

## Questions and Answers

### 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue City of Eugene owned property

**SHPO submittal.** Text from RFP: “The selected developer may need to submit the proposed project design to SHPO in 2023 to ensure compliance with historic preservation guidelines, and to identify effects on possible historic properties in the surrounding ‘area of potential effect or APE’.” **Question 1:** Has SHPO indicated that there may be requirements for building form, type, or size to respond to surrounding historic properties? **Question 2:** is SHPO predominantly concerned with the potential unknown archaeological significance of the site?

- *If there are any historically significant properties within the indirect APE of the development (surrounding area), SHPO would like to ensure that the design of the development has no adverse effect on the historical significance of those structures. There are structures in the APE that are 50 years old and older, including the Army Reserve and the church adjacent to the site, but SHPO has not yet determined if those buildings are ‘Eligible’ for the National Register of Historic Places and would be considered ‘historic’ by that designation.*

*SHPO has not indicated that there are specific requirements for building form, type or size that would be responsive to the context of the site. The City’s experience is that SHPO responds to proposed projects by agreeing or disagreeing that the site design has No Adverse Effect on historic properties in the APE. Some examples of recent developments in Eugene for which SHPO agreed had No Adverse Effect on historic properties in the APE were The Keystone at 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Tyler Street, The Nel at 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Charnelton Street, and Lincoln Apartments at 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Lincoln Street.*

- *SHPO is also interested in identifying potential archaeological or cultural resources in the Eugene area, which is why they requested additional research for the direct and indirect APE for the subject site.*

**Transportation Access.** Text from RFP Addendum A [and EC 7.420 1 (c)]: “Transportation access must be on the lower traffic volume street. Access can be taken from 13th Avenue or 14th Avenue; 13th Avenue as the higher classification street has the conditions under Eugene Code 7.420(1)(c)1 met outright on 13th Avenue.” **Question:** The first sentence says that transportation access *must* be on the lower traffic volume street. Then it goes on to say that access can be taken from 13<sup>th</sup> or 14<sup>th</sup>. Our understanding from EC 7.420 1 (c) is that access can be taken from both 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup>. Is that accurate?

- *[Eugene Code Chapter 7.](#) EC 7.420 only address the location of the accesses. Development sites are only entitled to one access EC 7.410(1). In order to have an access point on both 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue, an exception to EC 7.410(1) would need to be made through the Alternative Traffic Safety Study (ATSS) process (EC 7.410(3)) meeting the criteria as noted in in EC 7.410(3)(b)1-3.*
- *The design must not allow “through motor vehicle traffic” (in other words, it doesn’t allow cars to go from 13<sup>th</sup> to 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue or vice versa. Please see [Eugene Code Figure 9.550 \(12\)](#) which is on page 71 of the 99-pages of figures.)*

**Through motor vehicle traffic.** Text from RFP Addendum A [and 9.5500 11 (b) 2]: “Parking drives should not be designed to allow “through motor vehicle traffic”. A loop would be considered through motor vehicle traffic.” **Question:** If we are thinking of having vehicles access from both 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup>, does this mean that we have to block vehicles from being *able* to enter and exit from both access points? In other words - does this mean that parking drives can allow for through motor vehicle traffic but should be designed to discourage it (e.g. with traffic calming devices, drive aisle alignment that discourages through traffic, etc.)?

- *The Relevant Code Section is EC 9.5500(11)(b)(2) “Parking Drives. Parking drives are driveways lined with head-in parking spaces, diagonal parking spaces, garages, or any combination thereof along a significant portion of their length. Parking drives for multiple-family developments with more than 20 units shall be designed so as to permit no through-motor vehicle movements.” If there is access on both 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> Avenues, the site should be designed so that cars would not be able to go through from 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue to 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Please see [Eugene Code Figure 9.550 \(12\)](#) which is on page 71 of the 99-pages of figures.*

**Building Mass.** Text from RFP Addendum A [and EC 9.5500 6 (a)]: “Neither the maximum length nor width of any building within 40 feet of the front lot line can exceed 150 feet.” **Question 1:** does this apply to a building that is only partially within 40’ of the front lot line? What if a building steps back outside of the 40’ setback but is over 150’ long?

- *If any part of the building is within 40 feet of a front lot line, then the whole building is subject to the standards of [EC 9.5500\(6\)\(a\)](#).*

**Question 2:** Does the “front lot line” apply to both 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> Avenues?

- *Yes, both 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue are front lot lines because they are fronting streets.*