

<b>To:</b>	Springfield and Lane County Planning Commissions
<b>From:</b>	Gregory Mott, Planning Manager
<b>Date:</b>	March 16, 2010
<b>Subject:</b>	Planning Commission Actions on Proposed Springfield 2030 Refinement Plan Package

### Issue

The City of Springfield has initiated the following post-acknowledgement plan amendments to the Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan (Metro Plan) and the Springfield Development Code (SDC):

1. A parcel-specific plan diagram for Springfield (Springfield 2030 Refinement Plan Diagram);
2. Selection of a preferred alternative for Springfield's separate Urban Growth Boundary;
3. Springfield 2030 Refinement Plan text and appendices: Residential Land Inventory and Housing Needs Analysis, Commercial and Industrial Buildable Lands Inventory and Economic Opportunities Analysis, Economic Development Objectives and Strategies;
4. Amendments to the Springfield Development Code to implement Land Use Efficiency Measures.

The planning commissions are asked to consider all of the testimony in the record applicable to these actions and then forward their individual recommendations to their respective elected officials.

### Background

The City of Springfield is required by ORS 197.304 to conduct a residential lands determination and establish an urban growth boundary (UGB) separately from the City of Eugene. The residential lands determination was completed by the statutory deadline of December 31, 2009. There is no specific deadline for establishment of the UGB; however, the residential lands determination is based on the period 2010-2030 therefore the new UGB needs to be congruent with this time period to remain a valid representation of supply-demand balance during the planning period.

The City decided to evaluate other urban land needs for this same time period (2010-2030) inasmuch as comparable data on these other activities was either not updated to the year 2030 (commercial and industrial lands); not adopted to the year 2030 (Willamalane Park Plan); or had never before been prepared (school district facilities plan). A complete picture of the City's future land needs and supporting infrastructure is not possible to prepare if the evaluation does not include these other land uses.

The City also included a variety of land use efficiency measures to enable more intensive development of the land already within the City's jurisdiction. Although this latter proposal could have been processed exclusively by the City of Springfield, either before or after the 2030 Refinement Plan, staff believed that the "whole package" of actions might just as well include the whole package to preserve the obvious relationship between new refinement plan policies and respective implementation measures.

### Discussion

The four proposals identified in the Issue section above are based upon the findings and conclusions of the various studies and plans entered into the record as well as the additional evidence provided by staff and the City's consultants. The planning commissions have also received written and oral testimony throughout the open record period of this public hearing from citizens, property owners, state agencies

and interested parties on matters related to one or more of these four proposals. As the planning commissions consider this evidence in furtherance of their deliberation on these proposals, staff has some additional comments on the relationship of these proposals we hope will provide some assistance to your work.

### **Parcel-Specific Plan Diagram**

The four proposals under consideration are related in a purposeful way, but each proposal can proceed independently through this process and independent of the approval or denial of any of the other proposals. The City is proposing a parcel-specific diagram to eliminate uncertainties or the need for interpretation regarding the plan designation of property within the Springfield UGB. This will be an asset for decision-making, customer service, and record keeping purposes.

The parcel-specific plan diagram is an accurate depiction of the true location of each land use category, and the urban growth boundary, as that data is digitized in our GIS system. None of the inventories are being changed (because the data is not being changed); only the representation on the diagram is changing. This is also why leaving the plan diagram as is (general, blob) has no effect on inventories either; the data is not being changed.

A new, parcel-specific urban growth boundary for Springfield does not change any current land use designations nor does it change the existing urban growth boundary (if no expansion to the UGB is adopted by the elected officials) because the UGB will remain exactly where it is with the exception of a new line down the center of I-5 right of way. It also enables the city to comply with the requirement of LCDC's new UGB rules. OAR 660-024-0020 requires that "The UGB and amendments to the UGB must be shown on the city and county plan and zone maps at a scale sufficient to determine which particular lots or parcels are included in the UGB. Where a UGB does not follow lot or parcel lines, the map must provide sufficient information to determine the precise UGB location."

Because a parcel-specific diagram simply interprets and refines the more general Metro Plan Diagram, it does not change the existing status or amount of land within each inventory category. Therefore, the evidence compiled in the review and analysis of the City's residential, commercial and industrial lands is unaffected by a decision to make the diagram parcel-specific or keep the diagram as is.

This action applies to all land within the City's UGB and establishment of the City's new UGB. Adoption of this action requires participation by the City and County as decision-makers.

### **A Preferred Alternative for Springfield's New Urban Growth Boundary**

The final decision on the location of Springfield's new UGB will be determined by the elected officials of Springfield and Lane County, subject only to possible appeals to LUBA, unless 50 or more acres not currently within the UGB are included. If more than 50 acres are added, then the City and County must submit the proposal to the Land Conservation and Development Commission for review in the manner provided for periodic review under ORS 197.628 to 197.650.

The City conducted evaluations of residential, commercial and industrial land needs for the planning period 2010-2030 in response to both a statutory mandate (ORS 197.304) and in compliance with other applicable statutes, Goals and Administrative Rules. These multiple evaluations determined that the City's current inventory of residential buildable lands could accommodate projected future populations, with some minor adjustments to assure adequate supplies of high-density residential lands. However, they also determined that some commercial and industrial sites needed to support the City's Economic Opportunities Analysis (EOA) for the same period do not exist within the City's UGB.

The City undertook an alternative sites analysis, as required by Goal 14, Goal 9 and OAR 660-009 and 660-0024, as a companion piece to the Commercial and Industrial Buildable Lands (CIBL) analysis. This project resulted in the identification of 10 sites adjoining the UGB for consideration to fulfill the requirements of the law and the conclusions of the EOA. The planning commissions are asked to consider the evidence in the record that applies to this matter and to forward their recommendation to the elected officials. The recommendations may be general in nature but should (a) indicate the planning

commissions' preferences regarding *whether, where, how much and for what purposes additional land should be included within Springfield's new UGB and (b) identify issues that they believe the elected officials need to address after they have taken additional evidence at their own public hearings on the subject proposals.*

Note: The alternative sites maps and analysis are illustrative and do not represent staff recommendations. The planning commissions are not limited to selecting just one of the sites identified in the alternative sites analysis, nor must they endorse the entirety of a particular site if the evidence does not support this type of exclusivity. However, if the principal evidence relied upon is the CIBL the planning commission recommendations should be consistent with the Economic Opportunities Analysis (EOA) embedded in the Commercial and Industrial Lands Study (CIBL). In summary, the EOA recommends adding a total of 17 commercial and industrial sites of various sizes and characteristics that comprise 640 total acres.

The planning commissions can forward different recommendations to their respective elected officials, but it is hoped that they will agree on a joint recommendation, : subject to whatever specific concerns each commission may wish to have addressed as the process moves into the public hearings before the elected officials.

The parcel-specific plan diagram will be prepared to reflect the UGB location or locations, if any, recommended by the planning commissions. New plan designations and overlay zones, as described in the following section, will be applied to any new areas included in Springfield's UGB.

The elected officials will make the final determination on this matter and either: 1) provide notice of the decision to the Department of Land Conservation and Development if additional land added is less than 50 acres; or, 2) submit the proposed UGB to the Land Conservation and Development Commission for approval if more than 50 acres are included.

### **Springfield 2030 Refinement Plan Text and Appendices**

The refinement plan text has been developed with several objectives and outcomes in mind: 1) reflect the HB3337 changes to the Metro Plan resulting in new UGBs, new population forecasts and new land use inventories for Springfield separately from Eugene; 2) incorporate recommendations from the EOA which includes a 640 acre expansion of the UGB; 3) create an Urbanization Element describing Springfield's proposal to designate the newly-urbanizable areas as "Urban Holding Areas" that require a Metro Plan Amendment process prior to annexation and urbanization. The UGB Alternatives Analysis will be adopted as an appendix to the Urbanization Element; 4) create an Economic Element that articulates Springfield's economic development goals, objectives, and implementation actions to support Springfield's development and redevelopment strategy. The *Commercial & Industrial Lands Inventory & Economic Opportunities Analysis*, and *Economic Development Objectives and Implementation Strategies* will be adopted as appendices of the Economic Element; and 5) a Residential Land & Housing Element that includes Springfield's proposed housing density and mix to provide land for needed housing and a preliminary proposal to designate land for high density housing in the Glenwood North Riverfront Corridor and in Downtown Springfield. The Springfield Residential Land and Housing Needs Analysis will be adopted as an appendix of the Residential Land & Housing Element.

In the event the elected officials do not add land to the existing UGB, the refinement plan text that was developed to implement the UGB expansion will probably be deleted from the refinement plan. The remainder of the text would be adopted in support of and as a refinement to existing Metro Plan policies in the post-HB3337 environment, and in response to the recommendations of the various citizen advisory committees that participated in the visioning and development of the 2030 Refinement Plan. These policies are applicable to either a parcel-specific or general format plan diagram.

The Planning Commissions can forward recommendations to the elected officials that support, modify or recommend deletion of these policies. It probably makes sense to "batch" recommendations on UGB expansion with urbanization policies: recommend they go forward together or recommend no UGB expansion and no expansion policies.

## **Amendments to the Springfield Development Code to implement Land Use Efficiency Measures**

The fourth element in the package of proposals is a set of land use efficiency measures. These measures were selected from a larger set first proposed during the latter stages of the residential land needs determination in 2008. At that time the stakeholders and city staff believed there was a deficiency of approximately 1,200 acres of residential land. In addition to the potential option of expanding the UGB to address this shortage, the statute requires a city to: “Amend its comprehensive plan, regional plan, functional plan or land use regulations to include new measures that demonstrably increase the likelihood that residential development will occur at densities sufficient to accommodate housing needs for the next 20 years without expansion of the urban growth boundary.” To this end, the planning commission and city council endorsed a number of residential land use/development efficiency measures that have been included as part of this proposal even though the City’s own analysis has concluded there is sufficient residential land within the UGB to accommodate 20 years of growth at slightly higher, but currently permitted densities.

These efficiency measures only apply to land within the city limits (urban level of development is not allowed outside the city limits) and are implemented through changes to the Springfield Development Code rather than the Metro Plan. As such, the normal process for review and adoption is exclusively the purview of the City of Springfield. However, the city council preferred that all proposals required by HB3337 or related to this requirement be processed simultaneously because of the connection each of these elements has to the whole. Implementation of these measures has no effect on the presence or absence of a parcel-specific plan diagram; no effect on the consideration of an expanded UGB; and no effect on proposed 2030 Refinement Plan policies. The planning commissions may forward these efficiency measures as submitted (as new provisions of the Springfield Development Code); as amended; without support; or without comment.

Each proposal requires a separate motion from each planning commission; you are not required to adopt identical motions; you are not required to agree on outcomes; you are not even required to forward a recommendation at all if that is your choice. These are the same options available to the Planning Commission any time they act in an advisory capacity to the elected officials on Metro Plan amendments.

### **Recommendation**

This is a work session discussion of this project; no recommendations are proposed at this time.