. THE REASON I ASK IS BECAUSE IT SAYS THAT 110 IS THE HUD STANDARD AND 70 IS THE BUILDING CODE STANDARD.

>> OH, THANK YOU FOR FLAGGING THAT.

YEAH.

I COULD FOLLOW UP WITH YOU.

I DON'T REMEMBER EXACTLY OFF THE TOP OF MY HEAD WHERE IT COMES FROM.

I THINK IT'S RELATED TO HOUSING ASSISTANCE VOUCHERS.

>> KASHINSKY: OK.

IF IT'S RELATED TO VOUCHERS THAT MAKES MORE SENSE TO ME THAN IF IT'S RELATED TO LIKE BUILDING ASSISTANCE, RIGHT? BECAUSE IF SOMEONE WANTS TO BUILD WITHOUT HUD MONEY, GREAT, BUILD THE SMALLER UNIT.

IF IT'S OK AND THIS UNIT EXISTS AND I CAN'T USE MY HUD VOUCHERS FOR IT, THAT'S A VERY DIFFERENT SCENARIO.

AND I WILL PROBABLY WANT A SECOND ROUND.

THANK YOU.

>> MAYOR KNUDSON: COUNCILOR ZELENKA.

>> ZELENKA: FOLLOWING UP ON COUNCILOR KASHINSKY'S QUESTION.

THE RECOMMENDATION TWO SAYS THAT CLARIFY THE UNIVERSITY AREA NUMBER OF BEDROOM LIMITATIONS DOES NOT APPLY TO SRO'S, AND CODE ESTABLISHES A MAXIMUM COUNT OF THREE BEDROOMS IN A DWELLING IN THE UNIVERSITY AREA.

AND CLARIFY THAT BEDROOM COUNT DOES NOT APPLY TO SRO'S.

SO WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR DOING THAT?

AND HOW MANY BEDROOMS CAN THERE BE IN A DWELLING?

IS IT UNLIMITED BY THIS CRITERIA?

>> ARE YOU ASKING IF THE RATIONALE BEHIND THE CURRENT LIMITATION ON --

>> NO, MORE REMOVING IT.

>> OK.

>> ZELENKA: THE CHANGE, RIGHT?
THE PROPOSED CHANGE.

>> IT'S CLARIFYING THAT PROVISION

DOESN'T APPLY TO SRO'S.

WE NEED TO ALLOW FOR 4-6 SRO'S
ANYWHERE THAT SINGLE UNITS ARE
ALLOWED.

SO MAKING IT VERY CLEAR THAT YOU
COULD STILL BUILD 4-6 SRO'S ON A LOT IN
THE UNIVERSITY AREA.

>> ZELENKA: SO MAYBE IT WOULD BE
CLEARER IF IT SAID, CHANGE THE MAXIMUM
OF THREE TO FOUR TO SIX.

>> THEORETICALLY, BUT THAT WOULD THEN
APPLY TO OTHER HOUSING TYPES AS WELL.
SO WHAT WE DRAFTED IN THE CODE IS
JUST SAYING THAT SRO'S ARE
SPECIFICALLY CARVED OUT IN THAT
PROVISION OF NO MORE THAN THREE DOES
NOT APPLY TO SINGLE ROOM
OCCUPANCIES.

IT DOESN'T CHANGE HOW IT IS APPLIED TO
SINGLE UNIT DWELLINGS, FOR EXAMPLE.

>> ZELENKA: BUT IT COULD BE INCREASED
TO FOUR TO SIX BY THIS CHANGE?

>> UH-HUH.

>> ZELENKA: OK.

GENERAL COMMENT ABOUT THE URBAN
GROWTH STANDARDS PACKAGE.

TO DATE ALL OF THIS HAS BEEN ABSTRACT
AND ABOUT RULE CHANGES.

AND INCREASES IN DENSITY.

IT'S NOT REALLY MANIFESTED ITSELF IN
NEIGHBORHOODS.

BUT WE'RE STARTING TO SEE THE PHYSICAL
MANIFESTATION OF THESE IN OUR
NEIGHBORHOODS.

I'LL PASS THIS AROUND.

BUT THIS IS A PICTURE OF A BUILDING IN MY
NEIGHBORHOOD, ON RICHARD STREET.

AND WHAT IT SHOWS IS A HUGE -- THIS IS A
HUGE THREE STORY TALL BUILDING THAT
DWARFS THE HOUSE NEXT DOOR AND
DWARFS THE HOUSE IN FRONT OF IT.

I COUNTED 12 AIR CONDITIONING UNITS, SO
I'M ASSUMING IT'S 12 PEOPLE, LITTLE TO NO
PARKING ON THIS.

I DOUBT THIS IS WHAT PEOPLE HAD IN MIND.

IT WASN'T CERTAINLY WHAT I HAD IN MIND
WHEN WE WERE TALKING ABOUT
INCREASING THE HOUSING DENSITY.

AND COUNCIL HAS ALREADY ALLOWED A
SEVEN-STORY DORM.

PASS IT AROUND, PLEASE.

AND SEVEN-STORY DORM IN THE FAIRMONT
NEIGHBORHOOD WITHOUT ANY STUDY OR
IMPACTS ON THAT DEVELOPMENT.

SO THAT SHOULD BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT
BY NEIGHBORHOODS.

AND AS WELL, THERE'S ANOTHER HIDDEN
GEMS IN ALL OF THIS.

TURNS OUT THAT THE PROPOSED
AFFORDABLE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT
THAT'S OCCURRING IN FLORAL HILL ROAD IN
THE LAUREL HILL NEIGHBORHOOD NO
LONGER REQUIRES A PUBLIC HEARING.

IT CAN NOW JUST BE DEVELOPED AND
APPROVED BY THE PLAN DIRECTOR.

THAT'S A PRETTY BIG CHANGE.

SO THESE ARE JUST TWO EXAMPLES IN THE
NAME OF HOUSING, MORE HOUSING, THAT
ARE GOING TO IMPACT OUR
NEIGHBORHOODS SIGNIFICANTLY.

NEIGHBORHOODS ARE ALREADY FEELING THAT THE PROCESS IS STACKED AGAINST THEM.

THEY SEE THE COUNCIL AS VERY PRO DEVELOPMENT WITHOUT CONCERN FOR PROTECTING NEIGHBORHOODS.

AND WHAT WE'RE PROTECTING IS THE MOST IMPORTANT, LARGEST INVESTMENT THESE PEOPLE MAKE IN THEIR LIFETIMES, A PLACE WHERE THEY ARE RAISING THEIR CHILDREN, GO TO CREATE QUALITY OF LIFE AND COMMUNITY.

AND IF WE DON'T DO ANYTHING ABOUT THIS, I THINK IT'S JUST A MATTER OF TIME BEFORE WE SEE A DRAMATIC CHANGE IN HOW THEY REACT TO THIS IN THE FORM OF A SIGNIFICANT BACKLASH AGAINST THIS STUFF.

AND THE COUNCIL COULD CONSIDER LIKE A NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT BILL OF RIGHTS TO ADDRESS SOME OF THESE CONCERNS.

BUT I JUST DON'T SEE -- I SEE THIS GOING DOWN A ROAD THAT'S NOT GOING TO END WELL.

>> MAYOR KNUDSON: COUNCILOR LEACH.

>> LEECH: THANK YOU, MAYOR, AND THANK YOU FOR PUTTING TOGETHER THIS PACKAGE.

I AM GENUINELY REALLY EXCITED ABOUT THE ADDITION OF THESE TWO DIFFERENT TYPES OF HOUSING.

I WANTED TO ASK ABOUT THE CONVERSIONS.

SRO'S CANNOT BE ADDED TO A SITE WITH AN EXISTING DWELLING BUT DWELLINGS CAN BE CONVERTED TO AN SRO.

CAN SOMEONE CONVERT A DWELLING TO AN SRO AND THEN ADD SRO'S?

>> IT DEPENDS ON WHERE IT'S LOCATED.

IF WE WERE TALKING ABOUT A SINGLE DETACHED HOME IN ONE LOW DENSITY AREA, AND THEY DECIDED THEY WANTED TO CONVERT THAT INTO A SIX-ROOM SRO, THEY WOULDN'T BE ABLE TO ADD ANY MORE UNITS TO THE SIX.

LET'S SAY THERE'S FOUR SRO UNITS, AND THEN THEY ADD TWO DETACHED SRO.

BUT IT KIND OF DEPENDS ON THE
SITUATION.

>> LEECH: THANK YOU.

THE LOT SITUATION.

IF A LOT ALREADY HAS PARKING AND HAS
MORE THAN THE ALLOWED MAXIMUM, SO
SAY IT'S EIGHT -- SORRY, EIGHT UNITS
WOULD BE ALLOWED UP TO THREE OFF
SHOOT PARKING SPACES, IF THAT LOT
ALREADY HAS FOUR PARKING SPACES, DO
THEY HAVE TO DESTROY A PARKING
SPACE?

>> I DON'T THINK SO.

I DON'T REVIEW THE ACTUAL LAND USE
PROPOSALS, SO I CAN DEFINITELY CONFIRM
THAT.

BUT I DON'T THINK SO.

>> LEECH: OK.

THANK YOU.

YOU KNOW, IN THE LINE OF ALAN'S
COMMENTS, COUNCILOR ZELENKA'S
COMMENTS, THE THING I GET,

COMMUNICATION FROM MY CONSTITUENTS ABOUT THE MOST, IS THE PROXIMITY AND THE HEIGHT OF THESE UNITS COMING IN RIGHT UP AGAINST THEIR BACKYARDS. AND THEY FEEL IT'S SO IMPOSING ON THEIR FAMILY AND THEIR PRIVACY BECAUSE IT, YOU KNOW, YOU HAVE A SIX-FOOT TALL FENCE, AND YOU HAVE A 35-FOOT HOME BEING BUILT, YOU REALLY CAN JUST LOOK STRAIGHT INTO YOUR WINDOWS AND YOUR BACKYARDS.

SO THAT'S A LOT OF COMMUNICATION I'M GETTING.

I'M A LITTLE HESITANT TO SUPPORT THE ADDITIONAL HEIGHT THAT WE'RE DISCUSSING TODAY BECAUSE OF WANTING TO PRESERVE OUR NEIGHBORHOODS TO THE POINT WHERE, YES, I WANT HOUSING. I WANT TO ADD IN THESE MICRO VILLAGES AND THESE DIFFERENT TYPES OF HOUSING. AND I KNOW WE'RE GOING TO GET A LOT OF COMMUNICATION AND A LOT OF DISGRUNTLED FOLKS IN OUR NEIGHBORHOODS WHO WANT ALSO -- ALSO WANT HOUSING.

BUT I OFTEN HEAR, I REALLY -- I REALLY SUPPORT THIS, AND THIS IS ROUGH, AND I DON'T REALLY WANT TO LIVE HERE ANYMORE BECAUSE OF IT.

SO I WANT US TO BE ABLE TO BALANCE THOSE TWO THINGS AS WELL.

SO I'M INTERESTED IN UNDERSTANDING KIND OF THAT DIFFERENTIAL BETWEEN THE 30 FEET AND THE 35 FEET AND WHAT THAT ACTUALLY LOOKS LIKE.

IS IT AN ADDITIONAL -- CAN YOU JUST DESCRIBE THAT FOR ME?

>> YEAH.

WE ACTUALLY HAVE ILLUSTRATIONS, IF IT WORKS.

THESE ARE TRYING TO ILLUSTRATE THE CURRENT R-1 BUILDING HEIGHT.

AND THEN WE HAVE A SECOND SLIDE THAT ILLUSTRATES -- I THINK I DID A PRETTY GOOD JOB THAT YOU CAN KIND OF TOGGLE BACK AND FORTH WITH, IF YOU GO BACK, LEAH.

SO THE FIRST BUILDING THAT SAYS TYPICAL EXISTING, IS TRYING TO GET SOMETHING

SIMILAR TO THE PICTURE THAT WAS PASSED AROUND.

OFTENTIMES WE SEE 1 1/2 STORIES FOR EXISTING HOMES IN EUGENE.

AND THEN THE MIDDLE IS SHOWING MORE OF A BUILDING ENVELOPE, SO NOT NECESSARILY A TYPICAL 30-FOOT -- HITTING THE 30-FOOT MAX, BUT MORE OF THE BUILDING ENVELOPE TO THE 5-FOOT INTERIOR AND SETBACK, KIND OF GETTING AT YOUR POINT OF HOW FAR YOU CAN ACTUALLY BUILD OUT UNDER THE CURRENT STANDARD.

AND THEN THE CURRENT STANDARDS ALSO ALLOW WITH A STEEPER PITCHED ROOF AN ADDITIONAL SEVEN FEET ABOVE THE 30-FOOT MAX.

AND SO THAT'S WHAT THE THIRD OR -- YEAH, THE THIRD BUILDING IS SHOWING, IS THAT STEEPER PITCHED ROOF.

YOU CAN GO UP TO 37 FEET.

AND THAT'S MEASURED TO THE HIGHEST POINT, JUST LIKE THE 30.

AND THEN IF YOU FLIP OVER TO THE

PROPOSED, THAT TYPICAL EXISTING IS STAYING EXACTLY THE SAME.

AND THEN YOU SEE THAT WITH THE 35 FEET, WITH JUST A TYPICAL ROOF PITCH, YOU GET THAT FULL THREE STORIES.

WHEREAS ON THE LAST ONE IN THE MIDDLE, YOU DIDN'T HAVE THE FULL THREE STORIES.

AND THEN WITH AS CURRENTLY WRITTEN, WITH THAT ADDITIONAL SEVEN FEET, BECAUSE THAT COMES OFF OF THE BASE MAX, SO IT WAS SEVEN FEET ONTO 30 ON THE LAST SLIDE.

AND THE PROPOSED CHANGES AREN'T TOUCHING THAT PROVISION.

SO IT WOULD BE SEVEN FEET ON TOP OF THE 35.

AND THEN -- SO THAT'S KIND OF -- WE CAN FLIP BACK AND FORTH AS MUCH AS YOU WANT.

THE OTHER INFORMATION THAT IS INCLUDED IN THE TABLE AT THE TOP IS AS I MENTIONED WE ARE REQUIRED TO ACCOMMODATE BONUS UNITS FOR MIDDLE

HOUSING SPECIFICALLY.

AND THAT INCLUDES HEIGHT INCREASES.

SO THOSE WOULD BE ON TOP OF THESE
MAXIMUMS.

AND THEN WE ALSO HAVE OTHER
RULE -- OTHER STATE LAWS.

YOU WILL SEE SENATE BILL 1537 UP THERE,
WHICH REQUIRES US TO ALLOW ANOTHER
ADDITIONAL STORY.

SO THE HEIGHTS DO START TO STACK AT
LEAST ON PAPER.

BUT RIGHT HERE WHAT WE'RE SHOWING IS
JUST THAT BASE MAXIMUM FOR CURRENT
VERSUS PROPOSED.

>> LEECH: IS THERE AN ESTIMATE ON HOW
MANY ADDITIONAL PEOPLE CAN LIVE IN THIS
BUILDING WITH THAT EXTRA FIVE FEET?

>> YEAH, NO.

I MEAN, THIS -- BECAUSE IT WOULD REALLY
DEPEND ON THE SIZE OF THE BUILDING, THE
NUMBER OF UNITS.

IF IT'S DIVIDED UP OR IF IT'S JUST ONE
STRUCTURE.

A LOT OF DIFFERENT THINGS.

SO WE WERE JUST SHOWING MORE THE BUILDING ENVELOPE, THE MAX BUILDING THAT THEY COULD BUILD OUT TO UNDER THE DIFFERENT SCENARIOS.

IT'S NOT ABOUT THE CAPACITY.

>> LEECH: THANK YOU.

>> MAYOR KNUDSON: COUNCILOR EVANS.

>> EVANS: THANKS, MAYOR.

A THOUGHT CAME TO ME ABOUT -- IN SOME OF THESE CASES, COULDN'T WE REQUIRE IN CODE PRIVACY SCREENS?

IN OTHER WORDS, SO THAT THE VIEW WOULD BE MITIGATED, SO BASED ON THE HEIGHT OF THE BUILDING AND THE APPROXIMATE NEXT DOOR OF THE OTHER UNITS THAT ARE AROUND IT.

>> LAUREN WANTS TO JUMP IN.

FEEL FREE.

>> JUST AS FAR AS I KNOW THAT THERE ARE REGULATIONS -- THERE ARE STATE

RULES AROUND HOW WE TREAT SINGLE UNIT AND MIDDLE HOUSING, THAT YOU HAVE TO GENERALLY BE AS PERMISSIVE AS YOU ARE WITH SINGLE UNIT THAT YOU ARE WITH MIDDLE HOUSING.

AND SO FOR INSTANCE YOU COULDN'T REQUIRE A LOWER HEIGHT WITH MIDDLE HOUSING THAN YOU ARE WITH SINGLE UNIT. THAT'S NOT WHAT YOU'RE ASKING.

SO WHETHER OR NOT WE COULD THEN REQUIRE NONSINGLE UNIT HOUSING, SO IN THIS CASE LET'S SAY MIDDLE HOUSING, TO HAVE PRIVACY SCREENS AND NOT ALSO THEN REQUIRE IT FOR SINGLE UNIT, THAT'S SOMETHING THAT I'M NOT SURE IF WE WOULD BE ABLE TO DO THAT UNDER THE LAW.

I WOULD ALSO WONDER AS FAR AS PRIVACY SCREENS IF YOU WOULD ACTUALLY BE ABLE TO GET THEM TALL ENOUGH TO MEET THE CONCERNS THAT I'M KIND OF HEARING

[AUDIO DROPPED OUT]

>> MAYOR KNUDSON: A FIRST ROUND FOR ANY OTHER COUNCILLORS?

I KNOW COUNCILOR KASHINSKY WOULD LIKE ANOTHER ROUND.

>> KASHINSKY: YES, THANK YOU.

THE VAST MAJORITY OF THE CHANGES THAT WE'VE BEEN MAKING TO OUR CODE SURROUNDING MIDDLE HOUSING, SRO'S, ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS OVER THE PAST FIVE, SIX YEARS, THOSE HAVE BEEN STATE MANDATED, CORRECT?

NOT ALL OF THEM, BUT A MAJORITY OF THEM, RIGHT?

I'M SEEING NODDING.

>> I THINK THAT'S A FAIR CHARACTERIZATION, YEAH.

>> KASHINSKY: OK.

THANK YOU.

AND WHEN WE'RE TALKING ABOUT HOW MANY PEOPLE COULD LIVE -- ESPECIALLY WHEN WE'RE TALKING ABOUT THE HEIGHT LIMITS, THIS IS -- WE'RE TALKING ABOUT

THIS FOR R-1.

AND SO THE NUMBER OF UNITS WOULD BE BASED ON THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE R-1 CODE SO YOU COULD HAVE FOUR UNITS IN A FOURPLEX, SIX ROOMS IN AN SRO.

IT WOULDN'T APPLY TO COTTAGES.

SO WE'RE TALKING FOUR HOUSEHOLDS PROBABLY.

>> YEAH.

SO WITH THE BONUS UNIT FRAMEWORK, THE MATH THAT STARTS TO GET KIND OF FUNNY --

>> KASHINSKY: OK.

SIX UNITS?

>> IN THAT IF YOU QUALIFY FOR BEING ABLE TO DO BONUS UNITS, A TRIPLEX COULD HAVE UP TO FOUR UNITS.

SO IT'S FOUR TRIPLEX UNITS.

A FOURPLEX COULD HAVE TWO ADDITIONAL BONUS UNITS.

SO IT'S SIX FOURPLEX UNITS.

SO ALL OF THAT IS TO SAY THAT THE NUMBERS GET A LITTLE BIT WONKY.

BUT, YES, WE'RE STILL SUBJECT TO DENSITY IN THE R-1.

AND I WILL SAY THAT MIDDLE HOUSING IS NOT SUBJECT TO A MAXIMUM DENSITY, AND THAT'S PER STATE LAW.

>> KASHINSKY: AND FROM A PRACTICAL PERSPECTIVE, DO WE HAVE A SENSE OF HOW MANY FOLKS ARE BUILDING TO THE LAW?

BECAUSE IF YOU START DOING THE MATH, IF YOU HAVE THIS SQUARE FOOTAGE OF LOT, IF YOU'RE FILLING IT ALL UP WITH THE NUMBER OF STORIES, IT FEELS LIKE YOU'RE GETTING INTO SOME PRETTY LARGE UNIT SIZES, IF YOU'RE ONLY SAYING THERE'S FOUR UNITS AND --

>> RIGHT.

I THINK THAT THE CODE USES A NUMBER OF THINGS THAT, I THINK, LIMIT THE DEVELOPABLE AREA AGAINST KIND OF SETTING ASIDE THE BONUS UNIT FRAMEWORK, WHICH REQUIRES US TO EXPAND THE DEVELOPABLE AREA. BUT THERE'S SETBACKS.

THERE'S MAXIMUM LOT COVERAGE.

THERE'S STORM WATER REQUIREMENTS.

THERE'S A BUNCH OF THINGS THAT YOU

PUT TOGETHER THAT YOU MAY NOT

ACTUALLY BE ABLE TO BUILD ALL THE WAY

TO A FIVE-FOOT SETBACK.

SO I DON'T HAVE NUMBERS ON HOW MANY

FOLKS ARE DOING THAT.

BUT I KNOW THAT DURING THE LAST MIDDLE

HOUSING CODE PROCESS, WE DID RUN

SOME NUMBERS ABOUT THE FEASIBILITY

[AUDIO DROPS OUT

[ALL THE WAY OUT TO THE FIVE-FOOT

SETBACKS.

SO WE CAN DIG SOME OF THAT UP.

>> KASHINSKY: OK.

THANK YOU.

SPEAKING OF THE SRO CONVERSION

LANGUAGE, I UNDERSTAND THAT SOME OF

THE INTENT OF THAT IS TO KEEP SOMEONE

FROM JUST BUILDING LIKE A SHACK IN

THEIR BACKYARD AND BEING LIKE, IT'S AN

SRO.

COME USE MY BATHROOM.

BUT I DO FEEL LIKE THERE COULD BE A BETTER, MORE FLEXIBLE WAY TO ADDRESS THAT, BECAUSE I'M THINKING LIKE IF SOMEBODY IS -- HAS A SINGLE FAMILY HOME RIGHT NOW, THEY COULD PUT A TRIPLEX IN THE BACKYARD, MAKE IT A FOURPLEX, AND PROVIDE THAT HOUSING THAT WAY.

I WOULDN'T WANT TO PROHIBIT SOMEONE WHO WANTS TO DO SOMETHING WITH A FOUR-UNIT SRO WHERE IT'S NOT NECESSARILY THEM COMING INTO THE MAIN HOUSE TO USE THE KITCHEN OR THE BATHROOM, BUT THERE'S A SEPARATE FACILITY SET UP FOR THAT SRO.

AND SO I THINK LOOKING AT MAYBE A DIFFERENT WAY TO MEET THAT NEED, TO CONTINUE TO NOT PREVENT LIKE SOMEBODY JUST BEING LIKE, OH, THIS IS SUBSTANDARD HOUSING, BUT ALSO PROVIDING THAT ADDITIONAL FLEXIBILITY. WITH HEIGHT, ONE THING I AM PARTICULARLY CONCERNED ABOUT IF WE

DO ADJUST THE HEIGHT LIMIT IS MAKING SURE THAT WE ADJUST THAT IN THE SPECIAL AREA ZONES ALSO, BECAUSE AS IT STANDS RIGHT NOW, I'M IN A SPECIAL AREA ZONE THAT IS DESIGNATED AS MEDIUM DENSITY.

IF WE DON'T ADDRESS THAT, THEN THE HEIGHT LIMITS FOR THE R-1 LOW DENSITY ZONES WILL BE HIGHER THAN IN THE MEDIUM DENSITY AREA I AM IN.

SO I WOULD ASK TO LOOK AT THAT.

AND FINALLY, IF SOMEONE IS PERMITTING SOMETHING, HOW DO WE KNOW IT'S AN SRO OR A MULTI-UNIT PLAN?

>> THEY WOULD HAVE TO SUBMIT THAT TO THE PLANNING COMMITTEE.

SRO'S HAVE TO SHARE EITHER A KITCHEN OR A BATHROOM FACILITY, SO THEY WOULD HAVE TO SHOW WHICH OF THOSE THEY WERE SHARING.

>> MAYOR KNUDSON: CLARIFICATION FOLLOW-UP.

>> KASHINSKY: I GUESS I'M THINKING ABOUT

SOME OF OUR STUDENT HOUSING COMPLEXES WHERE THEY HAVE A UNIT THAT'S LIKE A 5-BEDROOM UNIT, AND THEY ARE RENTING EACH UNIT OUT SEPARATELY. HOW DO WE KNOW THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THAT AND -- HOW DO WE KNOW FROM A PERMITTING STANDPOINT? IT'S JUST UP TO THEM WHICH ONE THEY PICK?

>> IT'S A GOOD QUESTION.

I CAN DO SOME DIGGING ON OUR LAND USE TEAM.

I THINK IT WOULD BE WHATEVER THEY CALL IT ON THEIR SITE PLANS, BUT WE CAN CONFIRM THAT.

>> MAYOR KNUDSON: COUNCILOR GROVES.

>> GROVES: THANK YOU, MAYOR.

I HAVE SEVERAL QUESTIONS ABOUT LIVEABILITY, NEIGHBORHOOD LIVEABILITY. FIRST OF ALL, I DID VOTE IN SUPPORT OF THE U.O. IN THE FAIRMONT AREA WHERE THEIR PETITION, BUT NOT WITHOUT SOME

CONSTERNATION.

ARE THERE ANY NEGOTIATIONS GOING ON
BETWEEN THE U OF O AND THE FAIRMONT
NEIGHBORHOOD GROUP?

>> NOT THAT I KNOW OF.

BUT WE CAN FIND OUT AND GET BACK TO
YOU.

>> GROVES: THAT WOULD BE GOOD.

ALAN, DO YOU KNOW?

>> THERE AREN'T ANY.

>> GROVES: IT WOULD BE NICE IF WE CAN
ENCOURAGE THEM TO KEEP WORKING
THROUGH THIS ISSUE, BECAUSE THOSE
WERE SOME LEGITIMATE CONCERNS THAT
THE NEIGHBORS HAD.

THAT WAS ONE.

SECOND IS ON MY WAY TO COUNCIL
TONIGHT, I HAD BUSINESS IN THE
WHITTAKER AREA, AND IN THE PROCESS I
WAS DRIVING DOWN WEST 5TH AND DROVE
BY THE NEW FIVE-STORY APARTMENT

COMPLEX.

AND I NOTED THAT THAT STRETCH, THERE'S NO PARKING ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF 5TH AVENUE.

ONLY ON THE NORTH SIDE.

THE STREET WAS FULL OF VEHICLES.

THERE WERE NO PARKING SPACES OPEN.

THE SIDE STREETS I LOOKED DOWN, THEY SEEMED TO BE PRETTY DARN FULL AS WELL.

AND THAT STRUCTURE ISN'T EVEN OCCUPIED YET.

I ALSO UNDERSTAND THERE'S ONLY SIX PARKING SPACES FOR THAT WHOLE BUILDING.

IS THAT CORRECT?

>> I DON'T KNOW OFFHAND THE PARKING SPACE NUMBER FOR THAT.

>> GROVES: I GUESS MY QUESTION IS, WHERE IS EVERYBODY GOING TO PARK? BECAUSE THEY'RE GOING TO HAVE CARS TOO.

I REALIZE IT'S A STATE LEGISLATIVE ISSUE.

BUT, I MEAN, IT'S AFFECTING OUR
RESIDENTS.

AND THIS IS IN COUNCILOR LEACH'S WARD,
BUT IT MADE ME PAUSE TO CONSIDER THAT.
THAT'S GOING TO BE A PROBLEM.

AND, YOU KNOW, WE ALREADY HEAR ABOUT
PARKING ALL THE TIME.

AND THEN I HAVE ONE IN MY WARD TOO
THAT I'M SURE YOU'RE VERY FAMILIAR
WITH, THE OAK MEADOWS DEVELOPMENT.
THE ROADWAY IS GOING INTO THAT -- I
REALIZE THEY ARE GOING TO BE PRIVATE
STREETS.

THEY AREN'T WIDE ENOUGH.

IN FACT, I WAS ON A ZOOM CALL FOR A
PUBLIC HEARING ON THAT.

AND I RAISED THE QUESTION, HOW'S FIRE
GOING TO OPERATE?

AND THE RESPONSE WAS, WELL, IT'S WIDE
ENOUGH THAT THE TRUCKS CAN FIT DOWN
THE STREET.

MY POINT HAVING DONE THAT WORK, ONCE
YOU HIT THE BRAKES, YOU'VE GOT TO BE
ABLE TO OPEN YOUR DOORS TO GET OUT
THE CAR.

AND THEN YOU HAVE TO BE ABLE TO
OPERATE OFF BOTH SIDES OF THE TRUCK
TO GET EQUIPMENT, STRETCH HOSE LINES,
PUT A SUPPLY LINE IN.

IT TAKES SPACE.

AND THAT JUST ISN'T ENOUGH ROOM.

I THINK WE NEED TO RETHINK OUR ROADS.

YOU KNOW, IF WE'RE GOING TO BE HAVING
SKINNY STREETS, AND THEN WE HAVE
CURB CUTOUTS FOR DRIVEWAYS, WE HAVE
FIRE HYDRANTS, WHERE IS EVERYBODY
GOING TO PARK?

I MEAN, WE LIVE IN THIS UTOPIA THAT
EVERYBODY'S GOING TO RIDE THE BUS.

WELL, IN MY NEIGHBORHOOD, IT'S A MILE
AND A HALF TO THE CLOSEST BUS STOP.

DOWN A STEEP HILL AND THEN BACK UP A
STEEP HILL TO GET HOME.

I JUST DON'T THINK WE'RE BEING REALISTIC
ABOUT THIS.

AND I UNDERSTAND IT'S THE STATE THAT'S
PRESENTING THIS.

BUT WE'RE THE ONES THAT HAVE TO LIVE
WITH IT.

AND I THINK WE NEED TO COME UP WITH

SOME STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS THAT.

THANK YOU.

THANK YOU, MAYOR.

>> MAYOR KNUDSON: OTHER DISCUSSION
FROM COUNCILLORS?

COUNCILOR KEATING.

>> KEATING: THANK YOU, MAYOR.

I APPRECIATE THE PRESENTATION AND THE
DIRECTION WITH A LITTLE BIT OF
HESITATION AND CONSTERNATION, AND I'LL
SHARE THOSE WITH YOU NOW.

I HAVE SEVERAL POINTS OF
EDITORIALIZATION, AND THEN A FEW
POINTS OF CLARIFICATION.

IT'S IN NO PARTICULAR ORDER.

IF ANYONE IS INTERESTED TO HEAR HOW
RESIDENTS RESPOND TO HEIGHT IN THEIR
NEIGHBORHOOD, TAKE A DRIVE DOWN 32ND
BETWEEN DONALD AND WILLAMETTE IN
SOUTH EUGENE.

I VOTED NO ON THE AFOREMENTIONED
VOTE TO ALLOW FOR THE UNIVERSITY TO
EXPAND SO AGGRESSIVELY INTO THE
FAIRMONT NEIGHBORHOOD BECAUSE I

WANTED THE UNIVERSITY TO COLLABORATE BETTER WITH THE NEIGHBORHOOD.

I'M SADDENED TO HEAR THAT THAT'S NOT HAPPENING.

AND IF THERE ARE SOME PATCHES OF WETLANDS THAT ARE PROTECTED IN THIS COMMUNITY, AND SOME PATCHES OF WETLANDS THAT ARE NOT, I'D SUBMIT WE NEED TO DO A BETTER JOB OF PROTECTING WETLANDS RATHER THAN MITIGATING THAT PROTECTION FOR THE SAKE OF BUILDING.

AND ON THE TOPIC OF BUILDING, I WANT TO PRESENT A WISH LIST, IF I MAY, TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION, IF ANY PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS ARE KEEPING SCORE AT HOME TONIGHT.

I WISH THE PLANNING COMMISSION WOULD TAKE UP REZONING IN THE UGB TO INCENTIVIZE BUILDING ON CURRENT COMMERCIAL LAND, COMMERCIAL ON THE BOTTOM AND RESIDENTIAL ON THE WAY UP, ESPECIALLY ALONG THE TIER ONE TRANSPORTATION CORRIDORS.

I DON'T SEE THAT IN THIS OPTION ONE PACKAGE AT ALL.

PLEASE CORRECT ME IF I'M WRONG.

INSTEAD, IT FEELS AS IF IT'S A FOREGONE CONCLUSION THAT COUNCIL IS ULTIMATELY WITH OPTIONS TWO OR THREE DOWN THE ROAD TO EXPAND OUR UGB, SOMETHING I'M WHOLLY UNENTHUSIASTIC ABOUT.

I WOULD RATHER SEE US STRATEGICALLY INCENTIVIZE AND APPROPRIATELY BUILD UP AND NOT OUT.

AND THEN IF -- AND FEEL FREE TO COMMENT AT ANY TIME CUT ME OFF.

BUT I ALSO RECOGNIZE THAT THERE ARE BUCKETS OF STATE MANDATED RECOMMENDATIONS, AND THEN THERE ARE TWO, THE BUILDING HEIGHT THAT WE'VE DISCUSSED, AND THE STREAMLINING OF THE LAND USE APPLICATION -- NO, I'M SORRY, NOT THAT ONE -- THE TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF LAND USE APPROVAL EXPIRATION DATES.

ARE THOSE THE ONLY TWO THAT ARE NOT STATE MANDATED IN THIS OPTION ONE PACKAGE?

>> MICRO VILLAGE HOUSING IS ALSO NOT

STATE MANDATED.

>> KEATING: THANK YOU.

>> AND I DO HAVE COMMENTS ON YOUR ZONING COMMENT WHEN YOU'RE DONE WITH YOUR COMMENTS.

>> KEATING: NOW BATTING.

GO AHEAD.

I'D LOVE TO HEAR IT.

THANK YOU FOR THE TIME AND THANK YOU FOR THE PRESENTATION.

>> YOU ARE CORRECT THAT WE AREN'T TALKING ABOUT UPZONING AROUND CORRIDORS OR AROUND CENTERS AS PART OF THIS PACKAGE, BUT WE ARE BRINGING THAT FORWARD AS PART OF OUR THIRD PACKAGE NEXT YEAR, BEFORE THE END OF NEXT YEAR.

SO PART OF WHAT OUR JOB IS, IS TO LOOK AT HOW TO -- HOW TO REGULATE AND WORK WITH OUR EXISTING LAND INSIDE THE URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY IN AS

EFFICIENT WAY AS POSSIBLE BEFORE WE CAN CONSIDER WHETHER WE NEED TO EXPAND OUR UGB.

SO ONE, AND THAT'S WHAT WE CALL WORKING ON EFFICIENCY MEASURES, LOOKING AT HOW WE CAN USE OUR LAND MORE EFFICIENTLY.

AND SO WE WILL BE DOING THAT.

WE'RE GOING TO COME BACK TO YOU IN DECEMBER TO TALK ABOUT OUR LAND SUPPLY STUDIES AND HOW -- WHERE WE THINK WE'RE GOING WITH THAT.

AND WE'LL NEED TO GET YOU TO HELP US INITIATE THIS ADOPTION PACKAGE, PROBABLY IN JANUARY.

SO WE'LL BE LOOKING AT LAND AROUND OUR COMMERCIAL CENTERS AND ALONG OUR KEY CORRIDORS AND HOW WE CAN CONSIDER UPZONING SOME OF THAT LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL LAND TO HIGHER DENSITY RESIDENTIAL LAND, LOOKING AT HOW WE CAN MORE USE OUR CENTERS FOR MIXED USE HOUSING AND COMMERCIAL LAND.

SO THAT WORK HAS STARTED INTERNALLY.

WE JUST HAVEN'T BROUGHT IT TO YOU YET.

>> MAYOR KNUDSON: FURTHER DISCUSSION
FROM COUNCIL OR ADDITIONAL
QUESTIONS?

SEEING NONE, I'LL JUST ADD A FEW
THOUGHTS.

ONE IS A LOT OF APPRECIATION FOR THE
WORK THAT STAFF HAS BEEN DOING TO
TRACK THE INTERFACE BETWEEN CHANGES
IN STATE LAW AND THE WORK THAT WE
HAVE BEEN DOING TO MAINTAIN
COMPLIANCE WITH SUCCESSIVE YEARS OF
WORK.

AND THE WORK THAT HAS DONE
HAPPENING LOCALLY TO TRY TO MEET OUR
HOUSING NEEDS.

AND ONE OF THE THINGS I APPRECIATE
ABOUT THE DISCUSSION AND THE
PRESENTATION OF THESE MATERIALS AND
THIS PACKAGE IS THE EMPHASIS ON
AFFORDABILITY AND ACCESSIBILITY.

AND I JUST WANT TO OFFER A FEW
FRAMING THOUGHTS RELATED TO THAT.

ONE OF THEM IS FROM A RECENT EVENT
THAT I ATTENDED WITH THOUSAND FRIENDS

OF OREGON AND SEVERAL OTHER LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS AND REGIONAL GROUPS. SOME OF THE MATERIALS THAT HAVE BEEN SHARED BROADLY AND WE KNOW STATEWIDE IN OREGON WE REALLY NEED TO FOCUS OUR HOUSING PRODUCTION UNITS TO HOUSING THAT IS AFFORDABLE. AND OUT OF THESE UNITS WE NEED TO PRODUCE STATEWIDE AND LOCALLY, THAT FOCUS OF OUR WORKFORCE BEING AT THE CENTER OF CONCERNS, AND THAT HOUSING THAT'S APPROPRIATE FOR SMALLER HOUSEHOLDS, ONE AND TWO-PERSON HOUSEHOLDS, AND THAT IS ACCESSIBLE TO PEOPLE WHO MIGHT HAVE NEEDS THAT ARE NOT MOST OF US LIVING IN THIS RELATIVELY SMALL WINDOW OF TIME WHEN WE HAVE ALL OF OUR PHYSICAL ABILITIES IN MANY CASES, AND IN OTHER CASES PERHAPS NOT, AND WE HAVE NOT PRODUCED NEARLY ENOUGH ACCESSIBLE HOUSING IN OUR COMMUNITY.

I WANT TO UNDERSCORE THAT BECAUSE I THINK THAT THE EMPHASIS AND THE DISCUSSION TODAY ABOUT BONUS UNITS

AND OPPORTUNITIES, THAT THE FOCUS OF THOSE BONUSES BE AROUND ISSUES OF AFFORDABILITY AND ACCESSIBILITY ARE CRITICAL TO THE WORK THAT WE HAVE TO DO TO MEET OUR COMMUNITY'S HOUSING NEEDS.

AND IN A NOT ABSTRACT WAY.

BUT IN TALKING WITH PEOPLE WHO ARE A MEMBER OF A SMALL HOUSEHOLD, A PERSON WHO HAS MOBILITY NEEDS OR ACCESSIBILITY NEEDS OR HAS A PARTICULAR VERY NARROW WINDOW OF AFFORDABILITY FOR THEIR FAMILY.

THESE TYPES OF UNITS ARE GOING TO BE INCREDIBLY IMPORTANT.

I ALSO WANT TO SAY THAT I REALLY APPRECIATED AND WILL CONTINUE TO APPRECIATE THE CONVERSATION WE'LL HAVE LEADING TO THE PUBLIC HEARING AND POTENTIAL ACTION BEFORE YOUR END ON THIS WORK AS IT RELATES TO THE NUMBER OF COMPLEXITIES AROUND ALLOWABLE HEIGHTS WITHIN R-1.

AND I REALLY WANT TO APPRECIATE STAFF, THE CLARITY OF THE INFORMATION THAT

YOU'VE SHARED TO US AS THE CONVERSATIONS AND THE VISUAL INFORMATION THE PLANNING COMMISSION SHARED WITH THE PUBLIC.

THAT'S INCREDIBLY IMPORTANT.

AND IN THE SECOND PARAGRAPH OF OUR AIS SUMMARY, THE NUMBER OF OPPORTUNITIES THAT ARE THERE FLUX DEPENDING ON DIFFERENT BONUSES THAT COULD BE QUALIFIED FOR.

AND I THINK THAT'S AN IMPORTANT AREA OF CONTINUED DISCUSSION, BECAUSE WE WANT OUR NEIGHBORHOODS TO FEEL LIKE HOME AND WE WANT A DIVERSITY OF UNITS TO BE PRESENT, BUT THERE'S WORK WE CAN DO TO NAVIGATE THAT GRACEFULLY.

ONE QUESTION, WHICH IS JUST TO CLARIFY THE EXISTING ALLOWABLE BUILDING HEIGHT IN OUR R-1.

IF I JUST WANTED TO BUILD A VERY LARGE HOUSE, JUST FOR MYSELF, WITH 10 BEDROOMS, JUST FOR ME, WHAT WOULD THE ALLOWABLE ENVELOPE FOR THAT STRUCTURE BE, AND HOW WOULD IT COMPARE TO THE VERSION THAT MIGHT

HOUSE EIGHT PEOPLE OR FOUR DIFFERENT HOUSEHOLDS?

>> SO IF WE'RE TALKING ABOUT THE R-1 ZONE, RIGHT NOW THE CODE WOULD ALLOW UP TO 30 FEET IN HEIGHT MEASURED AT THE HIGHEST POINT.

AND SO THAT WOULD BE FOR A FLAT ROOF OR ANYTHING LESS THAN A 6-12 PITCH, WHICH IS THAT REALLY STEEP PITCH THAT WE WERE SHOWING IN THE THIRD BUILDING ON THOSE GRAPHICS.

THEN THERE IS AN ALLOWANCE FOR AN ADDITIONAL SEVEN FEET IF YOU DO THAT 6-12 PITCH.

SO THAT IS SEVEN FEET ON TOP OF THE 30 FEET.

AND THAT'S MEASURED TO THE HIGH POINT OF THE PITCH OF THE ROOF.

SO YOU WERE SAYING JUST FOR A SINGLE UNIT.

THAT'S WHAT'S ALLOWED.

IF YOU'RE DOING -- AND I KNOW YOU DIDN'T ASK THIS.

BUT IF YOU'RE DOING MIDDLE HOUSING OR

ANYTHING THAT'S 10 UNITS OR GREATER, THERE ARE ALLOWANCES FOR ADDITIONAL BUILDING HEIGHT THROUGH STATE LAW THAT WE'RE CURRENTLY IMPLEMENTING, THAT WE'RE REQUIRED TO IMPLEMENT. BUT AT ITS CORE FOR A SINGLE UNIT, THAT'S WHAT IS ALLOWED IN R-1.

>> MAYOR KNUDSON: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

I THINK THAT IS AN IMPORTANT REFERENCE POINT.

I'M GOING TO GIVE MYSELF ANOTHER ROUND, UNLESS THERE IS A COUNCIL OR WHO WOULD LIKE TO JUMP IN.

THE NEXT QUESTION I HAVE RELATES TO PACKAGE THREE AND WHAT WAS DESCRIBED ABOUT A FOCUS ON TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT AND WALKABLE OPPORTUNITIES FOR PEOPLE EXPANDING THE TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS THAT PEOPLE MIGHT EASILY HAVE ACCESS TO. IN SO MANY CASES, INDEED IN EVERY CASE, PEOPLE USE WHAT IS AVAILABLE TO THEM. AND IF THAT IS ONLY DRIVING, THAT IS GOING TO MEAN A LOT OF DRIVING FOR

THAT HOUSEHOLD AND PROBABLY MORE VEHICLE COSTS AND TRANSPORTATION COSTS.

WE ALREADY KNOW IN OUR COMMUNITY THAT TRANSPORTATION COSTS ARE AN ON AVERAGE ALMOST 25% OF THE AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD'S INCOME.

AND SO EXPANDING THE OPTIONS FOR SOME OF THOSE TRIPS TO BE NOT DRIVING, BUT TO BE WALKING, OR USING A BUS OR RIDING A BIKE, THAT'S A REALLY IMPORTANT PART OF NOT JUST OUR CLIMATE ACTION PLANNING BUT OUR AFFORDABILITY PLANNING.

GIVEN THE CONTEXT WE HAVE, AND WHEN YOU DESCRIBE CORRIDORS, AND SOME CONTEXT IN CORRIDORS WHERE YOU HAVE RELATIVELY SHALLOW COMMERCIAL ZONING THAT EXISTS ALONG THOSE CORRIDORS, HOW IS OUR TEAM THINKING ABOUT THE CONNECTION BETWEEN THIS FIRST PACKAGE OF WORK AND A DESIRE TO SEE MORE HOUSING OPTIONS THAT ARE AFFORDABLE, AND THAT ARE ACCESSIBLE, WITHIN CLOSE PROXIMITY THAT WOULD

HAVE PEDESTRIAN ACCESS AND BICYCLE INFRASTRUCTURE?

HOW ARE WE THINKING ABOUT THAT GRADIENT BETWEEN OUR LARGE AREAS OF R-1 ZONING AND THOSE AREAS THAT WE WANT HIGHER MIXED USE BUILDINGS TO CONSIDER, BUT THERE'S STILL VERY LITTLE MEDIATING BETWEEN THOSE OPTIONS? AND THERE ARE VERY FEW PLACES IN OUR COMMUNITY WHERE THAT TRANSITION OCCURS BECAUSE WE HAD SO FEW PARCELS IN PLACES WHERE ANY OF OUR MEDIAN DENSITY HOUSING WAS EVER ALLOWED TO BE BUILT PRIOR TO THE MIDDLE HOUSING CHANGES.

HOW ARE WE LOOKING AT THAT TRANSITION AND THE CONNECTION BETWEEN PACKAGE ONE AND PACKAGE THREE?

>> GREAT QUESTION.

I DON'T KNOW THAT WE'RE FAR ENOUGH ALONG IN THE PROCESS TO HAVE A SATISFACTORY ANSWER ON THAT.

I MEAN, I THINK IT'S A GREAT POINT, AND SOMETHING WE CAN BE INTENTIONAL ABOUT AS WE'RE BRINGING BACK CONCEPTS TO YOU ALL.

RIGHT NOW WE'RE LOOKING AT, YOU KNOW, UPZONING AROUND CENTERS.

SO AROUND THAT EXISTING COMMERCIAL ZONING, AND ALONG OUR KEY CORRIDORS.

I THINK THERE IS CERTAINLY STILL AN OUTSTANDING QUESTION OF HOW FAR FROM THE CORRIDOR, HOW FAR FROM A CENTER IS THERE SOME SORT OF STEP DOWN.

I THINK ALL OF THOSE ARE KIND OF VALID OPTIONS.

THAT WE'LL BRING TO YOU KIND OF BASED ON HOW MUCH BUILDABLE LAND THERE MIGHT BE, HOW MUCH CAPACITY WE THINK WE CAN GET OUT OF THAT, HOW IT IMPACTS OUR -- THE HOUSING NEED THAT WE HAVE.

SO IN ADDITION TO UPZONING, THERE COULD BE, YOU KNOW, PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS CHANGES AROUND DENSITY AND HEIGHT.

THAT MIGHT GET AT SOME OF THAT

TRANSITION THAT YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT.
BUT WE'RE NOT QUITE FAR ENOUGH ALONG
ON THE ACTUAL CONCEPTS.

>>

>> WE WILL, HOWEVER, BE BRINGING SOME
OF THIS TO YOU IN PACKAGE TWO.
WE'RE GOING TO BRING OUR CLIMATE
FRIENDLY AREAS TO YOU FOR ADOPTION AS
PART OF PACKAGE TWO.
WE'RE GOING TO START TALKING TO YOU
ABOUT OUR COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
CHAPTERS, WHICH INCLUDE OUR CENTERS
IN KEY CORRIDORS MAPS AND CONCEPT
AND POLICIES.
SO WE'RE STARTING TO WORK TOWARDS
THE CODE WORK THAT GOES INTO THAT.
SO THERE WILL BE AN OPPORTUNITY
SOONER.

>> JUST SO I CAN ALSO ADD SOMETHING.
I GUESS AS FAR AS ADOPTION PACKAGE
ONE, YOU KNOW, WE'RE TRYING TO MAKE IT
EASIER TO DO MIDDLE HOUSING.
AND MIDDLE HOUSING IS COMING IN AT A
HIGHER DENSITY.

SO IN THE INTERIM, YOU KNOW, WE MAY SEE MORE MIDDLE HOUSING AROUND CENTERS OR NEAR CORRIDORS THAT WOULD PROVIDE SOME OF THAT, YOU KNOW, MEDIUM LIKE, HIGHER-END, LOW DENSITY, LOWER-END, MEDIUM DENSITY, AROUND CENTERS AND CORRIDORS IN THE INTERIM.

>> MAYOR KNUDSON: THANK YOU ALL VERY MUCH.

COUNCILOR EVANS.

>> EVANS: OK.

SO I'M GOING TO GO BACK TO THE PRIVACY ISSUE, BECAUSE I HAVE A TWO-STORY HOUSE.

AND OUR BEDROOMS AND MY OFFICE IS ON THE SECOND FLOOR.

AND I CAN LOOK OUT MY WINDOW AND SEE INTO MY NEIGHBOR'S BACKYARD.

A COUPLE OF NEIGHBORS' BACKYARDS.

BUT ARE THERE BEST PRACTICES MAYBE FROM SOME OTHER COMMUNITIES ACROSS THE COUNTRY THAT WE CAN BE ABLE TO, YOU KNOW, BORROW FROM THAT WE CAN

INCORPORATE INTO OUR CODE TO BE ABLE TO, FOR LACK OF A BETTER TERM, PRIVACY STANDARDS?

>> YEAH.

I MEAN, I THINK MY ANSWER WOULD BE THE SAME.

APOLOGIES.

THAT I DON'T KNOW PARTICULARLY GIVEN STATE LAW WHERE WE ARE IN OREGON RIGHT NOW WITH THE MIDDLE HOUSING REQUIREMENTS.

I WOULD ALSO SAY THAT ANY ADDITIONAL STANDARDS THAT WE ADD WILL BE ADDING COSTS TO THE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT.

SO THAT IS SOME CONSIDERATION.

BUT WE CAN FOLLOW UP AND RESPOND TO YOU WITH OTHER INFORMATION THAN I DON'T KNOW.

>> EVANS: YEAH.

I WOULD APPRECIATE US GETTING BACK SOME DIFFERENT INFORMATION THAT COULD BETTER INFORM HOW WE PROCEED WITH THIS.

AND ALSO LOOKING AT, YOU KNOW, WHAT ADDITIONAL COSTS WOULD BE INCURRED IF WE DECIDE TO IMPLEMENT SOMETHING THAT WOULD BE MORE IN LINE WITH, YOU KNOW, PROTECTING, YOU KNOW, THE VISUAL ACCESS THAT, YOU KNOW, WE'RE MOST CONCERNED ABOUT ON THIS.

>> AND JUST TO BE CLEAR, YOU'RE SAYING FOR ALL HOUSING?

>> EVANS: I WOULD SAY, YEAH, FOR ALL HOUSING, BECAUSE, AGAIN, I MEAN, LIKE I SAID, I CAN LOOK OUT MY BACK WINDOW AND, YOU KNOW, LOOK AT -- IF MY NEIGHBOR IS TANNING, I DON'T HAVE THAT PROBLEM.

BUT IF MY NEIGHBOR IS TANNING OR SOMETHING LIKE THAT, I DON'T WANT TO LOOK DOWN AND SEE THEM, YOU KNOW, DOING THEIR THING OR WHATEVER THE CASE MAY BE.

BUT, YOU KNOW, THERE ARE SOME WAYS OR SHOULD BE SOME WAYS THAT WE CAN PROTECT PRIVACY, HOPEFULLY WITHOUT

INCURRING, YOU KNOW, MAJOR COSTS TO DO THAT.

I HAVE A TWO-STORY HOUSE.

NOT THREE, YOU KNOW.

>> MAYOR KNUDSON: ANY OTHER DISCUSSION OR QUESTIONS FROM COUNCIL?

I'M GOING TO RESIST THE URGE TO ENCOURAGE OUR COMMUNITY TO SEEK OUT FRIENDS OF TREES AND MANY OTHER TREE PLANTING ORGANIZATIONS THAT EXIST BECAUSE WE HAVE AN EXTRAORDINARY OPPORTUNITY TO ADD TO OUR URBAN FOREST CANOPY ON PRIVATE PROPERTY, AND THAT IS ONE MORE EFFECTIVE WAY OF DOING SOME SCREENING IN SOME CIRCUMSTANCES. AND I NEVER MISS A CHANCE TO ENCOURAGE SOMEONE TO PLANT SOME TREES.

WITH THAT, I WANT TO SAY THANK YOU AGAIN TO OUR STAFF THAT'S HERE AND TO ALL OF THE STAFF THAT'S BEEN WORKING ON THIS MATERIAL AND THESE SEVERAL PACKAGES OF WORK.

IT'S PRESENTED VERY SUCCINCTLY AS PACKAGES, THE COMPLEXITY OF THE WORK AND THE INTERRELATIONSHIP OF THIS WORK WITH MANY REQUIREMENTS AND OUR LOCAL GOALS AND VALUES IS QUITE COMPLICATED AND COMPLEX, AND I JUST WANT TO APPRECIATE ALL THE EFFORT THAT GOES INTO THAT.

THANK YOU TO OUR PLANNING COMMISSION AS WELL FOR ALL OF THEIR WORK.

WITH THAT, THAT CONCLUDES OUR AGENDA FOR THIS WORK SESSION TODAY.

AND I NOW CLOSE THE SEPTEMBER 14, 2026, CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION.

WE ARE ADJOURNED.

[GAVEL SOUNDS]