



**Eugene City Council**

125 E. 8th Ave., 2nd Floor  
Eugene, OR 97401-2793  
541-682-5010 • 541-682-5414 Fax  
www.eugene-or.gov

# **EUGENE CITY COUNCIL AGENDA**

**May 20, 2019**

**5:30 p.m. CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION**  
**Harris Hall, 125 East 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue**  
**Eugene, Oregon 97401**

---

**Meeting of May 20, 2019;**  
**Her Honor Mayor Lucy Vinis Presiding**

**Councilors**

Betty Taylor, President  
Mike Clark  
Chris Pryor  
Jennifer Yeh

Emily Semple, Vice President  
Greg Evans  
Claire Syrett  
Alan Zelenka

---

**5:30 p.m. CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION**  
**Harris Hall, 125 East 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue**  
**Eugene, Oregon 97401**

**1. Committee Reports and Items of Interest**

- Resolution in Support of Juliana vs U.S. Youth Plaintiffs
- Resolution Endorsing Green New Deal

**2. WORK SESSION: Clear & Objective Housing - Approval Criteria Update**

For the hearing impaired, 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 receptionist at 541-682-5010. City Council meetings are telecast live on Metro Television, Comcast channel 21, and rebroadcast later in the week.

El consejo de la Ciudad de Eugene agradece su interés en estos asuntos de la agenda. El lugar de la reunión tiene acceso para sillas de ruedas. Se puede proveer a un intérprete para las personas con discapacidad auditiva si avisa con 48 horas de anticipación. También se puede proveer interpretación para español si avisa con 48 horas de anticipación. Para reservar estos servicios llame al 541-682-5010. Las reuniones del consejo de la ciudad se transmiten en vivo por Metro Television, Canal 21 de Comcast y son retransmitidas durante la semana.

For more information, contact the Council Coordinator at 541-682-5010  
or visit us online at [www.eugene-or.gov](http://www.eugene-or.gov).

**RESOLUTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_**

**A RESOLUTION CALLING FOR SUPPORT OF THE *JULIANA V. U.S. YOUTH PLAINTIFFS* AND THE SCIENCE-BASED NATIONAL CLIMATE RECOVERY PLAN THEY SEEK.**

**The City Council of the City of Eugene finds that:**

- A.** There is a broad scientific consensus among climate scientists that human activities, contributing to increases in greenhouse gas emissions, are the dominant cause of climate change.
- B.** Mean global temperature is increasing as a result of increased atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases, primarily carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), emitted from human activities, including burning fossil fuels; and the decade from 2000 to 2010 was the warmest on record; and if trends continue 2019 will join 2018, 2017, 2016 and 2015 in being the hottest years on record.
- C.** CO<sub>2</sub> levels in the atmosphere have surpassed 400 parts per million (ppm) for the first time in 3,000,000 years, with a global annual mean of 408.5 ppm in 2018.
- D.** The last time CO<sub>2</sub> levels were as high as they are today the seas were approximately 65 feet higher and Greenland was ice-free.
- E.** Emissions of greenhouse gases and especially CO<sub>2</sub> are already causing large-scale planetary changes including ocean acidification, ocean warming, and warming of the Earth's surface, which lead to rising seas, more frequent and severe extreme weather events, heat waves and drought, intense and destructive wildfires, disrupted ecosystems and agriculture, more disease, famine, and conflict and human loss of life, all of which have devastating impacts on physical, emotional and psychological wellbeing.
- F.** The impacts of climate change will worsen as greenhouse gases are emitted into the atmosphere and accumulate over the coming decades, and will profoundly impact the youngest generation throughout their lives, as well as the lives of future generations.
- G.** *The Fourth Oregon Climate Assessment Report*, issued by Oregon Climate Change Research Institute in 2018 (OCCRI Report), found that the threat posed by climate change is real and Oregon's climate is projected to warm on average 3–7°F by the 2050s and 5–11°F by the 2080s.
- H.** The OCCRI Report warns that the health of Oregonians is threatened, as more frequent heat waves are expected to increase heat-related illness and death; more frequent wildfires and poor air quality are expected to increase respiratory illnesses; warmth and extreme precipitation are expected to increase the risk of exposure to some vector- and water-borne diseases; access to sufficient, safe, and nutritious food may be jeopardized.

**I.** Specific to the Willamette Valley, including the City of Eugene, the most densely populated and fastest-growing region in Oregon, greater risks of extreme heat events, summer water scarcity, poor air quality and, according to the Fourth National Climate Assessment, a significant influx of climate refugees from other parts of the U.S. are expected.

**J.** The scientific prescription for avoiding the worst effects of climate change requires returning atmospheric levels of CO<sub>2</sub> to 350 ppm by the year 2100, requiring a 96% reduction in fossil fuel emissions by 2050, in addition to significant increases in natural carbon sequestration through reforestation and soil management changes.

**K.** If emission reductions are delayed, it will make it difficult or impossible to meet a safe target; thus, urgent and substantial reductions in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are critical.

**L.** Cities have a duty to current and future generations to protect our climate system and take science-based action on climate change.

**M.** The City of Eugene amended its Climate Recovery Ordinance in 2016 to establish a community CO<sub>2</sub> emissions reduction target in line with the 350 ppm by the year 2100 trajectory.

**N.** In a landmark constitutional climate case called *Juliana v. U.S.*, twenty-one youth, **including six Eugenians**, filed a lawsuit against the executive branch of the United States government for its role in perpetuating climate disruption, alleging violation of the youths' and future generations' rights to life, liberty and property, and equal protection under the law, while also failing to protect essential public resources.

**O.** If the *Juliana* youth plaintiffs are successful in their case, the federal government likely will be ordered to create and implement a science-based national Climate Recovery Plan designed to phase out the United States' fossil fuel energy system and emissions and draw down excess atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> in line with the 350 ppm by 2100 prescription, thus enhancing Eugene's efforts to get off of fossil fuels and **providing us an opportunity to avoid the worst of the predicted climate impacts**, stabilize the climate system for current and future generations, protect our communities from fossil fuel pollution, and protect vital natural resources for all.

**P.** On November 10, 2016, U.S. District Judge Ann Aiken found that "the right to a climate system capable of sustaining human life is fundamental to a free and ordered society," thus allowing the *Juliana v. U.S.* case to move toward trial.

**Q.** **The *Juliana v. U.S.* case will be heard on June 4, 2019 by a three-judge panel in the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals through a process called interlocutory appeal**, now is the time for cities to speak out in solidarity.

**R.** The voice of the City of Eugene on behalf of its citizens is critically needed, as we envision a society free of fossil fuels and thereby free of the physical, emotional and psychological impacts of climate change on residents of Eugene.

**NOW, THEREFORE,**

**BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF EUGENE, a  
Municipal Corporation of the State of Oregon, as follows:**

**Section 1.** The City of Eugene supports the 21 *Juliana v. U.S.* youth plaintiffs and Climate Recovery Plan they seek.

**Section 2.** The City of Eugene recognizes the need for all emissions reduction targets to be based in science.

**Section 3.** The City Council encourages people to attend events held in support of the *Juliana v. U.S.*

**Section 4.** The City of Eugene directs the City Manager to transmit official copies of this resolution to the following Oregon cities and counties: City of Ashland, City of Corvallis, City of Milwaukie, City of Portland, City of Salem; Benton County, Clackamas County, Columbia County, Deschutes County, Lane County, Linn County, Marion County, Multnomah County, Washington County and Yamhill County.

**Section 5.** This Resolution is effective immediately upon its passage by the City Council.

**The foregoing Resolution adopted the \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2019.**

---

**City Recorder**

# EUGENE CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY



---

## Work Session: Clear & Objective Housing - Approval Criteria Update

---

Meeting Date: May 20, 2019  
Department: Planning and Development  
[www.eugene-or.gov](http://www.eugene-or.gov)

Agenda Item: 2  
Staff Contact: Jenessa Dragovich  
Contact Telephone Number: 541-682-8385

---

### ISSUE STATEMENT

The City Council will be provided with a project update of the Clear & Objective Housing Approval Criteria Update, including draft land use code language to implement the previously approved recommendations. The City Council is requested to review the draft land use code language and take action to move forward with the formal adoption process.

### BACKGROUND

As part of the Envision Eugene urban growth boundary process, in 2015, City Council initiated several projects. These included establishing a baseline UGB, establishing urban reserves, growth monitoring and updating the City's needed housing (clear and objective) regulations. Related to the City's needed housing regulations, the council specifically directed the following action:

- *Update the City's procedures and approval criteria for needed housing applications (applications to develop housing in areas identified for housing in the City's Buildable Lands Inventory and Housing Needs Analysis).*
- *Target for City consideration of proposed updates: within 1 year of State acknowledgement of the baseline UGB.*

Through this project, Eugene's existing clear and objective approval criteria are being reevaluated for potential updates. Proposed updates must meet the following goals:

- accommodate housing on lands available within our current UGB
- provide a clear and objective path to land use approval for all housing as required by State law
- guide future housing development in a way that reflects our community's values

The project has identified land use approval criteria and procedures to be updated, added or removed to improve efficiency in complying with State requirements for clear and objective regulations, while still effectively addressing development impacts.

As a reminder, state law requires that local governments adopt and apply clear and objective standards, conditions and procedures regulating the development of all housing. The intent of this

requirement is to ensure that communities provide a predictable path to approval for housing projects and that path does not rely on discretionary or subjective criteria. This may include development standards such as setbacks and building height that apply to housing at the time of building permit as well as land use application criteria that apply to land use applications, such as subdivisions, for the development of housing.

Cities that provide a clear and objective land use application approval path may also adopt alternative or “discretionary” approval criteria that developers may elect to follow to, for example, allow greater flexibility in housing development proposals. Eugene has a two-track system currently, and this project is focused on the existing clear and objective approval criteria for our conditional use, partition, planned unit development, site review, and subdivision applications.

The Clear & Objective Update was kicked-off in 2018 and consists of four phases. The project was designed to provide incremental review of proposed code changes, with public involvement and review by Planning Commission and City Council provided during each phase of the project. Stakeholders helped identify significant issues in Phase 1, helped generate possible concepts in Phase 2, and had opportunity in Phase 3 to weigh in on draft amendments. Planning Commission and City Council check-ins have occurred at key project milestones. Phase 4 will be the formal adoption process, where the public will again be able to provide input through Planning Commission and City Council public hearings

### ***Draft Land Use Code Language***

The draft code writing phase is based on the [Draft Preferred Concept Report](#) (provided with the November 19, 2018, agenda packet), which was the outcome of Phase 2. The report presented staff recommendations on how to address the 37 key issues identified during Phase 1 of the project (and described in the [Summary of Key Issues Report](#)). The recommendations from the Draft Preferred Concept Report were derived using input from the working groups, research into the issues and possible concepts, consultation with internal staff who work with the land use application review process daily, and a concept evaluation rubric for the 19 significant issues. Planning Commission reviewed and provided feedback on all preferred concept recommendations over the course of four work sessions in November and December. The draft preferred concepts were split into two batches. Batch 1 includes all maintenance issues and less complex issues. Batch 2 includes the more complex issues. Approved concepts for both batches were advanced to the code writing stage by City Council. A summary of the approved concepts is provided in Attachment A.

Based on the approved concepts, draft land use code language was crafted using the help of consultants (for tree preservation and transition standards), researching other examples and best practices, and with internal review from City staff who work with the land use code on a daily basis. It is important to note that the proposed code language is still draft, and staff expects language to change before and during the formal adoption process as we continue to receive feedback and analyze the draft language in order to best achieve the approved recommendations. Draft code language will likely also evolve through the formal adoption process in response to ongoing feedback; however, the proposed language provides a basic framework for implementing the approved concepts.

### ***Planning Commission Review of Draft Code Language***

Planning Commission reviewed draft land use code language for Batch 1 issues at a work session in February 2019 and Batch 2 issues during three work sessions in April 2019. The items covered in each batch are listed below. For the proposed language, staff reviewed the related key issues and provided the approved preferred concept for context, before the commission opened the item for discussion. At the end of the discussion, a straw poll to determine support for each recommendation was taken.

#### **Batch 1 Items:**

- All Maintenance Issues
- 30-Foot Buffer Requirement for PUDs (COS-02)
- Emergency Response (COS-08)
- Conditional Use Requirement (COS-09)
- Partition Tree Preservation (COS-10)
- Site Review Requirement (COS-12)
- 19 Lot Rule—Motor Vehicle Dispersal (COS-14)
- PUD Requirement (COS-16)
- Arborist and Landscape Architect Requirement (COS-18)
- Pedestrian Definition (COS-20)

#### **Batch 2 Items:**

- Clear & Objective Compatibility (COS-01)
- 20 Percent Slope Grading Prohibition for ST & PUD (COS-03)
- One Acre Accessible Open Space for PUDs (COS-04)
- Limitation Over 900 Feet for PUDs (South Hills) (COS-05)
- Ridgeline Setback for PUDs (South Hills) (COS-06)
- 40 Percent Open Space Requirement for PUDs (South Hills) (COS-07)
- Tree Preservation Consideration (COS-11)
- Geotechnical Requirement (COS-13)
- Street Standards Modifications (COS-19)

A summary of Planning Commission's review of draft code language is provided in Attachment B and draft land use code language is included in Attachment C.

### ***Next Steps***

The formal adoption process will include a Planning Commission public hearing and recommendation to City Council, followed by City Council public hearing and action.

The [project website](#) contains all documents associated with this project and is updated regularly with information about where we are in the process as well as project resources as they are available.



## **PREVIOUS COUNCIL DIRECTION**

[May 30, 2018, Update](#)

[November 26, 2018, Work Session](#)

Move to advance the maintenance concepts and the significant concepts identified in this AIS as less complex to the draft land use code writing phase. *(Motion passed)*

[January 23, 2019, Work Session](#)

Move to advance the preferred concepts identified in Attachment B to this AIS, as supported by Planning Commission, to the draft land use code writing phase. *(Motion passed)*

## **COUNCIL OPTIONS**

The City Council may consider the following options:

1. Advance the draft land use code language identified in Attachment C to this AIS, to the formal adoption process.
2. Advance the draft land use code language identified in Attachment C to this AIS, to the formal adoption process, with specific modifications.
3. Decline to advance the draft land use code language identified in Attachment C to this AIS.

## **CITY MANAGER'S RECOMMENDATION**

The City Manager recommends the City Council advance the draft land use code language identified in Attachment C to this AIS, to the formal adoption process.

## **SUGGESTED MOTION**

Move to advance the draft land use code language identified in Attachment C to this AIS, to the formal adoption process.

## **ATTACHMENTS**

- A. Summary of Approved Concepts
- B. Summary of Planning Commission Review of Draft Amendments
- C. Draft Amendments

## **FOR MORE INFORMATION**

Staff Contact: Jenessa Dragovich, Senior Planner

Telephone: 541-682-8385

E-Mail: [jdragovich@eugene-or.gov](mailto:jdragovich@eugene-or.gov)

## Clear & Objective Update Approved Concepts Summary

*For background information on the proposed amendments, refer to the [Preferred Concepts Report](http://www.eugene-or.gov/3947/Clear-Objective) available on the project website at: [www.eugene-or.gov/3947/Clear-Objective](http://www.eugene-or.gov/3947/Clear-Objective)*

Approved Concepts are the recommended preferred concepts supported by Planning Commission and approved by City Council for each key issue identified within the scope of the Clear & Objective Housing: Approval Criteria Update. Proposed land use code language has been crafted to implement these approved concepts. The following table provides a quick reference to the key issues and their associated approved concepts. A short table at the end lists key issues where the approved concepts did not result in proposed code language.

Key Issue		Approved Concept
COM-01	Needed Housing Criterion	For conditional use, partition, planned unit development, site review, and subdivision applications, remove criterion that requires applicant to demonstrate that the proposed housing is needed housing.
COM-02	Applicable Standards Reference for CUPs	For conditional use, revise the language to require compliance with all applicable standards (instead of using “including but not limited to”) and add additional development standards to the list of standards, including public improvement and street standards.
COM-03	Bonding Requirement	For conditional use permits and site reviews, revise the timing specified to construct or bond for required public improvements to be prior to issuance of a development permit.  For final planned unit developments not associated with land divisions, add a criterion, similar to that required for final subdivisions, to require that public improvements be completed or bonded prior to approval of the final application.
COM-04	Overlay Zone Standards	Revise the clear and objective track approval criteria for the five application types to include compliance with the lot dimensions and density requirements in overlay zones. Use the same language provided for the discretionary track applications to require compliance with: “Lot standards of EC 9.2000 through 9.4170 regarding applicable lot dimensions and density requirements.”
COM-05	Planned Unit Development Adjustment/Modification	Replace criterion that requires compliance with “all applicable development standards explicitly addressed in the application except where the applicant has shown that a modification is consistent with the purposes as set out in EC 9.8300 Purpose of Planned Unit Development”

Key Issue		Approved Concept
		with a requirement for compliance with “all applicable development standards explicitly addressed in the application” and continue to allow for adjustment reviews.
COM-07	Access Management Requirement	Remove criterion
COM-09	Natural Resource Protection Requirement	Remove Criterion
COM-10	Solar Lot Standards	For planned unit developments, remove standard that requires compliance with solar lot standards, if subdivisions and planned unit developments are reviewed concurrently (See Issue # COM-11, below).
COM-11	PUD/Subdivision Concurrent Review	Revise to allow concurrent review of tentative planned unit development and tentative subdivision or partition applications.
COM-12	Review Track Renaming	Rename the review tracks “Clear and Objective” (instead of Needed Housing) and “Discretionary” (instead of General). Change references to these review tracks and to “Needed Housing” throughout Chapter 9 as needed.
COM-13	Site Review Street Standards	For site reviews, add compliance with Standards for Streets, Alleys, and Other Public Ways (EC 9.6800 through 9.6875) as an approval criterion.
COM-14	Duplicate Neighborhood/Applicant Meeting	Provide an exception under the neighborhood/applicant meeting requirement at EC 9.7007 for subdivisions and partitions when processed in conjunction with a planned unit development.
COM-16	Off-Site Bike/Ped Connections	For site reviews and conditional use, add the requirement for off-site connections for bike and pedestrian ways that already applies to partitions, planned unit developments and subdivisions.
COM-18	Does Not Hamper Provision of Public Open Space	For subdivisions, add new criterion that requires connection to adjacent City owned park land, open space or ridgeline trail, unless Public Works Director determines such a connection is not necessary.
COS-01	Clear & Objective Compatibility	Add compatibility criterion to site reviews, conditional use and planned unit development applications that applies to higher-intensity development abutting lower intensity development—include transition buffers (setbacks, height limitation areas, and landscape screening) that are scalable
COS-02	30-Foot Buffer Requirement for PUDs	Replace with new criterion from COS-01
COS-03	20 Percent Slope Grading Prohibition	Remove and rely on COS-13
COS-04	One Acre Accessible Open Space for PUDs	Revise required distance from open space from ¼ mile to ½ mile and make onsite requirement scalable

Key Issue		Approved Concept
COS-05	Limitation Over 900 Feet for PUDs	Revise to allow less intensive development above 900' (2.5 units/acre) and include more stringent tree/vegetation preservation requirements
COS-06	Ridgeline Setback for PUDs	Revise to make setback applicable to areas above 900' elevation.
COS-07	40 Percent Open Space Requirement for PUDs	Remove requirement and rely on COS-04 (Accessible Open Space for PUDs) and existing open space requirements for multi-family developments.
COS-08	Emergency Response	Add criterion to require letter from Fire Marshal's office stating that project complies with Eugene Fire Code for site reviews, conditional use and planned unit development applications; apply criterion to partitions and subdivisions per COS-14
COS-09	Conditional Use Requirement	Keep process, add compatibility criterion from COS-01
COS-10	Partition Tree Preservation	Remove criterion
COS-11	Tree Preservation Consideration	Add criterion that requires minimum preservation and mitigation and implement a rating scale that takes into account tree type, health, size and location.
COS-12	Site Review Requirement	Keep process, add compatibility criterion from COS-01
COS-13	Geotechnical Requirement	Revise existing criterion to address additional risk factors
COS-14	19 Lot Rule—Motor Vehicle Dispersal	Rely on COS-08 (apply COS-08 to partitions and subdivisions)
COS-19	Street Standards Modifications	Add clear exceptions and add adjustment option
COS-20	Pedestrian Definition	Use ORS definition with minor refinement

Approved Concepts Resulting in No Change		
Issue		Approved Concept
COM-06	Non-Conforming Reference for ST & PT	No change
COM-08	Perpendicular Lot Sides	No change
COM-15	Special Safety Requirements Reference	No change
COM-17	Application Requirement Criterion	No change at this time.
COS-15	Traffic Impact	Defer to Public Works Transportation project getting underway
COS-16	PUD Type III Process	Hold for future land use code improvement project
COS-18	Arborist and Landscape Architect Requirement	No change (Continue to require arborist on PUD design team)

## Clear & Objective Update

### Summary of Planning Commission Review of Draft Code Language

The Planning Commission discussed draft land use code language for Batch 1 and Batch 2 over four full work sessions. Staff asked commissioners to consider whether the draft code language generally satisfied the 30 recommendations approved previously by the Commission and City Council. It is important to note that the proposed code language is still draft, and staff expects language to change before and during the formal adoption process as we continue to receive feedback and analyze the draft language to best achieve the approved recommendations. Below is a summary of the Commission's support and suggestions as we move into the adoption process.

#### ***Batch 1 Draft Amendments (February 4, 2019)***

Batch 1 contains draft language implementing all maintenance items and several less complex significant items. Through straw poll votes, all proposed code language was supported unanimously. A few items generated discussion regarding minor changes and/or considerations that staff will carry forward.

#### ***Batch 2 Draft Amendments (April 16, April 23, and April 30, 2019)***

Batch 2 contains draft language implementing the more complex significant items. Most of the proposed code language was supported unanimously. The proposals that did not receive unanimous support are addressed below:

- *Changes to EC 9.6885 Tree Preservation and Removal Standards* – Planning Commission grappled with this item. The majority could support the proposed approach; however, several had shared concerns regarding:
  - Complexity of the proposed tree rating system
  - The requirement to physically tag trees in the field (added cost burden)
  - Lack of alternative options or choices for applicants
  - The proposed mitigation (replanting) ratio being too high

In response, the draft language has been revised to remove the tagging requirement, reduce the mitigation ratio, and add an alternative option. Staff will continue to explore options for making the rating system less complex and providing additional options prior to the formal adoption process. Planning Commission expressed that they would like to have sufficient time to help refine the language through the formal adoption process.

- *Elimination of the prohibition on grading slopes of 20 percent or greater for Planned Unit Developments and Subdivisions* – One commissioner was neutral on this given concerns around adopting a landslide hazard map in connection to proposed geotechnical requirement changes.
- *Changes to the PUD One-Acre Open Space requirement* – One commissioner is not in favor of the previously approved recommended concept for this item.
- *Change to the 300-foot Ridgeline Setback requirement for PUDs* – The Planning Commission had significant discussion about the intent and origin of this requirement, including the 300-foot setback. Some had concern that if the intent was to protect the

ridgeline trail, and no remaining land within the UGB is identified for acquisition by the City, then the criterion might be unnecessary. Others noted concerns that the Urban Growth Boundary, which the setback is actually measured from, is not an accurate marker for the ridgeline. Several commissioners suggested the criterion be reevaluated. In an initial straw poll, only one commissioner supported the proposed language. In an alternative straw poll, to eliminate the original criterion, four commissioners supported elimination, one commissioner did not, and two commissioners refrained from voting based on wanting more information. In response, staff suggests moving forward with the draft language as proposed to seek additional input from the public during the formal adoption process.

- *Elimination of the 40% Open Space requirement for PUDs in the South Hills area* – One commissioner is not in favor of the previously approved recommended concept for this item.

For background information on the proposed language, refer to the [Preferred Concepts Report](http://www.eugene-or.gov/3947/Clear-Objective) available on the project website at: [www.eugene-or.gov/3947/Clear-Objective](http://www.eugene-or.gov/3947/Clear-Objective)

Proposed text in ***bold italic***

Proposed deletions in ~~bracketed strike-out~~

Explanatory text in alternate font

## Definitions

**9.0500**     **Definitions.** As used in this land use code, unless the context requires otherwise, the following words and phrases mean:

***Pedestrian. Any person afoot or using any type of wheelchair.***

This change implements the recommendation for COS-20 (Pedestrian Definition), to add a definition for the term ‘pedestrian’ based on the Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) definition with a minor modification. ORS defines pedestrian as “any person afoot or *confined in a wheelchair.*” [Emphasis added] The minor modification is to replace “confined to a wheelchair” with “using any type of wheelchair.”

## Commercial Zones

**9.2181**     **Special Standards for Table 9.2180.**

(1) Lot area, frontage, and width minimums may be adjusted in accordance with the provisions of EC 9.8030(1). Modifications may be approved through a planned unit development. (For planned unit development procedures refer to EC 9.7300 General Overview of Type III Application Procedures and for approval criteria refer to EC 9.8320 Tentative Planned Unit Development Approval Criteria - General/Discretionary or EC 9.8325 Tentative Planned Unit Development Approval Criteria – Housing/Clear and Objective.)

This change is related to COM-12 (Review Track Renaming) and revises code references to the currently named General and Needed Housing tracks. The General track is proposed to be called “General/Discretionary” and the Needed Housing track is proposed to be called “Housing/Clear and Objective.”

## Employment and Industrial Zones

**9.2471**     **Special Standards for Table 9.2470.**

(1) Lot area, frontage, and width minimums may be adjusted pursuant to the provisions of EC 9.8030(1) of this land use code. Modifications may be approved through a site review or planned unit development. (For planned unit development procedures refer to EC 9.7300 General Overview of Type III Application Procedures and for

approval criteria refer to EC 9.8320 Tentative Planned Unit Development Approval Criteria – General/Discretionary.)

This change is related to COM-12 (Review Track Renaming) and revises code references to the currently named General track. The General track is proposed to be called “General/Discretionary.”

## Natural Resource Zone

**9.2520 Natural Resource Zone Land Use and Permit Requirements.** The provisions of the NR zone do not exempt a person or property from state or federal laws and regulations that protect water quality, wetlands, or other natural areas. In cases where the NR zone overlaps with the /WB wetland buffer overlay zone or the /WP waterside protection overlay zone, only the provisions of the NR zone are applied.

\* \* \*

**(2) Uses Subject to a Conditional Use Permit.** The following uses are permitted conditionally in the NR zone:

- (a) Nature interpretive centers and wetland research facilities, when such centers or facilities are specified in or consistent with adopted plans or policies.
- (b) Maintenance facilities for storage of equipment and materials used exclusively for maintenance of wetlands and other natural resource areas.

Conditional use permit approval shall be based upon conformance with EC 9.2530 Natural Resource Zone Development Standards (2) through (19), in addition to EC 9.8090 Conditional Use Permit Approval Criteria -General/Discretionary.

This change is related to COM-12 (Review Track Renaming) and revises code references to the currently named General track. The General track is proposed to be called “General/Discretionary.”

## Public Land Zone

**9.2687 Special Standards for Table 9.2686.**

- (1)** Lot area, frontage, and width minimums may be adjusted pursuant to the provisions of EC 9.8030(1) of this land use code. Modifications may be approved through a planned unit development. (For planned unit development procedures refer to EC 9.7300 General Overview of Type III Application Procedures and for approval criteria refer to EC 9.8320 Tentative Planned Unit Development Approval Criteria - General/Discretionary or EC 9.8325 Tentative Planned Unit Development Approval Criteria – Housing/Clear and Objective.)

This change is related to COM-12 (Review Track Renaming) and revises code references to the currently named General and Needed Housing tracks. The General track is proposed to be called “General/Discretionary” and the Needed Housing track is proposed to be called “Housing/Clear and Objective.”

## Residential Zones

**9.2751 Special Development Standards for Table 9.2750.**

\* \* \*



- (2) Maximum building height, minimum building setbacks, and maximum building dimensions may be modified with an approved planned unit development permit. (For planned unit development procedures refer to EC 9.7300 General Overview of Type III Application Procedures and for approval criteria refer to EC 9.8320 Tentative Planned Unit Development Approval Criteria - General/Discretionary or EC 9.8325 Tentative Planned Unit Development Approval Criteria – Housing/Clear and Objective.)

This change is related to COM-12 (Review Track Renaming) and revises code references to the currently named General and Needed Housing tracks. The General track is proposed to be called “General/Discretionary” and the Needed Housing track is proposed to be called “Housing/Clear and Objective.”

**9.2761      Special Standards for Table 9.2760.**

**(1)      Lot Standards.**

\* \* \*

- (c) Lot area, frontage, and width minimums may be modified with an approved cluster subdivision in R-1 or Planned Unit Development (PUD) in any zone, ***or adjustments may be made if consistent with the criteria in EC 9.8030(1) and reviewed and approved concurrently with a planned unit development in any zone, except that for applications proposing housing to be reviewed with clear and objective approval criteria these standards may not be adjusted within 50 feet of any property line that abuts property zoned R-1.***

This change is related to COM-05 (Planned Unit Development Adjustment/Modification) and COS-01 (Clear & Objective Compatibility). The change is needed to retain the ability to adjust these standards under a discretionary adjustment review option as the existing PUD allowance to modify them by showing consistency with the purpose of PUD (EC 9.8300) is proposed to be removed. In addition, the exception to the adjustment allowance within 50 feet of a property line that abuts a property zoned R-1 is to ensure a compatible transition between existing single family development in R-1 and proposed PUD developments by requiring proposed lots abutting existing development to meet lot standards.

**Downtown Westside Special Area Zone**

**9.3216      Special Development Standards for Table 9.3215.**

- (1) Maximum building height, minimum building setbacks, and maximum building dimensions may be modified with an approved planned unit development permit. (For planned unit development procedures refer to EC 9.7300 General Overview of Type III Application Procedures and for approval criteria refer to EC 9.8320 Tentative Planned Unit Development Approval Criteria - General/Discretionary or EC 9.8325 Tentative Planned Unit Development Approval Criteria – Housing/Clear and Objective.)

This change is related to COM-12 (Review Track Renaming) and revises code references to the currently named General and Needed Housing tracks. The General track is proposed to be called “General/Discretionary” and the Needed Housing track is proposed to be called “Housing/Clear and Objective.”

**9.3221      Special Standards for Table 9.3220.**

- (1) Lot area, frontage, and width minimums may be modified with an approved planned

unit development permit. (For planned unit development procedures refer to EC 9.7300 General Overview of Type III Application Procedures and for approval criteria refer to EC 9.8320 Tentative Planned Unit Development Approval Criteria - General/Discretionary or EC 9.8325 Tentative Planned Unit Development Approval Criteria – Housing/Clear and Objective.)

This change is related to COM-12 (Review Track Renaming) and revises code references to the currently named General and Needed Housing tracks. The General track is proposed to be called “General/Discretionary” and the Needed Housing track is proposed to be called “Housing/Clear and Objective.”

## Jefferson Westside Special Area Zone

### 9.3626 Special Development Standards for Table 9.3625.

- \*\*\*
- (9) Maximum building height and minimum building setbacks may be modified with an approved planned unit development permit. (For planned unit development procedures refer to EC 9.7300 General Overview of Type III Application Procedures and for approval criteria refer to EC 9.8320 Tentative Planned Unit Development Approval Criteria - General/Discretionary or EC 9.8325 Tentative Planned Unit Development Approval Criteria – Housing/Clear and Objective.)

This change is related to COM-12 (Review Track Renaming) and revises code references to the currently named General and Needed Housing tracks. The General track is proposed to be called “General/Discretionary” and the Needed Housing track is proposed to be called “Housing/Clear and Objective.”

## Riverfront Park Special Area Zone

### 9.3725 S-RP Riverfront Park Special Area Zone Review Procedures. The master site plan for developments proposed within the S-RP zone shall be reviewed through the conditional use permit process provided in this land use code. For the purpose of this review, the following criteria shall be applied in lieu of the criteria provided in EC 9.8090 Conditional Use Permit Approval Criteria - General/Discretionary.

This change is related to COM-12 (Review Track Renaming) and revises code references to the currently named General track. The General track is proposed to be called “General/Discretionary.”

## Wetland Buffer Overlay Zone

### 9.4830 /WB Wetland Buffer Overlay Zone Land Use and Permit Requirements. Within the /WB overlay zone, there are 2 categories of uses: those allowed by the base zone or special area zone outside of the /WB area, and a more restrictive list of uses allowed within the /WB area.

\*\*\*

#### (2) Within /WB Areas:

\*\*\*

- (c) Uses Permitted Conditionally. The following uses are permitted conditionally in the /WB overlay zone:

1. Nature interpretive centers, when specified in or consistent with adopted

- plans or policies.
2. Maintenance facilities for storage of equipment and materials used exclusively for maintenance and management of wetlands and natural areas.

Conditional use permit approval shall be based upon conformance with EC 9.2530 Natural Resource Zone Development Standards (2) through (19) in addition to the conditional use criteria contained in EC 9.8090 Conditional Use Permit Approval Criteria – General/Discretionary.

This change is related to COM-12 (Review Track Renaming) and revises code references to the currently named General track. The General track is proposed to be called “General/Discretionary.”

## Telecommunication Facilities

### 9.5750 Telecommunication Devices-Siting Requirements and Procedures.

\* \* \*

- (2) **Siting Restricted.** No telecommunication facility, as defined in this land use code, may be constructed, modified to increase its height, installed or otherwise located within the city except as provided in this section. Depending on the type and location of the telecommunication facility, the telecommunication facility shall be either an outright permitted use, subject to site review procedures, or require a conditional use permit.

\* \* \*

- (b) Site Review. A telecommunication facility which, pursuant to subsections (3) through (5) of this section, is subject to site review shall be processed in accordance with the site review procedures of this land use code. The criteria contained in this section, as well as the criteria contained in EC 9.8440 Site Review Approval Criteria – General/Discretionary, shall govern approval or denial of the site review application. In the event of a conflict in criteria, the criteria contained in this section shall govern. No development permit shall be issued prior to completion of the site review process, including any local appeal.
- (c) Conditional Use Permit. A telecommunication facility which, pursuant to subsections (4) or (5) of this section, requires a conditional use permit shall be processed in accordance with the conditional use permit procedures of this land use code, except that the variance provisions shall not apply. The criteria contained in EC 9.8090 Conditional Use Permit Approval Criteria –General/Discretionary and subsections (6) and (7) of this section shall govern approval or denial of the conditional use permit application. In the event of a conflict in criteria, the criteria contained in subsections (6) and (7) of this section shall govern. No development permit shall be issued prior to completion of the conditional use permit process, including any local appeal.

This change is related to COM-12 (Review Track Renaming) and revises code references to the currently named General track. The General track is proposed to be called “General/Discretionary.”

## Special Development Standards for Certain Uses

### 9.5860 Transition Standards for Housing/Clear and Objective Applications.

- (1) **Applicability of Transition Standards.** The transition standards at EC 9.5860(2) shall apply to land use applications proposing housing to be reviewed with clear and objective approval criteria under EC 9.8100 Conditional Use Permit Approval Criteria – Housing/Clear and Objective, EC 9.8325 Tentative Planned Unit Development Approval Criteria – Housing/Clear and Objective, or EC 9.8445 Site Review Approval Criteria – Housing/Clear and Objective. The transition standards at EC 9.5860(2) apply to all new buildings and any building additions that increase the square footage of livable floor area by 20 percent or more for any of the following:
- (a) **Multiple-family development on property abutting or directly across a public alley from land zoned R-1, R-1.5, S-C/R-1, or S-RN/LDR except where the multiple-family development consists of:**
    - 1. a single tri-plex on one lot.
    - 2. a single four-plex on one lot.
    - 3. structures that are less than 30 feet in height.
  - (b) **Assisted care, boarding and rooming house, campus living organization, university or college dormitory, or single room occupancy (SRO), proposed on property abutting or directly across a public alley from land zoned R-1, R-1.5, S-C/R-1, or S-RN/LDR.**  
*In cases where the standards in subsection (2) apply to building additions, they shall be applicable between the addition and any property line abutting or directly across a public alley from land zoned R-1, R-1.5, S-C/R-1, or S-RN/LDR.*
- (2) **Standards.** The following standards apply to new buildings and building additions identified in subsection (1) and must be applied along the portion of any property line that abuts or is directly across a public alley from land zoned R-1, R-1.5, S-C/R-1, or S-RN/LDR:
- (a) **Height and Setback Options.** The proposed development must comply with one of the following four options:
    - 1. **Option 1.** The maximum building height of a new building or building addition shall be limited to 35 feet. In addition, at least one of the following must be provided along the entire portion of any property line that abuts or is directly across a public alley from land zoned R-1, R-1.5, S-C/R-1, or S-RN/LDR:
      - a. A 6-foot high, 100 percent sight-obscuring wooden fence or masonry wall.
      - b. Landscaping with a minimum plant bed width of 7 feet meeting EC 9.6210(3) High Screen Landscape Standard (L-3).*Driveways off an alley may intersect the required screening within 30 degrees of perpendicular, as measured from the centerline of the driveway to the centerline of the alley right-of-way, and are limited to a maximum width of 15 feet for one-way access or 28 feet for two-way access.*
    - 2. **Option 2.** The minimum interior yard setback shall be 10 feet from the portion of any property line that abuts or is directly across a public alley from land zoned R-1, R-1.5, S-C/R-1, or S-RN/LDR. In addition:
      - a. At a point that is 25 feet above grade, the interior yard setback shall slope at the rate of 10 inches vertically for every 12 inches horizontally away from that property line until a point 50 feet away from the property line.
      - b. For new buildings or building additions within 30 feet of R-1, R-1.5, S-C/R-1, or S-RN/LDR zoned property, trees growing to a mature height of at least 20 feet shall be planted at a minimum interval of 15 feet, parallel to the property line, between buildings and any property line that abuts or is directly across a public alley

*from land zoned R-1, R-1.5, S-C/R-1, or S-RN/LDR. In addition, one of the following shall be provided along the portion of any property line that abuts or is directly across a public alley from land zoned R-1, R-1.5, S-C/R-1, or S-RN/LDR:*

- (1) A 6-foot high, 100 percent sight-obscuring wooden fence or masonry wall.*
- (2) Landscaping with a minimum plant bed width of 7 feet meeting EC 9.6210(3) High Screen Landscape Standard (L-3). Driveways off an alley may intersect the required screening within 30 degrees of perpendicular, as measured from the centerline of the driveway to the centerline of the alley right-of-way, and are limited to a maximum width of 15 feet for one-way access or 28 feet for two-way access.*
- 3. Option 3. A minimum 30-foot setback shall be provided between a new building or building addition and the portion of any property line that abuts or is directly across a public alley from land zoned R-1, R-1.5, S-C/R-1, or S-RN/LDR. The 30-foot setback area may be used for open space, vehicle use area, pedestrian circulation, bicycle parking, stormwater quality facilities, or landscaping and must contain trees growing to a mature height of at least 20 feet, spaced at a minimum interval of 25 feet, parallel to and within five feet of the property line, in the setback area.**
- 4. Option 4. A new building or building addition shall be set back at least 50 feet or a setback equal to the height of the tallest building on the development site, whichever is less, from the portion of any property line that abuts or is directly across a public alley from land zoned R-1, R-1.5, S-C/R-1, or S-RN/LDR. The 50-foot setback area may be used for open space, vehicle use area, pedestrian circulation, bicycle parking, stormwater quality facilities, or landscaping.**
- (b) Allowed intrusions into setbacks. In lieu of the permitted setback intrusions provided at EC 9.6745(3) the following intrusions are allowed within the interior yard setback area described in EC 9.5860(2)(a)2 through 4:**
  - 1. Eaves and chimneys may intrude a maximum of 2 feet into the vertical plane of the interior yard sloped setback area. No other intrusions are allowed into the vertical plane of the setback.**
  - 2. Dormers may intrude into the sloped portion of the interior yard sloped setback area provided each dormer is no more than 10 feet wide and the total width of all dormers on a given wall does not exceed 30 percent of the linear length of the building wall.**
  - 3. Architectural screens or arbors serving an upper floor balcony may protrude a maximum of 6 feet into the sloped portion of the interior yard sloped setback area.**
- (c) Balconies, decks and other outdoor spaces located above the ground floor shall be setback at least 20 feet from any property line that abuts land zoned R-1, R-1.5, S-C/R-1, or S-RN/LDR.**
- (d) Tree Exception. An exception to the tree planting required by subsections (a)(2) and (3) is allowed if the applicant provides a signed and notarized letter from the abutting property owner stating that the abutting property owner does not desire the trees required by this section. This exception does not apply to trees required by other applicable standards. Future development proposals subject to the standards in this section will need to obtain a separate exception from the tree planting requirements of this section.**



family development in the R-1 Low-Density Residential zone). The proposed code language provides four options for providing a transition buffer where required.

## General Standards for All Development

### 9.6010 Applications Proposing [Needed] Housing.

- (1) As used in EC chapter 9.6000, the term “applications proposing [needed] housing **to be reviewed with clear and objective approval criteria**” includes:
- (a) Applications that are proceeding (or have proceeded) under EC 9.8100, 9.8220, 9.8325, 9.8445, or 9.8520; or
  - (b) Applications for **housing** developments [permits] for **residential** uses permitted outright in the subject zone that are **entitled to clear and objective standards pursuant to state statutes** [proposed housing is needed housing as defined by state statutes].

The changes listed above are related to COM-12 (Review Track Renaming). The changes revise and clarify references in the general standards contained in EC chapter 9.6000 that only apply to proposals reviewed under the clear and objective approval criteria.

### 9.6710 Geological and Geotechnical Analysis.

\* \* \*

- (6) **[Needed] Clear and Objective Housing.** Unless exempt under 9.6710(3)[(a)-(f)], in lieu of compliance with subsections (2), (4), and (5) of this section, applications proposing [needed]housing **to be reviewed with clear and objective approval criteria** shall include a certification from an Oregon licensed Engineering Geologist, **an Oregon licensed Geotechnical Engineer**, or an Oregon licensed Civil Engineer with geological experience, **prepared within five years of the date of application, that includes the following information**[stating]:
- (a) **Identification of any portion of the proposed development site that is located in an area of moderate or high landslide susceptibility as shown on the city’s adopted Eugene Landslide Hazard Map.**
  - (ab) **A statement [T]hat the proposed development [activity]will not be impacted by existing or potential stability problems or any of the following site conditions: slopes 20 percent or greater, springs or seeps, depth of soil bedrock, soil types, variations in soil types, open drainage ways, fill, or a combination of these conditions.**
  - (bc) If proposed development [activity]**will be located in an area identified as moderately or highly susceptible to landslides pursuant to (a), or will be impacted by existing or potential stability problems or any of the site conditions listed in (ab), the certification must also include:**
    - 1. **A review of the suitability of the proposed lot layout, street locations, and proposed locations for utilities, driveways, parking areas, and buildings given the landslide hazards, stability problems, and/or site conditions identified in the certification;**
    - 2. **Any recommended modifications to the proposed lot layout, street locations, and proposed locations for utilities, driveways, parking areas, and buildings that in the engineer’s opinion, would mitigate the landslide hazards, stability problems, and/or site conditions identified in the certification;**
    - 3. **Methods for safely addressing the landslide hazards and/or site conditions identified in (a) and (b)[-]; and,**

4. **Recommendations, if any, for additional geotechnical analysis for future buildings or improvements on the development site.**
5. **Recommendations, if any, for additional geotechnical analysis for future buildings or improvements on proposed lots or parcels.**

If ~~[a statement]~~ **certification** is submitted under (6)(~~b~~**c**), the application shall include the applicant's statement that it will develop in accordance with the Engineer's ~~[statement]~~ **certification**.

This change implements COS-13 (Geotechnical Requirement). The revised code language adds additional risk factors to be considered and clarifies specific items the professional certification must address. A new Eugene Landslide Hazard Map—based on the recently released Department of Geology and Mineral Industries (DOGAMI) landslide hazard maps—will be adopted as part of the proposed code amendments. Changes to this section also relate to COS-03 (20 Percent Slope Grading Prohibition) and the recommendation to remove the prohibition on grading and instead rely on the geotechnical review. The proposed change includes adding 20 percent or greater slopes as an indicator of potential stability problems and specifically requires review and recommendations of the proposed lot layout and street locations.

#### **9.6810 Block Length.**

- (1) ***Except as provided in subsections (2) and (3) of this section, b[B]lock length for local streets shall not exceed 600 feet.***~~[7]~~
- (12) ***Applications not proposing housing to be reviewed with clear and objective approval criteria, ~~[unless an exception is]~~ may be exempt from the block length requirements in subsection (1)*~~[granted]~~ based on one or more of the following:**
- (2a) Physical conditions preclude a block length 600 feet or less. Such conditions may include, but are not limited to, topography or the existence of natural resource areas such as wetlands, ponds, streams, channels, rivers, lakes or upland wildlife habitat area, or a resource on the National Wetland Inventory or under protection by state or federal law.
- (3b) Buildings or other existing development on adjacent lands, including previously subdivided but vacant lots or parcels, physically preclude a block length 600 feet or less, considering the potential for redevelopment.
- (4c) An existing public street or streets terminating at the boundary of the development site have a block length exceeding 600 feet, or are situated such that the extension of the street(s) into the development site would create a block length exceeding 600 feet. In such cases, the block length shall be as close to 600 feet as practicable.
- (5d) As part of a Type II or Type III process, the developer demonstrates that a strict application of the 600-foot requirement would result in a street network that is no more beneficial to vehicular, pedestrian or bicycle traffic than the proposed street network and that the proposed street network will accommodate necessary emergency access.
- (23) ***Applications proposing housing to be reviewed with clear and objective approval criteria, must comply with the block length requirements in subsection (1) unless existing slopes would result in a street grade that exceeds the grade allowed under current adopted street design standards when measured along the centerline of the proposed streets to the existing grade of the subdivision boundary or abutting property under separate ownership.***
- (4) ***Block length may be adjusted in accordance with EC 9.8030(37) for applications proposing housing to be reviewed with clear and objective approval criteria.***

This change relates to COS-19 (Street Modifications). The proposed changes add new language to clarify the available exceptions to block length, street connectivity, and cul-de-sac or emergency turnarounds for Clear & Objective applications. An option to seek a discretionary adjustment review is also proposed.

## 9.6815 Connectivity for Streets.

\* \* \*

### (2) **Street Connectivity Standards.**

\* \* \*

- (e) Except for applications proposing ~~[needed]~~ housing **to be reviewed with clear and objective approval criteria**, all applicants shall show that the proposed street alignment shall minimize excavation and embankment and avoid impacts to natural resources, including water-related features.

\* \* \*

- (g) ***Except for applications proposing housing to be reviewed with clear and objective approval criteria, [i]n the context of a Type II or Type III land use decision, the city shall grant an exception to the standards in subsections (2)(b), (c) or (d) if the applicant demonstrates that any proposed exceptions are consistent with either subsection 1. or 2. below:***

\* \* \*

- (h) ***For applications proposing housing to be reviewed with clear and objective approval criteria, exceptions to street connectivity standards may be granted if one of the following conditions exists:***
  - 1. ***Existing buildings on land abutting the development site and under separate ownership obstruct the extension of the planned street;***
  - 2. ***Existing slopes would result in a street grade exceeding current adopted street design standards when measured along the centerline of the proposed streets to the existing grade of the subdivision boundary or abutting property under separate ownership;***
  - 3. ***Provision of an intersecting street would require dedication of 25 percent or more of the total development site area.***
  - 4. ***Abutting residential land cannot be further divided under current development standards.***
- (i) ***Street connectivity standards may be adjusted in accordance with EC 9.8030(37) for applications proposing housing to be reviewed with clear and objective approval criteria.***

This change relates to COS-19 (Street Modifications). The proposed changes add new language to clarify the available exceptions to block length, street connectivity, and cul-de-sac or emergency turnarounds for Clear & Objective applications. An option to seek a discretionary adjustment review is also proposed.

## 9.6820 Cul-de-Sacs or Emergency Vehicle Turnarounds.

\* \* \*

- (5) As part of a Type II or Type III process, an exception may be granted to the requirements of (1), (3) and (4) of this section. ***For applications proposing housing to be reviewed with clear and objective approval criteria, exceptions may only be granted as provided in subparagraph (c). For all other applications, exceptions may be granted*** because of the existence of one or more of the following conditions:

\* \* \*

- (c) ***For applications proposing housing to be reviewed with clear and objective approval criteria, an exception to the requirements of***



- subsections (1) through (4) may be granted if the applicant provides certification from an Oregon licensed civil engineer stating that a cul-de-sac or emergency vehicle turnaround cannot be constructed to meet current standards according to the adopted Design Standards and Guidelines for Eugene Streets, Sidewalk, Bikeways and Accessways;*
- (6) *Cul-de-sacs or emergency vehicle turnarounds standards may be adjusted in accordance with EC 9.8030(37) for applications proposing housing to be reviewed with clear and objective approval criteria.*

This change relates to COS-19 (Street Modifications). The proposed changes add new language to clarify the available exceptions to block length, street connectivity, and cul-de-sac or emergency turnarounds for Clear & Objective applications. An option to seek a discretionary adjustment review is also proposed.

**9.6845**     **Special Safety Requirements.** Except for applications proposing [needed] housing ***to be reviewed with clear and objective approval criteria***, where necessary to insure safety, reduce traffic hazards and promote the welfare of the general public, pedestrians, bicyclists and residents of the subject area, the planning director or public works director may require that local streets and alleys be designed to discourage their use by non-local motor vehicle traffic and encourage their use by local motor vehicle traffic, pedestrians, bicyclists, and residents of the area.

**9.6865**     **Transit Facilities.**

- (1) Except for applications proposing [needed] housing ***to be reviewed with clear and objective approval criteria***, the city manager may require provisions, including easements, for transit facilities where future transit routes are required on streets extending through or adjacent to the area of the development, and where a need for bus stops, bus pullouts or other transit facilities within the development has been identified, provided the city makes findings to demonstrate consistency with constitutional requirements.
- (2) Except for applications proposing [needed] housing ***to be reviewed with clear and objective approval criteria***, where the provision of transit stops, bus pullouts or other facilities along a public street requires a right-of-way or paving width greater than that listed in Table 9.6870 Right-of-Way and Paving Widths and where a need for transit service within the development has been identified, the planning director or public works director, depending upon the type of application being processed, may require that additional right-of-way or paving be provided.

The changes listed above are related to COM-12 (Review Track Renaming). The changes revise and clarify references in the general standards contained in EC 9.6000 that only apply to proposals reviewed under the clear and objective approval criteria.

**9.6885**     **Tree Preservation and Removal Standards.**

\* \* \*

- (2) **Tree Preservation and Removal Standards.** ~~[No permit for a development activity subject to this section shall be approved until the applicant submits plans or information, including a written report by a certified arborist or licensed landscape architect, that demonstrates compliance with the following standards:~~
- ~~(a) The materials submitted shall reflect that consideration has been given to preservation in accordance with the following priority:]~~
- ~~[1. Significant trees located adjacent to or within waterways or wetlands designated by the city for protection, and areas having slopes greater than 25%;~~

- ~~2. Significant trees within a stand of trees; and~~
- ~~3. Individual significant trees.]~~

**(a) Definitions. For the purposes of this subsection (2), the following definitions apply:**

- 1. Significant Tree.** A living, standing tree having a trunk with a minimum diameter breast height of 8 inches, or, when there are multiple trunks, having a minimum cumulative diameter breast height of 8 inches, considering the 2 largest trunks measured at 4.5 feet above mean ground level at the base of the trunk or trunks. Invasive species listed in Table 9.6885(2)(d)4. are not significant trees.
- 2. Significant Tree Cluster.** A group of five or more significant trees where each tree in the group shares overlapping branches with at least one other tree in the group.
- 3. South Hills Area:** All properties located within the City's adopted Urban Growth Boundary, above an elevation of 500 feet, and:
  - a. South of 18th Avenue,
  - b. South of Franklin Boulevard and East of the intersection of 18th Avenue and Agate Street, or
  - c. If 18th Avenue were extended from the intersection of 18th Avenue and Willow Creek Road directly west to the Urban Growth Boundary, the area south of that extension of 18th Avenue.
- 4. Tree Preservation and Removal Plan.** A written report and site plan prepared by a certified arborist or licensed landscape architect that includes all significant trees on the development site and their critical root zones (CRZ). This plan shall specify trees to be preserved, trees to be removed, and trees to be mitigated according to 9.6885(2)(d)5. This plan shall include proposed lot or parcel boundaries. For development sites within the South Hills Area, this plan shall delineate areas between 500 and 700 feet elevation, between 700 and 900 feet elevation, and areas above 900 feet elevation.

**(b) Exemptions. A proposed development shall be exempt from the requirements of EC 9.6885(2) if either of the following apply:**

- 1.** The development site is 13,500 square feet or less and not located in the South Hills Area.
- 2.** There are fewer than four significant trees on the development site.
- 3.** The development site is in the R-1.5 Rowhouse zone.

**(c) Tree Preservation and Removal Plan. An applicant must submit a Tree Preservation and Removal Plan, prepared by a certified arborist or licensed landscape architect, that includes all of the following:**

- 1.** Locations of all significant trees on the development site. For each tree to be preserved, include the critical root zone (CRZ), protective fencing location, and a percentage calculation of impacts to the CRZ. For a tree to be counted as a preservation tree, CRZ impacts of more than 30 percent are not allowed.
- 2.** The location of all public and private utility easements, driveways, and areas of grading or excavation on the development site.
- 3.** All proposed development on the site and proposed lot or parcel boundaries.
- 4.** Identification of trees to be preserved, removed, or mitigated according to 9.6885(2)(d)3.
- 5.** For development sites within the South Hills Area, delineate areas between 500 and 700 feet elevation, between 700 and 900 feet elevation, and areas above 900 feet elevation.
- 6.** A table with the Diameter Breast Height (d.b.h.), genus, species, location factor, size factor, key species factor, and tree rating score

for all significant trees on the development site. The table shall be organized by Location/Zone category according to Table 9.6885(2)(d)3.

- a. **Location Factor.** Each significant tree shall be assigned a numeric location factor according to Table 9.6885(2)(c)6.a. If more than one listed location applies, then the highest rating must be used.

Table 9.6885(2)(c)6.a. Tree Location Factor	
Tree Location	Rating
Front yard setback of proposed lot or parcel	1
Interior yard setback of proposed lot or parcel	2
Significant tree cluster	3
Front yard setback of development site (for land divisions, this means prior to the proposed land division)	4
Interior yard setback of development site (for land divisions, this means prior to the proposed land division)	5
In an area with slope greater than 25 percent	5

- b. **Size Factor.** Trees shall be assigned a numeric size factor based on genus, species, and Diameter Breast Height (d.b.h.) in accordance with Table 9.6885(2)(c)6.b.

Table 9.6885(2)(c)6.b. Tree Size Factor								
Genus and Species	Common Name	8-11" d.b.h.	12-15" d.b.h.	16-19" d.b.h.	20-23" d.b.h.	24-30" d.b.h.	31-42" d.b.h.	>43" d.b.h.
<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	0	0	0	1	2	3	4
<i>Calocedrus decurrens</i>	Incense Cedar	0	1	1	2	2	3	4
<i>Thuja plicata</i>	Western Red Cedar	0	1	1	2	2	3	4
<i>Abies Grandis</i>	Grand Fir	1	1	2	2	3	4	5
<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Bigleaf Maple	1	1	2	2	3	4	5
<i>Alnus rhombifolia</i>	White Alder	1	1	2	2	3	4	5
<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	1	1	2	2	3	4	5
<i>Fraxinus latifolia</i>	Oregon Ash	1	1	2	2	3	4	5
<i>Pinus ponderosa</i>	Ponderosa Pine	1	1	2	2	3	4	5
<i>Pinus contorta</i>	Lodgepole Pine	1	1	2	2	3	4	5
<i>Salix lucida ssp. Lasiandra</i>	Pacific Willow	1	1	2	2	3	4	5
<i>Salix scouleriana</i>	Scouler's Willow	1	1	2	2	3	4	5
<i>Tsuga heterophylla</i>	Western Hemlock	1	1	2	2	3	4	5
<i>Acer circinatum</i>	Vine Maple	1	2	3	4	5	5	5
<i>Cornus nuttallii</i>	Pacific Dogwood	1	2	3	4	5	5	5
<i>Quercus garryana</i>	Oregon White Oak	1	2	3	4	5	5	5
<i>Quercus kelloggii</i>	California Black Oak	1	2	3	4	5	5	5

<i>Arbutus menziesii</i>	<i>Madrone</i>	2	3	4	5	5	5	5
<i>Taxus brevifolia</i>	<i>Pacific Yew</i>	2	3	4	5	5	5	5
<b>Other Significant Tree</b>	<b>Other Significant Tree</b>	0	0	1	1	2	3	4

- c. **Key Species Factor.** Significant trees listed by species name in Table 9.6885(2)(c)6.b. shall be assigned a key species factor of 3. Trees that fall within the category of “Other Significant Tree” shall not be assigned a key species factor.
  - d. **Tree Rating Score.** Each significant tree shall be assigned a tree rating score that is the sum of location factor, size factor, and key species factor.
- (d) **Tree Preservation Requirement.**
1. Except as provided in EC 9.6885(2)(d)5, significant trees must be protected and preserved in accordance with the requirements of Table 9.6855(2)(d)3.
  2. The overall tree rating score referenced in Table 9.6885(2)(d)3. is the sum of the tree rating scores for all significant trees located within the development site or, if the development site is located in more than one of the Location or Zone categories listed in Table 9.6885(2)(d)3., the overall tree rating score is the sum of the tree rating scores for all significant trees located within each Location or Zone category.
  3. If a development site is located in more than one Location or Zone categories listed in Table 9.6885(2)(d)3., the Tree Preservation and Removal plan must address each Location or Zone category separately.

<b>Table 9.6885(2)(d)3. Tree Preservation Requirements</b>		
<b>Location</b>	<b>Zone</b>	<b>Minimum Preservation</b>
<b>Outside the South Hills Area</b>	<b>All zones except R-1 Low-Density Residential</b>	<b>At least 25 percent of the overall tree rating score</b>
	<b>R-1 Low-Density Residential</b>	<b>At least 35 percent of the overall tree rating score</b>
<b>Within the South Hills Area, located above 500 feet and below 700 feet elevation</b>	<b>All zones</b>	<b>At least 35 percent of the overall tree rating score</b>
<b>Within the South Hills Area, located at or above 700 feet and below 900 feet elevation</b>	<b>All zones</b>	<b>At least 40 percent of the overall tree rating score</b>
<b>Within the South Hills Area, located at or above 900 feet elevation</b>	<b>All zones</b>	<b>At least 50 percent of the overall tree rating score</b>

4. **Tree Preservation Exceptions.**
  - a. **Trees that are not significant can be removed.**

- b. *Trees not counted toward meeting the minimum preservation requirements in Table 9.6885(2)(d)3. can be removed.*
- c. *Invasive species listed in the following table can be removed:*

<b>Table 9.6885(2)(d)4. Invasive Species</b>	
<b>Genus and Species</b>	<b>Common Name</b>
<i>Acer plantanoides</i>	Norway Maple
<i>Aesculus hippocastanum</i>	Horsechestnut
<i>Ailanthus altissima</i>	Tree-Of-Heaven
<i>Betula pendula</i>	European Birch
<i>Betula pubesc</i>	European Birch
<i>Buddleia alternifolia</i>	Fountain Butterfly Bush
<i>Buddleia davidii</i>	Fountain Butterfly Bush
<i>Crataegus monogyna</i>	English Hawthorn
<i>Ilex aquifolium</i>	English Holly
<i>Juniperus virginiana</i>	Eastern Redcedar
<i>Ligustrum vulgare</i>	Common Privet
<i>Populus alba</i>	White Poplar
<i>Prunus avium</i>	Sweet Cherry
<i>Prunus cerasifera</i>	Thundercloud Plum
<i>Prunus domestica</i>	Plum
<i>Prunus laurocerasus</i>	English Laurel
<i>Prunus lusitanica</i>	Portugal Laurel
<i>Prunus mahaleb</i>	Mahaleb Cherry
<i>Pyrus communis</i>	Pear
<i>Robinia pseudoacacia</i>	Black locust
<i>Sorbus aucuparia</i>	European mountain-ash

**5. Mitigation.**

- a. *An applicant may elect to mitigate significant trees on the development site as provided below:*
- b. *An applicant may mitigate significant trees with a collective tree rating score of up to 50 percent of the overall tree rating score applicable to the development site or portion of the development site, as provided in EC 9.8865(2)(d)2-3 and Table 9.6885(2)(d)3.*
- c. *Each tree to be mitigated must be replaced with one tree selected from the named species listed in Table 9.6885(2)(c)6.b. At the time of planting, deciduous trees used for mitigation must have a minimum diameter of 2 inches as measured by American Association of Nurserymen Standards and evergreen trees used for mitigation must be a minimum of 6 feet in height.*
- d. *Mitigation is not available for trees located on portions of the development site at or above 900 feet in elevation.*

**6. Tree Preservation Area Alternative. A Tree Preservation and Removal Plan according to EC 9.6885(2)(c) is not required if the applicant chooses to preserve 30 percent of the existing number of significant trees on the development site within one or more tree preservation areas and the following conditions are met:**

- a. *Applicant must provide certification from a certified arborist or licensed landscape architect stating that the area(s) designated for*



*tree preservation includes 30 percent of the existing number of significant trees on the development site.*

- b. Tree preservation area(s) must be delineated and individual trees to be preserved must be shown on the final plan set submitted for approval by the City.*
- 7. **Protection Standards.** *The following notes must be included on the final plan set submitted for approval by the City and shall apply at the time of development:*
  - a. "Protective fencing for trees identified to be preserved shall be installed by the applicant and inspected by the City prior to beginning any development activities. All protective tree fencing must remain in place until completion of all construction activities; any relocation, removal, or modification of the protective fencing shall only occur under the direction of a certified arborist and a written explanation of the reason for the relocation, removal, or modification of the protective fencing from the certified arborist must be provided to the City."*
  - b. "At the time of building permit, a site plan in compliance with the approved tree preservation and removal plan is required."*
  - c. "No excavation, grading, material storage, staging, vehicle parking or other construction activity shall take place within protective tree fencing areas."*
  - d. "The removal of trees not designated as 'to be preserved' is not required; removal may occur at the applicant or future owners' discretion."*
  - e. "In the event a tree designated to be preserved must be removed because it is dead, diseased, or hazardous, documentation by a certified arborist must be provided to the City prior to tree removal. The tree(s) must be replaced with trees selected from the named species listed in Table 9.6885(2)(c)7.b., and two replacement trees must be planted for every one tree removed. At the time of planting, replacement deciduous trees must have a minimum diameter of 2 inches as measured by American Association of Nurserymen Standards, and replacement evergreen trees must be a minimum of 6 feet in height."*

(b)e) **Street Tree Removal.** If the proposal includes removal of any street tree(s), removal of those street trees has been approved, or approved with conditions according to the process at EC 6.305 Tree Felling Prohibition.

- (3) **Adjustment to Standards.** Except for applications being processed under EC 9.8100 Conditional Use Permit Approval Criteria - [Needed] Housing/Clear and Objective, EC 9.8325 Tentative Planned Unit Development Approval Criteria - [Needed] Housing /Clear and Objective, EC 9.8445 Site Review Approval Criteria - [Needed] Housing /Clear and Objective, or EC 9.8520 Subdivision, Tentative Plan Approval Criteria - [Needed] Housing /Clear and Objective, adjustments to these standards may be made, subject to compliance with the criteria for adjustment in EC 9.8030(13) Tree Preservation and Removal Standards Adjustment.

This change implements COS-11 (Tree Preservation Consideration). The new language establishes a clear and objective tree rating system and sets minimum tree preservation requirements, mitigation allowances, and exemptions. The changes also relate to COS-05 (Limitation Over 900 Feet for PUDs) as they impose a higher tree preservation requirement and do not allow mitigation in areas above 900 foot elevation. Changes in subsection (3) are related to COM-12 (Review Track Renaming) and revise code references to the currently named General and Needed Housing tracks. The General track is proposed to be called "General/Discretionary" and the Needed Housing track is proposed to be called "Housing/Clear and Objective."

## Application Procedures

### 9.7007 Neighborhood/Applicant Meetings.

(1) This section applies to the following types of applications:

- (a) Type II: 3-lot partitions, tentative subdivisions, tentative cluster subdivisions and design reviews, ***except for 3-lot partitions and tentative subdivisions that implement an approved tentative planned unit development;***

This change is related to COM-14 (Duplicate Neighborhood/Applicant Meeting) and would provide an exception for subdivisions and partitions when processed in conjunction with a planned unit development.

## Application Requirements and Criteria

9.8030 Adjustment Review - Approval Criteria. The planning director shall approve, conditionally approve, or deny an adjustment review application. Approval or conditional approval shall be based on compliance with the following applicable criteria.

\* \* \*

(37) ***Street Standards Adjustment. Where this land use code provides that street standards may be adjusted, the standards may be adjusted upon a demonstration by the applicant that the requested adjustment is consistent with the following:***

- (a) ***The applicant has submitted a report prepared by an Oregon licensed civil engineer that demonstrates it is not technically or financially feasible to construct the street in accordance with adopted plans and policies, and adopted "Design Standards and Guidelines for Eugene Streets, Sidewalks, Bikeways, and Accessways."***
- (b) ***The adjustment is necessary due to at least one of the following conditions:***
  - 1. ***Existing on-site or off-site geologic or topographic conditions, or existing wetlands designated for protection by the City of Eugene; or***
  - 2. ***Existing development on lands abutting the development site.***

This change relates to COS-19 (Street Modifications). The proposed new language provides discretionary approval criteria for a new adjustment review option for Clear & Objective applications. If the clear and objective exception to the standards cannot be met, applicants would have the option to apply for a discretionary adjustment to the standards.

9.8045 Applicability of Cluster Subdivisions. Cluster subdivision provisions shall be applied when requested by the property owner and when the proposed subdivision meets the definition of cluster subdivision in section 9.0500 of this land use code. A subdivision application proposing [~~needed housing, as defined in state statutes,~~] ***housing to be reviewed with clear and objective approval criteria*** shall be processed pursuant to EC 9.8520 Subdivision, Tentative Plan Approval Criteria – [~~Needed~~ Housing/Clear and Objective. No development permit shall be issued by the city prior to approval of the cluster subdivision.

This change is related to COM-12 (Review Track Renaming) and revises code references to the currently named General and Needed Housing tracks. The General track is proposed to be called "General/Discretionary" and the Needed Housing track is proposed to be called "Housing/Clear and Objective."

**9.8055** **Cluster Subdivision- Approval Criteria – General/Discretionary.** The planning director shall approve, approve with conditions, or deny a proposed cluster subdivision. Approval or approval with conditions shall be based on the following:

- (1) The proposed subdivision complies with:
  - (a) EC 9.8515 Subdivision, Tentative Plan Approval Criteria- General/Discretionary except for the standards related to EC 9.2760 Residential Zone Lot Standards; and

This change is related to COM-12 (Review Track Renaming) and revises code references to the currently named General tracks. The General track is proposed to be called "General/Discretionary."

**9.8085** **Conditional Use Permit Application Requirements.**

\* \* \*

- (3) If the proposal includes ~~[needed housing, as defined by state law]~~ **housing**, the written statement submitted with the conditional use permit application shall clearly state whether the applicant is electing to use the ~~[general]~~ **discretionary** approval criteria in EC 9.8090 Conditional Use Permit Approval Criteria – General/Discretionary instead of the approval criteria found in EC 9.8100 Conditional Use Permit Approval Criteria – [Needed] Housing/Clear and Objective.

This change is related to COM-12 (Review Track Renaming) and revises code references to the currently named General and Needed Housing tracks. The General track is proposed to be called "General/Discretionary" and the Needed Housing track is proposed to be called "Housing/Clear and Objective." It also revises subsection (3) consistent with state law requirement that proposals including housing, not just "needed housing," are entitled to clear and objective approval criteria.

**9.8090** **Conditional Use Permit Approval Criteria – General/Discretionary.** A conditional use permit shall be granted only if the proposal conforms to all of the following criteria:

This change is related to COM-12 (Review Track Renaming) and revises code references to the currently named General track. The General track is proposed to be called "General/Discretionary."

**9.8100** **Conditional Use Permit Approval Criteria- [Needed] Housing/Clear and Objective.**

The hearings official shall approve, conditionally approve, or deny the conditional use permit application. Unless the applicant elects to use the ~~[general]~~ **discretionary** criteria contained in EC 9.8090 Conditional Use Permit Approval Criteria – General/Discretionary, where the applicant proposes ~~[needed housing, as defined by the State statutes]~~ **housing**, the hearings official shall approve or approve with conditions a conditional use based on compliance with the following criteria:

This change is related to COM-12 (Review Track Renaming) and revises code references to the currently named General and Needed Housing tracks. The General track is proposed to be called "General/Discretionary" and the Needed Housing track is proposed to be called "Housing/Clear and Objective." This change also clarifies that this section is only applicable to "housing applications entitled to clear and objective review pursuant to state statute."

- (1) ~~[The applicant has demonstrated that the proposed housing is needed housing as defined by State statutes.]~~ **The proposal complies with EC 9.5860 Transition Standards.**



This change implements COS-01 (Clear & Objective Compatibility). The replacement text points to proposed new transition standards. For ease of use and code efficiency (as the standards will apply to three application types), the new transition standards are proposed to be located under EC 9.5860 Transition Standards for Housing/Clear and Objective Applications. Applicability is clear as the approval criteria for each of the three application types will include a criterion requiring compliance with the transition standards. In addition, the transition standards start with an applicability statement that identifies the three application types and proposed uses subject to the standards.

- (3) For areas not included on the city's acknowledged Goal 5 inventory, the proposal will preserve existing natural resources by compliance with ~~[all of the following:~~
  - ~~(a) The proposal complies with]~~ ***the provisions of EC 9.6880 to EC 9.6885 Tree Preservation and Removal Standards.***
  - ~~[(b) Natural resource areas designated on the comprehensive plan diagram as "Natural Resource" are protected. Protection shall include the area of the resource and a minimum 50 foot buffer around the perimeter of the natural resource area.]~~

This change is related to COM-09 (Natural Resource Protection Requirement). The proposed change revises the criterion to remove subsection (b) per the recommendation outlined in the Draft Preferred Concepts Report.

- (4) The proposal complies with ~~[all applicable standards, including, but not limited to:~~
  - (a) ***EC 9.2000 through EC 9.4170 regarding lot dimensions and density requirements for the subject zone and overlay zone.***
  - (b) ***EC 9.6500 through EC 9.6505 Public Improvement Standards.***  
*\*Renumber remaining subsections\**  
*\* \* \**
    - (i) ***EC 9.6800 through EC 9.6875 Standards for Streets, Alleys, and Other Public Ways.***
    - (j) ***All other applicable development standards for features explicitly included in the application.***
    - (ik) An approved adjustment to a standard pursuant to the provisions beginning at EC 9.8015 of this land use code constitutes compliance with the standard.

This change to subsection (a) is related to COM-02 (Applicable Standards Reference for CUPs) and would add clarity around which development standards apply; and COM-04 (Overlay Zone Standards) as it would extend the range of the referenced code sections to include all overlay zones.

The changes to subsections (b), (i), and (j) are related to COM-02 (Applicable Standards Reference for CUPs) and would require compliance with additional development standards.

- (5) Public improvements as required by this land use code or as a condition of ~~[tentative plan]~~ approval ***will be*** ~~[have been]~~ completed ***prior to issuance of a development permit,*** or:
  - (a) A performance bond or suitable substitute as agreed upon by the city has been filed with the city finance officer in an amount sufficient to assure the completion of all required public improvements; or
  - (b) A petition for public improvements and for the assessment of the real property for the improvements has been signed by the property owner seeking the conditional use permit, and the petition has been accepted by the city engineer.

This change is related to COM-03 (Bonding Requirement). The proposed change revises the timing of the requirement for completion or bonding of public improvements to prior to issuance of a development permit.

- (6) ***If the standards addressed under EC 9.8100(4) require a public street, or if the applicant proposes the creation of a public street, the proposal will provide pedestrian and bicycle circulation to adjacent residential areas, transit stops, neighborhood activity centers, parks, schools, commercial centers, office parks, and industrial parks located within ¼ mile radius of the development site, provided the city makes findings to demonstrate consistency with constitutional requirements.***

This change is related to COM-16 (Off-Site Bike/Ped Connections). The proposed change adds a requirement that already applies to partitions, subdivisions, and planned unit developments. Minor revision to add clarity to the requirement is also proposed.

- (7) ***The applicant has submitted a letter from the Eugene/Springfield Fire Marshal's office stating that the proposed development complies with the applicable Eugene Fire Code (2014) requirements regarding fire apparatus access roads and fire protection water supply, or will comply subject to conditions of approval that are specified in the letter.***

This change is related to COS-08 (Emergency Response). The proposed criterion would require a letter from the Fire Marshal's office to address Emergency Response concerns regarding fire apparatus access and fire protection water supply.

#### **9.8105 Conditional Use Permits within the NR Natural Resource Zone or /WB Wetland Buffer Overlay Zone.**

\* \* \*

- (2) **Criteria for Hearings Official Approval.** Applications for conditional use permits within the NR natural resource zone or /WB wetland buffer overlay zone shall be processed and scheduled for public hearings in the same manner as other conditional use permit applications, except that NR standards (2) through (19) listed in EC 9.2530 Natural Resource Zone Development Standards shall be considered as additional criteria along with the criteria listed in EC 9.8090 Conditional Use Permit Approval Criteria – General/Discretionary.

This change is related to COM-12 (Review Track Renaming) and revises code references to the currently named General track. The General track is proposed to be called "General/Discretionary."

#### **9.8205 Applicability of Partition, Tentative Plan Applications.**

\* \* \*

- (2) A ***tentative plan application to partition land*** ~~[application that also involves a PUD request]~~ ***may be submitted and reviewed concurrently with the*** ~~[not be submitted until a decision on the]~~ ***tentative PUD application following a Type III application procedure*** ~~[approval is final]~~. ***If a partition application that also involves a PUD request is not submitted concurrently with the tentative PUD, the partition application may not be submitted until a tentative PUD is approved.*** (Refer to EC 9.8305 Applicability.)

- (3) If the partition tentative plan application is not reviewed concurrently with the tentative PUD, No development permit shall be issued by the city prior to approval of the tentative partition application. If the tentative partition is reviewed concurrently with the tentative PUD application, no development permit shall be issued by the city prior to approval of the final PUD application.**

This change is related to COM-11 (PUD/Subdivision Concurrent Review). The proposed revisions would allow concurrent review of tentative partition applications when the proposal also involves a PUD.

**9.8210 Partition, Tentative Plan Application Requirements.** In addition to the provisions in EC 9.7010 Application Filing, the following specific requirements apply to partition tentative plan applications:

\* \* \*

- (4)** If the proposal includes ~~[needed housing, as defined by State statutes]~~ **housing**, the written statement submitted with the partition application shall clearly state whether the applicant is electing to use the ~~[general]~~ **discretionary** approval criteria in EC 9.8215 Partition, Tentative Plan Approval Criteria- General/Discretionary instead of the approval criteria found in EC 9.8220 Partition, Tentative Plan Approval Criteria- [Needed] Housing/Clear and Objective.

This change is related to COM-12 (Review Track Renaming) and revises code references to the currently named General and Needed Housing tracks. The General track is proposed to be called "General/Discretionary" and the Needed Housing track is proposed to be called "Housing/Clear and Objective." It also replaces the term "needed housing" with "housing," consistent with the state law requirement that proposals including housing, not just "needed housing," are entitled to clear and objective approval criteria.

**9.8215 Partition, Tentative Plan Approval Criteria- General/Discretionary.** The planning director shall approve, approve with conditions, or deny a partition, with findings and conclusions. Approval, or approval with conditions, shall be based on compliance with the following criteria:

**9.8220 Partition, Tentative Plan Approval Criteria- [Needed] Housing/Clear and Objective.** **Unless the applicant elects to use the discretionary criteria contained in EC 9.8215 Partition, Tentative Plan Approval Criteria- General/Discretionary, for housing applications entitled to clear and objective review pursuant to state statute,** ~~the planning director shall approve, conditionally approve, or deny the partition application. [Unless the applicant elects to use the general criteria contained in EC 9.8215 Partition, Tentative Plan Approval Criteria- General, where the applicant proposes needed housing, as defined by State statutes, the planning director shall approve or approve with conditions a partition]~~ based on compliance with the following criteria:  
~~[(1) The applicant has demonstrated that the proposed housing is needed housing as defined by State statutes.]~~ *\*Renumber remaining subsections.\**

These changes are related to COM-12 (Review Track Renaming) and revise code references to the currently named General and Needed Housing tracks. The General track is proposed to be called "General/Discretionary" and the Needed Housing track is proposed to be called "Housing/Clear and Objective." This change also clarifies that this section is only applicable to "housing applications entitled to clear and objective review pursuant to state statute."

The changes to EC 9.8220 also relate to COM-01 (Needed Housing Criterion) as they remove subsection (1), the requirement to demonstrate that housing is 'needed housing,' consistent with the state law requirement that proposals including housing, not just "needed housing," are entitled to clear and objective approval criteria.

(21) The proposed partition complies with all of the following:

- (a) ~~[Lot standards of]~~ EC 9.2000 through ~~[9.3980]~~ **9.4170** regarding applicable parcel dimensions and density requirements **for the subject zone and overlay zone**. Within the /WR Water Resources Conservation Overlay Zone or /WQ Water Quality Overlay Zone, no new lot may be created if more than 33% of the lot, as created, would be occupied by either:

\* \* \*

- (k) ~~[EC 9.6880 through EC 9.6885 Tree Preservation and Removal Standards.]~~

*\*Renumber remaining subsection\**

*\*Renumber remaining subsections\**

The change to subsection (a) is related to COM-04 (Overlay Zone Standards) as it would extend the range of the referenced code sections to include all overlay zones.

The change to subsection (k) is related to COS-10 (Partition Tree Preservation) and proposes removal of the criterion.

~~[(4) Partitions abutting collector and arterial streets comply with access management guidelines of the agency having jurisdiction over the street.]~~ *\*Renumber remaining subsections\**

This removal of subsection (4) is related to COM-07 (Access Management Requirement) and would eliminate the criterion (this criterion is redundant and unnecessary as other jurisdictional agencies already have authority to require compliance with their guidelines).

(53) If the provisions of EC 9.8220(2) require a public street, or if the applicant proposes the creation of a public street, the following criteria also apply:

\* \* \*

~~[(c) The street layout of the proposed partition shall disperse motor vehicle traffic onto more than one public local street when the sum of proposed partition parcels and the existing lots utilizing a local street as the single means of ingress and egress exceeds 19.]~~

(4) ***The applicant has submitted a letter from the Eugene/Springfield Fire Marshal's office stating that the proposed partition complies with the applicable Eugene Fire Code (2014) requirements regarding fire apparatus access roads and fire protection water supply, or will comply subject to conditions of approval that are specified in the letter.***

The changes above are related to COS-14 (19 Lot Rule—Motor Vehicle Dispersal) and COS-08 (Emergency Response). The proposed replacement of subsection (c), with the new criterion at subsection (4) that would require a letter from the Fire Marshal's office, is necessary as the Land Use Board of Appeals determined that subsection (c) is not clear and objective.

## **9.8310 Tentative Planned Unit Development General Application Requirements.**

(5) **[Needed] Housing.** If the proposal includes ~~[needed housing, as defined by State statutes]~~ **housing**, the written statement submitted with the PUD application shall clearly state whether the applicant is **proceeding under: (a)**~~[electing to use]~~ the ~~[general]~~ approval criteria in EC 9.8320 Tentative Planned Unit Development Approval Criteria- General**Discretionary; or (b)** ~~[instead of]~~ the approval criteria

~~[found]~~ in EC 9.8325 Tentative Planned Unit Development Approval Criteria-  
[Needed] Housing/Clear and Objective.

This change is related to COM-12 (Review Track Renaming) and revises code references to the currently named General and Needed Housing tracks. The General track is proposed to be called "General/Discretionary" and the Needed Housing track is proposed to be called "Housing/Clear and Objective." It also replaces the term "needed housing" with "housing," consistent with the state law requirement that proposals including housing, not just "needed housing," are entitled to clear and objective approval criteria.

- 9.8320 Tentative Planned Unit Development Approval Criteria- General/Discretionary.** The hearings official shall approve, approve with conditions, or deny a tentative PUD application with findings and conclusions. Decisions approving an application, or approving with conditions, shall be based on compliance with the following criteria:

This change is related to COM-12 (Review Track Renaming) and revises code references to the currently named General track. The General track is proposed to be called "General/Discretionary."

- 9.8325 Tentative Planned Unit Development Approval Criteria – [Needed] Housing/Clear and Objective. Unless the applicant elects to use the discretionary criteria contained in EC 9.8320 Tentative Planned Unit Development Approval Criteria- General/Discretionary, for housing applications entitled to clear and objective review pursuant to state statute,** ~~the hearings official shall approve, conditionally approve, or deny the PUD application [with findings and conclusions. Unless the applicant elects to use the general criteria contained in EC 9.8320 Tentative Planned Unit Development Approval Criteria – General, where the applicant proposes needed housing, as defined by the State statutes, the hearings official shall approve or approve with conditions, a PUD]~~ based on compliance with the following criteria:

These changes are related to COM-12 (Review Track Renaming) and revise code references to the currently named General and Needed Housing tracks. The General track is proposed to be called "General/Discretionary" and the Needed Housing track is proposed to be called "Housing/Clear and Objective." This change also clarifies that this section is only applicable to "housing applications entitled to clear and objective review pursuant to state statute."

- (1) ~~The applicant has demonstrated that the proposed housing is needed housing as defined by state statutes.]~~ *The proposal complies with EC 9.5860 Transition Standards.***

This change implements COS-01 (Clear & Objective Compatibility). The replacement text points to proposed new transition standards. For ease of use and code efficiency (as the standards will apply to three application types), the new transition standards are proposed to be located under EC 9.5860 Transition Standards for Housing/Clear and Objective Applications. Applicability is clear as the approval criteria for each of the three application types will include a criterion requiring compliance with the transition standards. In addition, the transition standards start with an applicability statement that identifies the three application types and proposed uses subject to the standards.

- (3) ~~[The PUD provides a buffer area between the proposed development and surrounding properties by providing at least a 30 foot wide landscape area along the perimeter of the PUD according to EC 9.6210(7).]~~**



*\*Renumber remaining subsections.\**

The removal of subsection (3) from the Tentative PUD approval criteria implements COS-02 (30-Foot Buffer Requirement for PUDs). The 30-foot buffer criterion is being replaced by the proposed new transition standards under EC 9.5860 Transition Standards for Housing/Clear and Objective Applications. See related issue COS-01 and proposed language at EC 9.5860.

- (43) For areas not included on the city's acknowledged Goal 5 inventory, the PUD preserves existing natural resources by compliance with ~~[all of the following:~~  
~~(a) The provisions of EC 9.6880 to EC 9.6885 Tree Preservation and Removal Standards, [(not subject to modifications set forth in subsection (11) below)].~~  
~~[(b) Natural resource areas designated on the comprehensive plan diagram as "Natural Resource" are protected.]~~

This change is related to COM-09 (Natural Resource Protection Requirement). The proposed change revises the criterion to remove subsection (b) per the recommendation outlined in the Draft Preferred Concepts Report.

- ~~(5) [There shall be no proposed grading on portions of the development site that meet or exceed 20% slope.]~~

*\*Renumber remaining subsections.\**

The removal of subsection (5) from the Tentative PUD approval criteria implements COS-03 (20 Percent Slope Grading Prohibition). Slope stability in the context of road layout and lot locations will be addressed under the revised geotechnical requirement (see related issue COS-13 and proposed revisions at EC 9.6710).

- (64) The PUD provides safe and adequate transportation systems through compliance with all of the following:

\* \* \*

- ~~[(c) The street layout of the proposed PUD shall disperse motor vehicle traffic onto more than one public local street when the PUD exceeds 19 lots or when the sum of proposed PUD lots and the existing lots utilizing a local street as the single means of ingress and egress exceeds 19.]~~

This change is related to COS-14 (19 Lot Rule—Motor Vehicle Dispersal) and COS-08 (Emergency Response). The proposed replacement of (c) with the new criterion at subsection (9) below, that would require a letter from the Fire Marshal's office, is necessary as the Land Use Board of Appeals determined that (c) is not clear and objective.

- (75) The PUD complies with all of the following:

- (a) EC 9.2000 through ~~[9.3980]~~ **EC 9.4170** regarding **applicable** lot dimensions and density requirements for the subject zone **and overlay zone**. Within the /WR Water Resources Conservation Overlay Zone or /WQ Water Quality Overlay Zone, no new lot may be created if more than 33% of the lot, as created, would be occupied by either:

\* \* \*

- (k) **All applicable development standards explicitly addressed in the application.**

An approved adjustment to a standard pursuant to the provisions beginning at EC 9.8015 of this land use code constitutes compliance with the standard.

The change to subsection (a) is related to COM-04 (Overlay Zone Standards) as it would extend the range of the referenced code sections to include all overlay zones.

The addition of subsection (k) is related to COM-05 (Planned Unit Development Adjustment/Modification). The proposed change would remove the modification allowance currently allowed under existing subsection (11) below (text to be deleted), but retain the ability to use approved adjustments to show compliance with applicable standards.

- (97) ~~[All proposed dwellings within the PUD are within 1/4 mile radius (measured from any point along the perimeter of the development site) of an accessible recreation area or open space that is at least 1 acre in size and will be available to residents.]~~**  
***PUDs proposed on development sites that are two acres or larger must comply with either subsection (a) or subsection (b) below:***
- (a) *The PUD is located within 1/2-mile of a public park, public recreation facility, or public school (determined using the shortest distance as measured along a straight line between a point along the perimeter of the development site and a point along a property line of a public park, public recreation facility, or public school); or***
  - (b) *Except as provided in EC 9.8325(8)(b)1, the PUD shall provide common open space within the development site equal to a minimum of 10 percent of the development site or 14,500 square feet, whichever is greater.***
    - 1. *If the PUD includes lot areas smaller than the minimum lot area allowed in the base zone, then common open space must be provided as follows:***
      - a. *If the average lot area is within 10 percent of the minimum lot area of the base zone, then the PUD shall provide common open space within the development site equal to a minimum of 15 percent of the development site or 14,500 square feet, whichever is greater.***
      - b. *If the average lot area is more than 10 percent below the minimum lot area of the base zone, then the PUD shall provide common open space within the development site equal to a minimum of 20 percent of the development site or 14,500 square feet, whichever is greater.***
    - 2. *Common open space shall be provided in one separate tract of land, except that developments providing more than 29,000 square feet of common open space may include up to three common open space tracts provided no tract is less than 14,500 square feet..***
    - 3. *Ownership of the common open space tract(s) must be dedicated to all lot or parcel owners within the development site.***
    - 4. *Each common open space tract must include a portion with minimum dimensions of 70 feet by 70 feet.***
    - 5. *Common open space tracts must have a minimum of 20 feet of lot frontage along an existing or proposed public way or private street.***
    - 6. *Common open space tracts do not have to meet lot standards.***

The above changes to the Tentative PUD approval criteria implement COS-04 (One Acre Assessible Open Space for PUDs). The first change revises the required distance from existing public open space from ¼ mile to ½ mile distance. The remaining revisions implement a scalable on-site open space requirement so that more common open space is required for PUDs proposing to reduce lot area below the minimum base zone standard, and clarify common open space requirements.

- ~~(108)~~ Lots proposed for development with one-family detached dwellings shall comply with EC 9.2790 Solar Lot Standards ~~[(these standards may be modified as set forth in subsection (11) below)].~~

This change is related to COM-05 (Planned Unit Development Adjustment/Modification). The proposed change removes the modification allowance currently allowed under existing subsection (11) below (text to be deleted). Exceptions and exemptions to these requirements are already allowed per EC 9.2790(3) and (4).

- ~~(119)~~ ~~The PUD complies with all applicable development standards explicitly addressed in the application except where the applicant has shown that a modification is consistent with the purposes as set out in EC 9.8300 Purpose of Planned Unit Development.]~~ ***The applicant has submitted a letter from the Eugene/Springfield Fire Marshal's office stating that the proposed development complies with the applicable Eugene Fire Code (2014) requirements regarding fire apparatus access roads and fire protection water supply, or will comply subject to conditions of approval that are specified in the letter.***

This change is related to COS-14 (19 Lot Rule—Motor Vehicle Dispersal) and COS-08 (Emergency Response). The proposed replacement of (6)(c) above with this new criterion at subsection (9), that would require a letter from the Fire Marshal's office, is necessary as the Land Use Board of Appeals determined that subsection (6)(c) is not clear and objective.

- ~~(1210)~~ For any PUD located within or partially within the boundaries of the South Hills Study, the following additional approval criteria apply:
- (a) ~~[No development shall occur on land above an elevation of 900 feet except that one dwelling may be built on any lot in existence as of August 1, 2001.]~~ ***Development on any portion of the development site located above 900 feet elevation is limited by the following:***
- 1. The sum of all building area, measured using building footprints, shall not exceed 5,000 square feet on proposed new lots or parcels.***
  - 2. Driveways shall not exceed 20 feet in width on proposed new lots or parcels.***

The removal of existing subsection (a) from the Tentative PUD approval criterion implements COS-05 (Limitation Over 900 Feet for PUDs). The change replaces the former limitation of one dwelling with the new density limit under subsection (c)(4) below. The proposed new language adds new limitations to reduce the impacts of development and protect the area above 900 feet elevation from an "intensive level of development" consistent with the South Hills Study.

- (b) Development ***on any portion of the development site located above 900 feet elevation*** shall be setback at least 300 feet from the ridgeline unless there is a determination by the city manager that the area is not needed as a connection to the city's ridgeline trail system. For purposes of this section, the ridgeline ~~[trail]~~ shall be considered as the line indicated as being the urban growth boundary ~~[within the South Hills Study plan area].~~

This revision implements COS-06 (Ridgeline Setback for PUDs). The change clarifies that the setback will now only apply to portions of the development site located above 900 feet elevation and removes redundant language.



- (e) ~~[Development shall cluster buildings in an arrangement that results in at least 40% of the development site being retained in 3 or fewer contiguous common open space areas. For purposes of this section, the term contiguous open space means open space that is uninterrupted by buildings, structures, streets, or other improvements.]~~

*\*Renumber remaining subsections.\**

The removal of subsection (c) implements COS-07 (40% Open Space Requirement for PUDs). The intent is to instead rely on other existing regulations for lot coverage and on-site open space provisions.

- (dc) Residential density is limited as follows:
1. In the area west of Friendly Street, the maximum level of new development per gross acre shall be 8 units per acre.
  2. In the area east of Friendly Street, the maximum level of new development per gross acre shall be limited to 5 units per acre.
  3. Housing developed as Controlled Income and Rent Housing shall be exempt from the density limitations in subsections 1 and 2 above, but are subject to the other applicable development standards and review procedures.
  4. ***For any portion of the development site located above 900 feet elevation, the maximum density shall be 2.5 units per gross acre, or one dwelling per legal lot in existence as of August 1, 2001, whichever is greater.***

The addition of subsection 4. implements COS-05 (Limitation Over 900 Feet for PUDs). The change adds a new density restriction for any portion of the development site located above 900 feet elevation.

**9.8360 Planned Unit Development, Final Plan Application Requirements.** In addition to the provisions in EC 9.7010 Application Filing, the following specific requirements apply to PUD final plan applications:

\* \* \*

- ~~[(4) Public improvements as required by this land use code or as a condition of tentative plan approval have been completed, or:~~
- ~~(a) A performance bond or suitable substitute as agreed upon by the city has been filed with the city finance officer in an amount sufficient to assure the completion of all required public improvements; or~~
- ~~(b) A petition for public improvements and for the assessment of the real property for the improvements has been signed by the property owner seeking the subdivision, and the petition has been accepted by the city engineer.]~~

**9.8365 Final Planned Unit Development Approval Criteria.** The planning director shall approve, approve with conditions, or deny a final PUD application, ***based on compliance with the following criteria:*** ~~Approval shall include a finding that the final PUD plan conforms with the approved tentative PUD plan and all conditions attached thereto.]~~

- (1) *The final PUD plan conforms with the approved tentative PUD plan and all conditions attached thereto.***
- (2) *For final PUDs not associated with a land division, public improvements as required by this land use code or as a condition of tentative plan approval will be completed prior to issuance of a development permit, or:***
- (a) *A performance bond or suitable substitute as agreed upon by the city has been filed with the city finance officer in an amount sufficient to assure the completion of all required public improvements; or***
- (b) *A petition for public improvements and for the assessment of the real***

***property for the improvements has been signed by the property owner seeking the subdivision, and the petition has been accepted by the city engineer.***

These changes relate to COM-03 (Bonding Requirement). The proposed changes would remove this requirement from application requirements and add the requirement to approval criteria.

**9.8440 Site Review Approval Criteria- General/Discretionary.** The planning director shall approve, conditionally approve, or deny the site review application. Approval or conditional approval shall be based on compliance with the following criteria:

This change is related to COM-12 (Review Track Renaming) and revises code references to the currently named General approval criteria. The General track is proposed to be called "General/Discretionary."

**9.8445 Site Review Approval Criteria- [Needed] Housing/Clear and Objective. Unless the applicant elects to use the discretionary criteria contained in EC 9.8440 Site Review Approval Criteria- General/Discretionary, for housing applications entitled to clear and objective review pursuant to state statute,** ~~the planning director shall approve, conditionally approve, or deny the site review application. [Unless the applicant elects to use the general criteria contained in EC 9.8440 Site Review Approval Criteria- General, where the applicant proposes needed housing, as defined by the State statutes, the planning director shall approve, or approve with conditions, a site review]~~ based on compliance with the following criteria:

These changes are related to COM-12 (Review Track Renaming) and revise code references to the currently named General and Needed Housing tracks. The General track is proposed to be called "General/Discretionary" and the Needed Housing track is proposed to be called "Housing/Clear and Objective." This change also clarifies that this section is only applicable to "housing applications entitled to clear and objective review pursuant to state statute."

- (1) ~~[The applicant has demonstrated that the proposed housing is needed housing as defined by state statutes.]~~ The proposal complies with EC 9.5860 Transition Standards.**

This change implements COS-01 (Clear & Objective Compatibility). The replacement text points to proposed new transition standards. For ease of use and code efficiency (as the standards will apply to three application types), the new transition standards are proposed to be located under EC 9.5860 Transition Standards for Housing/Clear and Objective Applications. Applicability is clear as the approval criteria for each of the three application types will include a criterion requiring compliance with the transition standards. In addition, the transition standards start with an applicability statement that identifies the three application types and proposed uses subject to the standards.

- (3) For areas not included on the city's acknowledged Goal 5 inventory, the proposal will preserve existing natural resources by compliance with ~~[all of the following:~~**
- ~~(a) The proposal complies with]~~ **the provisions of EC 9.6880 through EC 9.6885 Tree Preservation and Removal Standards.****
  - ~~(b) Natural resource areas designated on the comprehensive plan diagram as "Natural Resource" are protected.]~~**

This change is related to COM-09 (Natural Resource Protection Requirement). The proposed change revises the criterion to remove subsection (b) per the recommendation outlined in the Draft Preferred Concepts Report.

- (4) The proposal complies with all of the following ~~standards~~:
- (a) EC 9.2000 through ~~[9.3980]~~ **EC 9.4170** regarding **applicable** lot dimensions and density requirements for the subject zone **and overlay zone**.
  - (b) **EC 9.6800 through EC 9.6875 Standards for Streets, Alleys, and Other Public Ways.**
- \*Renumber remaining subsections\**

The change to subsection (a) is related to COM-04 (Overlay Zone Standards) as it would extend the range of the referenced code sections to include all overlay zones.

The proposed addition of subsection (b) is related to COM-13 (Site Review Street Standards).

- (5) Public improvements as required by this land use code or as a condition of ~~[tentative plan]~~ approval **will be** ~~[have been]~~ completed **prior to issuance of a development permit**, or:
- (a) A performance bond or suitable substitute as agreed upon by the city has been filed with the city finance officer in an amount sufficient to assure the completion of all required public improvements; or
  - (b) A petition for public improvements and for the assessment of the real property for the improvements has been signed by the property owner seeking the subdivision, and the petition has been accepted by the city engineer.

This change is related to COM-03 (Bonding Requirement). The proposed change revises the timing of the requirement for completion or bonding of public improvements to prior to issuance of a development permit.

- (6) ***If the standards addressed under EC 9.8100(4) require a public street, or if the applicant proposes the creation of a public street, the proposal will provide pedestrian and bicycle circulation to adjacent residential areas, transit stops, neighborhood activity centers, parks, schools, commercial centers, office parks, and industrial parks located within ¼ mile radius of the development site, provided the city makes findings to demonstrate consistency with constitutional requirements.***

This change is related to COM-16 (Off-Site Bike/Ped Connections). The proposed change adds a requirement that already applies to partitions, subdivisions, and planned unit developments. Minor revision to add clarity to the requirement has also been proposed.

- (7) ***The applicant has submitted a letter from the Eugene/Springfield Fire Marshal's office stating that the proposed development complies with the applicable Eugene Fire Code (2014) requirements regarding fire apparatus access roads and fire protection water supply, or will comply subject to conditions of approval.***

This change is related to COS-08 (Emergency Response). The proposed criterion would require a letter from the Fire Marshal's office to address Emergency Response concerns regarding fire apparatus access and fire protection water supply.

**9.8505 Applicability of Subdivision, Tentative Plan Applications.**

Requests to create 4 or more lots shall be subject to the subdivision provisions of this land use code under a Type II application process.

- (1) A ***tentative plan application to subdivision land may be submitted and reviewed concurrently with the*** ~~[application that also involves a PUD request may not be submitted until a decision on the]~~ ***tentative PUD application following a Type III application procedure*** ~~[approval is final]~~. ***If a subdivision application that also involves a PUD request is not submitted concurrently with the tentative PUD, the subdivision application may not be submitted until a tentative PUD is approved.*** (Refer to EC 9.8305 Applicability.)
- (2) ***If the subdivision tentative plan application is not reviewed concurrently with the tentative PUD, no development permit shall be issued by the city prior to approval of the tentative subdivision tentative plan application. If the tentative subdivision is reviewed concurrently with a PUD application, no development permit shall be issued by the city prior to approval of the final PUD application.***

This change is related to COM-11 (PUD/Subdivision Concurrent Review). The proposed revisions would allow concurrent review of tentative subdivision applications when the proposal also involves a PUD.

**9.8510 Subdivision, Tentative Plan Application Requirements.** In addition to the provisions in EC 9.7010 Application Filing, the following specific requirements shall apply to tentative subdivision plan applications:

\* \* \*

- (5) If the proposal includes ~~[needed housing, as defined by State statutes]~~ ***housing***, the written statement submitted with the subdivision application shall clearly state whether the applicant is electing to use the ~~[general]~~ ***discretionary*** approval criteria in EC 9.8515 Subdivision, Tentative Plan Approval Criteria- General/Discretionary instead of the approval criteria found in EC 9.8520 Subdivision, Tentative Plan Approval Criteria- [Needed] Housing/Clear and Objective.

This change is related to COM-12 (Review Track Renaming) and revises code references to the currently named General and Needed Housing tracks. The General track is proposed to be called "General/Discretionary" and the Needed Housing track is proposed to be called "Housing/Clear and Objective." It also replaces the term "needed housing" with "housing," consistent with the state law requirement that proposals including housing, not just "needed housing," are entitled to clear and objective approval criteria.

**9.8515 Subdivision, Tentative Plan Approval Criteria – General/Discretionary.** The planning director shall approve, approve with conditions, or deny a proposed subdivision. Approval, or approval with conditions shall be based on compliance with the following criteria:

\* \* \*

- (2) Approval does not impede the future best use of the remainder of the property under the same ownership or adversely affect the development of the remainder or any adjoining land or access thereto, based on the provisions of this land use code. For subdivisions involving phasing, it shall be demonstrated that each sequential phase will maintain consistency with the provisions of EC 9.8515 Tentative Subdivision Approval Criteria – General/Discretionary.

This change is related to COM-12 (Review Track Renaming) and revises code references to the currently named General track. The General track is proposed to be called "General/Discretionary."

- 9.8520** **Subdivision, Tentative Plan Approval Criteria – [Needed] Housing/Clear and Objective. Unless the applicant elects to use the discretionary criteria contained in EC 9.8515 Subdivision, Tentative Plan Approval Criteria- General/Discretionary, for housing applications entitled to clear and objective review pursuant to state statute,** ~~the planning director shall approve, conditionally approve, or deny the subdivision application. [Unless the applicant elects to use the general criteria contained in EC 9.8515 Subdivision, Tentative Plan Approval Criteria- General, where the applicant proposes needed housing, as defined by the State statutes, the planning director shall approve or approve with conditions a subdivision]~~ based on compliance with the following criteria:
- ~~[(1) The applicant has demonstrated that the proposed housing is needed housing as defined by State statutes.]~~ *\*Renumber remaining subsections\**

These changes are related to COM-12 (Review Track Renaming) and revise code references to the currently named General and Needed Housing tracks. The General track is proposed to be called "General/Discretionary" and the Needed Housing track is proposed to be called "Housing/Clear and Objective." This change also clarifies that this section is only applicable to "housing applications entitled to clear and objective review pursuant to state statute."

The changes also relate to COM-01 (Needed Housing Criterion) as they remove subsection (1), the requirement to demonstrate that housing is 'needed housing,' consistent with the state law requirement that proposals including housing, not just "needed housing," are entitled to clear and objective approval criteria.

- (32)** The proposed subdivision complies with all of the following, unless specifically exempt from compliance through a code provision applicable to a special area zone or overlay zone:
- (a) EC 9.2000 through ~~[9.3980]~~ **EC 9.4170** regarding **applicable** lot dimensions and density requirements for the subject zone **and overlay zone**. Within the /WR Water Resources Conservation Overlay Zone or /WQ Water Quality Overlay Zone, no new lot may be created if more than 33% of the lot, as created, would be occupied by either:

The change to subsection (a) is related to COM-04 (Overlay Zone Standards) as it would extend the range of the referenced code sections to include all overlay zones.

- (5)** ~~[There shall be no proposed grading on portions of the development site that meet or exceed 20% slope.]~~  
*\*Renumber remaining subsections.\**

The removal of subsection (5) from the tentative subdivision approval criteria implements COS-03 (20 Percent Slope Grading Prohibition). Slope stability in the context of road layout and lot locations will be addressed under the revised geotechnical requirement (see related issue COS-13 and revisions at EC 9.6710).

- (64)** The proposed subdivision provides ~~[safe and adequate transportation systems through compliance with the following:]~~ **for the**  
~~[(a) P]~~ **provision of pedestrian, bicycle and transit circulation among buildings located within the development site, as well as to adjacent and nearby residential areas, transit stops, neighborhood activity centers, office parks, and**



industrial parks, provided the city makes findings to demonstrate consistency with constitutional requirements. “Nearby” means uses within 1/4 mile that can reasonably be expected to be used by pedestrians, and uses within 2 miles that can reasonably be expected to be used by bicyclists.

~~[(b) The street layout of the proposed subdivision shall disperse motor vehicle traffic onto more than one public local street when the subdivision exceeds 19 lots or when the sum of proposed subdivision lots and the existing lots utilizing a local street as the single means of ingress and egress exceeds 19.]~~

This change is related to COS-14 (19 Lot Rule—Motor Vehicle Dispersal) and COS-08 (Emergency Response). The proposed replacement of subsection (b) with the new criterion at subsection (10) below, that would require a letter from the Fire Marshal’s office, is necessary as the Land Use Board of Appeals determined that subsection (b) is not clear and objective.

**(75)** For areas not included on the city’s acknowledged Goal 5 inventory, the subdivision will preserve existing natural resources by compliance with ~~[all of the following:~~

~~(a) The proposal complies with]~~ **the provisions of EC 9.6880 through EC 9.6885 Tree Preservation and Removal Standards.**

~~[(b) Natural resource areas designated on the comprehensive plan diagram as “Natural Resource.”]~~

This change is related to COM-09 (Natural Resource Protection Requirement). The proposed change revises the criterion to remove subsection (b) per the recommendation outlined in the Draft Preferred Concepts Report.

**(9) The applicant has submitted a letter from the Eugene/Springfield Fire Marshal's office stating that the proposed subdivision complies with the applicable Eugene Fire Code (2014) requirements regarding fire apparatus access roads and fire protection water supply, or will comply subject to conditions of approval.**

This change is related to COS-14 (19 Lot Rule—Motor Vehicle Dispersal) and COS-08 (Emergency Response). The proposed replacement of subsection (6)(b) above with this new criterion at subsection (9), that would require a letter from the Fire Marshal’s office, is necessary as the Land Use Board of Appeals determined that (6)(b) is not clear and objective.