



# Planning Commission Agenda

## Interim Development and Public

**Works Director:** Tom Boyatt 541.744.3373

**Interim Community Development Manager:**

Sandy Belson 541.736.7135

**Management Specialist:**

Brenda Jones 541.726.3610

**City Attorney's Office**

Kristina Kraaz 541.744.4061

City Hall

225 Fifth Street

Springfield, Oregon 97477

541.726.3610

Online at [www.springfield-or.gov](http://www.springfield-or.gov)

## Planning Commissioners:

Michael Koivula, Vice Chair

Tim Vohs

Andrew Landen

Troy Sherwood

Grace Bergen

Kuri Gill

Sophie McGinley

---

The meeting location is wheelchair-accessible. For the hearing-impaired, an interpreter can be provided with 48 hours' notice prior to the meeting. For meetings in the Council Meeting Room, a "Personal PA Receiver" for the hearing impaired is available. To request a reasonable accommodation at this meeting, please contact Brenda Jones at 541.726.3610 or [bjones@springfield-or.gov](mailto:bjones@springfield-or.gov).

**Meetings will end prior to 10:00 p.m. unless extended by a vote of the Planning Commission.**

All proceedings before the Planning Commission are recorded.

**October 16, 2018**

---

**6:00 p.m. Work Session  
Jesse Maine Meeting Room**

---

## CALL TO ORDER

## ATTENDANCE:

**Springfield:** Vice Chair Koivula \_\_\_\_\_, Bergen \_\_\_\_\_, Vohs \_\_\_\_\_,  
Sherwood \_\_\_\_\_, Gill \_\_\_\_\_, and McGinley \_\_\_\_\_.

## WORK SESSION ITEM(S)

### **1. Oregon Land Use 101: Land Use Decision Making for Planning Commissioners-**

Patrick Wingard of the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development will conduct the first in a series of training sessions for the Planning Commission. Patrick is the Southern Willamette Valley Regional Representative. Hew will provide some history and describe state and local responsibilities for planning.

**Staff: Sandy Belson**

**60 Minutes**

## ADJOURNMENT

**October 16, 2018**

---

**7:00 p.m. Regular Session  
Council Chambers**

---

CONVENE AND CALL TO ORDER THE REGULAR SESSION OF THE SPRINGFIELD PLANNING COMMISSION

ATTENDANCE: Vice Chair Koivula \_\_\_\_\_, Bergen \_\_\_\_\_, Vohs \_\_\_\_\_, Sherwood \_\_\_\_\_, Gill \_\_\_\_\_, and McGinley \_\_\_\_\_.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ADJUSTMENTS TO THE REGULAR SESSION AGENDA

In response to a request by a member of the Planning Commission, staff or applicant; by consensus

BUSINESS FROM THE AUDIENCE

Testimony is limited to 3 minutes; testimony may not discuss or otherwise address public hearings appearing on this Regular Session Agenda

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

- March 6, 2018 Joint Regular Minutes
- March 20, 2018 Regular Minutes
- May 8, 2018 Joint Regular Minutes

REPORT OF COUNCIL ACTION

BUSINESS FROM THE DEVELOPMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

- Planning Commission Leadership  
  
Sandy Belson, Interim Community Division Manager  
15 Minutes

BUSINESS FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION

- Upcoming Planning Commission meetings, committee assignments, appointments or other business

ADJOURN REGULAR SESSION OF THE SPRINGFIELD PLANNING COMMISSION

---

**AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY**

**Meeting Date:** 10/16/2018  
**Meeting Type:** Work Session  
**Staff Contact/Dept.:** Sandy Belson/DPW  
**Staff Phone No:** 541-736-7135  
**Estimated Time:** One Hour  
**Council Goals:** Encourage Economic Development and Revitalization through Community Partnerships

**SPRINGFIELD  
PLANNING COMMISSION**

---

**ITEM TITLE:** Oregon Land Use 101: Land Use Decision Making for Planning Commissioners

---

**ACTION  
REQUESTED:** General discussion.

---

**ISSUE  
STATEMENT:** The Planning Commission has an important role in advising the City Council on matters of policy and in implementing the City's adopted plans and codes. To provide the best level of service to the Springfield community, each Commissioner needs a basic understanding of our complex land use system.

This series of training sessions will provide background and context for Springfield's current situation and allow for the experienced Commissioners to share what they have learned with the new Commissioners.

---

**ATTACHMENTS:** None

---

---

**DISCUSSION:** Patrick Wingard of the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development will conduct the first in a series of training sessions for the Planning Commission. Patrick is the Southern Willamette Valley Regional Representative. He will provide some history and describe state and local responsibilities for planning.

To prepare for this work session, please consider taking the Oregon Land Use Planning Online Training found at <https://www.oregonlandusetraining.info/>. The following sections would be helpful to prepare for Patrick's presentation and your subsequent discussion.

Introduction  
Chapter 1: Overview of the Oregon Land Use Planning Program  
Chapter 3: Implementing Measures and Land Development Practice  
Chapter 4: Making Land Use Decisions

---

MINUTES OF THE JOINT REGULAR SESSION MEETING OF  
THE SPRINGFIELD PLANNING COMMISSION AND THE  
LANE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION HELD  
Tuesday, March 6, 2018

The City of Springfield Planning Commission and the Lane County Planning Commission met in a joint regular session in the City Council Chambers, 225 Fifth Street, Springfield, Oregon, on Tuesday, March 6, 2018 at 7:00 p.m., with Commissioner James presiding for Springfield and Commissioner Gary Rose presiding for Lane County Planning Commission.

**ATTENDANCE**

**Springfield:**

Present were Chair James, Vice Chair Koivula, Commissioners Nelson, Landen, Vohs, Dunn, and Sherwood. Also present were, Current Development Manager Greg Mott, Senior Transportation Planner Emma Newman, Transportation Engineer Michael Liebler, City Attorney Mary Bridget Smith and Management Specialist Brenda Jones and members of the staff.

**Lane County:**

Present were Chair Gary Rose, Vice Chair Robert Weeks, Commissioners Taylor, Thorp, Dignam and Hledik. Also present were: Senior Transportation Planner Becky Taylor.

**ABSENT FOR SPRINGFIELD**

- None

**ABSENT FOR LANE COUNTY**

- Ryan Sisson
- Dwight Coon

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chair Greg James

**BUSINESS FROM THE AUDIENCE**

- None

**LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARING**

**1. TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN (TSP) IMPLEMENTATION PROJECT-**

**INFORMATION SHARE:**

Emma Newman Senior Transportation Planner. Tonight Emma will present the criteria again and provide a high-level overview, then go into the recommendation and the discussion of different pieces of the project. First she would like to highlight for everyone in the audience how to access materials. They are available in paper form over on the table there, but the full project materials from the Planning Commission materials are available on the webpages, they are also linked on the Springfield homepage. For a second here, if you go to City of Springfield homepage, scroll down to the bottom. The Planning Commission is accessed via public meeting then the Transportation System Plan implementation project link is right here. You follow that through the latest drafts of everything are up at the top of the page as well as the frequently asked questions sheet is available.

Commissioner James added, also for the audience, we have a sign in sheet over by the door, if you are not connected and would like to receive any emails or updates on this and you leave your email information we certainly will distribute information as it becomes available.

Emma wants to cover the approval criteria, so these are the criteria which the Planning Commission needs to make the recommendation based on. For the Transportation System Plan project list and figures otherwise known as the maps and the Conceptual Street Map. The approval criteria and the amendments are consistent with the relevant statewide planning goals and that the adoption of the amendment shall not make the metro plan internally inconsistent.

Becky Taylor Senior Transportation Planner with Lane County wanted to remind that Lane County's role in this process is for applicability within the urban transition area, that's the area between the incorporated city limits and the Springfield urban growth boundary.

Emma continued, for the Springfield Development Code amendments, the amendments need to be consistent with the metro plan, applicable state statutes and the applicable statewide planning goals and administrative rules. So, where are we in the process? Emma would like to cover, where we've been, where we are tonight and where we are headed so that everyone understands where we are at in the process. First, she'd like to thank all the community members for participating in the Transportation System Plan implementation project and providing comments to help shape the project materials and create a better product.

She really appreciates the Commissions involvement and additional information that has been presented and submitted into the project record that has helped inform what we're discussing this evening. There have been over 900 interactions with people regarding the project including the open house participants, walk-ins, phone calls, the emails, public comments and hearing attendees. The city and county Planning Commissions heard public comments at the public hearings both on January 23rd and February 6th, 2018. The public hearing was closed on February 6 but the public record was held open until February 13.

Tonight the Planning Commissions will start discussing the various pieces of the project and provide staff with direction to prepare for our future meeting at which they will provide their full recommendation. The Planning Commissions will make recommendations once they feel ready to do so. It's common practice for the City of Springfield Planning Commission to make a recommendation for adoption first and then that will be followed by a recommendation for the Lane County Planning Commission. After this evening's discussion, the Planning Commission can choose whether to have a joint meeting or a separate meeting to complete the full recommendations.

After the Planning Commissions have made recommendations, the City Council and the Board of County Commissioners will hold public hearings, deliberate and take final action. Emma would like to remind what Chair James said, If anyone does want to receive updates about those upcoming meetings, opportunities to participate in the City Council's public hearings there's a sign-up sheet at the door and she'll also provide her email you can just send her an email and say, "I'd like to make sure that I'm receiving materials for each of the meetings."

Now the summary for the evening, Emma will present a draft summary recommendation, some sections of the draft recommendation are being discussed tonight are ready for recommendation while others are identified as needing more time to ensure that we fully respond to the large volume and high level of community input we have received for the project. After presenting the high-level draft recommendation summary, staff suggested the Planning Commission discuss the different pieces of the project based on the order presented in attachment 1 briefing memo and staff recommendations.

At the beginning of each section she will explain the staff recommendation and reasoning prior to commission deliberation and questions. A slide is provided at the end of each section with the draft motion so you can see where those sections fall. Emma thinks it'll be easier if we take that approach where we go one piece at a time. The slide summarizes the recommendations -- community members can also see what is being discussed. For the full materials, please see the Planning Commission packet which is available on the project and Planning Commission web pages as Emma pointed out earlier.

Staff request that the Planning Commission provide staff with direction regarding any additional revisions and findings the Planning Commission would like to see incorporated at the next meeting that are not already being addressed in the recommended revisions that have been presented. We've heard a lot from the public comments and if you have items to contribute tonight will be a great time to be hearing those. Staff request the full commission agreement is reached to direct staff as a body as to what revisions you'd like to see.

Emma started her PowerPoint Presentation of the high-level recommendation summary then we'll go into each section.

The first piece is to adopt the Transportation System Plan project list and figures with revisions. Second is to adopt the Springfield Development Code amendments with revisions presented. Split the Conceptual Street Map into two maps and adopt both with revisions. The first piece will be the Conceptual Street Map and the second piece will be a Local Street Network Map and we also have options for approaching the local streets which you heard a lot of public comments.

Becky confirmed that she's been working with Emma and the rest of Springfield staff to ensure a consistent recommendation so what the City is recommending is also Lane County staff recommendation.

Emma, first she'll address the Transportation System Planning project list and map recommendation. The overall recommendation is to adopt the project list and figures with provisions as described in attachment 1 and shown in exhibit D of attachment 3. This includes the revisions that she'll walk through as well. Most of the public comments received about the TSP project were commenting on already adopted projects that were adopted through a public process in 2014, with the original adoption of the Springfield 2035 Transportation System Plan. Public comments regarding these already adopted projects pertain to property and impacts which may be better addressed in a future public involvement process as part of a project development process specific to the project that they are commenting on.

The next slide has the recommended revisions in response to these public comments regarding community involvement for a specific planning project. Emma briefly explained the recommended revisions which have been incorporated into the 2.26.2018 draft project list and figures which you'll find in exhibit D of attachment 3 in your packet. If you're looking for it in the large packet, the project list starts on page 89 of 164 and then it goes for the next 14 pages with the figures attached as well. For the first one adjusts PB-32 which is the McKenzie River Path, McKenzie Levy Path to 52nd Street to be fully inside the Springfield Urban Growth Boundary also known as the UGB. On TSP figures 4 and 11. The reasoning for this is that showing TSP projects within the Springfield Urban Growth Boundary will allow the project development and additional planning by the Lane County bicycle and pedestrian planning to further determine the project alignment. This adjustment neatly keeps the project within the Springfield Urban Growth Boundary. It's just an alignment change on the figures to keep it in alignment with the Springfield Urban Growth Boundary.

Second is to remove the new project that we brought forward, Urban Standards project US-19 and that was South M Street, South 28th Street to South 26th Street. In conjunction with this, we want to propose changing US-20, Oakdale, Pheasant Boulevard to Game Farm Road to US-19 for a list consistency so we don't have a gap where US-19 was. The reason for removing the US-19 South M Street project is that it is in the UGB expansion area, and when we were developing the draft materials, she thought that the city's UGB expansion may have been fully acknowledged by the time that the project got to this point of the process, but that process is still rolling out and taking more time. Once the UGB expansion is fully acknowledged, specific master planning for that area will be done, and that will be a future amendment to plans and there's more planning to be done specific to that area, but at this time it's not appropriate to move forward.

The next one is to adjust table corrections for PB-46, R-47, R-34. For PB-46 that's the Haul Road Path, which is an already adopted project. South 49th place to UGB is the description, and R-47 and Haul Road, Quartz Avenue to UGB. Previously, the arrows continued outside the UGB, so we're just fixing those to match up on the map with the description in the text. Lastly, the add project "has since been modified" bubble for R-34 is indicated in the Centennial Boulevard Industrial Avenue Project from the 28th Street to 35th Street making that bubble shown on figure 4. This is purely for customer service, to let people know this is the change that's being made on this figure. It's just as a communication tool, not a substantive of change. Emma also highlighted that she's provided tonight as part of a request from one of the Planning Commissioners a list of TSP projects that received comments. Emma explained the different projects that we received public comments on that were part of the Transportation System Plan. As you can see, the vast majority of them were comments pertaining to already adopted projects, and there's a section in your briefing memo about already adopted projects. It's staff's recommendation to not remove any already adopted projects.

Becky continued, the Commissions have heard staff recommendations that are very technical in nature. You're probably anxious to hear how we've responded or recommended responding to the public testimony and the options available to you. Just to confirm, at the last hearing she mentioned that Lane County recommended removing lines in projects that were shown outside of the Urban Growth Boundary so that's what was reflected here for Lane County.

Emma, This portion of the project is ready for a motion to recommend tonight, but first she'd like to go through the next slide. As she was speaking about earlier, we did hear public comments about already adopted Transportation System Plan projects. Staff would like to suggest adding language highlighted in yellow here the non-highlighted piece is already in the Transportation System Plan on page 3. The yellow portion is provided as an addition if you'd like to see it added. This is from the Springfield Development Code requirements into the Transportation System Plan under those transportation project development sections. To further clarify community involvement in response to the testimony. This is explained in your briefing memo as well.

Becky, Lane County staff also recommends that you not tinker with previously approved projects because they were reviewed for compliance with state law, they were found to be in compliance, they went through the significant process, to try to amend those now is outside of the city's scope and would be quite an endeavor. What she heard in response to the existing projects was about property impacts and so the language being proposed here just further clarifies that there is a subsequent process that is the appropriate place to talk about property impacts as projects are developed.

Emma, again our proposal is to not remove already adopted projects and then to add this text that's shown in yellow to that section of the plan. Here is her suggested action to approve or not to approve, the TSP amendments for the project list and figures with provisions and TSP amendment to include the text that was just shown in yellow on the screen about additional community involvement. Emma asked the Commission to discuss the TSP project list and figures.

Commissioner James, Springfield Commissioners, he knows during public testimony, they had some public testimony around a couple of the projects that were included in the list. He understands that staff's recommendation that those that had been previously adopted, but why don't you-- Could you point to where concerns might have been voiced about existing projects or projects that existed in the TSP list.

Emma, so the handout provided to the commissions shows a number of those. There were various comments about Main Street planning and they've explained in the previous packets that that is being addressed through a separate process. We also have a recommendation a little later on with the Springfield Development Code amendments where she'll talk about that more. There were some comments about Game Farm Road and concerns about widening. That's already adopted project from Mallard Avenue to Harlow Road as an urban standards project that would add bicycle and pedestrian facilities along that street. R-8, Mallard Avenue, that's from Gateway Street to Game Farm Road, similar concerns about building sidewalks along a street that currently doesn't have it and potential roadway widening that would be figured out more at time of that project being developed. PB-2 is Flamingo Avenue to Gateway Street. That's a path project. Concerned about the location of that connection and not wanting it in close proximity to an individual's property. PB-4, Wayside Lane and Ann Court to Riverbend Path, they heard several comments about this from property owners. PB0-6, Springfield Christian School Channel path, Dornoch Street to Laura Street, heard a comment on that one about concern about the alignment of that already adopted project with the Laura Street connection. R-25 Hayden Bridge Road from 19th Street to Marcola Road. Once again, concerns about what does this project look like, potential widening. Urban Standards Project number 12, Jasper Road, South 42nd Street to Northwest of Mt. Vernon Road. There were a variety of comments about roundabouts. We have several already adopted projects that identify roundabout treatment as the project or as an option for addressing some intersections throughout the already adopted City of Springfield project list. We also heard a comment with regards to the new proposed project PB-56 which is a multi-use bridge from Holly Street to Rocky Road and that helps with pedestrian and bicycle system network connectivity and this was more due to the overall cost of new infrastructure and concerned about transients who may use the bridge if it is built. Did you want me to also cover the implications of if you were to consider removal of an already adopted project or was that answering your question?

Commissioner James responded that he thought that would be good as well.

Emma responded that Becky was speaking to this one as well, but if the Planning Commission recommends removal of any already adopted projects, the Planning Commission should also recommend findings to the City Council to justify removing these projects from the TSP under the criteria of approval for a Metro Plan amendment including compliance of the transportation planning role state planning Goal 12. Removing a project could be a significant undertaking and could very well require additional public notice and may require additional public hearings because we have not presented to the community the thought about removing projects so people haven't had an opportunity to comment on that sort of proposal that wasn't being proposed as part of the initial scope of this project.

Commissioner Dignam, regarding this list of already approved projects which as he understands you said they were approved in 2014? Can staff verify that there was some sort of a public process by which all of these projects were discussed and then approved back at that time?

Emma responded, correct.

Commissioner Dignam, if indeed we already went through this in 2014, he wouldn't be inclined to resurrect this. Can you talk about what that-- It mentioned there was a process but was it a hearing? What was it exactly in 2014?

Emma, it was a similar process that goes through the appropriate hearings and legislative amendments to adopt the Transportation System Plan. At that time for developing Springfield 2035 Transportation System Plan, it was taking the regional TransPlan that was for Eugene and Springfield and the areas within UGB and then splitting that plan and updating it so that Springfield would have its own Springfield Transportation System Plan for the first time that identifies all the different projects. The project list was included and there were opportunities for community members to comment on all the already adopted projects at that time.

Becky, the Lane County Board of Commissioners did adopt the 2014 plans as well.

Commissioner Hledik, Becky two questions. First are there any projects in the urban transition area that haven't been pre-approved? Are the new projects that show up on this list in the urban transition area that has not been pre-approved?

Becky, yes.

Becky, this is in your Lane County packet on page 5 of 6. There are 3 in the original amendment package that was presented to us for co-adoption. There were 3 projects; one was a multi-use bridge at Holly Street to Rocky Road North of Jasper. Then US 19-

Emma, which is the one that we're recommending removal. That one you don't have to worry about anymore.

Commissioner Hledik, that's project R-46?

Emma, US 19 is no longer the South M Street because it was located outside of the urban growth boundary that's currently acknowledged we've proposed to remove that at this time.

Becky, then US-20 Oakdale Avenue, modify to a two-link cross-section with sidewalks and light facilities. Two projects in the urban transition area are proposed.

Commissioner Hledik was trying to cross reference the projects and their recommendations against the projects that were testified in the public hearings. Did any of these 3 receive testimony at the public hearing?

Emma, there was in this handout that we just provided has the note about PB-56 the Holly Street to Rocky Road multi-use bridge. That is partially in the County that's on the edge transition piece and that was a general comment about cost of infrastructure and why are we continuing to plan projects and we can't pay for infrastructure. Then concerns about transients who may use the bridge if it was built and that was the one comment that we received on that.

Commissioner Hledik, that helps with his first question. Second question, he doesn't know what the process all is tonight, but again what he tried to review when reading the comments for the staff report, is take a look at the testimony that we received at the public hearings and the specific new testimony regarding projects in the urban transition area. That is between the City limits, Urban Growth Boundary and then look to see where you addressed those in the staff response. He thinks you addressed-- He found where you addressed most of them but there were a number of projects that he couldn't plan that- - Things like Allen Avenue, Garden Avenue, Dondea Street, the 65th Street path to Thurston, that was brought up by Springfield Utility Board (SUB). There as an issue with something in the Tyson Park area and then Kalmia street, the vicinity in South 42nd and then also he thinks there was testimony regarding something around 66th Street by a Mr. Davidson and Miss Craig.

Emma, correct. All those locations that you just listed are the planned local streets and there is a section coming later on that will be talking about that. That's most of the content of the testimony earlier--

Commissioner James asked if there was any other questions? At this time. Yes?

Commissioner Sherwood, in the section, He sees on your list you have Main Street planning. He has one major question about Main Street, He saw that you had responded to lot of things but he saw a lot of concerns about Main Street and it was brought up multiple times that of ODOT turned over Main Street jurisdiction to the City of Springfield what that would look like? Is there any response from Staff for that possibility?

Emma, those comments were as we understand them primarily with regards to Springfield Development Code amendments, which is the next topic that we'll be talking about so I'll address that further at that point.

Commissioner James, specifically in response to the TSP project list and figures amendments which, is what we are dealing with right now. Which is the list that we were discussing and those projects on this handout which we all should have, that there were public comments on them, staff have addressed what staff's comment were related to removal of projects and Commissioner Dignam's comment in relation to the previous process that occurred back in 2014 that these projects had been vetted and then we had some questions about projects that had been added since that time. He thinks we're fairly clear where we stand, Springfield Commissioners, is there an interest at this time to entertain a motion. Staff has indicated that they would request that we add that additional language should we so choose to get some clarity. Do I hear a motion to move forward on the TSP project list and figures amendments?



Commissioner Koivula, before that, he would like to propose an addition to the text for community involvement. To say that some of the criteria for removal of previously approved projects, he would like to see that as part of the communication particularly to people who objected to some of the ones that were previously approved. If we could include what kind of process they would have to go through to get those removed. He thinks that would really help them.

Emma, can she ask a clarifying question, do you want that added into the Transportation System Plan itself or put on the project website saying here's the response and the reasoning behind the additional text and then what the process would entail?

Commissioner Koivula wants to make sure that the people were aware that the projects had been previously approved. The people who object to it, however that was done formally or informally.

Commissioner James, all right. Springfield Commissioners. Do I hear a motion?

***Springfield Planning Commission:***

- *Commissioner Sherwood moved to forward recommendation to the City Council to Approve, amendments to the Transportation System Plan Project List and Figures, as proposed in Attachments 5 and 6 to the January 23, 2018 staff report including the revisions set out in the March 6, 2018 staff memorandum. Seconded by Commissioner Dunn. 7:0:0 Motion carries.*
- *Commissioner Sherwood moved to forward a recommendation to the City Council to Approve Text Amendment to the Transportation System Plan regarding additional community involvement. Seconded by Commissioner Dunn. 7:0:0 Motion carries.*

Becky, Chair Rose, if I may, the Lane County Planning Commission doesn't feel comfortable taking action of pieces of the package that as staff is presenting tonight. You can defer to a subsequent meeting to act on this. What I really want to hear from you on this piece is confirmation that you are not looking for additional information about existing projects that were-- You are not entertaining the idea of removing existing projects so that you feel comfortable with the technical edits that staff has recommended. If you do feel comfortable to act on this piece of the package you could also take action just as Springfield did.

Commissioner Rose, my fellow Commissioners, so should we wait?

Commissioner Hledik is ready to move on this piece.

Commissioner Rose, of this one piece?

Commissioner Hledik, yes.

Commissioner Rose, do I hear a motion?

***Lane County Planning Commission:***

- *Commissioner Weeks proposed a motion that the Lane County Planning Commission accepts the TSP Project list and figures as discussed. Seconded by Commissioner Hledik. 6:0:2 absent. Motion carries*
- *Commissioner Weeks propose a motion, TSP amendment include text, additional community involvement as suggested in the Lane County Planning packet. Seconded by Commissioner Hledik. 6:0:2 absent. Motion carries*

Emma, next section. The next section is the Springfield Development Code recommendation and primarily we're presenting a recommendation saying adopt with recommended revisions. Those recommended revisions are still forthcoming in your next meeting. We have some additional work to do. Various sections of the Springfield Development Code are being proposed to change to further implement the Springfield Transportation System Plan policy direction. That's the charge of this overall project. Many of the sections of the Springfield Development Code amendments received no comments beyond the support expressed by the Stakeholder Sounding Board.

A public comment was received in support of the proposed changes and staff has been asked by developers when the changes will be implemented. Some developers are awaiting the implementations so that they can help build housing to address needs in our community and use land more economically in accordance with the policies of the Transportation System Plan. She will briefly go over each section of the revisions, recommended revisions and then open up to the Planning Commission for discussion.

Staff would like direction on any potential revisions that you would like in addition to what we are presenting here for you. For table 4.2-1 it's the minimum right-of-way and curb-to-curb widths table. Staff is taking another look to see if there are additional revisions that could be made to further address concerns expressed by the Main Street business and property owners. Footnote 5 additions to the table that was presented at the February 6th Planning Commission meeting have been integrated into the current draft. That is in your packet this evening and that was with regards to ODOT facilities and commenting in regards to what you were asking earlier. Comments were also received by Ron and Michele Barth in opposition to an option to design streets without on-street parking. The currently adopted table 4.2-1 shows the current right-of-way widths as one number, which does not describe the pieces of the street that would be included. It just has one number that says, "Here is the needed minimum right-of-way", for the standard. The proposed amendment shows options for on-street parking on both, one or no side of the street. To provide more clarity on the minimum right-of-way and curb-to-curb with standards. Staff recommends keeping the table as presented and supported by the Stakeholder Sounding Board in order to provide options for context sensitive design. Decisions regarding which standard to apply in a specific situation would be decided through the development review process and could allow for a more efficient use of land in Springfield. That applies to the parking section and how the table is set out with the three different measurements as to whether there's on-street parking on both-sides, no sides, one side of the street. The arterials portion of the table we are looking at more and we'll be providing more information in your next meeting packet with regards to how to respond to the Main Street concerns. Street connectivity standards are also a section that we recommend further revisions. Staff recommends continued work on the revisions to the street connectivity standard section of the code. This will provide more clear and effective standards and keep it consistent with the local street approach direction, from the Planning Commission which will be an item discussed later this evening. So your decision later on tonight will help inform the street connectivity standard revisions.

There was also a request and we've had a meeting with Springfield Utility Board staff and they requested additional language to be included in the access ways, multi-use paths and street connectivity standards sections to ensure additional coordination with utilities for those types of projects and development. Then there is also a section in the code that pertains to the urban transition area and inserting criteria with regards to the extensions of local streets. These tie into the whole local street, street connectivity standards topic. There are little items that we're proposing further revisions. They are not ready for this evening's meeting but we are working on those and we'll bring them to your next meeting. With that, I want to open up for additional items for the Planning Commission after Becky speaks a little bit to the urban transition area.

Becky, this is the City's Development Code and at the last hearing I said that most instances this wouldn't apply directly to the urban transition area and most development would trigger annexation first. The new information which was provided in your packet is from Springfield staff, that there are instances where a property could partition in the urban transition area without annexation. Which would then trigger compliance with applicable code standards? Your co-adoption of this code is important to the City of Springfield, also keep in mind that it is Lane County policy. It was adopted as part of our Lane County Transportation System Plan to defer to cities for street standards and for TSP policies.

Emma, with that, here are the recommended items for further revision. If you have other items to discuss or questions, I'd like to take those now please.

Commissioner James, table 4.2-1. Emma, do you know what page, packet that is? Are those the street cross sections?

Emma, it is page 14 of 164 and page 15 of 164. A lot of yellow on that page if you're looking for it.

Emma, just before that section, earlier in the public streets, pages 12 through 14 are the street connectivity standards.

Commissioner James, this has changed, actually quite a bit since we initially began conversation and again, a nod to public input and listening to our citizenry and you're Planning Commissioners, and I know we've made several revisions recently, and he really appreciated that a great deal. You're taking this input and putting it into practice.

Commissioner Hledik, Greg, you brought this up at the conclusion of our last get together and that had to do with this whole topic of connectivity. As he looked at the street connectivity standards in particular. This was brought up specifically by somebody who testified at the public hearing. That section, he thinks it is 105, there are, as he recalls 10 criteria that he understands the City uses

when you're talking about connectivity and safety is one of those issues, in addition to including traffic and emergency access, and so forth.

He heard a considerable amount of testimony at the public hearing, both on connectivity within the city limits and also within the urban transition area. He understands this is a city policy issue, not a county policy issue. He never had a question that he brought up at least once, answered to me, and specifically, it's this. A lot of people are concerned about when they have currently two dead-end streets or other streets that are eventually going to connect to those, that it will increase traffic. At least some of those streets don't have sidewalks. We heard that kids walk to school along the street, not along sidewalks. We heard other concerns about traffic being diverted from other local streets now onto a relatively quiet city street, local streets. He thinks a big fear with these lines that are drawn on the maps, and I'm specifically honing in on local streets, not on the arterials or collectors but on the local streets, is that once that line gets drawn, despite whatever public input, this latest provision that we're adding would allow that those 10 points in the SDC pretty much weigh in favor of connecting the streets for connectivity purposes and it, in his opinion, ignores land use issues in terms of established neighborhoods and the peace and quiet and safety that people that live in established neighborhoods currently have.

He is fully supportive of emergency access where that is headed and he's not that familiar with the city's links of how long the streets have to be before you can have a secondary access but it seems to him that a relatively simple solution that would at least go to partly solve some of these issues is providing emergency access that doesn't create through traffic on some of these streets, and that's with a narrow lane so that a fire truck or an ambulance can go down that lane, but there are removable bollards. He knows that in other parts of the community, other communities use these things. He doesn't know if Springfield does or not, but to the extent that this could be an option for neighborhoods or neighborhood residents when they have potential development that's going to connect these streets and create this excess traffic. That'd be an option that's considered and if it isn't in the code somewhere now, he would ask the members of the Springfield Planning Commission to at least give that some consideration as this moves forward. Otherwise, he thinks there are trade-offs between local streets for emergency vehicles by all means and when you start talking about the probabilities and the fire or emergency that needs to be accessed from more than one direction versus actually diverting traffic from one busier local street through a quiet street. Personally, he thinks there needs to be some consideration given to the neighborhoods in that regard and if you talk about policies and some alternatives that could lead the middle ground in that regard, he for one would appreciate it and have that discussion at least at this time in this process.

Commissioner Rose would like to add to that. He's in a hundred percent agreement, and he'd like to put his name on that statement also.

Commissioner Landen, he thinks he agrees, but he'd like to see a way for roads to get through but he lived in Europe for a long time and they had the roads that went through but they would have occasional- I don't know what you call them but they would come out into the street and it narrowed the street to one lane. There were things that were done, they were elevated, the crosswalks. There were things that forced you to, yes you could go through there which is the purpose of what the city's trying to do but you couldn't do it in 50 miles an hour. If you were going faster than 25 you're going to have problems. He's just suggesting that would be a great mix to have your cake and eat it too.

Commissioner Koivula wants to weigh in on that as well. Very much thank you for your comments. He doesn't select to suggest that some of the issues regarding currently existing dead-end streets that could be in fact the extent of not just for connectivity but also to serve undeveloped parcels beyond the current dead end could be handled with a hammerhead or a cul-de-sac being built entirely inside the developed area. Especially in areas where the connectivity standards of what is 30 houses has not yet been achieved. Say, you'd have 26 houses then you're going to go over your 30 so maybe you do need a through street, or some other form of emergency access. But if you've got nine or 10 houses on one street that currently dead ends, and you're going to develop another 14 houses in a developed parcel. Why can't the developed parcel simply build either a hammerhead or a cul-de-sac for their connectivity, or for their service? The other thing he'd like to point out is in the packet comments from February 6th to 13th, one of our noted area planners who's also in the audience who works for CDC Management corporation, mentioned something about how lines on paper as they're actually drawn, do eventually lead to construction of the street within that corridor. If I'm not mistaken that's how I read his comment. It was on page 18 of 103 by our esteemed colleague, Mr. Farrington. It seems to him as if these local streets are approved at least in regard to just the connectivity, that does lead to the point that the streets actually will be constructed.

Commissioner James, before we continue he knows there's some overlap here on the street map issue and code issue, as it relates to connectivity. Commissioners, we as subsequent to this, we certainly will be discussing the maps and those issues, but he's heard some comments related to connectivity, and that was one of the topics you were asking for information related to. Would you like to respond?

Emma, this exemplifies that there is some more work to be done on this section. Proposing to have these revisions, and think about this some more and bringing it to a future meeting is helpful. She did want to highlight in the packet for the City Council page 11 and 13. We provided some information in response to Commissioner Hledik about the context sensitive design. There's text from the Transportation System Plan included here that talks about, "Okay, maybe not every street is created the same way. How can we have variety in the system to meet the context of that specific location?" Then, in response to Commissioner Landen's comments from the former February 6th meeting, there's some additional information about policies, and elements of the Transportation System Plan that talk about traffic calming options, and how there are different streets with different features, and a local setting, whether it is a neighborhood context. Streets should be built differently than on some larger streets that are connecting the bigger network, and expecting higher-volumes, and higher speeds of traffic. Those two items she just wants to highlight for you. She asked if Michael Liebler Springfield Transportation Engineer wants to say anything with regards to anything you heard, or if we want to just defer to the next packet, and keep moving, and say, "We'll bring more information about this topic forward?"

Commissioner James, you have a couple of other things, coordination with utilities. He thinks that was reflective of a comment that was made by one of our County Commissioners.

Emma. Yes, from Springfield Utility Board. That was specific to adding utility coordination language to the street connectivity centers, multi-use paths, and access ways sections of the code. Are there any items that Commissioners would like to see as a full Planning Commission, direction provided to staff, or further revision? Or, are these the remaining pieces that we need to look at further?

Commissioner Koivula, Further revisions for anything within the code?

Emma, within the Springfield Development Code amendments.

Commissioner Koivula, yes. He's got three particular items. One of which is, again, my reiteration of the sidewalk code. He believes that, as the code is proposed, revised right now that that could cause, potentially, massive costs to developers and achieving little safety standards improvement. That's the obstruction standards, and he would like to see that revised, to say that, "in general, existing utilities should be allowed within the side walk, in general. Particularly, everything that's large and would be expensive to move. Large electrical junction boxes, Large water heater boxes, sanitary sewers, storm drains, water meters, small water meters you can move easily, small junction boxes you can't," but he would like to see that, in general, existing utilities should be allowed, unless, in special circumstances, they can- the city engineer can deny that.

He think it's generally better to allow, unless there's special circumstances, rather than disallow, unless special circumstances. Because, then, the reasons for disallowing them are much clearer to the developer. He thinks that that one really needs some revision. He's mentioned that three times, and as yet, to my thinking, it hasn't been addressed. Also, he would like to speak about bike parking. There's a couple of minor revisions that he's finally have written out that he would like to give on that, but he would really would like to see a lot more long-term bike parking, particularly in institutional settings. Because he thinks that, in general, those are bike commuters, and he would like to see the more long-term, secure bike parking.

Also, he has some pretty serious objections to the parking allowances. The existing code says that there is a 20% reduction, maximum, with a professional traffic study, and special approval required. The new proposed code allows for an automatic 25% reduction, with no traffic study, and no special approval. He thinks that lack of parking is not necessarily going to increase transit used in a lot of businesses. What is going to happen instead is that employees of a business are going to be forced out to on-street parking. You're going to end with something like, there is over in Eugene, at 11th in Garfield, where all on-street parking in the residential zones are completely used by employees of some of the large employers. Because it's a couple of really large employers that have, literally, no parking for their employees. His proposal is that he'd like to see either, require a study and approval for 25% maximum, or go back to the 20% maximum, with no study and approval, or require reserved areas for parking if impacts are noted on the surrounding properties. Alternatively, leave the code as it is.

Commissioner James, okay, it's exactly what the staff is asking, so he appreciates his attention to that.

Commissioner Sherwood wants a second on the flush mount utility issue. He has heard this brought up multiple times. He feels that the response hasn't been detailed enough to warrant moving forward he thinks it will be extremely costly, and he wants to know why we are going to change all of this. When he read the language, it seemed to me that any time there was an existing utility in the sidewalk, then it would have to be moved any time some sort of development was to occur. He thinks that's unreasonable. At least, unless you can convince him otherwise.

Emma, thinks it would be helpful to understand that this is a full Planning Commission direction, or these are just individual Commissioners commenting?

Commissioner Dunn, he won't go over all of them again. On a few of them, he has heard that stakeholder board, like with the long-term parking maybe, as a counter-balance to his request, if there was any discussion on that in the stakeholder board, if we could have, maybe, some of those comments to further understand why it was done the way it was, to, maybe, help to see if there is a consensus on changing it, or if it had just been hammered out before. Maybe there are some pieces missing in the stakeholder board to the Planning Commission. He would maybe, second trying to pull a little more language from that to see if that may solve some of the concerns.

Commissioner James, the parking issue, he tends to agree that the—although, what he heard, previously, from my fellow Commissioner was, we didn't want to block development. However, what you've tried to do is ease that a bit by raising that standard to 25% without a traffic survey. What he's hearing is the impact of that could be very negative. As we develop out, the on-street parking often is a difficult issue. He would tend to agree that we should follow those standards that were previously stated. As far as the utilities, again, we need to think in terms of making the development a little simpler, rather than more complex for those folks who are trying to develop. He would have another look at that, and see if you can incorporate some language in a way that inculcates that kind of thinking. He doesn't think, right now, a few of your Commissioners don't feel fully comfortable.

Emma, just to reiterate what they're hearing, she heard some concerns about the street connectivity standards, and different options for local street design. Sidewalk code, looking at the obstruction language in that section of the development code amendments. Bike parking, looking at more long-term parking, specifically in institutional settings, and providing more information as to the basis for the proposed recommendations. We can come back with options. Then, the last item is, the parking reduction options, and providing those buffet of options to developers, to reduce up to a certain amount, without a traffic impact study. We can come back with those items, and add them to the list that's under the suggested action.

Emma asked if she needs a motion for that, or we just consider that correct--

Mary Bridget Smith Springfield Counsel replied that no motion is necessary.

Commissioner James, now, onto the street management.

Emma, going into the fun stuff. Okay. Staff is recommending a split map approach that separates the draft Conceptual Street Map from previous meetings into two maps. Emma explained what that looks like. This approach helps separate the required road plan elements from the useful visual planned local streets, and that was a topic of discussion for the Planning Commission at the last meeting. It also helps clarify where the adopted maps will be located, and how they'll be adopted. We've taken two layers, and separated them out, calling one the Conceptual Street Map, and one the Local Street Network Map. Options are presented later on this evening's discussion for the Planning Commission to decide the approach to take, with the local streets reflected on the Local Street Network Map, which is exhibit C, right there on the right-hand of the slide, or whether or not to keep the map at all. Map 1, the new Conceptual Street Map retains the existing and planned arterials, collectors, and multi-use paths layer of the original map. We just lifted that off, and removed all the local streets, and that's what that left-hand side packet, exhibit B is.

Commissioner James, for the record, those are the elements that must remain in the TSP.

Emma, correct. They are required to fulfill the transportation planning rule state requirements.

Emma, map two. The new Local Street Network Map consists of the planned local street layer from the previous draft Conceptual Street Map, and puts the planned local streets on their own map. The planned local streets were the topic of the vast majority of the comments received, as commissioner Hledik was alluding to earlier, and with the locations he listed. Staff will now move onto the recommendation discussions for each of these maps. We'll take them one at a time, and she thinks this will help to focus in discussion.

Commissioner Koivula questioned part that is possible. He does see that the existing and planned arterials and collector are required. The multi-use paths, are they actually required to be shown, again, as lines on paper? It appeared to me as if, what we're talking about is, just improving, or having a general plan for bicycle connections, rather than actually specific projects.

Emma, correct. The multi-use paths planned pieces on the map are technically not required by the rule for the road plan itself, but are useful and are helpful. They do fulfill other goals and policy direction. Although, that specific element is represented on this map is not required. Thank you for clarifying. For the Conceptual Street Map, we recommend adopting the Conceptual Street Map, showing existing and planned arterials, collectors and multi-use paths with the revisions, as a new TSP figure 12. This map will be located in the Transportation System Plan, similar to the other figures that we were talking about earlier this evening.

As described with the two map approach that she just went through, the Conceptual Street Map, now, does not show any planned local streets, which were the primary topic of most of the public comments received during the public hearing. State law requires, as we were talking about, the adoption of this map to fulfill the transportation planning rule requirements for a road plan that shows both existing, and future classifications of the street network. This map, primarily, reflects already adopted Transportation System Plan projects, but it puts it all in one place, so that it fulfills the road plan requirements.

Emma would like to note that the map does show a Main Street, which was a topic that was commented on. It's simply identifying its current classification as a minor arterial, which is already established and adopted in TSP Figure 2: Existing Street Classification map. This Conceptual Street Map describes the current type of street that Main Street is, and does not propose any changes from the existing conditions for Main Street. It's just saying, "This is what Main Street is today, here it is reflected as this type of street." The recommended revisions are as follows, and also, are provided on the screen for a high-level summary.

Adjustment, similar to what we did earlier, adjustment of PB-32, McKenzie River path, McKenzie Levee Path to 52nd Street, to be fully inside of the Springfield urban growth boundary, and that's the same comment as what we talked about earlier. The addition of an arrow to the northern extent of South 26 Street, plan multi-use path connection, and this responds to comments from the Springfield Utility Board, and it's supported by SUB.

The addition of the arrow indicates the conceptual nature of the path connection, and additional details for that path connection can be further defined through either the master planning process, when UGB expansion area is fully acknowledged, or the upcoming Lane County pedestrian and bicycle master planning process with additional conversations with Springfield Utility Board, and Willamalane. Willamalane has the Middle Fork Path, which that connection would tie into. We also recommend removing the minor collector along Oakfield Avenue from Pleasant Boulevard to Game Farm Road, and keeping that existing local street classification for that one block segment. Staff recommends the adoption of this Conceptual Street Map, with the recommended revisions as described and shown on the draft map dated 2.26.18. The Conceptual Street Map without planned local streets shown is ready for recommendation, and after the Planning Commission discusses the new Conceptual Street Map, we'll move into the approach for the local streets, which I know a lot of you are waiting to talk about.

Commissioner James asked for questions from the Commissioners. Does this process make sense to the Planning Commission to pull those two pieces apart? It certainly does, from my standpoint. I appreciate this approach, and we can deal with the whole local street issue separately. Does that make sense?

Commissioner Dignam wonders, though, if the split of the map is a distinction without a difference. Because we still will have a map that has those local streets on it. It's my understanding that, even if we don't include the local streets into the TSP, if they're on this map number two, the city could still move forward with construction of those proposed local streets, regardless of whether we've incorporated that into the TSP. That's the first question, whether I'm correct in that. Then, secondly, it's his understanding, under previous combined map, that having that local street included would require a property owner to do a development review, if they wanted to develop their property, taking into consideration that line on the map. Is that still the case if we split things up? If you could answer those two questions for me, if the answer is that, that really doesn't change, then he's not really sure what we're accomplishing for the public and property owners by splitting this map.

Emma, yes. She'll take a go at it, and then if Becky wants to chime in. One of the reasons for this split map approach is to clarify that the arterials, collectors portion, they relate to the Transportation System Plan. They're responding to state law requirements for the transportation planning rule. It's something that we need to have. That makes sense to locate in the Transportation System Plan. The local streets are, primarily, as Springfield develops, to provide that system connectivity with the local street system. That's primarily happening through our development review, and it makes sense to put it in the Springfield Development Code, so that it pairs with the street connectivity standards, and the development requirement pieces. Previously, she thinks that was a little bit confusing, showing two different layers of a map, but then, one applies over here, and one applies over here. By splitting this out, we're hoping to provide clarity on the reason for having the different pieces, and where they reside, and what planning requirements they're responding to.

Becky thanked the commissioners for their question. What this action is suggesting, is that you consider a map that shows arterials, collectors, and bike paths, or multi-use paths. The local street piece, we're saving the best for last. Your decision on map one is separate from what we're going to talk about next with the local street. You did, unanimously, recommend approval of the new projects, and indicated that you didn't want to tinker with existing projects. That's what this map does. It shows all the proposed and existing TSP projects on one map, to fulfill some state law requirements, and it takes off the local streets. She heard that you're supportive of this city pursuing code amendments to their street connectivity standards, to partially address all of the controversy that we've received on a Local Street Map. You already showed support to move toward addressing more of the content concerns, and then we'll get to the second map about local streets next.

Commissioner Dignam supports including the arterials, and connectors, and multi-use paths on map one, but staff didn't really answer his question regarding map two. He asked if Emma/Becky was saying to hold off on that until later in the meeting, because he asked two very specific questions, Emma/Becky didn't answer either of them.

Emma responded that yes, for the local streets, they have three different options to present, and that's the next piece. They're trying to see if they can get to agreement with the Conceptual Street Map for the required planned arterials, collectors, and multi-use paths. That shows the existing and planned for these, so that they can, then, move into that conversation about, "Here are a few different options about how to approach and respond to the public comments heard on the local streets and the connectivity."

Commissioner Dignam responded that that's fine, as long as before the evening is out, or before our discussion is done that there is in this evening, he needs those two questions of his answered.

Commissioner Koivula, He would like to say that he approves that partially. One question that he has is, since the proposed bike paths, other than, say, for instance the wayside lane, according to our pre-approved 2014 list which, there was a lot of controversy on some of the bike paths as well. If the multi-use paths are not required to be included in the Conceptual Street Map, what does including them, what goal or what additional help does including them bring?

Emma: It shows more of a comprehensive network for people walking and biking throughout Springfield, and some planned projects that would provide connections and key locations where there currently isn't a facility that you can walk or bike along. It's not necessarily required to be on the map. If that is something that you want to propose, removing the multi-use paths, and just having the existing and planned arterials and collectors, that is an option. She thinks that there has been good review, and development of some key connections that would be beneficial to the Springfield community. As the community develops, having that vision for, "Here's where we really could benefit from bike and pedestrian path connections, instead of trying to retrofit and try to fit them in later on, having it in our plans sooner rather than later is beneficial.

Commissioner James would be in support of that inclusion because, often, we have opportunities to reach out for some grants, and things of that nature to offset some cost. When you have in your transportation systems plan that path network, it's much easier to leverage local funds, and pull in some additional outside funding. We've seen that in the past with rivers-to-ridges, and some other planning tools that have been used in the local region. For the City of Springfield, his personal feeling is, having that in the TSP with those connectors and arterials say, "This is an important element of transportation. It's part of that high-level transportation support."

Commissioner Vohs asked question as well, the need to turn one map into two, and it's primarily because the thrust of public comment has been on projects, specific projects, and not on mapping.

Commissioner Sherwood asked a clarifying question for staff. When we approach this process, amending the TSP, moving forward projects over the next couple of years, since this happens every two years. Every once a while?

Emma answered that the TSP is updated periodically.

Commissioner Sherwood: Hypothetically, next time they come to this, if they split this into two maps, is the Conceptual Street Map portion of this brought back up. If you have new connectivity, suggestions, and black lines, will those be brought back up with the TSP, or would those be separate because they're only part of the SDC?

Emma answered that the black lines are representing the planned local streets, and it might be beneficial for the conversation to go on to the local street options, have that conversation, and then come back to this piece, because she thinks that this piece is really a lot simpler, but you are wanting to get to the next piece of conversation. If it's helpful to move on, go to the next item down, and then move back to this.

Commissioner James thinks as he read this, is the splitting of these maps, that secondary map, they have flexibility to deal with those specific issues, there, within that map, that we had probably could amended relation to, and hold this piece harmless, and focus on that. One of the things that they could certainly choose to do is not to adopt those Local Street Maps. It would be one end of the continuum. Staff certainly are going to advocate for having some level of support for that, and, probably, rightfully so. He thinks Emma is right. Why doesn't the Commission move on, and then they can come back to-- They generally understand that Conceptual Street Map now reflects the arterials, what it reflects, so let's move into the second piece.

Emma: In response to public input, and discussion, and comments from the Planning Commission at the previous meetings, staff provided a variety of different options for how to approach the local streets. The planned local streets were the topic of the majority of public comments, as she said several times. Staff is asking instruction from the Planning Commission, regarding how to respond to the public comments. The recommended revisions presented are in direct response to public comments, and are intended to address the community concerns, while also fulfilling the project goals, and the direction that was given at the beginning for this project.

Staff will prepare the Planning Commission's final order and recommendation, in accordance with the direction received in preparation for the next meeting, so that you can make your full recommendation at that point. This will be helpful guidance to hear tonight. Emma will walk through each of the options, starting with option one, which is the option supported by the staff. First, she would like to talk a little bit about local streets in general, and the purpose of this [unintelligible 01:19:08], time and space. Future local streets need to exist to make system connectivity connections, and are required to fulfill State Planning requirements, and City Policy. We need to have local street connections. As we build Springfield, streets need to serve the different land uses, and connect different destinations. How those specific local streets are aligned to provide connectivity is flexible. When development occurs, the City needs to have a framework in place, to determine how street connectivity will be implemented, as Springfield grows. When a local street connection is implemented, often by development, a more detailed level of analysis is done. This analysis takes into account private developers, and preferences for the layout of their site, current wetland conditions, and other factors that may change over time.

The draft map that was developed, with the planned local streets shown provides a starting point that can be adjusted, as long as the street connectivity, and other development code requirements are met. Development occurs when private property owners choose to develop their property. The street connections would be constructed at time of development, based on the property owner's choice and timing. There are planned local street connections shown on the map that could be built decades from now, or never built, depending on the property owner's development choices. The city provides the framework, and then it's up to individual property owners to choose what they do with their property and land.

Showing the planned local streets on a map is not required by the State Transportation Planning Rule, but showing a planned Local Street Map is one way to help meet the Transportation Planning Rule requirements. Having a map that visually and clearly conveys to the community and developers planned future street network connections is a helpful customer service tool, and communication tool. You can look at the map and understand, "Okay, this is what the future could look like." Option one consists of adopting the Local Street Network Map with revisions. The Local Street Network Map is the planned local street layer from the former draft Conceptual Street Map. We lifted off all the local streets, put them on this map. We're still providing the arterials and collectors as a faded base layer, so it's like a one-stop location where people could see all the different pieces. The real focus of this map is those planned local streets shown in black lines. The recommended revisions are as follows, covering these different items.

Emma will go through each location that they're recommending revisions. First off is Fairhaven Street. The recommendation is to remove the two proposed conceptual local streets connecting with Fairhaven Street. The reasoning for this is that the public comments provided to the Planning Commission highlighted the communal ownership of the green space, as well as a reserved strip of property, located directly in front of the northern fence. The comments also included a copy of the declaration of covenants, conditions, and restrictions for Fairhaven subdivision, that defines the common areas, decision-making process, and property rights that would be in effect, if a change of use of either piece of property in question were to be considered. Initially, the two planned local streets were shown to indicate options that would increase connectivity, and further implement TSP policies.

However, based on the comments received that highlighted the development agreement, and reserve strip property, staff is recommending removing the two planned local streets from the map. Any future development in the area would evaluate connectivity, and be reviewed at time of development. They'll still have to fulfill connectivity, and go through the development review process. Staff is recommending removal of those two, and the first visual on the top left there shows that new, updated portion of the map, as reflected in your packet.



For Don Street and Lochaven Avenue intersection--

Commissioner Hledik asked Emma to remind the Commission, which of these is inside the city limits, and which of these is outside?

Emma answered that the gray is showing the area inside of the city limits. The only one up here, on the screen, that is outside the city limits are, the Thurston Middle School area and 65th Street, over on the right-left fourth item.

For Don Street and Lochaven Avenue intersection, the recommendation is to remove local planned street connections, and a Transportation System Plan study project, could be entitled S-17 with description, study street connectivity and traffic calming improvements, and I-5/Harlow Road/Laura Street/Highway 126 Area, which would encompass that whole neighborhood. Public comments indicated that connecting Don Street and Lochaven Avenue has been brought up previously. Many of the 30 comments received about this topic have expressed concern about speeding and safety if the barrier at Don Street and Lochaven Avenue were to be removed. This study project would also be able to evaluate and further engage community members.

Discussing the potential Clear Vue Lane street connection, which was presented in the staff memo handed out at the February 6, 2018 public hearing. Given that street connectivity in this area has been brought up at least two times in the past, adding a study project described above, to conduct a comprehensive study of the neighborhood, could address some of the concerns expressed. This study would provide an identified process to help achieve the TSP policy goals, including system connectivity, direct travel routes, and safety in the area, with additional community involvement to identify future potential projects, and connections throughout the neighborhood. As talked about earlier, it could also take into account traffic calming ways to physically design the neighborhood, so that freight traffic would be highly discouraged from cutting through the neighborhood, but additional connectivity could be achieved. It would be a more comprehensive conversation with the neighborhood.

Commissioner James: Just from my insight, this is the one where we had the two streets that turned [inaudible 01:25:08] block in between the two?

Emma responded that yes. That's currently a gate. We own all of the right-of-way, but it does not connect for cars to go through right now.

Commissioner James added that this would really look at the bigger picture?

Emma continued that they would look at the full neighborhood.

Commissioner James added that it could be a number of years before that plan would occur.

Emma answered yes. The study would be added to the TSP, and then the timing will depend on City priorities, and funding, and when we decide to focus on it. It would earmark it as, "Okay, this is the topic that we've heard a lot about, and clearly, it needs to have a more involved conversation that looks at all the different bits and pieces."

Emma continued, for 31<sup>st</sup> Street and Yolanda Avenue area- this one is also in the county. This screen is not showing it very well enough, but this is a county one, 3 and 4 are in the county. The proposal is to revise planned local streets to align, as shown up on the screen, and in your packet. The reasoning for this, is that the proposed alignment for the planned local street in this area, based on a public comment from Earl McElhany, that was provided at the February 6, 2018 public hearing, and was also supported by a couple of the neighbors in the area. That's why we're bringing this proposal forward. Since then, Mr. McElhany provided additional information regarding the wetlands in the area, and worked with staff to provide an alternative layout of local streets to reduce impacts to the wetlands. There's a wetland that runs northwest to southeast through that section where we, now, don't have any planned local streets shown. Staff further revised McElhany's suggestions to fulfill the Springfield Development Code, block length, and other standards. The planned local street alignment shown above also incorporates feedback from Jim Branch, who owns property in the area, and has been speaking with City staff to provide input on his preferred depiction of the planned local streets in the area. Both Mr. McElhany and Mr. Branch have confirmed that they prefer the alignment shown and presented to you this evening, and it responds to the wetland concerns expressed by Paul Bedortha and Brian Jones at the February 6, 2018 public hearing.

Emma continued Aaron Lane and 65<sup>th</sup> Street, staff will revise Aaron Lane and 65<sup>th</sup> Street portion of the Conceptual Street Map, and Local Street Network Map before council review, based on collaborative meetings with SUB. This one is pending some additional revisions, but the recommendation is to revise it, based on the collaborative meetings we're having. Staff met with the

Springfield Utility Board, to learn more about their planned water treatment facility at the north end of 65<sup>th</sup> Street, where they own that property that was raised in their comments. SUB is in the process of reworking the conceptual design for this site, in order to fulfill secondary emergency access requirements and provide increased pedestrian and bicycle connectivity to and from Thurston Middle School. This planned alternative neighborhood route would provide a multi-use path, and local street option for students traveling to and from school from the neighborhood, that does not require using Thurston Road, which has higher traffic volumes and speeds than the neighborhood streets and path connections would. SUB plans to share the revised proposal with staff in March, in order to bring the proposed revisions forward in time for City Council consideration, or possibly in time for your next meeting, depending on the timing of that. Emma will get the information as soon as it's available. Staff also plans to share the revised proposal, when it's available, with adjacent property owners, Chris Davidson and Dawn Craig property owners of 918 66<sup>th</sup> Street who have provided some input and once we start working through the revisions, we'll be looping back around with them, and making sure that they're a part of the conversation.

Lastly, Emma would like to highlight that the header of the map, since they split the map, now reads, and this is to provide more clarity, the Springfield Local Street Network is an adopted as a land use regulation that depicts connection points of planned local streets. The alignment of the planned local streets shown can be adjusted consistent with Springfield Development Code, street connectivity standards, and other code requirements. It directs people to the chapter 4.2 of the Development Code.

Emma would also like to note that in the staff report and findings on Exhibit E in your attachment 3. The findings that were presented to you at your last meeting have been incorporated into the staff report and findings, as well as additional findings regarding Kalmia Street that had been added in response to comments that they've received since the public hearing, but were presented into the record. That's near the end of the packet. If you're looking in the paper packet, it's page 145 of 164, all the way to page 163 of 164. That provides the findings with support to the other locations that we heard in public comments. Staff recommends this option for a variety of reasons. Staff continues to look at the approach for local streets, and evaluate the planned local streets shown on the map, that people testified about. This approach with the recommended revisions responds to public comments received, and additional information received regarding several street locations, while maintaining future local street connections that are necessary, according to the street connectivity, dead-end street, block length and perimeter standards in the Springfield Development Code, as well as the Oregon Fire Code.

It also provides a visual representation of the envisioned Springfield transportation system connectivity, which helps to create a clear, more objective and efficient development process. People can easily look at the map and understand it, but they typically do not look through the code in as much detail and piece together the various different requirements to envision a future street network. With as much clarity as a visual map provides, anyone can look at it, and understand, "Okay, that's a map, I see a line. It makes sense."

Adopting the Local Street Network Map supports reaching housing and development density goals set by the City in accordance with state requirements and ensures that local street connections are built as part of development. This approach furthers the implementation of the Transportation System Plan policies in a timely manner. Local street comments that were received, but are not proposed for revisions, have those findings added into the staff report. That is option one. That is what staff is recommending, but she would also like to present option two and three, based on feedback that we've heard from the Planning Commissions.

Option two would be, do not adopt map with planned local street connection points, and defer to the text requirements in the Springfield Development Code. Staff would still like to continue refining the street connectivity standard that we've talked about earlier this evening, as part of the Development Code text. This responds to public comments wanting planned local streets removed. State planning requirements would be met with code language alone, rather than a combination of a map, and code language. Although the streets would no longer be shown on the map visually, street connections will be built, over time, as Springfield development occurs.

Based on the Springfield Development Code text, requirements to further implement the transportation policies and direction. This approach would simplify the TSP implementation project approval process, but could prompt feelings of distrust among community members later, if they perceived a street was removed from the map, but then it ended up being built. Additionally, developers would not have a visual representation of an option to help achieve the City's street connectivity policies and code provisions. Staff, who work in the development review process, daily, see a lot of value in having a visual representation of the planned future local street connection points, and this option would not provide that visual.

Commissioner James asked if other communities the size of Springfield, typically have a Local Street Map like this?

Emma responded that they do it different ways. Staff is looking at Hillsboro and they have a Local Street Map, and then they zoom into different neighborhoods. There's different ways the different municipalities approach it, but she thinks that this is a nice hybrid. There's the text, and the visuals. The visuals are starting point, but then there are opportunities to revise through the development process.

Option three has two parts. 3A and 3B, but the main piece of option three is to adopt the Local Street Map, showing planned local streets, and then, choose either 3A or 3B. 3A would be to slow down and conduct more outreach. If you choose that option, we want to hear more about what you would want that to involve. Option 3B is to visually remove local streets that have opposition, that haven't been resolved through the conversations that we've been having. For instance, SUB and the 31st and Yolanda property owners.

Commissioner James asked about Delrose and some others.

Emma continued, this option responds to public comments received and provides visual representation of the envisioned Springfield Transportation System connectivity. This creates that clear and more efficient development process. Option 3A would take more time and resources, if the Planning Commission does recommend this, staff would like to hear more from them, what you would want that additional outreach to consist of, and what you're trying to achieve with that route. Option 3B could remove local streets that continue to have opposition. Option 3B is similar to option two, because it would simplify the TSP implementation project approval process, but could also prompt feelings of distrust among community members later, if they perceived that a street has been removed, but then it actually gets built, due to development and the code provisions. Emma would also like to note that she had one error in the memo. She meant to note that it was A and B street west of Mill Street, which is what the slide says. The packet said Water Street. A and B Streets west of Mill Street was what that meant to read. Then, Becky has a comment on this as well.

Becky continued that the urban transition area testimony was largely directed at the local streets, as you know. The Commissions are supportive of the City continuing to work on the street connectivity standards. The streets listed on this slide, about half of them are in the urban transition area and staff recommendation only addresses two of those specifically with the map, but the rest of them are addressed through findings. Again, we're looking to you for direction on how to approach this Local Street Map.

Commissioner Hledik asked so he can understand, the Conceptual Street Map, back to the outline, the arterials and collectors that are shown on that are previously approved without the transportation planning goals?

Emma answered yes. The arterials and collectors are either existing or are in the TSP as a project.

Commissioner Hledik: Whereas, in this local network map, these streets are not previously approved. Correct?

Emma: Correct.

Commissioner Hledik continued, he thinks there's the big difference between the two types of roads that he's talking about here. Those that are already in the TSP and these are not. That's the distinction between the two maps. Can we go to the first project? Since that's in the urban transition area. Let's assume that that black line that proposed Local Street goes across private property. The developer is ready to do his thing, and needs to build a road. Is he correct that, by adding this text, this public review for Type I and Type II reviews, would give the people that live on Aaron and Jules an opportunity to comment on the street configuration?

Emma answered that it would depend on what level of development. If someone's building a single-family home on a property that they own, they can go ahead and do that. If it's in this location where Springfield Utility Board (SUB) is building a water treatment facility, that's a large level of development that people would be notified in the text that you're referring to.

Commissioner Hledik continued, if they are developing and building 20 homes.

Emma answered yes.

Commissioner Hledik asked what kind of input is that. Is that a public hearing? How do they voice their concerns?

Emma answered that there are public hearing opportunities.

Emma asked Mary Bridget if she would like to speak more to that process.

Mary Bridget thought it would probably be through the Site Plan Review process, which would include public notice to surrounding property owners. Then, they would have the opportunity, then, to respond to the City. Potentially appear at Planning Commission, if there was a Planning Commission hearing, even an appeal. Depending on what level would be. Most likely, that's where you get.

Commissioner Hledik asked if there will be an opportunity. Okay. Does that exist now, or is that because we're including this caveat?

Emma answered no that exists now. That's taking the language from the Development Code that's already adopted, and locating it there to make it clearer.

Commissioner Hledik, Jules and Aaron connect to two north-south streets, let's say. That one looks like it's a dead end, the one that would be on the left side. Now, let's say that's the street that people that live there don't want traffic coming from Thurston Middle School driving down. Okay? That's where they want to put emergency access maybe, but not a through street. He appreciates Emma responding to his question last week, but in terms of this context-sensitive variation, what bothers him is that it says- upon City Engineer approval, it says, "Depending on case-specific issues, such as topography and environmental constraints." It does not specify neighborhood livability, and neighborhood safety issues. That's the hang up that he interpret, the public telling us about before, is that, "Okay, we worked-in the public hearing process, where they get notice of this local street improvement." They can bring it before the planning director, or the public hearing, but then, what case do they make? Right now, he's been in front of you all before, I look at these words, wall locators no topographic or environmental constraint, but he's got some real issues with safety, quiet or whatever. He wants to make sure that folks have the opportunity to make that case. That's what he would ask the Springfield Planning Commission to roll into this. He came in here ready to fight against this map, but thinks he understands how it can work provided, for good land use attorneys, they've got this code memorized. However, as we've sensed from 200 people that came to the hearings over the past couple of months. Emma, you brought it up kind-of-thing. This kind of stuff needs to be stated right on the map, because this is a framework map, subject to change, subject to Planning Director review, public hearing process, opportunity seeking for, opportunities to provide for emergency access rather than through traffic, based on not just topographic and environmental constraints, but neighborhood issues. He would really hope that that sort of caveat language could be right on the map because most folks aren't going to pick up, most folks, except, unless you're a groupie, aren't going to pick up the big plans and start digging through here and understand at all. They will pick up that map see that there is a black line connecting their neighborhood and need to understand right on there, what their opportunities and rights are for public consideration. Okay? If that's in there, then I'm a whole lot more comfortable with this.

Commissioner James: You pointed to the Local Street Map header in your opening comments, and that resonates with me strongly and he appreciates that a great deal. He thinks that's incredible for the public to understand. He thinks that's what we felt was some misunderstanding with the public around what these lines mean on this map, and how can he as a citizen voice my concerns? He thinks the points in relation to livability, safety, those other issues are what you heard when you heard us discussing the connectivity issues and some other ways that deal with some of those things. We're hearing that from our citizens.

Commissioner Thorp, he generally agrees with what Commissioner Hledik has said, but before he gets there, there is one housekeeping item he has to take care of. For the record, my name is Larry Thorp, County Planning Commissioner. He did not attend either of your wonderful public hearings that went on for six hours, but instead he listened to it on tape to the sound of keyboard next to the microphone. He did review the staff reports so he feels like I'm qualified to participate. That being said, this is predominantly a Springfield [unintelligible 01:43:48] When they look at the local streets, apparently there're only two that are in the transition areas, sounds like staff has pretty good control of both of those. The McElhany property and he believe dealing with SUB on the other piece. Having had a considerable experience dealing with land-use issues, he fully agrees with Commissioner Hledik. There needs to be abundantly clear for the residents of Springfield, and those few people who might be affected in the early transition area, that those black lines are strictly illustrative. In the county staff report was some language that he didn't see it in the City report, but he's sure it came from the City on the language about the [unintelligible 1:44:43] Street map being illustrative, but the word, "illustrative" was not used and he would suggest that in the second sentence after the word, "shown", we insert "is illustrative only and" so it makes it absolutely clear that the line is clearly that. The way it is written, the default is to follow the line and then you have to establish some reason to go elsewhere, if you don't want to follow that line, and what he is proposing is language, which will make it clear that, that line is purely illustrative and the field is open for the actual location of the street, there is no default to the line.

Becky apologized for the confusion. This option one, identifies corrections to two urban transition area local streets but option three lists all of the many other local streets that we heard, public opposition to, and over half of them, she would say, are in the urban transition area, at least nine.

Commissioner Thorp misunderstood the quantity, but he thinks that makes his point all the more important is the perspective of the County. What the City elects to do within the City is the City's prerogative.

Commissioner Dignam would still like a little clarification on his earlier question, but he'd like to restate or maybe simplify it a little bit. The question regarding how is this second map really helping us? With option one, you're recommending that we erase a couple of those black lines, four of them as he recalls, but that obviously, means there're still quite a few black lines on the local street network map, in map number two. If he is a property owner and he has in map number two, the local street network map, a black line going right by my property, how is that any different than what it was under the previous proposal where we had the maps consolidated and he had a black line going by my property? How is this different from the property owner's perspective?

Becky apologized upfront, she's not going to probably answer your question exactly as you've stated them, but what she would observe is you're absolutely right. What she heard some of your fellow Commissioners say is that the relationship to the street connectivity standards was really important to understand, before making a decision on the Local Street Map. What she's hearing is, rather than having you just select option one, two or three, whether to adopt a modified map, not adopt the map at all. That you really want to see some code changes that help implement, and guide a map. Then come back and decide whether there needs to be a companion map to the Code is what she's hearing, because you asked a question that I think is difficult to answer. Unless Emma has a specific answer?

Emma answered that Becky is correct, that this is not different for the places that there still are planned local streets shown on the map. The value in showing a visual representation of [planned local streets is that, it clearly presents an option for street connections in the future street network. Therefore, community members can understand that easily, developers can come in and have a starting point. Then they can look at the detailed code criteria that were spoken to earlier in the street connectivity standard section, to make sure they are fulfilling all the requirements, but it provides a clear starting point and we can't just get rid of local streets. We can't just say, "Okay, Springfield is not building any more local streets ever again, because that doesn't fulfill the state requirements." We need to provide access to sites as they develop, and we have policies stating there needs to be connectivity, so people can take direct routes, and move throughout the transportation system. There are certain requirements to have local streets and to develop them over time. It's more a question of how does the Planning Commission want to approach this, and what's the most useful way to respond to the public comments that you've heard.

Commissioner Dignam continued that Randy in his recent comment said he now understood the difference and why we have two maps, but Commissioner Dignam doesn't understand it. What difference? You're saying it makes no difference to put these new black lines on map number two that it's still the same as having the black line on map number one, then what is map number two accomplishing? Why are we splitting it apart? He doesn't understand.

Becky replied that she can explain the value of splitting the maps apart so that the map showing the arterials and collectors can be adopted as part of the TSP, and separate from the discussion about local street, maps, or connectivity, which is a much more complex issue and will take more time. The value of the Local Street Map is probably debatable and that's something that staff is seeking the Commissions direction on.

Commissioner Dignam, if he is a property owner though, it doesn't make any difference. It's what he thinks he heard Becky say. The impact is the same to me. From the city perspective, and administrator perspective perhaps there's some distinction here, but from the property owner's perspective, he doesn't see any distinction.

Becky asked if Commissioner Hledik's comments about what he would like to see Springfield address in the street connectivity standards, that in tandem with a map that provided some guidance to implement the code, she thinks could be a value to a property owner is one scenario that she can imagine.

Commissioner Koivula, as someone who was formerly a mapping professional, he would like to say that he not only support splitting the two maps but also think there is an opportunity perhaps for different interpretations of how to serve some of these developments. For instance, if he's looking at page 140 of 164 Dondea, Garden and Kintzley, he thinks that those just right off the top of his head, those pieces of property, could all be served by cul-de-sacs and that would be an alternative access for a developer that would certainly be cheaper than the connection road. He can see how one solution was arrived at for local street connectivity, but he doesn't see that that is necessarily the preferred connection, either in terms of cost, or in terms of

neighborhood impact in many of the areas. He thinks that's what people are talking about, is through traffic and speeding etc. If you can serve a piece of property with a simpler and cheaper road system where are you going to build the connections that people wouldn't object to?

Commissioner James, generally, he likes the two map approach, he thinks that is a good framework and he loves the language that was discussed related to illustrative only, and he thinks that gets to some of the questions that he's hearing regarding, why you need these? He thinks Emma has done a good job talking about why staff would like to have this as a background outside of just the code. He thinks that's important. Will it make a difference? We're going to have to address those connectivity issues regardless. However, he thinks it is a good framework, a place to start, but he thinks how we phrase it, how we bench it, to let our public know and let the developers know that this is really- -staff could work at this for time in memorial, and you're always going to have disagreements on what might be the best approach for connectivity for those. The reality is, when development happens, it's going to be addressed one way or another. Is that correct? It's going to happen, whether it's from the illustration on the map or from some other creative approach that gets to that end result, and meets the fire requirements and hopefully meets the neighborhood issues that develop and bubble-up related to safety and all the other things that we've heard our public say. He thinks we're close to getting there.

Commissioner Rose asked for clarification. The conceptual map, that takes care of the state regulation? Then the other map, if you did it that way would give you more time to fine-tune the maps?

Emma answered yes. The Conceptual Street Map, those are the state requirements. The Local Street Network Map is to address the local streets and we need to have system connectivity, we need to build local streets out, but how this is approached- - that's why we're providing the different options, because it's not required to have the visual local street network map, but we see a lot of value in it.

Commissioner Hledik asked Becky, from your own staff report, attachment 2, beginning at the bottom of page 2, specifically sites the transportation of [unintelligible 01:56:21]. The discussion was, was that a plan for a system of arterials and collectors is required, whereas, standards for local roads is what's expected. Therein lies a distinction, and then Becky told him, that the Conceptual Street Map showing the collectors and arterials those are fixed. There's no more public hearing opportunity for how those roads are going to be sited, correct?

Emma explained for the sections of the Conceptual Street Map that correlate with the new proposed projects that you already supported earlier this evening, there is opportunity for comment on that limited piece of it.

Commissioner Hledik continued, whereas for the local roads, this is a much broader opportunity for public comment.

Emma responded correct.

Commissioner Hledik: That's why keeping on, not only distinct for purposes of transportation planning rule, but for local public input there is a distinction.

Becky: Chair Rose, it's sounding like there could be some concern that, if you recommend approval of splitting the map that by default you're creating the map with the black lines for local streets, and you're not comfortable with that map yet. She thinks what staff wants clarity on is, you're comfortable with the map that is required by the state law that shows the previously approved projects, the arterials and collectors, and not so much a decision on the local- mapping local streets at this point?

Commissioner Rose answered, he would agree to that.

Commissioner Sherwood apologized that he would be repeating a little bit of my questions earlier, but he thinks he was putting the cart before the horse on that one. Maybe this is a better time for it. When we split this up- it's like a multi-part question based on what you told me. When we split the Conceptual Street Map for arterials and collectors that is going to stay part of the TSP. Will the street connectivity map still be in TSP or will that just be in the Springfield Development Code separately?

Emma answered that the Local Street Network Map is proposed to be adopted only into the Springfield Development Code.

Commissioner Sherwood: In the future, when we look at the TSP again, whenever that meaning would come up eventually. We won't be looking at those local street connectivity issues again. They won't be brought forward again, and we'll only be dealing with the arterials and collectors?

Emma responded, correct, for a TSP update. There could be a Springfield Development Code project that looks up the local streets.

Commissioner Sherwood, which would, hopefully is on a different day.

Emma responded, correct.

Commissioner Sherwood, so we don't get 220 people in here all frustrated at the same time. He did see a lot of value in splitting those up for the public, so that they can have a much smoother process for them not just administratively, because it separates two things that don't necessarily have to be combined.

Commissioner Weeks, he started on one side of the fence and has ended up on the other. He sees the splitting of the two maps as being a conceptually good idea because it allows recommended language to be attached to it, which makes it very transparent and very clear and provides it absolutely.

Commissioner James asked staff, from an action standpoint on this piece, what do you need from the Springfield Planning Commission?

Emma responded that it sounds like there might be support for going back to the Conceptual Street Map now, now that we have a better understanding. And that could be a motion to approve the Conceptual Street Map with provisions, if you'd like to move to that. I can go back to that.

Commissioner James: Let's move back to the Conceptual Street Map, now that we understand the division much better, in the Local Street Map, and what's included in the Conceptual Street Map. Do we have any other questions? We know for clarity that the bike paths and connectors are part of that and we had discussion about that. He thinks they had leanings both directions. He did state clearly that he thought that's an important piece of that, for a couple of reasons. Springfield Commission, looking to hear support for acceptance of the Conceptual Street Map? Or adoption of the recommendation of the City Council to adopt the Conceptual Street Map with the revisions as indicated?

Commissioner Koivula's main concern about including the multi-use paths in the Conceptual Street Map was that, as he recalls there was some opposition to a few of the bike paths, besides the Wayside Lane and corp Park. He does see what Commissioner James and others have said about the value of having them in there. If we include the bike paths, there is again, still the chance that they wouldn't be built as shown, is that correct?

Emma answered, yes, in particular the revision that was proposed for South 26<sup>th</sup> Street, the ones that have arrows, and are dash lines with an arrow those are more conceptual things, additional planning needs to be done to figure out exactly where this lands, where it connects. But it does show the network, and she thinks that there's benefit with that. And just to clarify, there were also additional comments as presented on the sheet that we were talking about earlier, with regards to the Flamingo Avenue to Gateway Street path, and the Springfield Christian School channel path down the Street to Laura Street. Those were the path concerns that she heard outside of the sub-comments, which we've addressed with the conversation and the arrow presented in the revision.

Commissioner Sherwood, he thinks one of the primary benefits of having the Ped/Bike paths on this map is that they can receive government-ran funding help based on the fact that those projects have been mentioned in the Transportation System Plan. And those projects being mentioned in the Springfield Development Code on a separate conceptual map would not warrant the same support.

Emma responded that it's not as an appropriate of a location to present it. The Transportation System Plan based on the state guidance for the elements of the TSP, deals with the larger facilities, the arterials, the collectors, the higher-volume traffic, those are required to be identified in our plans as well as bicycle and pedestrian elements, such as the off-street paths. The Development Code is the finer-grain detail of the local streets; maybe some access ways, all sorts of things.

Commissioner Sherwood continued that the other part that is - it was asked if those would be built the same way that they're mentioned. If, suppose, a grant came along, or funding from the government came along for one of those projects, would it be binding that that project takes the shape that it was represented in the Transportation System Plan, based on that funding?

Emma answered that if we were to apply for funding, we would say "This is in our plan. If we got funding, there's public involvement process." In your packet there was additional information about Transportation Project Development, so there's usually public involvement. For instance, the Virginia Daisy Bikeway Project that they have been working on. They did a whole planning phase with the community, mailed all the neighbors and said "we're having open houses, we're looking at street designs, we're putting in traffic calming, considering a lot of different things, come on out and help determine what that looks like." Those sorts of projects do have additional community involvement. Depending on the location of the project, it might not be adjacent to many people's residences or homes, it could just be a path connection that is by the SUB well fields and Willamalane properties, and we work more closely with SUB and Willamalane. Some of it depends on where the project is. She guesses there's additional public involvement in planning.

***Springfield Planning Commission***

*Commissioner Dunn moved to forward a recommendation to the City Council to adopt the Conceptual Street Map showing existing and planned arterials, collectors, and multi-use paths with revisions as an amendment to the Transportation System Plan. Seconded by Commissioner Landen. 6:1:0*

Becky asked Chair Rose if this adjusted action is on the slide in front of the Lane County Commissioners. If the Lane County Planning Commission chose to act on item as well, this is the language that they could propose, replacing City Council with Board of County Commissioners.

***Lane County Planning Commission.***

*Commissioner Weeks proposed a motion that Lane County Planning Commission approve the Conceptual Street Map, showing an existing arterials, collectors, multi-use paths to the Board of County Commissioners, seconded by Commissioner Hledik 6:0:2 absent*

Commissioner James: As far as the Local Street Maps, he doesn't know that they're going to reach consensus certainly on that tonight. We are going to meet subsequently on the second piece of the agenda as well. Because you're still pulling information together on code revisions, is that correct?

Emma answered, correct. Some of those code revisions will correlate with the direction provided on this item, and so it would be beneficial, if there's an option that is not supported by anyone, that could be removed, that would be helpful information. She was hearing support for some additional proposed language to be added to the map, and they could go back to the drawing board and come up with some additional language options for the map itself. That would lean towards option 1 or option 3 with keeping the map.

Commissioner James general feeling is, as one member, that that map is important for development. He thinks some of the language that has been talked about, illustrative only, and some potential revisions to the code in relation to traffic-calming and connectivity issues, he thinks they are probably moving toward consensus.

Commissioner Landen would like to see if they could pass a motion.

Commissioner James thinks they have some things that we still need to bring forward that are code-related potentially, on a connectivity pieces that could relate to the map.

Commissioner Landen asked if they are just looking right now to exclude something. Take it off the board?

Commissioner James continued with what he heard staff say, your recommendation number 1 was, you had identified some that you have resolved some issues on. Option 2, was to not have a Local Street Map at all, and option 3A and B were slight variations of that. He thinks they're ending up with our own option that may adopt some elements of option 1. He likes the work that Staff has done on option one, personally, and resolving some of those issues with their public. However, he thinks the language on the map is certainly an issue, he would like for Staff to bring back something to the Commissions based on the comments they've heard this evening. Staff also heard pretty resoundingly on the code pieces with some issues- on those connectivity issues- about some other language in there related to the public's ability to have input. Not just on fire access and some of those other things, but also on the elements of keeping the nature of the neighborhood. Keeping it safe, those types of things. He thinks that's going to take some staff work to bring back to them.

Commissioner Weeks agreed, he would like to add to that, and that is the Lane County stuff, since they're looking at Springfield finished products, we would not be able to offer full comment without all of the pieces being there.



Emma asked if the Planning Commission's like to- it sounds like you're leaning toward option 1 or 3, and that you want additional language with regards to the map header and the description on the map. She's wondering if there's support for moving option 1 forward, saying, "yes, adopt the Local Street Network Map with revisions, and please add that additional header language and provide options for text that could be added to the map."

Commissioner Koivula's feeling is that's premature. I would like to spend a little more time looking at some of the language regarding alternative connections, as he stated earlier. There's more than one way to provide access and connectivity, as Commissioner Hledik said. He thinks it's premature to approve the process at the moment.

Commissioner Sherwood is in favor of excluding option 2 altogether, if the other commissioners feel that way, he thinks the map's necessary. He thinks they all have said that we see the value in it, if not, the majority of us. He doesn't think option 2's going to be something that helps because we were looking for exclusions. But he still sees a possibility between option 1 or 3, given further information and further review.

Commissioner James thinks what he is hearing is option 3B probably, based on what he has heard staff say, is- that gives more of a misunderstanding to our public. He thinks what they're trying to do is make it clearer for our public. That what this map represents- and if we're just taking lines off the map- and when it develops, it's going to develop that way anyway. That doesn't build trust with your citizenry. He thinks what he would like to see, it may take some slow-down and more outreach. Maybe partially 3A, but we may be able to get there under option 1 as well. He thinks it's some combination of those.

Commissioner Landen asked if they could take option 2 and 3B, in light of Emma's request to get rid of something- it sounds like we have agreement to get rid of 2-

Becky asked if this is just the Springfield Commission.

Commissioner James answered that the Springfield Planning Commission.

Commissioner Rose responded that if Springfield is happy, they're happy.

Commissioner James commented that he thinks that's pretty clear direction to staff. You know that we're in favor of the Local Street Map. You know that 3B removed- just taking lines off the map -probably is not an approach that they will want to take. They've heard some comments about how staff might preface that map, in a much more direct way and deal with some of those issues. Staff needs to still come back and have further discussion about how we get somewhere between 1 and 3A to resolution. Does that make sense?

Commissioner Dignam is not prepared yet, to take any options off the table, however he recognize that he may be in the minority in the Lane County Planning Commission on that.

Becky asked the Lane County Chair: If the Lane County Planning Commission were to vote to remove option 2, what that could mean is that the City proceeds to make amendments, amend their code, and then it comes back to you- if you don't feel like your issues have been addressed through the Code Amendments, to the extent you don't feel comfortable adopting the Local Street Map, you could have potentially waived that future possibility.

Commissioner Weeks agrees with that. He doesn't think they should take that off.

Commissioner James added that what he thinks they are hearing is a consensus-based direction to Staff. They need to formalize this at this stage, legal counsel?

Mary Bridget Smith, answered that she doesn't think they need a motion, what she's hearing, is some hesitancy to remove options off the table until they have a better look at the actual written connectivity standard, if those really address some of those issues.

The property owner comes in and says "Okay, I see that black line is here, but do the standards actually mean that a black line moved based on adopted standards. Or do those standards in effect not allow the black line to be moved." That's kind of the issue. You don't want to commit to local map until you have an idea of what those standards say. You want a map and the standards are really going to work together.

That's probably what some of the hesitancy is, because if you can't get the standards where you think they should be, then the map's not really serving the purpose. You want to be real clear on what the map's doing. Does that sound right? So when we come back, if we come back to you with connectivity standards that address some of the other issues in addition to the current text that's there, and the local street network map, if those two are together then it sounds like you'd be happy to move that recommendation forward, but if they don't then you want to re-look at what we're doing.

Commissioner James thinks the Springfield Commission, and kicks me under the table if I'm incorrect, but we're trying to assist Staff in our leanings. He thinks legal addressed it- the focus is really on- yes, we think that the Local Street Map is an important element for the code, and number two, we don't feel comfortable with just taking black lines off the map, without either slowing down and conducting more research or having more conversation. For several different reasons.

Commissioner James added that the next step's for us, Staff has some more work to do. By the way, thank you, Staff, you've actually done an incredible job. This is a huge amount of information to compile and it's been presented in a very succinct way. I would just like to say thank you to Staff for the work and the continued work. The other thing he would like to do again, is thank our citizenry for coming here and being part of this process. The input that we have received has shaped this process. That is goal one, and so thank you for being here and being engaged, in this process.

Commissioner Koivula also, thank you to the Lane County Commissioners for the amount of time that you've spent with them, largely spent on Springfield issues.

Emma would like to note briefly that if anyone would like to receive notification of upcoming meetings because we are not announcing when that next meeting will be we need to go back and figure out how much work do we have do, what time line do we need to be able to bring you the information you requested, can sign up on the sign up list by the door or send me an email saying, "I'd like to make sure to receive information about the upcoming meetings." The Planning Commissions' meeting dates will also be posted on the project web-page and the Planning Commission web-page and then the next steps are the Planning Commissions will make recommendations, and they could choose to do that at joint meetings, continue with the joint meetings, or you could do it separately. That would be a good item to discuss briefly and then Staff will figure out what dates based on that. After that the City Council will hold their public hearings, their deliberations and make that final action.

Commissioner James reiterated what he heard, this may not be correct, but what he heard was, we have one more meeting that may be very beneficial for us to deliberate collectively, is that the general feeling?

Commissioner Rose responded, yes. There seems to be strong enough feelings all the way around both within the Springfield Commission and the Lane County Commission. He thinks it is worthwhile to have, everybody in the same room listening to everyone else, even though this is largely a Springfield issue. We do have a significant number of county property owners who will be affected. He thinks collectively meeting is a good idea it becomes a little un-wieldy the number of players. Unfortunately, it takes time but with more than one staff but he thinks it's the best way to approach it.

Commissioner? He thinks he agrees with that.

Commissioner James responded that they will move forward with that.

Commissioner James: All right at this time, the Springfield Planning Commission has some additional business. He will just take a recess for five minutes and allow the County Commissioners to leave.

#### REPORT OF COUNCIL ACTION

Commissioner Vohs gave his report of Council Action for March 5, 2018.

#### ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

Minutes Recorder – Brenda Jones

---

Greg James  
Planning Commission Chair

Attest:

---

Brenda Jones  
Planning Secretary

City of Springfield  
Regular Meeting

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR SESSION MEETING OF  
THE SPRINGFIELD PLANNING COMMISSION HELD  
Tuesday, March 20, 2018

The City of Springfield Planning Commission met in a regular session in the City Council Chambers, 225 Fifth Street, Springfield, Oregon, on Tuesday, March 20, 2018 at 7:00 p.m., with Commissioner James presiding.

**ATTENDANCE**

Present were Chair James, Vice Chair Koivula, Commissioners James, Nelson, Vohs, Dunn and Landen. Also present were, Current Development Manager Greg Mott, City Attorney Mary Bridget Smith and Management Specialist Brenda Jones; Molly Markarian Senior Planner; and members of the staff.

**ABSENT**

Commissioner Sherwood- Excused

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chair Greg James

**DECLARATION OF CONFLICT**

Read by City Attorney Mary Bridget Smith

**CRITERIA OF APPROVAL**

Read by Greg Mott

**BUSINESS FROM THE AUDIENCE**

**Greg James:** Any adjustments to the agenda tonight? Hearing none: This is our time that we have an opportunity to take input and testimony from the audience. I would just tell you that we are moving into a Legislative Public Hearing later during our session tonight, specifically related to relocating the Glenwood Riverfront Street Design Standards from the Engineering Design Standards and Procedures Manual into the Springfield Development Code. Testimony related to that specific topic will be entertained during our Legislative Session.

If you wish to address the board on other Glenwood issues or topics, you're welcome to do that now. I have two requests. I'm assuming these requests are related to the public hearing, is that correct? Yes? Okay.

That being said, we'll move forward. We have the approval of our January 23rd Joint Work Session minutes and Joint Regular Session minutes. Do I hear a move, a motion, to approve those minutes?

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**Tim Vohs:** I move to approve the minutes of the Joint Meeting with Lane County for January 23, 2018; the Work Session minutes; and the Regular Meeting minutes.

**Mike Koivula:** As amended? I sent some amendments, corrections.

**Tim Vohs:** As amended.

**Greg James:** As amended, do we have a second?

**Mike Koivula:** Second.

**Greg James:** Motion to approve the Work Session minutes of January 23rd and the Regular Meeting minutes of January 23<sup>rd</sup>, as amended, was moved by Commissioner Vohs and seconded by Commissioner Koivula. All those in favor, say your part by saying, "Aye."

**All:** Aye. 6; 0; 1 absent

### **LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARING**

#### **1. RELOCATE GLENWOOD RIVERFRONT STREET DESIGN STANDARDS FROM ENGINEERING DESIGN STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES MANUAL (EDSPM) TO THE SPRINGFIELD DEVELOPMENT CODE**

**Greg James:** Vohs' motion carries. At this time, we will conduct a Legislative Public Hearing to relocate the Glenwood Riverfront Street Design Standards from the Engineering Design Standards and Procedures Manual, EDSPM, to the Springfield Development Code, 811-17-000137-TYP4. This is a Legislative Public Hearing, so I don't think I need turn it over to the Legal Counsel; I'll just turn it over to our senior planner, Molly.

### **STAFF REPORT**

**Molly Markarian:** Good evening, Commissioners. I'm presenting the Staff Report for Case Number 811-17-000137, proposing to move the text and images from Appendix 1A of the EDSPM, Engineering Design Standards and Procedures Manual, to the Springfield Development Code by Council Ordinance. A copy of the Staff Report is found in Attachment 2 of your packet. As some of you will recall, following an extensive four-year process, the City adopted a package of Land Use Amendments to the Metro Plan, Glenwood Refinement Plan, Springfield Development Code, and Springfield Zoning Map, in 2012, for the Glenwood Riverfront, or the Phase 1 area of Glenwood, as part of a comprehensive effort directed by the City Council to update the Glenwood Refinement Plan. To support implementation of the Glenwood Refinement Plan's infrastructure policies, the City also adopted specific design standards for the internal street network in 2012, as well.

These Glenwood specific street standards were adopted by Resolution into the Engineering Design Standards and Procedures Manual, as was customary at that time. Based on the recommendation of the City Attorney's office, the City is currently in the process of moving all design standards that implement Comprehensive Plan policies into the Development Code.

At this time, we propose moving the Glenwood Street Standards, currently comprising Appendix 1A of the Engineering Design Standards and Procedures Manual, to the Development Code as outlined in Attachment 3 of your packet. In accordance with the Oregon Administrative Rules, staff submitted notice of the proposed amendment to the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development on February 13th. Additionally, in accordance with the Springfield Development Code and with the Citizen Engagement Plan approved by Springfield's Committee for Citizen Engagement for this project, notice of this Public Hearing was published in the *Register Guard* on February 28th. Notice of this Hearing and responses to Frequently Asked Questions were mailed to all property owners and residents in the Glenwood Riverfront area. All owners and residents were also invited to a general Glenwood Open House on March 13th.

In response to Public Notice, I received four emails and three phone calls; the written contents of which I've placed into the record and which you have in front of you. In all instances, comments, questions or concerns, are related to the possible impact of the proposed amendments on the individuals. As I explained to those property owners and residents, the action before you will have no material impact on them, as the standards were adopted in 2012, and we are thus proposing to merely relocate them from the Engineering Design Standards and Procedures Manual to the Development

Code. Furthermore, the standards guide street improvements at the time of development or redevelopment. In addition to clarifications regarding the proposal before you, questions and comments were also submitted regarding streets south of Franklin Boulevard, sewer availability, permitted uses and the Franklin Boulevard construction project. Additionally, questions were posed regarding the possible future of manufactured home park development and concerns about the impact of the implementation of the Glenwood Refinement Plan policies on very low-income residents. While not the subject of what is before you, I would like to note that this topic was explored in depth at the time the Phase 1 Glenwood Refinement Plan was originally adopted and through the subsequent appeal, LUBA remand, revisions, and re-adoptions of the Glenwood Refinement Plan and its ultimate acknowledgement by the Department of Land Conservation and Development in 2014. The City subsequently took a leadership role in convening Local, State, and Federal partners in developing a coordinated housing and social services assistance response to vulnerable populations in manufactured home parks. The outcome of that effort is a tool kit for communities to inventory, assess, and support manufactured home parks at risk of closure. In 2016, the City Council also directed staff to evaluate housing needs and to build on existing strategies to increase the supply of housing and accessibility of affordable housing in Springfield.

In summary, as stated in Springfield Development Code section 5.6-115A, the criteria of approval for amendments to the Development Code are conformance with the Metro Plan, applicable State statutes, and applicable statewide planning goals and administrative regulations. As outlined on pages 3 to 10 of the Staff Report, staff finds the subject code amendment to be consistent with this criteria. Staff, therefore, requests that the Springfield Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval to the Springfield City Council regarding the proposed amendments to Springfield Development Code section 3.4-200.

**Greg James:** Any questions for Molly at this time?

**Tim Vohs:** In your original report, you indicated or it was stated, that concluding this process of moving the Glenwood language from the Procedure Manual to the Development Code, that there will be additional steps forward. What are those additional steps?

**Molly Markarian:** I am not sure I understand.

**Tim Vohs:** I can summarize quickly, it's saying that the Glenwood Standards Amendment is the first in a series of amendments of transferring from the manual to the Code.

**Molly Markarian:** I believe that you have the transportation, TSP implementation policies, the downtown policies, and I don't know if there's--

**Mary Bridget Smith:** There will be some current standards that are in the Engineering Design Manual that will be moved to the Development Code. Some of those relate to transportation and other ones to Downtown.

**Tim Vohs:** Okay, thank you.

**Greg James:** At this time, we will take public input.

#### **TESTIMONY FROM THOSE IN SUPPORT**

**Greg James:** First, testimonies in support of the proposal. Hearing none, I have one marked neutral, and against the proposal and one not marked and one against the proposal.

#### **TESTIMONY OF THOSE OPPOSED**

**Greg James:** We will move to oppose the proposal next. When I call your name, if you could come to the mic and state your name and address for the Commission, it would be appreciated, so it's entered in the public record. Martin Desmond is first.

**Martin Desmond:** Good evening Springfield Planning Commission and members. My name is Martin Desmond. I live at 4531 Franklin Boulevard, Space 119. That's in the Glenwood area of Springfield. I drafted a letter, and Molly said that you would be provided a copy of it. I'll touch on a couple of highlights in the letter. I realize in one sense, this is just sort of a fairly bureaucratic move today as you're moving language from the Procedure Manual into the Code.

My spouse and I have lived in the Glenwood area for about three and a half years. We previously lived in the Thurston neighborhood for 15 years. I had the opportunity to read through parts of Glenwood Refinement Plan in the last day or two, I'll confess, it's the first time I ever read it.

I'm really concerned about a lot of the language in there, particularly the direction. And it ties into these road standards. I know the Planning Commission members will probably disagree with me, but what I see is an attempt by the City of Springfield to gentrify the Glenwood area. Because I live here now, I'll be the first one, as I put in my letter, to say that Glenwood area is an ugly wart but it serves a very useful function. There are many thousands of people that live in mobile homes, travel trailers, RVs. There really is not a place for these people, or few other options for a number of these people to have. So I'm quite concerned about both the general direction of the Refinement Plan and in one sense, from what I can understand, most of it is related to what is referred to as the Franklin Riverfront Area, where we live, which is referred to as the McVay area. Apparently, there's not as much planning done for that. Until I feel that we really have a commitment from Springfield City Council to protect and preserve mobile home parks in this area, I would ask that you actually delete the language at 3.4-270, A through F, where you address the McVay Highway. That concludes my testimony, and I appreciate it.

**Greg James:** Thank you. Next, I have Vicky McGowan.

**Greg James:** Vicky, state your name and your address, please.

**Vicky McGowan:** Yes, I would like to say good evening to all the Planning Commissioners and members.

**Greg James:** Name and address for the record, please.

**Vicky McGowan:** Vicky McGowan 4531 Franklin Blvd #119.

**Greg James:** Thank you.

**Victoria McGowan:** I have written a letter, and I believe you've all received a copy, so I'm going to try to summarize this and stay within my three-minute timeframe. I, too, am somewhat remiss in reading all 167-plus pages and will try to do so more thoroughly. I have looked at it several times throughout the course of the years, and I have been in contact with Molly over the course of the years as well, so this is not the first time I've had concern.

I was looking in particular at this letter written on January 30th, 2013, where the petitioner, Shamrock Homes, were talking in that letter that the whole intent of that letter was the City's decision to wipe out several hundred units of affordable housing, including 11 acres of the Shamrock property as most grievous. There's mention of a Metro Plan Housing Policy 825 that says to conserve this kind of housing. I'm also making a reference to ORS 197.307, which actually addresses the effect of need for certain housing in urban growth areas. Having lived in the park for three and a half years, I would say that I have been really struck by the number of wonderful people and seniors who've lived there. Some of them have lived there for over 20, 30 years. Some of them are really shaken up by all of this. They're expressing real fear and concerns for where they're going to go. Some of them couldn't even make it to this meeting; they're just too fragile, frail, or too old or sick, or whatever, so I'm also speaking out for those. Our home isn't too old; it was built in the '90s. It's a manufactured home, double-wide, but there's a lot of people that live in single-wides. Some of those homes are pretty precarious. They were built in the '60s, I think, or older. To be given some money to move those, One, the house would probably break down while they are moving. Second, where are they going to move them to? I don't think there's too many affordable senior home parks for these people to move to, should something ever happen, a rich developer come in and take over the park. That's my concern. In the future, where are these folks going to go to? Low-cost residents are

people too, same concerns, same dreams, and desires as any of our affluent members of our community, and they need to be taken more seriously by answering their concerns in how they can continue to live; not just in the next year or so but continue to live in affordable housing in the future.

I also concur with Mr. Martin Desmond that the manufactured home parks and such, that these do provide some real affordable living situation where people can afford and live reasonably okay. There are a lot of creative ways to get rid of the ugly eyesores that our parks may create. Some of that could be that the City could maybe, provide some monies to go into that to help improve the looks of some of those, especially on the outside. I'm sure you all are aware of what the Shamrock Park looks like on the outside but anyway, also monies to help people who are living in shacks and to help them fix up their places. Anyway, I appreciate your time.

**Greg James:** Thank you so much. The last request that we have is neither in favor or against, is from Alberto Miranda.

**Greg James:** Please step forward and address the commission, if you would, Mr. Miranda.

**Alberto Miranda:** Thank you. My name is Alberto Miranda. I'm from Costa Rica. I have been in Oregon for 39 years. My business, Cafeto, has been in the Glenwood area for 28 years. Do you need my home address for the record?

**Greg James:** Yes, you can state it for the record.

**Alberto Miranda:** My business address is 4000 East 22nd.

20 years ago, we built this facility. I really don't avoid any of the planning issues. We have been able to observe all of the specs and regulations. The City of Eugene at the time, because we were under their planning jurisdiction, requested from us and we built our facility that now provides 24 full-time positions and about six part-time positions. Cafeto has been in business for 35 years. We started here on Centennial in 1984, had a very short couple of years on Shelley Street, and eventually moved to Judkins Road where we began to plan the development of our site.

We are, in this moment, confronting a very aggressive move by the Springfield Utility Board to take our land away from us for the purpose of building a transmission line that is leading to their substation across the street from our building. That happens to be a wetland, the only Palustrine wetland in all of Glenwood. In the process to build this substation on the wetland, they will destroy a tremendous amount of trees, about 300 hundred of them. That is the last stand we have in Glenwood of woods of reasonable size that are currently doing the job that needs to be done, not only aesthetically but functionally, also. This environmental insult is in the works, and we came over to respectfully request the mediation of the Planning Commission for these issues. The problem that we have here is that there is a very competitive feeding frenzy between the two utilities, Eugene Water and Electric Board with over 20 acres adjacent to our property and Springfield Utility Board with 10 acres adjacent to our property.

Our property became an island; we have publicly owned property surrounding us. We need to find a way to stop this aggressive, invasive utility format and force the two utility companies to come to term with each other, choose a site, and take care of business. As it is right now, EWEB ran out of reasons to build in the McCauley property, which is the 24-acre property, and now the land is an idle there. We do have very complex demographics there. There is some camps currently on that property. SUB is in the works to see if they could build their substation there. We need to find a way to provide the spaces for these two entities to give us their needs and a way to resolve them without wrecking a 35-year effort that our company has been making to establish a viable business, a sustainable business, in this community.

With all due respect, I request your mediation to address this very serious planning issue that is currently under this jurisdiction. We would like to see if any of you could relate to my concerns right now. Is there a plan? This is going to all of you. Do you know of a plan that the City has to develop that entire area between the railroad track and I-5 on East 22nd? Is there an underlying plan in the works or is this just the result of improvisation and competition between the two utility companies? What do we have here that could make my business retain the property and the community retain the jobs and the next site that we have already projected?



**Greg James:** I hear what you're saying. I don't know that it's related to this specific Public Hearing. I certainly will relate, ask staff, post your testimony. As we get into deliberations and talk, we may be able to get some direction from staff and find out more, but let us get a little further in the process. We've taken your comments now. I don't have an answer for you, but I certainly will request the information from staff about that specific topic. Okay?

**Alberto Miranda:** Okay, thank you.

**Greg James:** Certainly.

**Gay Anne Brinda:** Excuse me. May I respectfully ask to submit a late one?

**Greg James:** Yes, you may. State your name and address, please.

**Gay Anne Brinda:** My name is Gay Anne Brinda I'm at the Shamrock Mobile Home in RV Park, 4531 Franklin Boulevard number 89, and I'm still really new to the area. I moved here because I'm on disability right now, and actually, it's very affordable for me right now. I think we've done a lot to start improving the cosmetics of Shamrock. The owners have done a lot, as far as updating and bringing up to code certain electrical issues and such.

Our previous managers didn't really stay current. I don't think it's an ugly little wart; I think it's a neighborhood that's not being gentrified necessarily, but it's definitely going through a facelift without white teeth. My biggest concern is the environment. There were some residents that were just stupid, cut down trees. The owner has had trees replanted there. I thought 35 feet, that's what the last manager, two managers ago, told me. It was 35 feet from the river for this bike path. Okay, 75 feet is going to wipe out a lot. Now looking over this plan here, I'm seeing all the parking that's just on the west side of the little bridges, and I'm wondering if what you have in mind isn't a little bit more like Denver, Colorado where you have a river and there is just no real natural life there at all. You've got concrete down the river on either side, and buildings. I'm a Portland girl, so I'm used to having a forest park there with all the eagles flying overhead. I was just telling my friend I saw like nine eagles just over the river, then two behind me, that would be on the other side of Franklin over there to the southwest, and that's going to go away. With all that pollution, they are going to go away. They are going to find other places to be. We have deer that cross the river, and I know that's very enjoyable. People raft. The first year I was there, which was July, 2015, the only eagle I saw swooped to like for a hundred yards up the river, and there were these college kids rafting. It was just totally unafraid and having a jolly, good time, and we'll lose that.

I do not disagree with gentrification. I was in Northeast Portland when that was gentrified. We kept a lot of the older buildings, though. New things happened along Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard, nice apartments, condominiums.

I see that is a lot of undeveloped ground, but I'm not really sure what you have. I heard something about college dorms, apartments, and all, but the pollution going up and down the river; we already get just tons and tons of grass seeds coming up because for some reason, that backs up. We have all this extra pollution in Springfield during the summer. I'm not sure how all that's going to work with all the extra car emissions. I looked at that proposal there; unfortunately, I did not have a chance to look online. You have mostly just disgusting parking; streets and parking; cars. Springfield is beautiful, I don't know if it's going to stay that way with all the cars. Okay, thanks.

**Greg James:** Okay. Thank you for the public testimony; certainly appreciate it.

## **PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION**

**Greg James:** We have some question and answer time from the Commission. We had a couple of topics that were brought up. We had two or three discussing the Shamrock Property specifically. Molly, these road standards moving from where they are to the Code; those properties will not be developed until, if and when, either a developer purchases the properties or the people who own them currently choose to develop, is that correct? The Shamrock Property.

**Molly Markarian:** Yes. Correct.

**Greg James:** Are you aware of the piece of property that Mr. Miranda was discussing related to the SUB electrical station, and what's going on there?

**Molly Markarian:** I am aware that EWEB was looking to purchase property in the Phase II area of the Glenwood Refinement Plan, and that SUB was also looking to do that. I don't know what the status of those sales is. Phase II, when the council directed staff to update the Glenwood Refinement Plan, it was intended to be a phased project. The Riverfront was completed first, and we're waiting for Council direction to do Phase II at some point in the future. So that's when the Comprehensive Planning update would happen for that area.

**Greg James:** Phase II, really we do not have--?

**Molly Markarian:** We don't have a timeline or proposal.

**Greg James:** A timeline or a plan specifically for that?

**Molly Markarian:** Mr. Mott might be able to answer more to that and also as it relates to EWEB, SUB. Maybe there's a current development application in for the SUB property.

**Greg Mott:** SUB is interested in pursuing the development of a substation in Glenwood in the vicinity of the bakery, and it will tie into the power lines that go down to the substation near Goshen, or I guess in Goshen. It's a backup line, in case of failure of other systems, is not needed to-

**Greg James:** So, it's redundancy, basically.

**Greg Mott:** Yes, it is. It's not needed for industry right now. In the past, EWEB was interested in exercising a water right that they have, and constructing an inlet facility close to where Nugget Way is. They were going to pump the water from that inlet facility to the base of the hill that goes up towards I-5, and they were going to build a treatment plant there. Then, they were going to connect that treatment plant to lines they have real close to I-5 where Franklin goes and possibly underneath I-5 into the Laurel Hill area. They requested the Springfield City Council initiate the amendment to the PFSP and the Glenwood Refinement Plan to allow that to go forward. Our Council declined to initiate, so Eugene City Council could initiate this on their behalf. It's a regional issue, all three jurisdictions have to participate. I haven't heard what their plan is to do with that property.

**Greg James:** Would that come before the Planning Commission?

**Greg Mott:** Well, it depends on what they want to do with it. If they want to do that water facility, it has to come to the Planning Commission first then go to the Elected Officials. If they want to do something else with it, I don't know what that might be but if they're going to propose to do something else with it, whatever zone, if they have a proposal that is consistent with that zoning, then it would probably just be a Site Plan Review kind of an application. I'm not even sure it's in the city limits, whether they would have to annex or not, what kind of services are available to it, I don't know. We never got far enough along the way with that water treatment plant to find out any of that information. I'm not aware of any pitch battle between SUB and EWEB. They may be in close proximity. SUB's interests are 100% electric, and up to now, all I know is EWEB's interests are 100% water, so that's all I know.

**Greg James:** It sounds as if we're not aware of anything being in the works currently, and there will be other opportunities if there were something to take place, for public testimony, then put into process?

**Greg Mott:** Again, it really depends on the nature of what they want to do; some activities don't require a Public Hearing to go forward.

**Sean Dunn:** It was discussed before the City Council on September 19th of 2016. That's where the council decided that they didn't want to basically carry the thing forward and deferred it back to the EWEB folks to do something else with it.

**Mike Koivula:** But as far as I know, according to the report we get every week, the high-profile report, there hasn't been any action on that, no updates on that as far as I know.

**Greg James:** Commissioners, do you have questions related to the action before us from staff, yes?

**Mike Koivula:** I don't know if this is premature, but Mr. Miranda, who has a business there is there already a discussion or some sort of an action which will cause him to lose his property?

**Greg James:** That's what we were just discussing, and number one, it really does not apply to this specific action or undertaking, and I want to be sure our staff have an opportunity to put the information out that you are aware of. You've heard now what our Planning Manager has said, and our Senior Planner. I think that there could be something coming downstream. I would encourage Mr. Miranda to stay connected with the activities of both SUB and EWEB and the City Councils. Certainly, we have jurisdictions over anything that's a planning-related issue, and at a certain level, it would come before us, and we could be engaged in their processes.

**Mike Koivula:** Both EWEB and SUB have public meetings of all their commissioners, they certainly do.

**Greg James:** Those are public processes as well, so I'd encourage you to stay connected there.

The business at hand is related to relocating the Street Design Standards from the EDSPM to the Springfield Development Code. Do we have other questions? I certainly appreciate the input and the concerns voiced from the public in relation to the mobile home parks. I think that was discussed in great detail when we went through and put this plan together initially. This action, this evening, is really relocating what our current standards are into our Development Code. It's really required, isn't it, Legal Counsel? Has there been a recent LUBA case or something related to that, that we really need to have these in the Code?

**Mary Bridget Smith:** That is right. They need to be listed as Land Use Regulations in the Development Code so that they can be relied on for development.

**Greg James:** Exactly. That's the action before us this evening. Any questions? Summary by staff?

**Female Speaker from Audience:** Can I ask a question?

**Greg James:** We are through the public testimony phase in the process; we are onto the staff, so let's get our staff summary.

#### **SUMMATION FROM STAFF**

**Molly Markarian:** I guess I would just say that, as stated in the staff report, we find that the subject Code Amendment is consistent with the criteria listed in Springfield Development Code Section 5.6-115a and request the Planning Commission to forward a Recommendation of Approval to the Springfield City Council.

#### **REBUTTAL FROM THE APPLICANT**

No Applicant

#### **CLOSE OF THE HEARING**

**Greg James:** Do we have any requests to continue? We don't have to do that?

**Mary Bridget Smith:** We don't have to. This is a legislative matter so it's in your discretion, but you need to make some record of what you want to do with the record and the Hearing.

**Greg James:** The record is open and the Hearing is open. Do I hear a motion to close the public record at this time?

**Sean Dunn:** I move to close the public record and the written record.

**Nick Nelson:** Second.

**Greg James:** Moved and seconded to close the public record and written record. All in favor say, "Aye."

**All:** Aye. 6; 0; 1 absent

**Greg James:** Motion to close the hearing?

**Tim Vohs:** I move to close the public hearing.

**Mike Koivula:** Second.

**Greg James:** All in favor?

**All:** Aye. 6; 0; 1 absent

#### **PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION**

**Greg James:** Discussion on the proposal before us? Any comments?

**Nick Nelson:** It seems like what you're saying is "we need to get this into the development codes or compliance", so I'm in favor of it.

**Greg James:** I would just say to those in the audience, we certainly appreciate you coming and being part of this process, and your public testimony is very important to us. This Glenwood process is going to continue to develop over the years to come. I think it's very important that your voices are heard as this process moves forward, certainly, both at the Planning Commission level and at the City Council level and at the SUB and EWEB level as you're impacted by potential development. We appreciate your input to this process. Do I hear a motion? A motion?

#### **MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OR APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS OR DENIAL OF THE REQUEST BASED ON STAFF REPORT AND ORAL/WRITTEN TESTIMONY.**

**Sean Dunn:** Sure, I move to forward the recommendation to the City Council to approve Journal number 811-17-000137-TYP4, Amendment to the Springfield Development Code regarding the Street Design Standards as proposed in Exhibit B to this agenda item because the amendments meet the applicable criteria of approval.

**Tim Vohs:** I second.

**Greg James:** Moved by Commissioner Dunn, seconded by Commissioner Vohs as stated to move recommendation forward to the City Council to approve 811-17-000137-TYP4 to the Developed Code, the Glenwood Riverfront Street Design Standards. All those in favor signify by saying, "Aye."

**All:** Aye. 6; 0; 1 absent

**Greg James:** Opposed? Motion carries. Report of council action?

#### **REPORT OF COUNCIL ACTION**

**Mike Koivula:** I attended last night's City Council. Appointed members for the budget committee and the museum committee. Nice discussion by Councilor Woodrow about a visit to Food for Lane County. They continue to need a lot of help to keep people fed. City Manager has proposed a wastewater flow management study for infiltration on wastewater lines. A private contractor by the name of Novak will be doing that. \$340,000 was the initial contribution of City fund. That was pretty much it.

**Greg James:** Okay. Other business from the Planning Commission?

### **BUSINESS FROM THE COMMISSION**

**Tim Vohs:** I have one quick question not related to tonight's current proceedings. I'll direct my question to Brenda to start with. Looking toward our next meeting with Lane County on the transportation issue, considering that our audience has diminished considerably, is there a possibility that considering moving us to the back of the Library Meeting Room for our next Joint Meeting?

**Brenda Jones:** Yes. I could make sure that's arranged.

**Tim Vohs:** Thank you.

**Nick Nelson:** One other comment, a couple of editorials recently in the *Register Guard* and a number of letters, also, I've been into a couple of community meetings where the ADU's were discussed. There's a lot of kudos to the City, to the City Council, and to staff for working on this proposal and everybody who's been involved in that should really proud of what the community is seeing from the commitment that the City is doing towards affordable housing.

**Greg James:** Absolutely. I was going to talk briefly about the ADU process as well. I think the City Council has not adopted that yet, is that correct? Have they taken any action on that?

**Mary Bridget Smith:** I think they just did.

**Greg James:** They did? Just did?

**Mary Bridget Smith:** Yes.

**Greg James:** That's incredible. I know they have had several work sessions and talked through a proposal that we forwarded on to them. Those Accessory Dwelling Units, I think, are going to be a very positive thing for this community, the ability to create Accessory Dwelling Units. We'll see over the next two or three years how that develops and how that moves forward but certainly, I know planners I've talked to in Eugene, and other folks, City Councilors even from Eugene said, "You guys are ahead on the game on this," and we are telling them to catch up. Kudos to the staff for that vision and our City Council as well.

Okay. Any other business? Hearing none, we stand adjourned.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Minutes Recorder – Brenda Jones

---

Greg James  
Planning Commission Chair

Attest:

---

Brenda Jones  
Management Support Specialist

MINUTES OF THE JOINT REGULAR SESSION MEETING OF  
THE SPRINGFIELD PLANNING COMMISSION AND THE  
LANE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION HELD  
Tuesday, May 8, 2018

The City of Springfield Planning Commission and the Lane County Planning Commission met in a joint special session in the City Council Chambers, 225 Fifth Street, Springfield, Oregon, on Tuesday, May 8, 2018 at 7:00 p.m., with Commissioner Greg James presiding for Springfield and Commissioner Gary Rose presiding for Lane County Planning Commission.

**ATTENDANCE**

**Springfield:**

Present were Chair James, Vice Chair Koivula, Commissioners Bergen, Landen, Vohs, Dunn, and Sherwood. Also present were, Community Development Interim Manager Sandy Belson, City Attorney Mary Bridget Smith and Administrative Specialist Shannon Morris.

**Lane County:**

Present were Chair Rose, Vice Chair Weeks, Commissioners Coon, Kaylor, Thorp, and Dignam. Also present were: Lane County Planning Supervisor Kier Miller and Planning Director Lydia Kaye.

**ABSENT FOR SPRINGFIELD**

- None

**ABSENT FOR LANE COUNTY**

- Ryan Sisson
- Randy Hledik

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chair James.

Chair James opens Public Hearing for Springfield Planning Commission: This evening we will be conducting a Legislative Public Hearing dealing with amendment to Springfield Development Code in relation to accessory dwelling units in between the city limits and the urban fringe.

Chair Rose opens the meeting for Lane County Planning Commission.

**BUSINESS FROM THE AUDIENCE**

- None

**LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARING**

**1. Amendment of the Springfield Development Code Accessory Dwelling Units, Journal No. 811-18-000065-TYP4**

Sandy Belson gives Staff Report: Good evening Planning Commissioners, thank you to the Lane County Planning Commission for agreeing to come join us for a special meeting tonight. I was able to provide a brief overview at your previous work session and the Springfield Planning Commission has been familiar with the changes to the accessory dwelling units that we have put in place to make it easier and less expensive to develop accessory dwelling units within the city limits. Those amendments were adopted by the City Council in March and went into effect in April. What is before both of your commissions this evening is amendments to allow accessory dwelling units in the urbanizable fringe, that urbanizable area between the city limits and the urban growth boundary. This is in response to legislation which was modified into statute that requires all cities and counties of certain sizes to allow accessory dwelling units in areas where single family dwellings are allowed. In order to accomplish requirements of the legislature, we are proposing amendments to two sections of the Springfield Development Code. Because these code provisions apply outside the city limits and inside the urban growth boundary, they are subject to both jurisdictions'

approvals, Springfield and Lane County. You will be making your recommendations to your respective elected officials and they will hold a public hearing and make a final decision on the amendments.

The Springfield Planning Commission will need to make this decision based on findings in conformance with the Metro Plan which is the Eugene-Springfield Comprehensive Plan, applicable State Statutes and applicable Statewide Planning Goals and Administrative Rules.

In your packet, as exhibit A, is the staff report and findings. There you can see the findings for the Metro Plan, which include citizen involvement elements, growth management, and the residential land use and housing element. In addition, in Springfield we are starting to develop our own Comprehensive Plan that is specific to Springfield. From that, there are also policies that come out of Springfield Residential Land and Housing Study that supplement the policies in the Metro Plan.

The state statutes that I referenced that were changed by Senate Bill 1051 are ORS 197.312-5(a). There are findings for that and ORS 197.307(4)(b)(A). Also the applicable Statewide Planning Goals and Administrative Rules are listed there: OAR 660-008-0010 for which, we have findings that show there will be no impact on the land supply; as well as the Clear and Objective Standards that are required under OAR 660-008-0015.

The two sections that are being proposed to change in the code are Section 3, the zoning district for the urbanizable fringe; Section 3.3-800, Urbanizable Fringe Overlay District. You can see the proposed changes in Exhibit B, allowing accessory dwelling units within that zone. We have made corresponding changes to section 5.5 which is specific to accessory dwelling units, deleting the requirement that they be within the city limits. Since we went through these changes, and we have had recent experience trying to explain the recent code provisions that the City already adopted to make it easier to allow accessory dwelling units, we have made a few minor tweaks to improve the language.

The first one is at the top of page 1, Exhibit B in terms of accessory dwelling units being located near an alley; that they can meet the same setback requirements for a garage. I don't think that will apply to anything outside the city limits.

The second minor change is to make it clear that all manufactured homes or towable units brought in would be on a permanent foundation. We have listed that as a design standard for the clear and objective path. By moving it from the design standards into the development standards it will apply across the board. Anyone bringing in a manufactured home or towable home will have to meet those standards.

With that, I'll be available for questions. Kier Miller is the staff planner for Lane County. He is also available if you have questions with regard to the County's role.

We did get one letter of testimony from Cynthia Pappas, writing in support of the amendments. She requests that we consider some restrictions in placement of an accessory dwelling unit to limit future conflict with replatting of a parcel so that it does not reduce the future density of a parcel. I think we have that covered with code requirements in the urbanizable fringe that would apply to having to have a future development plan in certain situations. So I am not thinking that there is need for additional code but that is something you may want to consider.

Greg James: It is time for public testimony.

Jenna Fribley, 1360 Tamarack St: Local architect in Springfield, in Ward 2. Speaking in favor, I want to applaud Springfield for being proactive with the initial round of code amendments; I would love to see this move into the UGB as well. I have a question about how SDCs will be calculated in the UGB for sites with or without on-site sanitation. Will SDC waivers apply to them? I am curious about the code language for design standards of former item 7, now item 6: language about the exterior wall. This doesn't seem applicable to something the size of an ADU and I would request you look at it, or explain the rationale for it.

Kris McAllister, 1909 12<sup>th</sup> Street: Ward 3. Kris comments about ADUs being cost prohibitive. Is hopeful ADU can be used in the UGB to help people in Glenwood parks that may be displaced in the future. Has fear that there will not be enough low income access with the current up-front cost of building ADUs, but talks about how he can reach out for grants or other opportunities to help the homeless.

Laurie Hauber, 376 E 11<sup>th</sup> Ave Eugene: Lives in Eugene but works in legal aide, with focus on affordable housing across Lane County. It has been a breath of fresh air to see how Springfield has progressed so rapidly with ADUs. Laurie asks that there is consideration of some kind of amnesty for people who already have an ADU without permits. That is something Eugene is talking



about. She also states affordability is an issue. Finding strategies to make development of ADUs affordable is an important part of this. She's done research that shows the cost of around 70-90 thousand dollars to add an ADU to property. That does make it cost prohibitive for a lot of households. As you deliberate on this, keep cost in consideration to make it affordable housing for low income people. Thank you.

Greg James: No more testimony from audience. We will move into questions from the Commissions. He asks about the communication from Cynthia Pappas in regard to ADU placed on LDR property in urban fringe. Sandy Belson: Replies with data from the Code section 3.3-8.25 and 3.3-8.20 and section 5.12: If lots are more than twice the size of minimum size allowed in that district, a future development plan is required. If there is potential to divide that property, you would need to show how that property would be partitioned and that your ADU is not being placed in a way that would prohibit future development.

Gary Rose: Asks how intensive are the plot plan requirements; what is required for a plot plan?

Stephen Dignam: Question regarding the testimony from Laurie Hauber about amnesty. How can something like that be implemented?

Sandy Belson: There are two aspects to this response. One is unrelated to the code: City of Springfield has an SDC waiver in place for City SDCs, which applies to any ADU to be permitted, whether constructed or not. In terms of building code requirements, that is up to the Building Official. There are fees involved in building permits, standard for any type of structure.

Mike Koivula: If a parcel is potentially partitionable, there will be sewage evaluation. If it is too small and not partitionable, is there a way to make sure the ADU will not overload the drain field or other private sewer facilities?

Sandy Belson: Yes, in the Code, there is a requirement that the sanitarian provide any permits necessary.

Larry Thorp: Has concerns about the future development plans. The purpose of this legislation is to facilitate ADUs as simply and easily as possible. How binding is the future development plan if someone turns one in and wants to change it later?

Sandy Belson: It is not binding. The point is to think about how you can develop in the future.

Mike Koivula: I have a question regarding findings on residential density. It says the ADU will tap into utility lines in place. I have a problem with wording of the finding. There is some discussion around this.

Sandy Belson: Let's delete that sentence to avoid confusion. There were two other typing errors to be corrected, brought up by Mike Koivula.

Larry Thorpe: Questions the maximum size lot where you cannot add an ADU. Asks about staff's thinking for putting that in there, it seems counterintuitive. Sandy replies that is this to preserve Medium and High Density property in order to meet density requirements. Gary Rose, Troy Sherwood, Mike Koivula and Greg James all discuss this with concern about property sizes, the possibility of subdividing, partitioning, and/or rezoning criteria in order to allow the ADUs. Suggestion by Mike Koivula to allow ADU on any size property, if able to show plans that meet density at future development. Sandy advises this be made part of the recommendation to be written into the amendment.

Sandy Belson: One person from the public asked if we will be charging System Development Charges. If you are not connecting to the Sanitary Sewer we would not charge System Development Charge for Sanitary Sewer. Our Municipal Code does require charging System Development Charges in conjunction with building permits outside city limits for stormwater and streets. It will be up to City Council whether that waiver would apply outside city limits. I will bring that to their attention. We won't be charging sanitary sewer SDCs until they hook up.

In terms of the design standards question that was questioned, the impetus for that was to address some design elements as some clear and objective design standards.

In terms of the amnesty, I think we have already addressed that.

Sandy recalls that she wanted to bring up another item included in the proposed amendments: in regards to parking, the change is that we would like to specify that unpaved parking spaces need to be rocked. We would have a standard that would go into

Engineering Design Standards and Procedures Manual that would be adopted in conjunction with these code amendments by the City Council.

Greg James: Any other questions? Greg talks about affordability of ADUs to help with the housing crisis in the city. There is discussion between Sandy and Greg to discuss how the recommendation can include the requirement of having a future development plan to place ADU on higher density properties. More comments and questions are brought up regarding size and dividing properties. Sandy Belson, Greg James and Larry Thorpe discuss how to phrase this recommendation to Council.

Mary Bridget Smith and Sandy Belson identify the three changes to findings to be made and discuss recommendation changes. We can say "add one or two ADUs on a parcel zoned medium or high density with a future development plan, irrespective of the size of the parcel, that will meet density requirements in the future.

Greg James: So we have the three changes to the findings plus that revision. This being a legislative hearing, there is no opportunity for the public to request a continuation. At this time, I would entertain a motion from Springfield Planning Commission to close or continue the public hearing and close or continue the written record.

Troy Sherwood makes a motion to close the Public Hearing and written record; Mike Koivula second. Motion carries unanimous. 7 ayes; 0 noes; 0 absent.

Gary Rose asks for motion from Lane County Planning Commission.

Robert Weeks makes motion for Lane County Planning Commission to close Public Hearing and written record; Dignam seconds. Motion carries unanimous: 6 ayes; 0 noes; 2 absent

Mary Bridget Smith reads motion: Amendments to Springfield Development Code for accessory dwelling units: The motion is to move forward a recommendation to City Council to approve Journal No. #811-18-000065-TYP4 Amendments to the Springfield Development Code regarding accessory dwelling units within the Springfield city limits and urbanizable fringe as proposed in Exhibit B to this Agenda Item with additional provisions that allow 1-2 accessory dwelling units to be built on medium and high density parcels that can meet the necessary densities in the future, irrespective of the size of the parcels, through a future development plan; and to include the revisions to the findings noted by Commissioner Koivula.

Greg James: I move, as stated by our legal counsel for the Springfield Planning Commission to push forward to City Council; Andrew Landen seconds. Motion carries 7 ayes; 0 noes; 0 absent.

Gary Rose: Who would like to make a motion?

Robert Weeks; I would like to make a motion to forward a recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners to adopt the proposed amendment to Lane Code 10 to co-adopt the accessory dwelling unit standards within the City of Springfield's urbanizable area, with changes recommended by legal counsel. Larry Thorpe seconds. Motion carries unanimous: 6 ayes; 0 noes; 2 absent.

Greg James: I move that Springfield Planning Commission forward a recommendation to Springfield City Council that based on the reasoning behind ADUs and the need for low income housing within the city that they consider waiver of SDCs for ADUs being developed within UGB.

Landen brings discussion about time limits for SDC waiver. Greg James says that is for Council to decide. Sean Dunn seconds motion. Vote 7 ayes; 0 noes; 0 absent.

Greg James: Thank you Lane County Commissioners for taking part in this process. Any other business? Hearing none, we are adjourned.

## ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:13 p.m.

Minutes Recorder – Shannon Morris

---

Greg James  
Planning Commission Chair

Attest:

---

Shannon Morris  
Administrative Specialist

---

**AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY**

**Meeting Date:** 10/16/2018  
**Meeting Type:** Regular Meeting  
**Staff Contact/Dept.:** Sandy Belson/DPW  
**Staff Phone No:** 541-736-7135  
**Estimated Time:** 10 minutes  
**Council Goals:** Mandate

**SPRINGFIELD  
PLANNING COMMISSION**

---

**ITEM TITLE:** Planning Commission Leadership

---

**ACTION REQUESTED:** Elect a new chairperson.  
Designate a member to serve as liaison with the City Council.

---

**ISSUE STATEMENT:** Since Commissioner James was the Chairperson and he is no longer on the Planning Commission, the Commission needs to elect a new chairperson. If Commissioner Koivula is elected chairperson, the Commission will need to elect a new vice-chairperson.

Per Council operating procedures, the Planning Commission should designate one member to liaise with the City Council.

---

**ATTACHMENTS:** None

---

**DISCUSSION:** Section 2.410 of the Springfield Municipal Code states that, “At the beginning of each calendar year, the planning commission shall elect a chairperson and a vice-chairperson who shall hold office for one year. Commissioner James has been chairing the commission with Commissioner Koivula as vice-chair. Since Commissioner James’ term expired, the Commission needs to elect a new chairperson.

Section 6 of the 2018 Council Operating Policies and Procedures covers “Communicating with the Mayor and Council”. It has been tradition to have Planning Commissioners attend City Council meetings on a rotating basis. However, Subsection 6.1 states, “Each year, each board, commission, committee or task force shall designate one member to serve as liaison with the City Council. The board member liaison shall coordinate with the City Councilor liaison to establish regular communication regarding upcoming City Council meeting agenda items and of Council decisions that are of interest to these advisory bodies.

Subsection 6.2 states, “Board member liaisons, particularly, and members of advisory bodies, in general, are encouraged to attend City Council meetings to keep abreast of Council actions. Board member liaisons are responsible for attending Council meetings when input from the respective board, committee or task force is requested. Such meeting attendance will be coordinated by the City Councilor liaison.

Currently, there are two Planning Commission liaisons for other Committees. Andy Landen is a non-voting member of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee. Tim Vohs represents the Planning Commission on the Community Development Advisory Committee.

---