



Phone: 541-682-5481
www.eugene-or.gov/pc

AGENDA

Meeting Location:
Sloat Room—Atrium Building
99 W. 10th Avenue
Eugene, OR 97401

The Eugene Planning Commission welcomes your interest in these agenda items. Feel free to come and go as you please at any of the meetings. This meeting location is wheelchair-accessible. For the hearing impaired, FM assistive-listening devices are available, or an interpreter can be provided with 48 hours' notice prior to the meeting. Spanish-language interpretation will also be provided with 48 hours' notice. To arrange for these services, contact the Planning Division at 541-682-5675.

MONDAY, JUNE 3, 2019 – REGULAR MEETING (5:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m.)

A. PUBLIC COMMENT

The Planning Commission reserves 10 minutes at the beginning of this meeting for public comment. The public may comment on any matter, **except for items scheduled for public hearing or public hearing items for which the record has already closed.** Generally, the time limit for public comment is three minutes; however, the Planning Commission reserves the option to reduce the time allowed each speaker based on the number of people requesting to speak.

B. DELIBERATIONS: DOWNTOWN RIVERFRONT ADOPTION PACKAGE

Staff: Will Dowdy/Gabe Flock

WDowdy@eugene-or.gov 541-682-5340

GFlock@eugene-or.gov 541-682-5697

C. ITEMS FROM COMMISSION AND STAFF

1. Other Items from Staff
2. Other Items from Commission
3. Learning: How are we doing?

Commissioners: Steven Baker; John Barofsky; Tiffany Edwards (Vice Chair); Lisa Fragala; Chris Ramey; William Randall; Kristen Taylor (Chair)

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY
June 3 & 4, 2019

To: Eugene Planning Commission

From: Will Dowdy, Urban Development Manager, Community Development Division
Gabe Flock, Senior Planner, Planning Division

Subject: Downtown Riverfront Land Use Adoption Package

ACTION REQUESTED:

To deliberate and make a recommendation to City Council on a City-initiated package of land use applications necessary to implement the overall concept plan for mixed-use redevelopment of the Downtown Riverfront site, including a new park, housing and commercial uses.

BRIEFING STATEMENT:

The proposal for implementation of the Downtown Riverfront concept plan includes a detailed package of concurrent land use applications, which were the subject of Planning Commission's public hearing held on May 7, 2019. These applications are briefly summarized below:

Code Amendments (City File # CA 19-1): Amends the Downtown Riverfront Special Area Zone (S-DR) as necessary to implement the updated vision and concept plan for redevelopment of the former EWEB riverfront site. Includes changes to the codified regulating plan, height standards, and other form-based zoning standards for mixed-use development and a new riverfront park; also includes related code amendments to integrate the updated zoning with other parts the of City's land use code.

Refinement Plan Amendments (City File # RA 19-1): Repeals the Downtown Riverfront Specific Area Plan to facilitate revisions to the S-DR zone; also amends Whiteaker Plan policies to allow for removal of existing Site Review overlays on parcels zoned S-W/SR north of 4th Avenue, which are proposed to be rezoned to S-DR (see below).

Zone Changes (City File # Z 19-5): Rezones several parcels north of 4th Avenue from Whiteaker Special Area Zone with Site Review Overlay (S-W/SR) to Downtown Riverfront Special Area Zone (S-DR). Also includes one parcel zoned Light-Medium Industrial with Transit Oriented Development and Water Resource Conservation Overlays (I-2/TD/WR) and one zoned Public Land with Water Resource Conservation Overlay (PL/WR), being rezoned to the Downtown Riverfront Special Area Zone with Water Resource Conservation Overlay (S-DR/WR), within the area of the new riverfront park.

Willamette Greenway Permit (WG 19-3): Approval of a new Willamette Greenway Permit for future development that is consistent with the updated concept plan and revised S-DR zone. The application address Goal 15 requirements related to the protection of the Willamette River, as implemented by the City's local approval criteria for Willamette Greenway Permits.

Tentative Subdivision (ST 19-3): Approval for a tentative subdivision that will create 17 new lots and rights-of way consistent with the revised S-DR zone. The plans also include conceptual designs for streets, accessways, and other infrastructure improvements necessary to serve the newly created lots.

Standards Review (SDR 19-2): Approval for the proposed design and construction of a new metropolitan riverfront park, including a new multi-use pathway, overlooks, riparian enhancement and a variety of other public riverfront amenities. This application addresses special standards for the proposed park improvements within areas having the Water Resources Conservation Overlay (/WR), intended to implement Goal 5 water resource protections along the edge of the site near the Willamette River.

As a reminder, the land use applications proposed in this City-initiated adoption package are subject to formal quasi-judicial procedures at EC 9.7065-9.7095, so if there are any declarations or disclosures related to conflict of interest or ex-parte contact, commissioners should provide those at the outset of our next meeting. As previously discussed, the applications are subject to review according to the approval criteria for each application type, and the commission's recommendation must be based on the available evidence in the record.

Open Record Period

Following the close of the public hearing held on May 7, 2019 the record was held open for any interested party to submit new evidence and testimony for consideration as part of the Commission's deliberations. Below is a brief summary of the additional materials received by staff during the open record period:

Initial Open Record Period (May 7-14, 2019)

- Williams & Dame/SERA Renderings (related to height/setback north of 4th Ave)
- Revised Code Diagrams (related to height/setback north of 4th Ave)
- E-mail Testimony from David Edrington
- E-mail Testimony from Charles Biggs

Open Response Period (May 14-21, 2019)

- Williams & Dame/SERA Materials addressing Bike Parking, Surface Parking, Minimum 14' Ground Floor Height, and Zero Lot Line Setbacks.

The admissible items listed above have been provided separately via email and are posted on the City's website for public viewing at <https://pdd.eugene-or.gov/LandUse/SearchApplicationDocuments?file=CA-19-0001>. The full set of application materials and other information in the record for consideration are also available at that location or upon request at the City's Permit and Information Center.

Staff notes that the materials submitted by Williams & Dame representatives during the response period were intended for the first open record period but were not received by the initial deadline at 5pm on May 14th. Those materials were received on May 15th, which makes them inadmissible as new evidence. The materials were intended to respond to questions raised by commissioners following the public hearing and are therefore not responsive to materials that came in during the first open record period. Without re-opening the record to all parties and given the current timeline for a public hearing

and action on the adoption package by City Council prior to the end of July, staff recommends against re-opening the record at this time. To that end, staff has not forwarded those materials to commissioners, to avoid any procedural error in considering that additional, inadmissible evidence.

Questions and Topics Raised for Further Discussion

To assist the commission, staff has provided a response to various questions and topics raised by commissioners following the public hearing (see Attachment A). Where possible, staff's response to topics raised by more than one commissioner have been grouped together or related to specific evidence submitted during the open record period.

NEXT STEPS:

We are set to begin deliberations on June 3rd, with additional meetings on June 4th and June 11th as needed to reach a recommendation to City Council on the proposed adoption package. As part of deliberations, staff recommends that commissioners focus on key topic areas of concern and be prepared to suggest or put forward motions that could direct any specific changes to the draft code amendments or related application components. Alternatively, and/or upon resolution of any key concerns or recommended changes, staff recommends informal straw poll voting as we move through each of the land use applications included in the adoption package to determine whether to recommend approval, approval with modifications, or denial.

Following the Commission's deliberations and recommendation, the request will be heard by the City Council in a second public hearing process where new evidence and testimony can also be received, before a final decision is made. City Council is tentatively scheduled to hold its public hearing on June 24, 2019 with possible final action in July.

ATTACHMENTS:

- A: Staff Response to Questions and Topics Raised for Further Discussion
- B: Downtown Riverfront Specific Area Plan Policies

The full package of land use application materials including the draft code amendments, site plans, findings addressing the applicable approval criteria, and a variety of supporting documentation will be provided separately. These materials are also available on the City's website as noted above.

FOR MORE INFORMATION:

Please contact Will Dowdy, Urban Development Manager, Community Development Division by phone: (541) 682-5340 or e-mail: wdowdy@eugene-or.gov. You may also contact Gabe Flock, Senior Planner, by phone: (541) 682-5697, or e-mail: gflock@eugene-or.gov.

Staff Response to Questions and Topics Raised for Further Discussion

Several of the topics and questions mentioned by commissioners essentially ask the question why development in this zone should be subject to some different requirements than development in other parts of the City. As a preface to the more specific responses provided below, there are two primary reasons why staff believes this makes sense.

First, it is important to remember that this area is already subject to different requirements by virtue of the special area zone that Council previously approved for the Downtown Riverfront property. The land use code contains a variety of special area zones for areas spread throughout the City. The land use code was adopted with a recognition that one size does not necessarily fit everything. The special area zone provisions in the EC 9.3000s implement that recognition. The proposed action before the Planning Commission is now to modify the regulations for an existing special area zone.

Second, unlike most neighborhoods, this neighborhood is being created from scratch. Except for the existing the Steam Plant, virtually everything including streets will be new. The area is uniquely situated between downtown and the Willamette River; it is a brownfield site; it has the potential to be a major connection from downtown to the river; and, it has a master developer for most of the private development who is working in conjunction with the City which is developing the public infrastructure and the park. Together, these entities have created a concept plan that has the potential to create higher density development in an area with a variety of site constraints and geographical challenges. To accomplish the objectives, especially given the constraints, requires some flexibility. If this pilot project can work here, then some of these proposed regulations could also be tried in other parts of the City.

1. Setback & Height Transition North of 4th Avenue

The materials provided by Williams & Dame/SERA architects propose a height limit of 15 feet for a distance of 20 feet into the subject parcel along the alley (and adjacent to two historic buildings north of 3rd Alley).

Staff has provided a revised height regulating plan and associated code diagram for consideration that would establish this height/setback limit as a “Historic Setback Area” according to Figure EC 9.3155(3)(a), Note 3. Specifically, it clarifies that any portion of the building above 15 feet shall be set back 20 feet from 3rd Alley. Staff requests that the Planning Commission provide direction on whether to include this change as part of the draft code amendments for the S-DR zone.

2. Stormwater Treatment Standards

As clarified by staff at the public hearing in response to concern about modifying the current stormwater standards, the proposed code amendments are specific to the S-DR zone and will not lessen or diminish the City’s existing requirements for treatment of stormwater runoff to minimize water quality impacts. The proposed changes at EC 9.3155(17) are specifically crafted to ensure that stormwater treatment will be required but allow the public system to be sized with additional capacity to handle runoff from private development. In effect, it would enable the sharing of public stormwater treatment facilities with private development, which is not otherwise allowed

under existing City-wide standards. Otherwise, generally, the facilities must comply with all other applicable stormwater standards at EC 9.6791-9.6797 and the City's Stormwater Management Manual.

3. Access Management & Surface Parking Locations

Concern was expressed about whether the proposed code changes related to curb cuts (i.e. driveway or access connections) are consistent with existing access management standards that otherwise apply City wide. Similar concern was expressed about the proposed standards regulating surface parking locations, and why this should be allowed in the S-DR zone rather than the typical requirement in other zones for parking to be located to the side or rear of buildings.

Staff understands this topic to be related to the proposed standards at EC 9.3165(1)(b) Location of On-Site Surface Parking and EC 9.3165(1)(d) Parking Access. As a point of clarification, the S-DR zone is generally crafted to provide more specific, customized standards which is one of the fundamental benefits of special area zones which allow the zoning requirements to be tailored to the unique nature of the specific area. Where more specific or customized standards do not prevail, generally, the proposed code relies on other existing standards.

So, for example, the access management standards in EC Chapter 7 do apply within the S-DR zone unless there is a more specific, prevailing standard within the S-DR zone. At EC 9.3165(1)(d), the requirement for a maximum 20-foot wide driveway/access connection is consistent with related access management standards at EC 7.410(2), but more restrictive in that it does not allow exceptions for wider access connections pursuant to 7.410(3). The limit of no more than 2 or 3 access connections depending on lot size is customized for the specific layout of parcels being created in the concurrent subdivision which will all have frontage on local streets, except where EC 7.410 is more restrictive. In other words, where the allowance of more than one access connection would violate EC 7.410(3)(d) based on limited street frontage, the more restrictive requirements of EC 7.410 would prevail, and the additional access connections would not be allowed. Lastly, the prohibition on driveway and access connections within 50 feet of any street intersection is also more restrictive in the S-DR zone compared to the standards at EC 7.420 that apply City wide. Those existing standards only require access connections to be 20 feet from the intersection.

The proposed amendments are also crafted to expand the allowance for new surface parking, but only in specific locations. According to the EC 9.3165(1)(b), new surface parking can only be located along the street next to the existing railroad, where access is provided via an alley, and on parcels where the parking is located behind the building (or to the side of the building where no alley is available). This is another example of creating customized standards that are tailored to the S-DR zone, but in a way that still expresses general intent to limit the amount of parking and vehicle access areas between building frontages and the adjacent street. The allowance for surface parking on parcels fronting the street along the railroad is also intentionally more permissive in recognition of the limited overall site areas, as well as orientation of lots and buildings toward 5th Avenue and the new riverfront park. It is also worth noting that in other zones, such as commercial, the limitation on parking and vehicle use areas between the building and the street is adjustable, meaning the applicant can apply for Adjustment Review to seek relief and allow parking and vehicle use areas between the building and the street. It is intentional that no such discretionary alternative is available in the S-DR zone.

4. Open Space Requirements

Concern was expressed about the allowance of private open space areas such as balconies or rooftops to count toward the minimum open space requirements in the S-DR zone. Staff understands this issue to relate to EC 9.3175 which requires that either 10% of the development site, or 10% of the livable floor area (whichever is greater) be provided as open space on the development site. Per EC 9.3175(2), up to 50% of that required open space is allowed in the form of private open space features such as balconies, porches, patios and eco-roofs.

EC 9.3175 was added by Ordinance No. 20513 in 2013 and is largely unchanged by the draft code amendments under consideration, except for the proposed deletion of subsection (1), which requires that multi-family development sites include a bare minimum of 400 square feet of common open space. Subsection (1) is unnecessary given the requirements in subsection (2) and (3) that either 10% of the development site or the livable floor area be provided as open space.

For purposes of comparison, staff notes the multi-family standards at EC Table 9.5500(9) require that 20% of the development site and 15% of the livable floor area (whichever is greater) be provided as open space on the development site. The table below provides a comparison of open space requirements between C-2, S-DR, and all other zones. The greater area determined by the percentages for the zone must be provided on the development site.

Comparison of Open Space Requirements by Zone

Open Space Requirements			
Zone	C-2	S-DR	All Other Zones
Percent of Development Site	20%	10%	20%
Percent of Livable Floor Area	25%	10%	15%
Minimum Density Exception from Open Space Requirements by Zone			
Zone	C-2	S-DR	All Other Zones
Dwelling Units Per Net Acre	23	N/A	45%

As staff explained at the hearing, the existing multi-family standards at EC 9.5500 include some allowance for private open space to count toward minimum percentages on a given development site. Open space includes combined common and private open space. Private open space includes ground level spaces, balconies, and roof terraces and must be adjacent to a dwelling unit providing an outdoor area for private use by the occupants of the dwelling unit. The S-DR zone open space requirements are lower than C-2 and all other zones, however the S-DR zone does not provide minimum density exception from the requirements.

Specific to the S-DR zone, a policy choice was made as part of the original adoption process in 2013 to favor a denser form of urban development than, for example, a typical suburban multi-family apartment complex. The adoption process resulted in less percentage of open space required overall per development site. It also resulted in the allowance for up to 50% of the required amount to be private open space such as balconies and roof terraces. EC 9.5500(9)(a) requires a minimum of 400 square feet of common open space on a development site, but the remainder of the required open space can be in the form of private open space. The S-DR zone requires a greater proportion of common open space on the development site as a tradeoff for reductions in percent of site and percent of livable floor area and, more significantly, the removal of a density

exception.

In other words, the allowance for private open space to count toward the minimum is part of the current, adopted S-DR zone provisions and is proposed to remain unchanged in the proposed code amendment package. There is also a recognition that the subject site includes a significant allocation of open space in the form of the Riverfront Park and the proposed street rights-of-way that are immediately adjacent and accessible to future residents.

5. **Bike Parking**

Concern was expressed about the proposed change to the required ratio of long-term and short-term bike parking within the S-DR zone. As staff explained at the hearing, we realized upon closer review as part developing this set of proposed amendments, that the 2013 adoption process included an error by inadvertently switching the intended ratio. As currently adopted in EC Table 9.3165(3), the S-DR zone requires 90% short-term and 10% long-term bike parking for residential uses. This is the *opposite* of what is typically required or intended for accommodating long-term bike parking demand for residential uses.

For comparison, see EC Table 9.6105(5) Minimum Bike Parking Required where almost all the listed residential uses require 100% long term bike parking. The proposed revision to the ratio, to require 10% short-term and 90% long-term bike parking, is intended to fix this error from the 2013 adoption process and to ensure that at least some (10%) is provided as convenient and accessible short-term bike parking for visitors and residents.

Otherwise, the primary change to the proposed bike parking standards is to allow up to two (2) in-unit bicycle parking spaces per dwelling unit, to count to toward the minimum long-term bike parking requirements. It's also worth noting that the requirement for 1.5 bike parking spaces per dwelling unit in the S-DR zone is more required bike parking than other residential uses, such as multi-family in other zones (which only require one space per dwelling unit). This was an intentional policy choice to promote the use of alternative modes of travel given the proximity of this site to the City's bike path system, downtown, and other nearby services, as well as to provide some balance to the reduction in required motor vehicle parking overall (0.75 spaces per dwelling unit rather than 1 per dwelling).

6. **Building Height, Frontage & Setbacks**

Planning Commission asked what the streetscape experience would be, and whether the 0-foot minimum setback allowed in the district would create a "canyon effect." This setback standard is the same in other commercial zones within the City; sometimes the experience of this condition is positive and popular (such as at Broadway between Starbucks and Sizzle Pie), and sometimes it is not. Staff understands this issue to be primarily a function of two qualities in the streetscape design: sidewalk width and the ratio of the building height to street width.

Because people gravitate away from the edges of a sidewalk as they walk, wider sidewalks mitigate the sense of claustrophobia. Whereas the minimum requirement in other parts of Eugene is only 5 feet, the sidewalks required in the Downtown Riverfront Special Area Zone on 5th Avenue are 15 feet. For the person walking down the center of the sidewalk on 5th Avenue, the extra sidewalk width translates to an extra 5 feet between them and the adjacent building. This difference may be a reason why the sidewalk in front of Bon Mi on Broadway (10

feet) feels more comfortable than the sidewalk on 13th Ave at the 13th & Olive apartments (6 feet in some places) or at the Coburg Road Walgreens (5 feet with a 2-foot paved setback). Despite the similarities, the experience is different. Additional factors, including the speed of the traffic and the presence of street trees and on-street parking as a protective barrier, may also affect where people choose to walk on the sidewalk, whether farther from the street (and closer to the building) or the opposite.

The careful consideration of building height to street width ratio is a common urban design practice that is rooted in the idea that public spaces, including streets, are often perceived by people as outdoor “rooms.” The height to width ratio is a way to measure the sense of enclosure and relates to evolutionary psychology theories in architecture that describe humans as desiring both “prospect,” to see danger and opportunities from afar, and “refuge,” to be shielded and protected from that danger. Architects and urban designers have noted human preference for public spaces that provide a blend of the two, in the way that forest edges offered our ancestors a compromise between the exposure of the plain and the confinement of the forest. A rule of thumb for successful streets is no wider than a height to width ratio of 1:1, and not much narrower than 3:1. In the core of downtown Eugene, buildings are often 3-4 stories (approximately 45 feet) on streets that are 66 feet wide, for a ratio of 0.67:1. Where the code allows heights of 150 feet, the narrowest ratio would be 2.3:1. In the S-DR Zone, if buildings are built to the limits of the code (maximum height coupled with minimum setback), the ratios would range from 0.88:1 to 1.9:1.

7. Minimum Ground Floor Height

Commissioners asked about the proposed amendment that would limit the requirement of first floor heights being 14 feet (floor to floor) to locations with non-residential uses (as opposed to all locations). The specific language for this provision can be found in the draft code at EC 9.3180(2)(c). In general, tall first floor ceilings are preferred for retail use; they are less desirable for residential use, because the tall ceilings have little utility while adding to the cost of construction and consuming floor area (each additional foot of height equals approximately 2 feet of additional stair length). The proposed code language reflects this difference, but Planning Commission also asked about the possible future conversion of ground floor space from residential to retail uses. Providing for this potential scenario is more difficult and requires balancing pros and cons. Flexibility to allow future uses is a preferred outcome for urban development; avoiding unnecessary costs and awkward configurations is also preferred.

Without entering a discussion of whether the trajectory of brick-and-mortar retail is likely to warrant these future conversions, there are other factors to consider. Not all buildings are easily converted to from one use to another and other design decisions are critical, including the provision of a zero-step entry and meeting any building code requirements for commercial space; the ceiling height is the least essential of these. Whereas the building code requirements are primarily a question of cost, the zero-step entry presents an urban design challenge, since the best practice for ground floor residential is to have the floor level raised above the sidewalk grade. If Planning Commission wants to include requirements for conversion-ready design, the requirements should be considered comprehensively, and should be balanced with the resulting impacts to the suitability of these units for residential use.

8. Design Review Criteria Comparison

A comparison of the existing and proposed criteria for Design Review was requested to better understand the changes proposed in the draft code amendments. EC 9.3190 S-DR Downtown Riverfront Special Area Zone Design Review requires that, as an alternative to designing a development that complies with applicable standards in the S-DR Zone, an applicant may apply for approval of a proposed development through the Design Review process.

In the current S-DR zone provisions, alternatives proposed to Lot Standards (EC 9.3150(3)), Transportation System Standards (EC 9.3160(7)), Required Off-Street Motor Vehicle Parking (EC 9.3165(1)), S-DR/MU Development Standards (EC 9.3180(3)), S-DR MU/1 Development Standards (EC 9.3181(3)), S-DR MU/2 Development Standards (EC 9.3182(3)), and Cultural Landscape and Open Space Subdistrict Development Standards (EC 9.3185(3)) are subject to the following approval criteria. These criteria are based on the language for Adjustment Reviews within the Downtown Plan area:

EC 9.8030(16)(a). The requested adjustment will allow the project to achieve an equivalent or higher quality design than would result from strict adherence to the standards through:

- 1. A building orientation, massing, articulation and façade that contribute positively to the surrounding urban environment; and**
- 2. An overall site and building design that creates a safe and attractive pedestrian environment. Design elements for this purpose may include special architectural design features, high quality materials, outdoor seating, pedestrian-scaled lighting, prominent entries facing the street, multiple openings or windows, and a significant use of clear, untinted glass.**
- 3. Within the S-DR zone, alternatives proposed pursuant to EC 9.3150(3), EC 9.3180(3), EC 9.3181(3), and EC 9.3182(3) shall demonstrate compliance with “urban design” plan policies in the Downtown Riverfront Specific Area Plan; alternatives proposed pursuant to EC 9.3160(7) and EC 9.3165(1) shall demonstrate compliance with “infrastructure” plan policies in the Downtown Riverfront Specific Area Plan; and, uses proposed pursuant to EC 9.3147(7) and alternatives proposed pursuant to EC 9.3185(4) shall demonstrate compliance with “open space” plan policies in the Downtown Riverfront Specific Area Plan.**

The proposed code amendments delete the reference to uses in EC 9.3147(7) and modify the reference to open space at EC 9.3185(4) to be EC 9.3185(3), which are both incorrect references. The existing provision at EC 9.8030(16)(a)3. also references and incorporates “urban design”, “infrastructure”, and “open space” plan policies in the Downtown Riverfront Specific Area Plan (see page 16, also included as Attachment B for ease of reference). The code amendments also delete Lot Standards and the associated Design Review process, since the subdivision tentative application is included in the adoption package and establishes the intended lot configurations.

In addition, the proposed code amendments modify the approval criteria for alternatives proposed to Transportation System Standards, S-DR MU Development Standards, S-DR MU/1 Development Standards, and S-DR MU/2 Development Standards as follows:

EC 9.3190(2)(a). Alternatives proposed pursuant to EC 9.3160(5), EC 9.3180(3), EC 9.3181(3), and EC 9.3182(3) shall demonstrate that the alternative proposal will allow the project to achieve an equivalent or higher quality design than would result from strict adherence to the standards through:

- 1. A building orientation, massing, articulation, and facade that contributes positively to the surrounding urban environment; and**
- 2. An overall site and building design that creates a safe and attractive pedestrian environment. Design elements for this purpose may include special architectural design features, high quality materials, outdoor seating, pedestrian-scaled lighting, prominent entries facing the street, multiple openings or windows, and a significant use of clear, untinted glass.**

The code amendments modify the approval criteria for alternatives proposed to Cultural Landscape and Open Space Subdistrict Specific Development Standards as follows:

EC 9.3190(b). Alternatives proposed pursuant to EC 9.3185(4) shall demonstrate that the alternative proposal will allow the project to achieve an equivalent or higher quality design than would result from strict adherence to the standards through:

- 1. An overall site design that includes public green space, interpretive sites, public art, vistas, and/or historic structures that teach about the history of Eugene’s Downtown Riverfront; and**
- 2. An overall site design that includes habitat enhancement areas that promote educational opportunities and demonstrate ecological enhancement in urban environments.**

As we’ve discussed, the overall proposal is intended as refinement of the redevelopment vision expressed in the Downtown Riverfront Specific Area Plan. The intent is to advance the purpose of the plan to support the creation of an active, vibrant, people place along Eugene’s downtown, yet without reliance on the highly subjective policies from the original plan which are being repealed as part of the proposed adoption package.

The S-DR zone has been crafted as a hybrid form-based code with specific standards that implement the original policy intent in a clear and objective manner, with flexibility built into the code through Design Review. The code amendments to modify EC 9.3190 Design Review are therefore intended to provide a more streamlined and effective method of addressing specific design features as part of the built environment, and recognizing that the plan policies were: 1) in some cases related to features that are being changed or no longer included within the updated concept plan; 2) are being implemented already through the S-DR zone provisions; or, 3) were so general and vague that they would have limited utility or effectiveness in the context of an individual building or development design on a site by site basis. The proposed, amended approval criteria for Design Review are more specific to the types of requests for flexibility we might see, with the intent of ensuring at least an equivalent or higher quality design than would be required by the applicable standards.

F. POLICIES

The following policies articulate the vision for the redevelopment of the Downtown Riverfront.

General

- New development shall promote the vision of the Downtown Riverfront as a unique, sustainable neighborhood through the implementation of a network of public and private open space areas that include parks, green infrastructure, urban agriculture, enhanced habitat, gathering spaces, and interpretive sites.
- New development shall utilize design strategies and construction techniques that integrate built and natural environments and contribute to the establishment of a high-quality riverfront district that includes urban uses, green infrastructure, cultural landscapes, and open space.
- New development shall contribute to a diverse public realm through an interconnected network of paths, streets, and open space areas.
- New development shall contribute to a mixed-use riverfront district that includes commercial/retail and residential activities and highly accessible public open space.
- New development shall contribute to the establishment of a vibrant, accessible, multi-use Downtown Riverfront by incorporating uses and amenities that invite the community to eat, gather, live, work, and play.

Urban Design

- New development shall promote an active, diverse, green, mixed-use neighborhood and strive for excellence in site and building design.
- New development shall enliven streets and public spaces by incorporating amenities and active ground-level uses with either a high degree of transparency with commercial uses or a frequency of entries with residential uses.
- New development shall maintain and enhance views to riverfront open space and the Willamette River.
- Building form shall reinforce the active and public nature of streets, open space areas, and riverfront amenities.
- Site, building, and infrastructure design shall contribute to a healthy and livable community by following sustainable development practices to the greatest degree practicable.

Infrastructure

- Extend the Downtown transportation network to serve the riverfront and safely accommodate pedestrian, bicycle and vehicle traffic along public streets, paths, and accessways.

- Implement the “Great Loop” concept in the EWEB Riverfront Master Plan, which builds on the “Great Streets” concept in the Eugene Downtown Plan, through the provision of a direct and efficient street connection between High Street and 8th Avenue that connects through the riverfront property and provides access to the riverfront open space.
- Preserve and enhance visual connections to the Willamette River through the establishment of View Corridors as shown in the EWEB Riverfront Master Plan in conjunction with the construction of the transportation network (streets, paths, accessways and trails).
- Encourage non-vehicular transportation by accommodating multi-modal pedestrian transportation amenities and through the design of a pedestrian-friendly street network.
- Public streets shall be constructed with green stormwater treatment systems to the extent feasible including, but not limited to, infiltration planters, rain gardens, flow-through planters, and vegetated swales.
- Public streets shall provide on-street parking that support commercial and retail uses and on-street bicycle parking to accommodate non-vehicular transportation.

Open Space

- Public and private open space areas shall be designed to emphasize connectivity, permeability, diversity, and sustainability.
- Design of public open space areas shall ensure safety and compatibility among adjacent uses and facilities, and comply with City design and development standards and specifications.
- Promote the development of a Cultural Landscape that consists of public green space, interpretive sites, public art, vistas, and historic structures that teach about the history of Eugene’s Downtown Riverfront.
- Use the riverfront landscape to teach about our community’s history, in a variety of ways and at a variety of scales.
- Envision and manage habitat areas as small samples of habitat whose primary purpose is to foster education and demonstrate the potential for ecological enhancement in urban environments, and recognize that, due to their relatively small size and human use impacts, these areas cannot achieve the level of ecological function that is possible in larger, undisturbed habitat areas in non-urban settings.