

ROUGHLY EDITED TRANSCRIPT
CITY OF EUGENE
PUBLIC HEARING
OCTOBER 19, 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: Good evening and welcome to the October 19th, Eugene city council public hearing. We thank you for joining us this evening in the hybrid format. Anyone wishing to watch may do so on our website. Follow the instructions for this meeting on the materials meeting page on the website. There are two public hearings this evening. If you have signed up to speak, you can do so at the appropriate time. We will accept requests to speak forms until 5:35 p.m. this evening. As a reminder, council's meeting rules of conduct apply to all attendees, both in the council chambers and in the lobby, include into flags, signs, noise or conduct that obstructs the business of the council. Keep the room quiet and respectful for all speakers. The person speaking at the podium should be the only person speaking. You are welcome to waive your hands in silent support. We encourage all those who have been ill to join the meeting remotely rather than in person. Spread out or wear a mask if you are comfortable doing so. We have masks available in the lobby, in case you need one. In case of an emergency, an AED is located on the counter behind staff. On the west side of this room, on your left, and in case of an emergency evacuation, the emergency exits are through the double doors located at the back of the room and the double doors near the front of the room. The doors to the patio can also be used as needed. With that, I call this meeting to order. The first public hearing on tonight's agenda, is a public hearing on an ordinance concerning urban growth strategies, housing and job code amendments. Assistant the city manager, would you please introduce the topic?

>> Thank you, mayor. At this meeting, the Eugene city council will hold two public hearings to consider two ordinances that make up urban growth strategies adoption package No. One. Together they are intended to increase housing choice and jobs development, align with Eugene code with state law, and meet state mandated end of year deadlines. The first ordinance includes a variety of code amendments, related to residential treatment facilities, and a five foot increase to the maximum building height in low density residential zones. Action on both ordinances are scheduled for November 23rd.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you. Testimony presented at this public hearing, should be directed towards the applicable criteria, or other criteria, the speaker believes applies to this decision. The applicable material are located in Eugene code section 9.8065. The full text of that code section is available, and the findings attached to the AIS for this public hearing. It's 5:36 by my watch, and you now open the public hearing. Staff, can you please share a list of the speakers on the screen and announce the first speakers.

>> Thank you, I'll need a couple more moments, but to know the first hearing has seven speakers and the second hearing has one.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you.

>> Thank you, everyone, for your patience. If you have signed up to speak via zoom, please take this time to ensure your screen name in zoom includes your last name and matches the name you used to sign up to speak. If it does not match, we cannot allow you to speak when it is time. When you are called to speak, please state your name and ward or neighborhood if known before beginning your comments. If you are providing testimony via zoom, when it is your turn, we will announce your name and allow you to speak. If you are announced as the next speaker and you are physically in the room, please move to the seat in the front row designated for the next speaker. When it is your turn, you may come to the podium. Please leave any bags you may have with you at your seat. If you have documents to give council, please place them in the basket near the podium. You will have 2.5 minutes to speak. The timer will flash red when you have 15 seconds to speak. Your microphone will be muted at the 2:30 mark. Our first speakers are Sabra Marcroft followed by Alex Chamberlains.

>> I'm Sabra Marcroft. I reside in the boundary of the first ward. I'm here to thank you and everyone else who put so much obvious good effort into the micro Village and SRO portions of the planning stuff that you guys are doing right now. It's so important that people have affordable places to live. Most of the people that I know, my friends and my friends kids and my kids friends, my kids are in their late 30s. They can't afford to live here. Finding ways that that can become possible again is super important for us to have a good community going-forward. So thank you. I have three questions I realize they probably can't be answered tonight, but I wanted to put them on to the record. One is, if a house is converted to an SRO, can

detached units be added to reach the maximum number of units for an SRO? In a converted property? The second is, can an SRO have both shared bath and shared kitchen, it says or. I'm not sure exactly what that means. The third is, how are we handling the situation with the SDCs, the system development charges. Is there any break available for projects that are specifically aimed at folks of lower income. And that concludes my questions. Thank you again. And it's really good to see this space, I haven't been in it before.

>> Thank you, SABRA. Our next speakers are Alex Chamberlain followed by Joe.

>> I wanted to come say that I've -- I've read the whole thing, it's pretty long, I'm supportive of the whole thing. I have some questions, the first one was, why is SRO's the minimum 4, why not 3, why not 2. We chose the number for a reason. That's one of the top of the mind questions. I've submitted the rest of them to you in an email. And I like -- I understand the basic tension between preserving neighborhoods and allowing for new housing, and I see that reflected in this code. But what I don't see, and what I'm hoping arrives in a future note is a tool for encouraging desired development, to kind of provide a preferred path, so that neighborhoods can shape what their neighborhood looks like in the future. Because I walk down like alley ways and I'll see a cute cottage that works with the neighborhood and is a proud -- I'm proud to have that in my neighborhood. I also seeing built under the same code, kind of this large bland thing that looks like it came unite of a can. It's not something that I like to see in the development. And a lot of development conversation gets around removing and preventing those canned solutions, the ones that don't look good. But I feel like we need to take another tact and try to encourage the preferred route. But basically, good job.

>> Thank you, Alex. Our next speakers are Joe, followed by Jacob fox.

>> Good evening. Thank you for allowing me this chance to exercise my first amendment. However, listening to your disclaimer to begin with, it's appalling that you limit what people are allowed to say, ask that we can't say things, when profanity has been voted on and ruled by the Supreme Court that it is a first amendment right, and this is a traditional public forum, and you guys are squashing that, that's just a load of crap. I'm allowed under the constitution of this country, the United States of America, to come up here and say whatever I want. So long as it's not an attack or physical threat against anyone up here. You all should be ashamed of yourselves, that you would add that in, vote in to ratify something that stomps on our rights in this country. It's fucking appalling.

>> Due to the wide range of viewers, we ask you to refrain --

>> That's your decorum, not mine. I love that you're working on affordable housing and low income housing and making this happen, I've currently been working on a few of these, working through a few of these, but have seen firsthand

evidence that the planners and the city council are greasing wheels already. I attempted to get a FOIA request, and they want to charge me \$250 for emails between a low income developer and the city. There is no such thing as transparency, you claim you have it, and you don't. When it comes to these applications that are clear and objective, they're unclear, yet considered objectively, and then they ask for subjective application qualifications and standards to be applied to them, and they're given. So the double-talk is really hard for me to swallow, when I come to this, when I'm a part of the community that actually builds these, and works on these, and helps these. I've experienced the benefit of things that have happened here, with this middle housing. And I've also seen the fact that developers get given things that they shouldn't be given, and are allowed to do things they shouldn't be allowed to do. I hope this council can exercise some caution while they go through this.

>> Our next speakers are Jacob fox followed by Greg Bryant.

>> My name is Jacob Knox, the executive director of homes for good, I'm here representing a group that's trying to think about how to dramatically increase housing production. I'm speaking specifically on the ordinance concerning urban growth strategies for housing and job code amendment. I want to just call out three things that I think are really going to move the dial as it relates to housing options. First, new standards for micro Village housing and single room occupancy communities. I think there's some real cost effective opportunities sort of in that space. I'm really excited about that. The maximum building height, we know the future is a more dense city of Eugene. And definitely -- [Audio difficulties] And then around jobs -- the other thing I'd say is I think you as councilmembers in the city of Eugene staff have done a very, very good job of connecting with the community. In advance of bringing this ordinance into public testimony, and then ultimately council deliberation. Particularly, staff were thoughtful about connecting with private sector developers -- [Audio difficulties] And then what I'd leave you with is what we all know, this is a great step in the right direction, but if we want to increase housing, we're going to need -- [Audio difficulties N. [Ask for your support. Appreciate your time.

>> Jacob? Thank you, Jacob. Our next speakers are Greg Bryant followed by Tiffany Edwards. Greg, I see you in zoom, I will allow you to speak. You should be able to speak now, Greg.

>> Okay. I'll give it a try. Can you hear me?

>> Yes, we can.

>> Thank you.

>> So a wide ranging package of stuff. I'm Greg Bryant, I'm on the board of the South university neighborhood association. And basically, we're trying to keep

the South university neighborhood from becoming -- from suffering the same fate of the western university neighborhood suffered, because of upzoning. And I'm asking you to amend this plan to remove the proposed five foot height increase, and also wouldn't it be wonderful if aside from that amendment to eventually remove the 7 foot bonus, because we've seen it was very harmful to really the fabric of the neighborhood. A very tall building that proposed to be middle housing, but ended up being for airbnb's next to each other. And as a result of its impact on the neighborhood, basically made everything around it, become airbnb's, in the midst of our residential neighborhood, we now have a little hotel district. And it's very expensive stuff meant for people traveling from out of town 20 go to sports games. And not go to hotels, but instead, go to hotels that have been built in the middle of a neighborhood. I think this is an unintended consequence, but on the other hand, if one is in the mind of deregulating, so that developers and the real estate industry can do anything they want, then wonderful, you've succeeded. I don't think that was the intention, and I think the -- one of the biggest problems with middle housing is that it is blanket and doesn't really involve the neighborhood in anyway. We have no visibility into building permits, when we have no opportunity to comment or reject buildings. Buildings are built before the land use process even begins, so they become moot. And, you know, when they build four townhouses that become airbnb's next to each other, we don't get to say anything, and the land use decision doesn't make it any different, their neighborhood has been destroyed, the trees have been torn down. Even city trees, and the sun has been blocked and the sky has been blocked for --

>> Thank you, Greg, your time has concluded.

>> Our next speakers are Tiffany Edwards followed by Mark Rabinowitz.

>> Good evening mayor and counselors, my name is Tiffany Edwards, I serve as the vice chair of the Eugene planning commission. I'm here tonight on behalf of the commission, to strongly encourage your adoption for adoption package No. 1. Eugene faces significant housing shortage, and addressing it helps remove unnecessary barriers to housing. On July 28th, following testimony and extensive deliberation, the planning commission voted unanimously to approve this package, including the maximum building height from 30 to 35 feet. I'd like to focus specifically on that recommendation. 5 additional feet may seem like a small change, but it can make a meaningful difference in whether housing was feasible to build. A 35 foot limit is consistent with Oregon's model housing code, and standards in comparable communities. Second, this is not a new recommendation, the planning commission supported the same height increase during the 2022 middle housing code amendments, and third, we heard directly, that these additional five feet provide flexibility on smaller lots, that can make three story housing and additional dwelling units more feasible. Because R1 is Eugene's most appreciated zoning designation, this modest adjustment has the potential to develop throughout the city. The change doesn't require anyone to build taller. It simply provides greater flexibility to those who chose to develop housing. As planning

commissioners, our responsibility is to consider differing perspectives, while keeping the broader public interest in Eugene's long term housing needs at the forefront. At a time when our community needs more housing, retaining a necessary height limit, without compelling planning justification would be a missed opportunity. We urge you to adopt the full package as recommended by the planning commission, including the 30 foot height limit, our land use regulations, should enable thoughtful housing development, not unnecessarily constrain it. We have a three page testimony that's been submitted into the record. Thank you.

>> Our next speaker is Mark Rabinowitz. Mark, I don't see you online. No one in the room is waiving their hand to be Mark. Mayor, that was our final speaker for this hearing.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you, staff, I will now close the public hearing. Council will continue to accept written testimony until action is taken, to the email or mailing address provided on the public notice for this public hearing. Instructions for submitting written testimony are provided in the public notice for this meeting as well as in the AIS, the agenda item summary for this hearing. If you would like to receive further notices about the proposed land use code amendments, please provide your name and mailing address to staff listed often the AIS for this item. Are there any questions or comments from the city council? Councilor Kashinsky?

>> Councilor Kashinsky: Yes, thank you. And thank you to everyone who came out to speak, and bring your questions and perspectives, and thank you to staff, all of the staff that have put so much work into this lengthy and complex package. Just as -- first of all, as a question to staff, when members of the public have questions at a hearing like this, does that -- do those answers get included 2349 packet later on? I know particularly there's a question about detached SROs, that I was also curious about, so maybe we'll see answers to that as part of the later process?

>> Thank you for the question. Principle planner. Yes, we're preparing a memo to be attached to your deliberations AIS, that will be a summary of the questions that we've gotten from the public, and from council, from the work session, so we'll be including those -- unless it's just a clarification piece that we can handle offline. If it's something that will help your deliberations, then we'll plan on including it.

>> Councilor Kashinsky: Thank you. I wanted to make sure that was out there, so folks who had questions knew where to look for answers. The second thing I wanted to bring up, as we're discussing the 35 height limit adjustment, one of the things I feel is important with that is that we are consistent, that our code is long, complex, lots of little lines, various places that were put in place at different times, and wanting to make sure we don't miss anything, where we create a result that may not make as much sense. In particular, I've been looking at places where we have height restrictions in higher density residential zones or commercial zones that

would end up being less than 35 feet, which doesn't seem to work great. Because then you have the higher density housing being required to be shorter than the lower density housing, which I don't think is what the intent is there, so I wanted to call out a piece in particular in the hopes that maybe we can talk about that more specifically, what we might need to do. So that's section -- or it's 9.2751, section 3A, and what this piece does is -- says that if you are adjacent to an R1 property, and you're building R23 or R4, the height limit is 30. When the height limit for R1 is 30. That makes sense. It seems that's something we should update to 35, if we are also changing the language. Just wanted to put that out there. Thank you.

>> Mayor Knudson: Any other questions or comments from council?
Councilor Keating?

>> Councilor Keating: Thank you, mayor. On July 28, 2026, there was a 5-0-1 vote. Does staff have any information as to why there was an abstention. Was it a real or perceived conflict of interest? Did that planning commission member share why they abstained from that vote?

>> Thank you for the question. We had a brand new planning commissioner, it was his first meeting, and he didn't feel prepared to vote it up or down is my understanding.

>> Councilor Keating: That's very helpful, thank you.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilors I'm not seeing your names on the tablet cue, in case anyone else has requested to have the opportunity to ask a question or comment. We'll move on to our next public hearing shortly, unless anyone else wants to speak. Thank you, and thank you, staff. With that, our second public hearing on tonight's agenda is a public hearing on an ordinance concerning time extensions for certain approved land use applications and providing an effective date. Assistant the city manager, would you please introduce this topic?

>> At this public hearing, the Eugene city council will consider the second ordinance of urban growth strategies adoption, package one. This would extend the expiration dates of type 2 and type 3 land use approvals for three years, such as subdivisions and zone changes, expedited land division and middle housing land approvals. A three-year extension -- city council previously adopted a similar three-year extension to comparable land use approvals in 2020, as an economic recovery tool in response to the impacts from the Covid-19 pandemic, and in 2009 in response to the economic challenges brought on by the great recession. Action on this ordinance is also scheduled for November 23rd.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you, assistant the city manager. Testimony presented at this public hearing should be directed toward the applicable approval criteria or any criteria that speakers believe apply to the decision. The applicable approved criteria are located in Eugene code section 9.8065. The full text of that

code section is available in the findings attached to the AIS for this public hearing. I now open the public hearing, staff, can you please share a list of the speakers or speaker on screen, and announce the speakers.

>> Thank you, mayor. We have one speaker. When you are called do speak, please state your name and your ward or neighborhood if known before beginning your comments. Please leave any bags you may have with you at your seat. If you have documents to give council, please place them in the basket in the podium, you will have 2.5 minutes to speak, the timer will flash red when you have 30 seconds to use. The use of profanity is not permitted. Our first and only speaker for this second hearing is Joe.

>> Good evening, my name is Joe, resident of Eugene, Laurel hill valley citizens. I love how I'm supposed to say my name and it takes five of my seconds. On to this point of a three-year extension for land use applications, I'll just say that I'm against this amendment, and I would hope that you would be too. What it does is allows developers who are attempting to make developments, cram them through without proper planning and sit in a cue after they are allowed to have whatever sort of application they get through for land use, and wait, and then reup for public funds, reup for public funds, whether it's through lift or the trust fund here, and they stay, and their application stays active. What they don't have, if they're not prepared when they come to do a development, if this happens, what they won't have, is a consequence for not being prepared to move forward with the development. Now, I understand we want to remove barriers, but what we don't want is to promote and support a landscape for developers to come to the table and ask for public funding because the majority of these low and -- low income affordable housing developments require and get money from the public. My tax dollars, your tax dollars, their tax dollars, everyone's, and then if you allow them to have an application that sits extended for three years, and continue to reup over and over and over again, when they're applying for funding, what they don't have is consequence for not being prepared. They can just haphazardly throw pasta at the wall and see if it sticks. They get to come in here without doing due diligence and get land use and then not move forward. And it's really really -- being a part of it, and having worked on these. Currently working on one that's being built in town right now, from a developer and a builder who did do their due diligence, and is following these plans, and met some barriers and was able to get around those barriers, there is a way to have barrier free right now, it's the clear and objective land use application track for tentative subdivisions for middle housing. It's there, it's available. Public doesn't get to say anything. The only person to appeal it is the developer themselves.

>> Mayor, that was our final speaker.

>> Mayor Knudson: I now close the public hearing. Council will continue to accept written testimony following the closure of the public hearing, until action is taken. You may submit written testimony to the email or address in the AIS. If you

would like to receive further notices about the proposed ordinance, please provide your name and mailing address to staff, listed on the AIS for this public hearing item. Are there any questions or comments from the city council? Seeing none, I will say thank you, and that concludes our agenda for this evening. And I now close the October 19, 2026 public hearing, we are adjourned.